

Montréal, le 18 décembre 2020

PAR DÉPÔT ÉLECTRONIQUE (SDE)

Maître Véronique Dubois

Secrétaire

Régie de l'énergie

Place Victoria

800 rue du Square-Victoria, 2^e étage, Bureau 255

Montréal (Québec) H4Z 1A2

Objet : R-3867-2013 Phase 2B

**Demande relative au dossier générique portant sur l'allocation des
coûts et la structure tarifaire d'Énergir**

Notre dossier : 650011-01

Chère consœur,

La présente fait suite aux commentaires d'Énergir à l'égard du budget de participation d'Option consommateurs (ci-après « **OC** ») et constitue sa réplique.

Énergir est préoccupée par la différence entre les heures de préparation de l'expert retenu par OC et celles de l'expert retenu par le ROÉÉ.

D'entrée de jeu, OC est d'avis que les heures de préparation indiquées dans son budget (C-OC- 0106) totalisent plutôt 239 (et non 251) si on fait abstraction des contingences.

Nous avons sollicité M. Marcus pour obtenir ses éclaircissements qui se résument comme suit :

1. The division of the hearing into Volets 1A, 1B, and 2 increases the cost of preparation for and attendance at the hearing. There are three separate hearings to be prepared and attended and three separate arguments to be filed. The extra filings add costs including those related to reviewing and drafting portions of materials and providing input into cross-examination.
2. Separate DDRs and reports will be needed for all three Volets, which also adds to costs. In particular, Volet 2 cannot be prepared until after the Régie decisions on earlier Volets, and its scope may be greater or less than predicted in our draft budget. Additionally, certain costs, such as responding

- to DDRs by other parties, are likely to be higher with three hearing phases than with one phase.
3. I think I could reduce my time if 1A and 1B were taken together by about 30 hours, mostly related to the hearing preparation, hearing attendance and arguments, although some would come from review of Energir's case and preparation of DDRs, and a few hours from preparation of evidence.
 4. I also wish to point out that this case is not an ordinary case, with Énergir on one side and the intervenors aligned with similar positions. In particular, the industrial intervenors (ACIG) and to a lesser extent the commercial intervenors (FCEI) may have positions that differ with those of OC. This makes the hearing more complicated in terms of preparation of cross-examination of other parties.
 5. With all due respect, the scope of issues and the participation of Mr. Chernick is less extensive than the scope of issues and participation I am proposing. Mr. Chernick appears to be participating essentially on issues relating to interruptible customers. OC will be weighing in on several other issues, including weekly load balancing and treatment of some costs as winter, not peak in Volet 1A, testing several items in Volet 1B on cost allocation (inventories, working capital, income taxes, and the method of developing peak loads), and the issues in Volet 2, in particular, rate design within the Rate D-1 class.
 6. To reduce costs, OC could agree to a reduction of Mr. Marcus' time partly offset by an increase in Mr. Cormier's time, whose hourly rate is lower. This reduction would be undistributed between the three Volets.

En terminant, nous tenons à rappeler que le budget d'OC n'est qu'une estimation et que l'évolution du dossier pourrait impacter la charge de travail.

En espérant le tout conforme, nous vous prions d'agréer, chère consœur, nos salutations distinguées.

MUNICONSEIL AVOCATS INC.

(S) Eric McDevitt David

Éric McDevitt David, avocat
emd@municonseil.com

EMD/ml

c.c. Me Hugo Sigouin-Plasse (Énergir)