Was preliminary page 1 1

RP-2001-0032

2

IN THE MATTER OF the *Ontario Energy Board Act* [12JF7-0:1], 1998, S.O. 1998, C.15, Sch. B;

3

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Application by Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc., formerly The Consumers' Gas Company Ltd., for an order of orders approving or fixing rates for the sale, distribution, transmission and storage of gas for its 2002 fiscal year.

4

BEFORE: Sheila K. Halladay
Presiding Member
A.Catherina Spoel
Member
Bob Betts
Member

5

DECISION WITH REASONS

6

2002 December 13

Was preliminary page 2 7

Blank page

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES (Contained in Volume 2)

Blank page

Blank page

Was page 1 14

1. INTRODUCTION

15

1.1 THE APPLICATION

16

1.1.1 Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc., formerly, The Consumers' Gas Company Ltd., carrying on business as Enbridge Consumers Gas, ("ECG", the "Company" or the "Applicant") filed an application dated September 25, 2001 (the "Application") with the Ontario Energy Board (the "Board") under section 36 [12JF7-0:266] of the *Ontario Energy Board Act*, 1998 (the "Act"), for an order or orders approving or fixing just and reasonable rates for the sale, distribution, transmission, and storage of gas for ECG's 2002 fiscal year commencing October 1, 2001 ("2002 Test Year"). The Board assigned file number RP-2001-0032 to the Application.

17

1.2 THE PROCEEDING

18

1.2.1 On October 15, 2001 the Board issued a Notice of Application, which was published and served in accordance with the Board's direction during the latter part of October 2001.

Was page 2 19

1.2.2 On November 16, 2001 the Board issued Procedural Order No. 1 establishing a two-phase proceeding. The Board determined that in the first phase, it would consider all of the issues contained in the Application, except for the Company's request for a review of the formula used to derive the rate of return on common equity ("ROE"). The Board would review the ROE formula in a subsequent phase.

20

1.2.3 Procedural Order No. 1 also provided the initial procedural schedule for the first phase: namely, written interrogatories to ECG, followed by an Issues Conference and an Issues Day on December 18 and 19, 2001, respectively.

21

1.2.4 Procedural Order No. 2, issued on December 28, 2001 established the Issues List, which is attached as Appendix A [1101] to this Decision with Reasons.

22

1.2.5 The Company completed its filing of new and updated evidence on January 29, 2002. In Procedural Order No. 3, dated February 4, 2002, the Board established an additional interrogatory process to deal with the Company's new and updated evidence.

23

1.2.6 Procedural Order No. 3 also made provision for Intervenors to present evidence by March 11, 2002 and for parties to submit written interrogatories on that evidence by March 18, 2002.

24

1.2.7 In response to Procedural Order No. 3, The Consumers Association of Canada ("CAC") submitted evidence prepared by Mark P. Stauft and the Green Energy Coalition ("GEC") submitted evidence prepared by Chris Neme.

Was page 3

25

1.2.8 On March 19, 2002 the Board issued Procedural Order No. 4 which provided for a Settlement Conference to begin on April 22, 2002, a Settlement Proposal to be filed on May 10, 2002, and proposed a hearing date of May 28, 2002. The Settlement Proposal was not filed until May 17, 2002.

26

1.2.9 Procedural Order No. 5 set June 4, 2002 as the date for the commencement of the oral hearing. The hearing took place over ten hearing days and concluded on June 21, 2002.

27

1.2.10 During the course of the hearing, the parties agreed to the following schedule for filing their respective written arguments: Applicant's Argument-in-Chief - July 5, 2002; Intervenors' Arguments - July 17, 2002; and Applicant's Reply Argument - July 29, 2002. In fact, arguments were filed on the following dates: the Applicant's Argument-in Chief - July 8, 2002; the Intervenors' Arguments - July 22, 2002; and the Applicant's Reply Argument - August 13, 2002.

28

1.2.11 Subsequent to the oral hearing the Board also received the following material on the dates indicated:

29

•	July 26, 2002	Affidavit of Stephen McGill
•	July 31, 2002	ECG Statement of Business Conduct
•	August 1, 2002	IGUA Further Argument
•	August 2, 2002	CAC Supplementary Argument
•	August 29, 2002	CEED Discussion Paper
•	August 30, 2002	CEED Further Argument
•	September 5, 2002	Letter from ECG disputing CEED's Further Argument
•	September 9, 2002	HVAC letter re CEED's Further Argument

Was page 4

30

•	November 12, 2002	IGUA Submission - Nova Scotia Power Decision
•	November 15, 2002	ECG Reply to IGUA Submission

• November 18, 2002 IGUA Reply Submission

31

1.3 QUARTERLY RATE ADJUSTMENT MECHANISM

32

1.3.1 During the course of the proceeding, ECG made three separate applications to the Board and the Board issued interim orders to implement, effective January 1, 2002, April 1, 2002 and July 1, 2002, adjustments to ECG's commodity rates under a quarterly rate adjustment mechanism ("QRAM"). Each of these applications was substantially in the format approved by the Board, on a trial basis, as part of the settlement proposal (the "2001 Settlement Proposal") in the RP-2000-0040 proceeding for setting rates for ECG's 2001 fiscal year.

33

1.4 LATE PAYMENT PENALTY

34

1.4.1 By letter dated October 4, 2001 the Board directed ECG to review its late payment penalty ("LPP") in the context of this proceeding. The Ontario Court of Appeal decided on December 3, 2001 that "the Board will need to address an alternative mechanism for applying late payment penalties forthwith": *Garland v. Consumers' Gas Co. Ltd.* (2001), 57 O.R. (3d) 127 at 152.

35

1.4.2 By letter dated December 14, 2001 ECG advised the Board that it was studying two alternative approaches to revising the LPP. On January 10, 2002 ECG advised the Board that one option was to reduce the percentage for the one-time LPP from 5% to 2% and the other was to adopt a revolving credit style interest charge. ECG proposed to implement its revised LPP on February 1, 2002. The Board assigned file number EB- 2001-0837 (RP-2001-0032) to this application.

Was page 5 36

1.4.3 ECG recommended the first option as an interim measure; however, it indicated that a time-based charge -- the second option -- might be the preferred LPP option and that ECG might bring forward this option in the future.

37

1.4.4 ECG also proposed to establish an LPP Variance Account for the Test Year ("2002 LPPVA") to capture the variances between actual and forecast LPP revenues, together with the implementation costs of the revised LPP.

38

1.4.5 The Board accepted ECG's recommendation for a one-time penalty of 2%, on an interim basis, and in its Decision and Interim Order dated January 31, 2002 ordered that the new LPP would be effective February 1, 2002. The Board did not approve ECG's proposed 2002 LPPVA. Modifications to the Company's Rate Handbook to reflect the new LPP of 2% were approved by the Board as part of the QRAM proceeding to implement interim rates effective April 1, 2002.

39

1.5 PARTICIPANTS AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES

40

1.5.1 Below is a list of participants and their representatives that were active either at the oral hearing or throughout the various other stages of the proceeding.

Board Counsel and Staff	Pat Moran
	Colin Schuch

Was page 6

42

Enbridge Consumers Gas	Jerry Farrell
	Helen Newland
	Marika Hare
	Tom Ladanyi
Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters ("CME")	Andrew Green
	Tom Moutsatsos
	Malcolm Rowan
Union Gas Limited ("Union")	Pat McMahon
Green Energy Coalition ("GEC")	David Poch
	Kai Millyard
The Ontario Association of School Business Officials (the "Schools")	Tom Brett
Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning Contractors Coalition Inc. ("HVAC")	Ian Mondrow

TransCanada PipeLines Limited ("TCPL")	Tibor Haynal
Consumers' Association of Canada ("CAC")	Robert Warren Julie Girvan
Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition ("VECC")	Michael Janigan Susan Lott Joyce Poon
Coalition for Efficient Energy Distribution ("CEED")	George Vegh Elisabeth DeMarco
Pollution Probe Foundation ("Pollution Probe")	Murray Klippenstein Jack Gibbons
Industrial Gas Users Association ("IGUA")	Peter C. P. Thompson

Was page 7 43

1.5.2 Gerry Haggarty, representing Superior Energy Management, requested and was granted late intervenor status to participate in the EB-2002-0364 proceeding, the QRAM effective July 1, 2002.

44

Witnesses

45

1.5.3 The following Company employees appeared as witnesses at the oral hearing:

46

Robert Bourke	Manager, Regulatory Accounting
Frank Brennan	Director, Energy Policy and Analysis
Dave Charleson	Manager, Strategic and Key Accounts
Pascale Duguay	Manager, Rate Research and Design
Janet Holder	Vice President, Operations

Tom Ladanyi	Manager, Regulatory Proceedings
Steve McGill	Manager, Customer Support Programs
Arunas Pleckaitis	Vice President, Opportunity Development
Rocco Riccio	Manager, Capital Knowledge Centre
Don Small	Manager, Gas Costs and Budget

47 1.5.4 In addition, the Company called the following witnesses:

48

Richard G. DeWolf	Senior Vice-President, Ziff Energy Group
Dr. W. G. Foster	Executive Vice-President, Foster Associates Inc.
Jim Bracken	Bracken Consulting

Was page 8 49 1.5.5 CAC called the following witness:

50

Mark P. Stauft	Independent Regulatory Consultant

1.6 THE SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL

51

52 1.6.1 A settlement proposal (the "Settlement Proposal") was filed with the Board on May 17, 2002 and updated pages were filed on June 14, 2002. A copy of the Settlement Proposal is attached as Appendix B [1150] to this Decision with Reasons.

