

June 26, 2026

Ian A. Mondrow
Direct 416-369-4670
ian.mondrow@gowlingwlg.com

VIA RESS

Mr. Ritchie Murray, Registrar
ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD
P.O. Box 2319, 27th Floor
2300 Yonge Street
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Mr. Murray:

Re: EB-2025-0295: Enbridge Gas Inc. (EGI) Application for Multi-Year Natural Gas Demand Side Management Plan (2027-2030)

Industrial Gas Users Association (IGUA) Schedule Revision Request

In its June 23rd *Decision on Evidence* the OEB has approved IGUA's proposed industry evidence, which we can confirm IGUA does intend to file.

In Procedural Order No. 4 the OEB has directed various procedural dates, including a one week period between July 29th and August 4th for preparation and filing of responses to interrogatories on intervenor evidence. We write to request extension of that period in respect of responses to any interrogatories received on IGUA's evidence.

In addition to being a one calendar week period over a statutory 3 day weekend, we would have particular difficulty meeting the relatively short timeline between receipt of, and response to, interrogatories because I will be on a scheduled vacation out of the country and in a different time zone for that entire one week period (and a few days leading up to, and following, that period). In the result, and given that IGUA's evidence will be industry evidence, and thus without an expert for the drafting of interrogatory responses - it would be quite difficult for IGUA and us as counsel to meet this directed turnaround time.

We therefore request a one week extension - to August 13th – for the filing of responses to interrogatories received on IGUA's evidence.

On the basis of the subsequent steps currently scheduled, which are related to consideration of additional process for the matter, the requested extension for filing IGUA's interrogatory responses would not have a substantive impact on advancement of the proceeding.

We acknowledge, however, that EGI filed a letter yesterday in which it requested that the currently scheduled EGI technical conference be rescheduled as a later technical conference on both EGI and intervenor evidence. Granting of IGUA's request for a one week delay in the filing of its interrogatory

responses would mean that EGI's suggestion that such a combined technical conference "*could be as early as the week of August 10th*" might not be tenable, if the OEB is inclined to grant IGUA's request but wishes to have written responses on any interrogatories on IGUA's evidence filed prior to that combined technical conference. EGI's request might also have implications for the scheduling of the procedural meeting contemplated in Procedural Order No. 4, and granting such request would also mean that intervenor witnesses would not have the benefit of the EGI clarification of its interrogatory responses prior to finalizing their own evidence. At the same time, we are sensitive to EGI's reasonable concerns regarding the very tight timelines provided in the currently directed schedule.

In any event, we would appreciate the OEB's consideration of IGUA's request herein, both in and of itself and in conjunction with any reconsideration of other aspects of the procedural schedule set out in Procedural Order No. 4.

Yours truly,



Ian A. Mondrow

c. Nazim Sebaa, IGUA
Haris Ginis, EGI
Dennis O'Leary, EGI Counsel
Intervenors of Record

95413264\2