53 1.6.2 The Settlement Proposal contained complete settlement for 26 issues and conditional settlement of the following four issues:

54 • Link Pipeline (Issue 2.2) ;

55 • Z-factor Budgeting Symmetry (Issue 6.3); and

56 • Customer Information System ("CIS") Z-Factor (Issues 9.1and 9.2).

57

1.6.3 There was no agreement in the Settlement Proposal to settle the following five matters, containing eight issues:

58

- Alliance and Vector Transportation Arrangements(Issue 2.1);

59

- System Gas Cost Allocations (Issues 2.3 and 2.4);

60

- ECG's Distribution Plant Work and Asset Management Solution ("DPWAMS ") Information Technology Project (Issue 4.2) ;

61

- Affiliate Outsourcing Arrangements (Issue 5.3); and

62

- Deferred Income Taxes (Issues 10.1,10.2 and10.3).

63

1.6.4 On June 4, 2002 counsel for ECG explained the Settlement Proposal to the Board; however, the financial impact statements relating to the Settlement Proposal were not available at that time, thereby delaying the Board's consideration of the Settlement Proposal.

Was page 9 64

1.6.5 At the oral hearing ECG advised the Board that the Company had revised its plans with respect to DPWAMS and, accordingly, there would be no rate impact as a result of DPWAMS for the 2002 Test Year. After hearing the submissions of the parties, the Board determined that dealing with the DPWAMS issue in this proceeding would be premature.

65

1.6.6 As part of the Settlement Proposal, ECG and the other parties requested that the Board deal with the Deferred Income Taxes (Issues 10.1,10.2 and 10.3) in a separate phase of this proceeding or a separate proceeding. In accepting the Settlement Proposal, the Board indicated that it would issue a procedural order to establish a separate proceeding to deal with the deferred taxes issues in due course.

66

1.6.7 ECG filed the financial impact statements relating to the Settlement Proposal on June 7, 2002. The Board reviewed the financial impact statements and on June 14, 2002, accepted the financial consequences of the Settlement Proposal for rate-making purposes for the 2002 Test Year. The financial statements reflecting the financial impact of the Settlement Proposal and forming the basis of the final rates are attached as Appendix C [1724] to this Decision with Reasons.

67

1.6.8 On July 12, 2002 ECG filed a letter with the Board withdrawing its request for a review of the formula used to derive ROE in this proceeding and on July 17, 2002 filed a letter with the Board requesting that the Board's order with respect to rates for the 2002 Test Year be made final. As a result it will not be necessary for the Board to hold a subsequent phase of this proceeding to deal with the ROE issue.

Was page 10 68

1.6.9 The Board issued its Final Rate Order for the 2002 Test Year on July 25, 2002. The new rates became effective on August 1, 2002 and included a retroactive adjustment to October 1, 2001, the beginning of the 2002 Test Year.

69

1.6.10 As a result of the Board's acceptance of the Settlement Proposal and the Company's decision on DPWAMS, the Board notes that none of the issues dealt with in the oral hearing had a direct impact on the determination of rates for the 2002 Test Year. This Decision with Reasons deals with the following issues, which were the subject of the oral hearing:

70

- Alliance and Vector (Issue 2.1);

71

- Cost allocation of Gas Supply Management Costs (Issues 2.3 and 2.4); and

72

- Affiliate Outsourcing (Issue 5.3).

73

1.6.11 In addition, in Chapter 6 [974], the Board has made comments on additional matters.

74

1.6 CHANGE OF NAME

75

1.6.12 The Company informed the Board that effective July 25, 2002 the legal name of The Consumers' Gas Company Ltd. was changed to Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. For ease of reference, however, in this Decision with Reasons, the Board continues to refer to Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. as "ECG", the "Company", or the "Applicant", since these are the terms that were used throughout the proceeding.

Was page 11 76

1.7 SUBMISSIONS AND EXHIBITS

77

1.7.1 Copies of the evidence, exhibits, arguments, and transcripts of the proceeding are available for review at the Board's offices.

78

1.7.2 The Board has considered the evidence, submissions and arguments in the proceeding, but has summarized the evidence and the positions of the parties only to the extent necessary to provide context for its findings.

79

1.7.3 The Board, with industry participation, has developed standards and processes for the electronic regulatory filing ("ERF") of evidence, submissions of parties, Board orders and decisions. This Decision with Reasons will be available in ERF form shortly after initial copies are issued in hard form. The ERF version will have the same text and numbered headings as the hard form, but may be formatted differently.

Was page 12 80

Blank page

Was page 13 81

2. THE SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL

82

2.1 COMMENTS

83

2.1.1 The Board believes that it would be helpful to the parties to make the following comments on the Settlement Proposal.

84

2.2 SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL - GENERAL

85

2.2.1 The Board is pleased that the parties were able to reach an agreement to propose a settlement to the Board on a large number of complex issues. In particular the Board would like to acknowledge the efforts of Gail Morrison, the settlement facilitator. The Board notes that as they did in the settlement of the 2001 Test Year, the parties were able to reach agreement on all of the monetary issues impacting rates for the 2002 Test Year, allowing the Board to issue a final rate order expeditiously.

86

2.2.2 The Board also recognizes the effort by all the parties in preparing the Settlement Proposal document, including delineating the scope of the issues. The Board appreciates the explanation of the issues, settled and unsettled, given by counsel for ECG at the commencement of the oral hearing.

Was page 14 87

2.3 TIMING

88

2.3.1 The Board is concerned about the length of time taken for filing the Settlement Proposal document. The Board notes that this delayed the start of the hearing by a week and contributed to the overall delay in the process.

89

2.3.2 The Board appreciates that there is a balance between a comprehensive Settlement Proposal document and the need to proceed expeditiously with the oral phase of the proceeding. It would assist the Board if, in future proceedings, the parties provided the Board with a realistic estimate of the time required to finalize the Settlement Proposal document so that an appropriate schedule for the proceeding could be determined.

90

2.3.3 The Board notes that the financial impact statements relating to the Settlement Proposal were not filed until after the start of the oral hearing. It is essential for the Board to consider and review the financial impact in order to determine whether the Settlement Proposal should be accepted. The Board reminds the parties that the *Settlement Conference Guidelines* anticipate that this material will be filed prior to the commencement of the oral hearing.

91

2.4 GAS VOLUME BUDGET

92

2.4.1 In settling Issue 1.1 in the 2001 Settlement Proposal intervenors expressed their concern about ECG's new average use forecasting methodology in general, and the accuracy of the new models in particular, and reserved the right to examine ECG's forecasting model in this proceeding. The 2001 Settlement Proposal required ECG to file evidence in this proceeding on the results the forecasting models would have generated for Fiscal 2001 using actual data for all driver variables. ECG contended that the results indicate that the average use models are "good objective predictors of average uses and do not exhibit any systematic bias". The intervenors believed that it was too soon to pronounce definitively on whether these models are working well at this point, given the limited experience with ECG's econometric models for forecasting average uses.

Was page 15 93

2.4.2 The Board notes that although the parties have reached an agreement in the Settlement Proposal on the throughput forecast to be used for setting rates in the 2002 Test Year, the Board makes no determination as to the overall accuracy of the model or whether the model should be accepted as a basis for forecasting throughput in future rates cases.

94

2.5 UNDERUTILIZATION OF THE LINK PIPELINE

95

2.5.1 The Board notes that the Settlement Proposal provides that the full costs of underutilization of the Link Pipeline will be to the shareholder's account and that the underutilization amount that was posted to the Purchased Gas Variance Account ("PGVA") will now be eliminated.

96

2.5.2 The Board expects ECG, when clearing the PGVA, to provide the Board with sufficient evidence to confirm that the underutilization entries have been eliminated in accordance with the agreement reached in the Settlement Proposal.

97

2.6 RISK MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Was page 16 98

2.6.1 As part of the 2001 Settlement Proposal ECG agreed to form a working group to examine the principles that underpin ECG's Risk Management Program. The Board notes that ECG has retained Peyton Feltus of Randolph Risk Management to review ECG's Gas Supply Risk Management Policies and Procedures Manual and has agreed to file the updated manual for examination in ECG's next rates case.

99

2.7 QUARTERLY RATE ADJUSTMENT MECHANISM ("QRAM")

100

2.7.1 In the 2001 Settlement Proposal the parties agreed to a new methodology for adjusting the utility gas commodity price during the test year and clearing ECG's PGVA on a quarterly basis.

101

2.7.2 The QRAM for ECG commenced in the 2002 Test Year, with the first adjustment under the new methodology effective January 1, 2002. The Board reviewed and approved, in the form of interim rate orders, a total of three QRAM applications relating to the 2002 Test Year.

102

2.7.3 The Board observes that on two occasions during the 2002 Test Year (rate adjustments effective January 1, 2002 and July 1, 2002) the QRAM applications did not strictly comply with the approved methodology. The QRAM methodology is designed so that applications can be dealt with on an expedited, summary basis and the Board is reluctant to agree to ECG's unilateral changes in the methodology without the agreement of the other parties.

Was page 17 103

2.7.4 The 2001 Settlement Proposal anticipated that:

104

> The new methodology, including the $0.5¢/m^3$ adjustment and clearance thresholds, will be examined thoroughly in the light of the eight principles enumerated earlier in this settlement. This examination will occur in ECG's next rates case following fiscal 2002 or, instead, in a proceeding held for this purpose subsequent to Fiscal 2002. ECG will prepare and file, for this purpose, a report on customer response, customer care costs, and administrative costs. ECG will also prepare and file a consequential recommendation on adjusting or maintaining, as the case may be, the size of the adjustment and clearance thresholds.

105

2.7.5 At the oral hearing, when dealing with the QRAM adjustment to be effective July 1, 2002, a number of parties commented that minor changes in the QRAM methodology may be desirable.

106

2.7.6 The Board notes that the Union settlement agreement in the recent RP-2001-0029 proceeding proposed that Union's QRAM methodology be examined in conjunction with ECG's fiscal 2003 rates case or in a generic proceeding held specifically for that purpose. Although the Board would like to see convergence in the QRAM methodologies for ECG and Union, the Board recognizes the two methodologies contain fundamentally different approaches.

107

2.7.7 The Board expects that the ECG's QRAM review will be dealt with in the fiscal 2003 rate case, if possible.

Was page 18 108

2.8 COST OF SHORT AND LONG TERM DEBT

109

2.8.1 The Board is concerned that ECG's credit rating has been downgraded, in part, due to the ratings actions on ECG's ultimate parent, Enbridge Inc. ("EI") and about the impact of the resulting additional costs of debt incurred by the utility. The Board expects ECG to establish the reasonableness of the cost of debt for rate-making purposes attributable to the utility alone, and not as a result of any linkage between ECG's and EI's credit profiles.

110

2.9 DISTRIBUTION PLANT WORK AND ASSET MANAGEMENT SOLUTION

111

2.9.1 The Board notes that the DPWAMS issue was not resolved in the Settlement Proposal. The Board has a number of concerns with respect to the DPWAMS project.

112

2.9.2 First, the Board notes that ECG's pre-filed evidence dealt with the DPWAMS project in a cursory manner and included only a small section on DPWAMS in the IT Capital Budget section although the project cost was estimated initially at $20.5 million over a two-year period.

113

2.9.3 While this evidence was augmented, to a degree, by interrogatories from Board staff and the intervenors, the Board notes that ECG did not file the supporting business case document, requested by parties in the interrogatories, until April 12, 2002, approximately one week prior to the commencement of the Settlement Conference.

Was page 19 114

2.9.4 Indeed, ECG had not responded to all of the interrogatories prior to the Settlement Conference and the Settlement Proposal indicated:

115

> ECG is prepared to respond to interrogatories from the other parties. ECG will use its best efforts to file responses to these interrogatories prior to the commencement of the Board's oral hearing.

116

2.9.5 On the first day of the oral hearing, ECG advised the Board that it would not be filing the responses to interrogatories nor updating its evidence on DPWAMS, including cost estimates, for several days.

117

2.9.6 While a number of intervenors acknowledged that ECG had made efforts to answer the interrogatories, the Board is very concerned that ECG did not provide the Board and the intervenors with all of the relevant information concerning DPWAMS on a timely basis. The Board realizes that some decisions, of necessity, must be made quickly and based on less than perfect information, however, this is not one of them.

118

2.9.7 At the oral hearing ECG further amended its Application and evidence to reflect that ECG had revised its schedule for the DPWAMS project and that it was no longer seeking approval to close any portion of the DPWAMS project to rate base in the 2002 Test Year. Consequently the DPWAMS project would have no impact on rates for the 2002 Test Year. However, ECG advised the Board that before it was prepared to proceed with the DPWAMS project, the Company required a "degree of confidence" that the costs of the project would be recovered from ratepayers.

119

2.9.8 Accordingly, at the oral hearing ECG advised that it was requesting the following decisions from the Board:

120

- approval in principle of the DPWAMS project;

Was page 20 121

- an indication that the reasonable costs of the project would be recovered from ratepayers under whatever rate methodology is used for rate setting purposes in the period in question provided that the project is demonstrated to be complete and fully functional; and

122

- acceptance of the $6.0 million of DPWAMS capital expenditure costs for the Test Year.

123

2.9.9 The approval in principle would comprise:

124

- agreement that a distribution plant work and asset management solution is required;

125

- agreement that the solution proposed by the Company would deliver the required functionality; and

126

- agreement that the costs of the Project, as currently forecast, are reasonable.

127

2.9.10 ECG claimed that the DPWAMS project was required to "maintain, not to enhance but to maintain, levels of productivity" and that without the project "service levels will deteriorate and costs will increase ... In other words DPWAMS is not discretionary".

128

2.9.11 However, in ECG's answer to a CAC interrogatory, ECG advised that senior management had not yet approved the implementation of the DPWAMS project. ECG argued that Company management "has complete confidence in the project and that was demonstrated when it approved the business case and gave us the green light to continue seeking the approvals that we require in this proceeding".

Was page 21 129

2.9.12 The Board notes that at the time of the oral hearing the Company's management had not given approval to the implementation of the DPWAMS project.

130

2.9.13 ECG advised that if the Board did not grant the requested relief, ECG would probably not spend money on the DPWAMS project and would see what other possible solutions there might be at less shareholder risk. At the time of the oral hearing, ECG had not investigated alternative solutions.

131

2.9.14 This approach is unacceptable to the Board. Prospective rate-making requires that the utility must advise the Board of its intended actions and forecasted costs in advance of the test year. The plans must be real and not hypothetical and management must be committed to implementing these plans. The Board is not prepared to scrutinize a project and "pre-approve" a project before the Company's management is committed to it.

132

2.9.15 Regulatory principles dictate that costs reasonably incurred to produce something that is used and useful are recoverable from ratepayers in rates. The onus remains on the utility to establish that expenditures have met this standard.

133

2.10 PBR O&M

134

2.10.1 The Board notes that in the EBRO 497-01 Decision [12K5V-0:1], dated April 22, 1999, approving the Company's targeted performance-based regulation plan for operations and maintenance expenses ("TPBR"), the Board stated at paragraph 3.0.5 [12K5V-0:194]:

135

> The Board also accepts the three year term of the plan, with the expectation that the Company will have developed, in consultation with stakeholders, and be ready to implement, an appropriate comprehensive PBR plan at the end of this term.

Was page 22 136

2.10.2 The Board notes that the 2002 Test Year is the last year of the TPBR. The Board understands that the Company has applied for a cost of service approach for ECG's 2003 fiscal year, as a basis for an incentive regulation plan.

137

2.10.3 The Board is also aware that there are ongoing discussions with the stakeholders group regarding the development of an appropriate incentive regulation structure. The Board encourages the parties to continue with their consultations in an effort to reach an agreement on a proposed structure.

138

2.10.4 The Board is concerned that timing may simply not permit an appropriate review and subsequent Board decision in time to implement an incentive regulation scheme prior to the start of the ECG's 2004 fiscal year. The Board cautions the parties that it may be reluctant to proceed with what would amount to a "retroactive" incentive regulation plan, as such a plan would not only be an oxymoron but appears to be counter-intuitive to the theory of incentive regulation.

139

2.11 DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT

140

2.11.1 In its comments on the 2001 Settlement Proposal, the Board stated:

141

> The Board shares the concern expressed by customer-oriented parties about the overall rate at which the Demand Side Management ("DSM") costs are increasing relative to gas savings, the consequential impact on rates, and the extent to which ECG needs incentives to further control costs in this area. The parties' agreement to determine the budget and the pivot point in advance of the test year is a good first step.

Was page 23 142

2.11.2 During Issues Day in this proceeding, responding to concerns raised by CME, the Board indicated that while there is a need to review the underlying design principles in the Company's DSM plan, the question is when and how. The Board noted that the Company was committed to completing its review and submitting a DSM plan that is compatible with comprehensive performance based regulation in the first or second quarter of calendar 2002. As a result, the Board determined at Issues Day that it would be premature to conduct a DSM review during this proceeding.

143

2.11.3 The Board notes that Issue 8.3 of the Settlement Proposal dealing with clearance of balances recorded in the 2000 Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account ("2000 SSMVA") and the 2000 Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism ("2000 LRAM") envisages that, after delivery of the final audit report, ECG will finalize the amounts to be recorded in the 2000 SSMVA and the 2000 LRAM by July 31, 2002. A settlement conference for this issue will be convened following the delivery of the position papers by the other parties, and resolved and unresolved issues will be presented to the Board in the proceeding established to examine ECG's rates application for Fiscal 2003, or earlier, if the schedule permits.

144

2.11.4 The Board realizes the importance of the DSM issue and the fact that these issues relate to clearance of 2000 accounts. Accordingly the Board has issued a procedural order establishing a settlement conference to deal with these issues commencing December 3, 2002.

Was page 24 145

2.12 DEFERRED TAXES

146

2.12.1 The Board notes that as part of the Settlement Proposal, ECG and the other parties requested that the Board deal with deferred taxes issues (Issues 10.1,10.2 and 10.3) in a separate phase of this proceeding or a separate proceeding. In accepting the Settlement Proposal, the Board indicated that it would be issuing a procedural order to establish a separate proceeding for dealing with the deferred taxes issues, in due course. The Board understands that the parties have been meeting with Board staff in an attempt to narrow the issues to be determined by the Board.

147

2.13 DEFERRAL AND VARIANCE ACCOUNTS

148

2.13.1 The Board once again is generally concerned with the proliferation of deferral and variance accounts. In particular the Board is concerned with the establishment of the Unaccounted For Gas Variance Account for the 2002 Test Year ("2002 UAFVA") to record variances between forecast and actual unaccounted for ("UAF") gas. While the Board notes that this account has been established on a "trial basis" the Board is concerned that ECG must establish valid reasons as to why the forecast error remains high and is a risk that should be mitigated by the creation of a variance account.

Was page 25 149

2.14 RETROACTIVITY

150

2.14.1 The Board continues to have concerns about the retroactive application of rates. The proposal outlined in section 12.3 of the Settlement Proposal for the Board to "assist ECG in getting back on

track, as it were, by issuing a partial, and then final, Decision with Reasons" is not a long term solution to this problem.

151

2.14.2 In particular, the Board is concerned with timing and delays in this rates proceeding. The Application was filed only days before the beginning of the 2002 Test Year. The initial evidence was incomplete and significant pieces of the Company's pre-filed evidence were filed well after the initial filing of September 25, 2001. Missed deadlines, incomplete evidence, lack of full disclosure, delays in answering the interrogatories, and unsolicited evidence updates requiring additional rounds of interrogatories all contributed to the length of time for the process. ECG is now approximately nine months behind where it should be for a typical prospective test year rate case.

152

2.14.3 The Board is not convinced that ECG is making sufficient efforts to "get back on track" and is concerned that ECG may not be dedicating sufficient resources to the regulatory process.

153

2.14.4 The Board expects ECG to develop, in consultation with Board Staff and the intervenors, a realistic plan for future applications to "get back on track" and avoid retroactivity.

Was page 26 154

Blank page

Was page 27 155

3. ALLIANCE AND VECTOR

156

3.1 BACKGROUND

157

The Alliance Pipeline Project

158

3.1.1 Alliance Pipeline Limited Partnership and Alliance Pipeline L.P. (together "Alliance") announced its pipeline project on June 10, 1996. The project involved a large scale natural gas pipeline extending from northeastern British Columbia and northwestern Alberta to Joliet in the vicinity of Chicago, Illinois ("Chicago"). The pipeline provided western Canadian gas producers with greater exit capacity from producing regions in northeast British Columbia and parts of Alberta and direct access to the major gas markets of the midwest region of the United States. EI was one of the 18 original sponsors of the Alliance pipeline and initially held a 10.9% ownership interest.

159

3.1.2 ECG advised the Board that the purpose of the Alliance pipeline was to provide an alternative to the existing TransCanada Pipelines Ltd. ("TCPL") pipeline which had insufficient capacity at the time to serve market growth projections and served as a limit on the extent to which western Canadian producers could supply that market growth.

Was page 28 160

3.1.3 Alliance received regulatory approval from the U.S. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC"), in the form of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, on September 17, 1998. Similar regulatory approval was received from the Canada's National Energy Board ("NEB") on November 26, 1998.

161

3.1.4 About the same time as Alliance was announced, there were a number of competing proposals, including TCPL's NEXUS project and the Northern Border project which, if approved and built, would also improve exit capacity and provide additional access to the U.S. Midwest markets.

162

3.1.5 ECG made its first formal commitment to the Alliance project in November 1996. At the time ECG made this commitment, it had not yet made firm arrangements to complete the physical delivery of the Alliance-delivered gas from Chicago to ECG's storage pools near Dawn, Ontario.

163

3.1.6 In the summer of 1996 however, ECG had begun discussions with parties about moving gas from Chicago to Dawn. ECG's most promising transportation route, at the time, was the path proposed by ANR Pipeline Company ("ANR") comprising ANR's system, expanded as required, and the Link pipelines with Michigan Consolidated Gas Company ("MichCon") as the intermediate transporter between the two.

Was page 29 164

3.1.7 With the withdrawal of ANR in February 1997, the ANR/MichCon/Link pipelines were not going to be built as planned. This meant that ECG was required to find another physical route to connect the gas delivered to Chicago by the Alliance pipeline to its storage pools near Dawn.

165

The Vector Pipeline Project

166

3.1.8 On June 27, 1997, Vector Pipeline L. P. and Vector Pipeline Limited Partnership (together "Vector") announced the Vector project, a new international pipeline project that would provide natural gas transportation service between the large market hub located at Chicago, Illinois and the existing hub located at Dawn. Gas transported on Vector could be purchased either at the Chicago hub or further upstream from a number of American and western Canadian supply basins.

167

3.1.9 TriState was a pipeline proposal in competition with Vector at the time. TriState filed its application with the FERC on November 9, 1998 and with the NEB on December 23, 1998. With the withdrawal of TriState's applications in January 2000, Vector became the only physical route from Chicago to Dawn.

168

3.1.10 ECG made its first formal commitment to the Vector project on June 1, 1999 and a subsequent commitment for transportation capacity was made to Vector on December 22, 1999.

169

3.1.11 ECG's first Vector commitment was designed to accommodate it's Firm Transportation ("FT") and Authorized Overrun Service ("AOS") entitlements with Alliance when the "rich gas" is converted to energy units. ECG described its Alliance commitments and the first commitment to Vector as a "matched pair" that created a single transportation path for ECG from western Canada to Dawn.

Was page 30 170

3.2 THE ISSUE

171

3.2.1 This issue in this proceeding concerns the prudence of ECG's decisions to enter into long term transportation arrangements with Alliance and Vector, including a review of the associated cost consequences of these arrangements.

172

3.2.2 There were four specific decisions made by ECG at issue in this proceeding:

173

- in November 1996 ECG's decision to enter into precedent agreements with Alliance, for a term of 15 years once all contractual conditions were satisfied, to acquire Firm Transportation ("FT") service from Alliance for a daily volume of 1,415.4 10^3m^3 /d and 50.0MMcf/d, plus authorized overrun service ("AOS") respectively in Canada and United States ("Alliance 1");

174

- in November 1997 ECG's decision to increase its commitment to Alliance by 708.2 10^3m^3 /d and 25.0 MMcf/d to 2,124.6 10^3m^3 /d and 75.0 Mmcf/d,of FT Service plus AOS ,respectively in Canada and United States by accepting an assignment of this capacity from Alberta Energy Company Ltd. ("AEC") at the same time as EI acquired an additional ownership interest of 8.036% in Alliance from AEC ("Alliance 2");

175

- ECG's decision, in June 1999 to acquire FT service from Vector for 96,000 Dth/d and 101,295 GJ/d, respectively in the United States and Canada ("Vector 1"); and

Was page 31 176

- ECG's decision, in December 1999 to acquire a second tranche of FT service from Vector for 79,000 Dth/d and 83,360 GJ/d, respectively, in the United States and Canada ("Vector 2").

177

3.2.3 The prudence of ECG's actions in entering into these long term transportation arrangements was challenged by several of the intervenors. CAC, CME and VECC each took a position challenging the prudence of ECG's decision, Union supported ECG, IGUA took no position, and CEED, HVAC and Schools were silent on this issue.

178

2001 Settlement Proposal

179

3.2.4 This issue arose in this proceeding as part of the 2001 Settlement Proposal. Intervenors were concerned about the cost consequences of ECG's new transportation path for gas sourced in western Canada relative to those of ECG's traditional transportation path (on TCPL's Canadian Mainline from Empress to, for comparative purposes, ECG's delivery points in TCPL's Central Delivery Area ("CDA") including Parkway).

180

3.2.5 ECG and the intervenors agreed in the 2001 Settlement Proposal that an examination of this issue would be facilitated by quantifying, during the 2001 Test Year, the cost differential between the two transportation paths by means of a notional deferral account (the "Notional Deferral Account"). The parties agreed that the entries in this Notional Deferral Account, together with the other information ECG provided, would form an evidentiary basis for examining whether the entire cost differential should be allowed for ratemaking purposes and, if not, the amount that should be disallowed. ECG and the intervenors agreed in the 2001 Settlement Proposal that any such disallowance would not be retroactive, however, but rather any amount disallowed would be applied prospectively as a credit to ECG's revenue requirement for the 2002 Test Year.

Was page 32 181

3.2.6 The 2001 Settlement Agreement provided that any party could challenge the cost consequences of the new transportation path, in this proceeding or thereafter, on any grounds including, without limitation, the prudence of management actions that gave rise to such gas cost consequences by reference, for example, to the delivered cost of gas via the new transportation path relative to market area prices.

182

3.2.7 In this proceeding, ECG filed evidence showing the amounts in the Notional Deferral Account and a written account of the events surrounding the Alliance and Vector transportation arrangements. The Notional Deferral Account showed that the transportation cost differential for the 10 month period from December 1, 2000 (the in-service date) to September 30, 2001, was $12.4 million in favour of the traditional path via TCPL.

183 3.2.8 ECG noted that the Notional Deferral Account recorded a "hypothetical" cost differential and suggested that there should two adjustments to this amount: namely a commodity price adjustment and a TCPL tolls adjustment.

184 3.2.9 ECG suggested a commodity price adjustment of $11 million, as a "means of normalizing the abnormally high commodity cost of gas for the new path in December 2000". ECG advised the Board that this cost was abnormally high because for this month "ECG's suppliers insisted on spot -- daily -- pricing rather than monthly pricing".

Was page 33 185 3.2.10 ECG also suggested another adjustment to reflect TCPL's final tolls for the 10-month period rather than ECG's forecast of them. ECG suggested that the adjustment should be $0.57 million in favour of the traditional path, rather than $3.33 million in favour of the new path.

3.3 REVIEW OF PRUDENCE

186

187 3.3.1 In a prudence review, ECG suggested the following guidelines, based on a study prepared by the National Regulatory Research Institute ("NRRI").

188 • A utility's decision should be presumed to be prudent.

189 • A prudence review should consider what a reasonable person would have done in the similar circumstances.

190 • A prudence review should take into account the information available to managers when the regulated firm made the decision in question.

191 • Prudence is determined by using factual information. Evidence must include facts, not merely opinion, about the elements that went into the decision.

192 3.3.2 ECG submitted that the test for prudence, in practice, is the "reasonable person" test. Would a reasonable person consider that a utility's management decision was formed by good judgment based on facts and premises that management knew or ought to have known? A reasonable person would have regard to prevailing industry practices in existence at the time the decision was taken.

Was page 34 193 3.3.3 ECG argued that a regulator's decision on the prudence of a utility's management is, "by its nature, a once and for all decision". A utility's management cannot be found to have acted prudently in making a decision in one proceeding and prudently in making the same decision in another proceeding.

194 3.3.4 ECG submitted that a regulator's decision that a utilities management was prudent is not a "blank cheque" in effect for the future. Utility's have an ongoing responsibility to provide a "best cost"

service, which means "utilities will provide safe and reliable services at the lowest reasonable costs".

195 3.3.5 Union agreed that the Board should apply the four-part test established by the NRRI for determining the prudence of utility management's business decisions.

196 3.3.6 CAC submitted that a determination of the issue of the prudence of a decision requires that the Board determine the following sub-issues:

197 • What is the test of prudence?

198 • Who bears the onus of establishing prudence or the absence thereof?

199 • What evidence is required to demonstrate prudence?

200 • If the Board were to determine that ECG was not prudent, what amount should it be entitled to recover with respect to its supply arrangements? To put the matter another way, what is the monetary measure of a finding that ECG was not prudent?

201 • What implications, if any, would a finding that ECG had not been prudent have beyond the test year?

Was page 35 202 3.3.7 CAC submitted that the test of prudence has been drawn from a number of authorities in the United States, which provide that the test should have the following components:

203 • There is a presumption that the investment decisions of utilities are prudent;

204 • The presumption of prudence can be overcome by an allegation of imprudence that is backed up by substantive evidence creating a serious doubt about the prudence of the investment decision;

205 • To be prudent, a utility decision must have been reasonable under the circumstances that were known or could have been known at the time the decision was made;

206 • The regulator should not use hindsight in determining prudence and it unwise for a regulator to supplement the reasonableness standard for prudence with other standards that look at the final outcome of a utility's decision, although consideration of outcome may have legitimately been used to overcome the presumption of prudence;

207 • Prudence must be determined in a retrospective factual inquiry. The evidence needs to be retrospective in that it must be concerned about the time at which the decision was made.

Testimony must present facts, not merely opinion, about the elements that did or could have been entered into the decision at the time.

208

3.3.8 CAC submitted that, in restating the test of prudence, the Board should underscore ECG's obligation to keep detailed records of the decision-making process, indicating what factors were considered, and by whom those factors were considered, and setting out the rationale for each decision.

Was page 36 209

3.3.9 CAC submitted that the evidence in this case on the Alliance/Vector issue suggests that it is both necessary and appropriate to re-state the test of prudence.

210

3.3.10 The original rationale for the so-called presumption of prudence, as expressed in the US authorities, was that the presumption would allow a utility the freedom to make decisions that were in the interests of ratepayers without undue constraint arising from the fear of regulatory oversight. CAC submitted that it is clear, on the evidence, the value of the presumption must be weighed against the fact that the operation of the presumption may have a significant detrimental effect.

211

3.3.11 CAC acknowledged that some form of presumption of prudence allows a utility to make small investments without having the positive burden of showing that each one was prudent. Balanced against that, however, is the danger, evident in this case, that the presumption will operate as a screen, allowing a utility to make significant decisions without regard to the best interests of ratepayers, evident conflicts of interest, and the obligation to consider all reasonable alternatives.

212

3.3.12 CAC submitted that the presumption of prudence should be eliminated, at least in the case of decisions that may have rate-making implications above some threshold of materiality. Where the presumption is eliminated, the Board should require ECG to satisfy it that it considered all reasonable alternatives in order to arrive at a decision that was in the best interests of ratepayers.

213

3.3.13 CAC argued that the existing formulation of the test, which allows the presumption of prudence to be dislodged where there is evidence of a conflict of interest or where the outcome is clearly disadvantageous to ratepayers, provides insufficient protection to ratepayers who wish to examine the prudence of ECG's decisions. That argument ignores the significant problems which ratepayers have in showing the existence of a conflict of interest, for example. Under existing rules, a utility can hide crucial evidence, or simply deny its existence, and do so with reasonable confidence that it will neither be caught nor sanctioned.

Was page 37 214

3.3.14 CAC acknowledged a legitimate concern with the use of hindsight. CAC further acknowledged that the prudence of a decision should not be assessed solely on the basis of the outcome of the decision. However, exercising caution in the use of hindsight, and eliminating the presumption of prudence, would still allow ECG considerable freedom to demonstrate that it appropriately considered all of the relevant factors at the time the decision was made.

215

3.3.15 VECC had no fundamental disagreement with ECG's description of the test for prudence and did not dispute that the focus of the review should be on the circumstances that existed at the time that the impugned decision was made. In VECC's view, however, these circumstances must include a

review of the reasonableness of the utility's expectations of future developments and of the future state of the market at the time that the relevant decisions were made.

216 3.3.16 VECC argued that this approach does not involve the use of hindsight; rather it is the recognition that utility decisions must be prudent, not just for circumstances that are contemporaneous with the decision, but also for future circumstances that could be anticipated at that time the decision was made.

Was page 38 217

3.4 OVERCOMING THE PRESUMPTION OF PRUDENCE

218 3.4.1 ECG argued that since it had agreed that the issue of the prudence of these decisions was open to any party to raise, it was not necessary for the Board to make a determination on whether the presumption of prudence was overcome in this case.

219 3.4.2 The intervenors put forward two bases on which it argued that the Board should find that the presumption of prudence had been overcome:

220 • there was a conflict of interest between EI and ECG; and,

221 • the outcome of the decisions to contract for capacity on the Alliance and Vector pipelines dislodged the presumption of prudence.

222 **Conflict of Interest**

223 3.4.3 Dr. Foster, ECG's expert witness, agreed that if there were evidence that a decision to make an investment were influenced by a conflict of interest, that would overcome the presumption of prudence. However, he did not see a conflict on interest in this case. ECG and EI "have pretty much the same interests, the LDC has the requirement to have long-term firm capacity delivered to their system, and the parent owns a portion of that pipeline".

224 3.4.4 Although ECG has never denied that EI made suggestions in favour of both Alliance and Vector, ECG strongly denied any suggestion that EI used its parental role to dictate ECG's decisions on Alliance and Vector.

Was page 39 225 3.4.5 CAC argued that since ECG's decision to contract for capacity on the Alliance and Vector pipelines conferred a benefit on EI by virtue of EI's ownership interests in Alliance and Vector this meant that ECG had a conflict of interest in deciding whether to contract for this capacity. While ECG has an obligation to its ratepayers to enter into contracts that benefit those ratepayers, ECG's decision to contract for capacity on Alliance and Vector would confer a benefit on EI, but might not benefit ratepayers. A decision to contract for Alliance and Vector capacity should not, in CAC's submission, benefit EI at the expense of ECG's ratepayers.

226

3.4.6 CAC stated that there is no evidence that ECG considered the conflict of interest it faced except to the extent that the concept of conflict of interest may a consideration of whether Board approval is required under the Undertakings.

227

3.4.7 Similarly, CME had problems with ECG's request that the Board find that there was no conflict of interest with respect to EI, favouring Alliance and Vector, and that ECG should be allowed to rely on the "presumption of prudence". ECG is effectively requesting the Board to give it the benefit of the doubt. CME was also concerned that ECG has not maintained adequate written records that would assist intervenors and the Board in assessing this matter after the fact.

228

3.4.8 CME submitted that ECG should not be allowed, under the circumstances, to rely on the presumption of prudence. EI made an investment in Alliance and EI received a benefit through Alliance. CME argued that a conflict of interest arises since ECG conferred a benefit on EI, by contracting for capacity on the Alliance gas pipeline since it helped EI obtain regulatory approval for the pipeline.

Was page 40 229

Outcome of the Decision

230

3.4.9 CAC argued that the amount recorded in the Notional Deferral Account shows that, in both the ten-month period and the 2001 Test Year, the TCPL route was cheaper than the Alliance/Vector routes, even factoring in the effect of the recent, NEB-approved, TCPL toll increase. Accordingly, CAC argued that the presumption of prudence has been overcome.

231

3.4.10 ECG argued that any consideration of the outcome of the decisions necessarily involved the use of hindsight and therefore should not be a consideration of the Board.

232

3.5 PRUDENCE OF ECG'S DECISIONS

233

3.5.1 In CAC's submission, since the presumption of prudence is dislodged, the onus then shifts to ECG to establish that the decisions to contract for Alliance and Vector capacity were prudent.

234

3.5.2 CAC stated that the second component of the test of prudence is the determination of the time period during which the decisions were made, and, therefore, the time period within which prudence must be assessed.

235

3.5.3 Since there were separate decisions for each of the Alliance and Vector contracts, and since the decisions were made at different times, CAC submitted that they should be considered separately.

Was page 41 236

3.6 ALLIANCE 1

237

Company's Position

238

3.6.1 ECG's evidence is that its decision to enter into the Alliance 1 contract was made in the period from approximately June of 1996 to November of 1996 and that is the appropriate time period for purposes of assessing prudence.

239

3.6.2 ECG submitted that it made its commitment to Alliance for the following reasons:

240

- ECG required incremental transportation to serve market growth in its franchise areas;

241

- ECG's comparative analysis of Alliance and TCPL, after giving effect to NEXUS and other TCPL-related projects, favoured Alliance on the basis of the information available at the time;

242

- Alliance would comprise the major segment of an alternative transportation path for gas sourced by EGC in western Canada; and

243

- Alliance's capacity could be expanded by compression, rather than pipe, so that expansion capacity would be cheaper to install on a unit basis than the original capacity.

244

3.6.3 ECG advised the Board that prior to contracting for capacity on Alliance, a comparative analysis of Alliance and TCPL was prepared. This analysis was synthesized in an internal memorandum dated October 25, 1996 from Juri Otsason, a member of ECG's Gas Supply Department, to Rudy Riedl, then Senior Vice President, Strategic Planning and Gas Supply of ECG and Janet Holder ("Otsason Memo"). The Otsason Memo was the centrepiece of the evidence offered by ECG in support of its decision to contract on Alliance.

Was page 42 245

3.6.4 At the hearing ECG also provided the Board with a number of other miscellaneous documents, including internal memos, options and risks assessments, and rudimentary financial analysis spreadsheets. ECG argued that these documents supported all of the factors identified in the Otsason Memo.

246

3.6.5 The Otsason Memo described the "pros" and "cons" of the two options identified as the traditional NOVA/TCPL route as its system would have been after expanding by 2.3 Bcf/d for the NEXUS project and the Alliance/ANR/Union/TCPL route to ECG's CDA, southern Ontario, in 2000. Other options such as purchasing gas on the Chicago market or using the Northern Border pipeline were not analysed at that time.

247

3.6.6 The "pros" of the Alliance route outlined in the Otsason Memo were as follows:

248

- The Alliance route was estimated to cost 5¢/GJ more than the TCPL route, although the range of cost differentials was from 23¢/GJ higher to 12¢/GJ lower;

- Alliance would provide competition to NOVA/TCPL, and would reduce the rate of expansion of TCPL and the rate of escalation of its tolls, although these would happen whether or not ECG contracted on Alliance; 249

- Alliance would allow ECG to diversify its transportation portfolio; 250

- By passing through an area such as Chicago with an active gas market, Alliance would enhance ECG's ability to provide transactional services and take advantage of arbitrage; 251

- ECG would be able to utilize its entitlement on the Link Pipeline; 252

- Alliance would enhance the prospects of third parties contacting for capacity on the Link Pipeline; 253

- Reduced risks of exposure to increased TCPL tolls; and 254

- An alternate supply route enhances physical security of supply. 255

Was page 43 256

3.6.7 The Otsason Memo also identified the following "cons" of the Alliance pipeline:

- Alliance involved a long term commitment at a time of uncertainty of future role for ECG regarding upstream capacity; 257

- Alliance had considerably higher risks of adverse regulatory treatment, in-service delays and cost overruns; 258

- Alliance increased reliance on Union for M12 transportation; 259

- Acquisition of gas supply for Alliance was more complex; 260

- The Alliance route was operationally and administratively more complex; and 261

- Alliance created potential complexities for direct purchase. 262

3.6.8 The Otsason Memo also pointed out that ECG contracting on Alliance would enhance the probability of the Alliance pipeline being built. The Otsason Memo made a recommendation in favour of Alliance instead of TCPL. 263

264

3.6.9 The Otsason Memo quantified the financial risks in broad terms and described the assumptions made about some of them. For example, it assumed that exchange rates for the U.S. and Canadian dollar would change in favour of the Canadian dollar.

265

3.6.10 ECG argued that the comparative analysis in the Otsason Memo also demonstrated that ECG not only looked at the "cons" as well as the "pros" of Alliance, but also the range of possible outcomes in the light of various assumptions for both Alliance and TCPL.

Was page 44 266

3.6.11 Ms. Holder testified at the hearing that the Otsason Memo "was never intended to capture everything that was already known by Mr. Riedl and myself at the time" "We were very knowledgeable people or individuals in this business at the time; that was Mr. Riedl's life and my life as well as Mr. Otsason's. So there were many discussions that went along with those memos." Mr. Riedl, in turn, passed on the Otsason Memo to Mr. R.D. Munkley who was ECG's President at the time.

267

3.6.12 The precedent agreements with Alliance were signed in November 1996 by Mr. Riedl and John Aiken, another Senior Vice President, on behalf of ECG. ECG advised the Board that together they had the authority to execute, without approval by ECG's board of directors, agreements for the transportation of natural gas with an annual value of up to $30.0 million. At the time, the annual value of ECG's initial commitment to Alliance was $18.3 million.

268

Intervenors' Positions

269

3.6.13 CAC, using the criteria in the New England Power Company case, contended that the relevant time periods in which to consider the Alliance contracts was either the six month period in 1996 when the decision was made or the period at the beginning of 2000 when the gas began to move on the Alliance pipeline, and ECG was thus obligated to pay.

270

3.6.14 CAC argued that its expert witness, Mr. Stauft, suggested that in 1996 there were at least four alternatives, reflecting developments that had occurred or were likely to occur before gas actually had to move, in 1999, that ECG knew about or should have known about.

271

Chicago Market

Was page 45 272

3.6.15 CAC took issue with ECG's suggestion that the development of Chicago as a market alternative would not have been known to them. CAC submitted, however, that the evidence suggests that, even within that narrow time frame, that was not the case. The expansion of the Northern Border pipeline, and the building of the Alliance pipeline itself, were going to add approximately 2.7 Bcf to the Chicago market from the Alberta supply basin alone. CAC submitted that the addition of this additional capacity could reasonably have been predicted to have an effect, whether on Alberta prices or the development of Chicago as a market, or both.

273 3.6.16 CAC pointed out that ECG's evidence, under cross-examination, was that it did not consider Chicago as an alternative supply source because it was not ECG's practice to contract back to a supply hub but rather to contract for long-term transportation back to the supply basin.

274 3.6.17 CAC took issue with Dr. Foster's assertion that, in 1996, Chicago was not a well-developed, functioning market centre. CAC said that assertion would be relevant only if the decision to contract for Alliance capacity either had to be made in 1996, which it didn't, or if the planning horizon for the decision to contract for capacity was limited to six months in 1996, which it wasn't.

275 3.6.18 Dr. Foster conceded, in cross-examination, that, in making its decision, ECG should have considered factors that might affect the contract over its 15-year term, which would seem, reasonably, should have included the development of the Chicago market in the nearly three years before the Alliance pipeline was scheduled to be completed.

Was page 46 276 3.6.19 CAC pointed out that ECG itself did eventually consider Chicago as a viable market as noted in the May 31, 1999 memo from Mr. G. Dann of ECG's Gas Supply Department ("Dann Memo").

277 **Timing of the Decision**

278 3.6.20 CAC expressed doubts about Dr. Foster's assertions concerning the alleged benefits of the Alliance/Vector contracts. He asserted, for example, that ECG needed gas in 1996, leaving the impression that ECG had to contract for Alliance capacity in 1996. In fact, ECG contracted for Alliance capacity in 1996 when, at the earliest, it would be available in late 1999, and at a time when it had no way of getting the Alliance gas from Chicago to Ontario.

279 3.6.21 Further, CAC pointed out that ECG's own expert, Dr. Foster, conceded that the development of the Chicago market was a predictable outcome of the expansion of the Northern Border pipeline and the building of the Alliance pipeline.

280 3.6.22 During the oral phase of the hearing ECG's witnesses strongly asserted that the ECG's participation was not required at the time that ECG contracted for capacity in order for the Alliance pipelines to be constructed.

281 **Lack of Physical Route from Chicago to Dawn**

282 3.6.23 CAC argued that there is no evidence that ECG was under any pressure to enter into a supply arrangement by the Fall of 1996. The evidence that TCPL capacity would not have been available by the Fall of 1999 is, at best, ambiguous. At worst, however, there was no greater uncertainty about the availability of TCPL capacity than there was about the completion of the Alliance pipeline on time. In addition, the evidence is that when the first Alliance contract was signed, there were no arrangements in place, or indeed even any arrangements on the horizon, by which ECG could get the gas from Chicago into Ontario.

Was page 47 283

Diversifying Supply

284

3.6.24 With respect to achieving the objective of diversifying supply, CAC stated that contracting for supply in the Chicago market would have accomplished that goal. Since TCPL and Alliance have essentially the same supply basin, contracting for capacity in the Chicago would have accomplished the goal of diversifying supply more readily than would have contracting for capacity on Alliance.

285

3.6.25 With respect to the objective of putting competitive pressure on TCPL, CAC suggested that this would have been accomplished merely by building the Alliance pipeline. ECG's own witnesses conceded that it was not necessary for ECG to contract for capacity on the Alliance pipeline in order to achieve that objective. In addition, competitive pressure would have been placed on TCPL by using the Chicago market as a source of supply.

286

3.6.26 CAC submitted that it is important to remember that ECG had conducted no studies or analyses to support its belief that its contracting for capacity on Alliance would cause TCPL rates to drop. ECG conducted no study or analysis to suggest that even if TCPL rates did drop, they would offset what ECG staff recognized would be the higher cost on the Alliance system.

Was page 48 287

Security of Supply

288

3.6.27 ECG stated that it examined alternatives to Alliance and Vector from a long term perspective and also "in light of a public utility's duty to provide security of supply - delivery as well as commodity - for its franchise areas on a long term basis". ECG advised the Board that its "preferred means of delivery in 1996, and for the foreseeable future at the time, was upstream pipeline capacity extending all the way back to supply basins."

289

3.6.28 With respect to security of supply, CAC relied on Mr. Stauft's testimony that "from the perspective of 1996, in particular, Chicago should have been seen as at least as good an option and likely a far better option for purposes of acquiring supply on a reliable basis.... at that time, it was pretty clear that the Northern Border pipeline extension -- expansion/extension project would go ahead, and ECG was clearly assuming that the Alliance project would go ahead; otherwise, they wouldn't be analysing the economics of doing that. Given all of that, and those two projects together represented about 2.7 Bcf a day of new incremental supply into the Chicago area, I think the only reasonable conclusion at that time would have been that that additional supply would have made Chicago fine as a supply source".

290

3.6.29 Mr. Stauft also pointed out that the supply market available to Alliance shippers is limited and consists of approximately 30-odd gas plants in Alberta plus some interconnects with the ATCO system. Mr. Stauft indicated that directionally, it "wouldn't be fair to say that Chicago was worse, from a security of supply perspective, than Alliance, even in 1996".

Was page 49 291

3.6.30 CAC questioned whether there were any factors at work, in 1996, that required ECG to contract for capacity on Alliance rather than allowing the Chicago market to develop.

292

3.7 ALLIANCE 2

293

Company's Position

294

3.7.1 ECG stated that it increased its commitment to Alliance by 708.2 10^3m^3 /d in Canada and 25.0 Mmcf/d in the Untied States in November 1997, by means of an assignment of capacity from the Alberta Energy Company Ltd. ("AEC"). This occurred at the same time as EI acquired an additional ownership interest of 8.036% in Alliance from AEC.

295

3.7.2 ECG stated that it was willing to accept the assignment from AEC because, at the time, ECG's updated forecast of market growth indicated that ECG would require more than the assigned volume for the 2000-01 gas year and beyond. ECG noted that its updated forecast of market growth formed part of ECG's written evidence for the hearing, before the NEB, of Alliance's Canadian facilities application (NEB file GH-3-97).

296

3.7.3 ECG argued that its opportunity to acquire this additional capacity with Alliance arose between TCPL's applications for its 1998-99 (GH-2-97) and its 1999-2000 (GH-3-98) expansion programs (J3.5/J3.6) and for this reason, acquiring additional capacity on TCPL was not an alternative at the time.

Was page 50 297

3.7.4 ECG's evidence was that the opportunity to increase its commitment on Alliance also arose after EI had announced the Vector project and TCPL and two other sponsors joined EI in the Vector project. As ECG pointed out, given the timing of the Vector announcement in June 1997, there was the prospect of a transportation path to move the increased volume from Chicago to Dawn at the time of signing Alliance 2 in November 1997.

298

Intervenors' Positions

299

3.7.5 CAC submitted that ECG's evidence does not establish that its initial decision to contract for Alliance capacity was a prudent one, even on its own chosen criteria. Beyond that, CAC submitted that there is no better or different evidence in support of its decision to contract for the second tranche of Alliance capacity.

300

3.7.6 The other Intervenors raised no additional concerns with respect to Alliance 2, but relied on their general concerns with respect to the Alliance project.

301

Company Reply

302

3.7.7 ECG countered intervenors with the argument that Chicago became a well-developed functioning market only when the Northern Border expansion/extension and thereafter Alliance became operational.

303

3.7.8 Dr. Foster's opinion was that ECG acted prudently when deciding to make commitments to Alliance and Vector.

Was page 51 304

3.7.9 ECG argued that it is the utility's commitment and the circumstances at the time, rather than the utility's subsequent compliance with the commitment by incurring costs, that should be the focus of a prudence review.

305

3.7.10 ECG argued that when considering likely future circumstances, a reasonable person would have regard to prevailing industry practices at the time; for example, the prevailing practice of an Ontario utility contracting for long-term transportation back to the supply basins.

306

3.8 VECTOR 1

307

Company's Position

308

3.8.1 ECG did not make a commitment to Vector 1 until June 1, 1999, when it signed precedent agreements for a term of 15 year once all the contractual conditions were satisfied. The 15-year term would commence on Vector's in-service date which, at the time, was expected to be November 2000.

309

3.8.2 ECG stated that it sized Vector 1 to accommodated ECG's FT and AOS entitlements with Alliance, post 1997, when "rich gas" is converted to energy units. According to ECG, Alliance and Vector 1 are a "matched pair" and, as such, comprise a single transportation path for ECG from western Canada to Dawn.

310

3.8.3 ECG stated that it examined not only physical transportation alternatives, but also Chicago-to-Dawn gas swaps, before committing to Vector 1. ECG submitted that it looked at the "cons" as well as the "pros" and selected Vector 1 - the cheapest route instead of swaps because:

Was page 52 311

- "it was uncertain as to whether [gas marketers] would be able to do the total volume" but, even if so, "the Dawn basis would likely increase because Dawn is thinly traded"; and

312

- "the potentially higher cost of Vector and all other physical transportation options versus a swap arrangement is offset by the non-monetary benefits of a physical route".

313

Intervenors' Positions

314

3.8.4 CAC stated that the considerations bearing on the prudence of ECG's decisions to contract for capacity on the Vector pipeline are somewhat different from the considerations that apply to its decision to contract for capacity on the Alliance pipeline.

315 3.8.5 It was CAC's position that ECG's decisions to contract for Alliance capacity were not prudent. As a result of those decisions, ECG had a substantial volume of gas, arriving in the Chicago market, which it then had to move to Ontario. It is arguable, accordingly, that the decisions to contract for Vector capacity were necessitated by the imprudent decision to contract for Alliance and were, accordingly, imprudent. To put the matter another way, ratepayers should not have to bear the cost consequences of a decision itself necessitated by an imprudent decision.

316 3.8.6 However, had ECG contracted for capacity in the Chicago market, it would have had to move the gas to Ontario and, as a practical matter, Vector was the only alternative. From that perspective, the decision to contract for Vector capacity was a necessary one. A necessary decision is, arguably, neither an imprudent nor a prudent one.

Was page 53 317 3.8.7 In CAC's view, the open question is whether ECG, in 1999, should have considered purchasing gas at Dawn as an alternative to Vector. ECG's staff recognized, in the Dann Memo, that it would be cheaper to buy gas at Dawn. Mr. Dann offset, against that cost benefit, what he characterized as the "non-monetary benefits" of a physical route from Chicago. Those benefits included the following:

318 • diversity of supply sources from, among other places, the US. That is, in other words, the benefit of purchasing gas supply in the Chicago market, something ECG, as a matter of "policy", had been unwilling to consider in 1996; and

319 • increased natural gas trading liquidity and price transparency in Ontario.

320 3.8.8 CAC argued that these would result from the building of a pipeline. Mr. Dann could see these results for Ontario, but his colleagues were evidently not able to see the same results for Chicago from the combination of Northern Border and Alliance pipelines in 1996.

321 3.8.9 CAC asserted that the issue for the Board is whether it is clear, from the evidence, that ECG adequately considered Dawn as an alternative market. The problem in undertaking that analysis is in assessing ECG's conflict of interest. At the time that the decision was made to contract for Vector capacity, EI had a substantial interest in the Vector pipeline. The reality is that Mr. Dann's analysis of monetary and non-monetary benefits was academic since:

322 • the Alliance gas had to move out of Chicago; and

323 • EI had an investment in Vector which its subsidiary could support in monetary and non-monetary ways.

Was page 54 324 3.8.10 VECC argued that in the C. Serpanchy memo to L. Beattie, dated May 31, 1999, the opening statement of the letter seems to imply there is an expectation to contract on Vector as opposed to renewing some TCPL capacity as the memo opens with the following statement: We expect to contract for Vector Pipeline capacity of 79,000 Dth/d from Chicago.

325

3.9 VECTOR 2

326

ECG's Position

327

3.9.1 ECG's evidence was that it needed Vector 2 to replace ECG's corresponding FT service entitlements with TCPL. ECG was effectively "swapping" FT capacity from TCPL to Vector as opposed to serving market growth requirements.

328

3.9.2 ECG submitted that was mindful of concerns about trading, in effect, one-year renewable service entitlements with TCPL for Vector 2's 15-year service entitlement. ECG accordingly negotiated a "put/call" arrangement with EI whereby, if need be, ECG can convert Vector 2 into medium-term capacity. ECG pointed out that it now has the benefit of a lower toll, at the negotiated 15-year level with a U.S. $0.25/Dth rate cap, that would not otherwise be available.

329

3.9.3 ECG made its commitment to Vector 2 at a time when EI held a 45% ownership interest in Vector. EI was then one of three sponsors of the Vector project. ECG denied that there was a directive from EI to make a commitment to Vector 2. ECG instead maintained that it made its commitment because Vector 2 was cheaper than a renewal of ECG's corresponding FT service entitlements with TCPL.

Was page 55 330

3.9.4 ECG advised the Board that it examined delivered service and Dawn supply as alternatives to renewing ECG's corresponding FT service entitlements with TCPL. ECG submitted that it looked at the "cons" as well as the "pros" and selected Vector 2 instead of the non-physical alternatives for the following reasons:

331

- the cost of delivered service "is likely to rise as competition for delivered service increases with further non-renewals" even though, for comparative purposes, delivered service and Dawn supply "are deemed to be equal";

332

- although Vector 2 with Chicago supply is more expensive, "Dawn is not a very liquid market centre" and, without "adequate supply at Dawn to meet all future demand...provided by a pipeline, the prices at Dawn will rise as competition for limited supplies at Dawn increase rapidly"; and

333

- "[t]he potentially higher costs of Chicago (via Vector) over the Dawn supply option is offset by the non-monetary benefits of a physical route listed below".

334

3.10 GENERAL COMMENTS ON ALLIANCE AND VECTOR

335

3.10.1 In Union's submission, whether or not the Board finds that the initial presumption of prudence is overcome on the facts of this case, the record does lead to the conclusion, considering only the reasonableness of the decision in light of the circumstances that existed *at the time*, excluding all con-

sideration of hindsight, that ECG acted prudently in contracting for upstream capacity on the Alliance and Vector pipelines.

Was page 56 336

3.10.2 CME was of the view that it was not prudent for ECG to enter into the Alliance and Vector long term contracts, particularly in circumstances where the contracts are with parties owned in part by ECG and/or its affiliates. In this regard, CME supported the position expressed by the CAC's expert witness, Mark P. Stauft, namely that there were more reasonable alternatives available to ECG than the Alliance/Vector option.

337

3.10.3 VECC argued that the pipeline ownership interests of ECG's parent EI were a significant, if not the primary, concern in the making of the decisions to contract for capacity on Alliance and Vector. VECC argued that there were numerous circumstances where the "conspicuous symmetry" of the actions of the utility and the interests of its parent are revealed.

338

3.10.4 VECC noted that the relevant decisions represent major financial commitments by ECG to new methods of gas supply. Unlike previous transportation paths, ECG would be contracting for capacity on pipeline systems owned by its parent.

339

3.10.5 VECC submitted that it is the reality of the cross ownership interests of EI that is the smoking gun for this issue, not the presence of a marching order from EI. It would also generally be thought to be incumbent on ECG to demonstrate that measures were taken to ensure independence in the face of the potential conflict.

340

3.10.6 VECC pointed out that there are some telling examples of the conflict available in the record of this proceeding. These include:

341

- ECG conceded that there were suggestions from EI favour of both Alliance and Vector ;

Was page 57 342

- ECG had communications with its parent concerning the development of transportation paths that would move the Chicago gas from Alliance Pipeline into pipelines owned by its parent EI;

343

- evidence provided in the proceeding appears to document an effort on the part of ECG to determine ways of using EI pipeline assets to move gas from Chicago to ECG s market and to assess what tolls are required from Chicago to the city gate to make the Alliance Pipeline competitive.

344

3.10.7 VECC pointed out that ECG never examined the Foothills/Northern Border pipelines as an alternative to bypass TCPL in the past, "an omission consistent with its affinity for its parent's project". The evidence suggested that ECG had never been in the queue for Transportation Services on the Foothills or Northern Border pipeline nor inquired about the 1998 expansion on the Northern Border system.

345

3.10.8 VECC submitted that there is little on the record to dispel the natural inference that ECG and its management acted, at all times, to favour its pipeline-owning parent. The evidence disclosed a trail of favouritism towards its parent's investment in the decisions of ECG, as well as providing evidence of demonstrable imprudence.

346

3.10.9 CAC submitted that the Board should find that ECG's decisions to contract for Alliance and Vector capacity were not prudently made. In the case of the decisions to contract for Alliance capacity, the Board should find that ECG failed to consider all reasonable alternatives, and in particular failed to consider the alternative of acquiring supply in the Chicago market.

Was page 58 347

3.10.10 With respect to both the Alliance and Vector contracts, CAC submitted that the Board should find that ECG has failed to prove that the contracts were made to benefit ratepayers as opposed to its parent, EI. In CAC's view, the evidence clearly points to a conflict of interest especially in light of the fact that Union and ECG are the only LDCs to contract for significant capacity on both pipelines, ones that their parents have a considerable interest in.

348

3.10.11 CAC is suspicious about the nature of Mr. Foster's retainer. Mr. Foster claimed that he was retained to provide an opinion on the prudence of ECG's decision to contract for capacity on Alliance and Vector. To support that opinion, Mr. Foster claimed that he had reviewed the record in this case. Yet at the time he delivered his opinion, in the form of his pre-filed evidence, the Otsason Memo and the Dann Memo, which are the only evidence of what ECG considered in reaching its decisions, were not yet part of the record. Accordingly, Mr. Foster arrived at his opinion without ever looking at what ECG considered. CAC submitted that the only reasonable conclusion is that Mr. Foster was retained to provide a patina of independence and respectability for ECG's own assertions.

349

3.10.12 CAC stated that it is clear that, with one exception, he has made no independent assessment but is relying on ECG's own assertions. The one exception is his contact with three, unidentified Chicago LDCs in an attempt, one presumes, to provide an independent assessment of the perception of the Chicago market. Not only does he not identify the three LDCs, he makes no effort to establish that what they purportedly say is representative of the entire market.

Was page 59 350

3.11 RELIEF AND REMEDIES

351

Relief Requested by ECG

352

3.11.1 ECG is seeking the following Board findings on the Alliance and Vector issue in this proceeding:

353

- The cost differential recorded in the Notional Deferral Account between ECG's new and traditional paths for the 10-month period preceding the test year is reasonable, under the circumstances, and so it is allowed in its entirety for rate-making purposes;

354 • The cost consequences of the new path for the test year are reasonable, under the circumstances, and so they are allowed in their entirety for rate-making purposes; and

355 • ECG's management was prudent in taking the actions that give rise to the cost consequences of the new path not only in the 10-month period, as reflected in the cost differential, but also in the test year.

356 **Intervenors' Position**

357 3.11.2 CAC submitted that the Board should find that:

358 • for the ten-month period, ECG should not be entitled to recover, in rates, the amount in the Notional Deferral Account; and

359 • for the 2002 Test Year, ECG should not be entitled to recover, in rates, the amount in the Notional Deferral Account.

Was page 60 360 3.11.3 With respect to the duration of the Alliance and Vector contracts, CAC submits that the following relief should be granted:

361 • that the Notional Deferral Account should be continued, but solely for the purpose of providing a short-hand means of assessing the outcome of the decisions to contract for Alliance and Vector capacity;

362 • that the Notional Deferral Account should be expanded to include calculation of the costs of acquiring similar volumes of gas at Chicago and Dawn;

363 • that, in each rate case, ECG should be required to submit evidence as to why it should be allowed to recover, in rates, more than the lowest cost of the four alternatives, namely Alliance/Vector, TCPL, Chicago and Dawn.

364 3.11.4 VECC did not agree with ECG's interpretation of the 2001 Settlement Agreement, to the effect that intervenors and the Board are precluded from examining in the 2001 fiscal year the Alliance and Vector cost consequences with the exception of the Notional Deferral Account. The Notional Deferral Account was established to facilitate the technical requirements of the resolution of the cost consequences issue, and was not intended to function as a substantive limitation.

365 3.11.5 VECC submitted that the Board should provide the financial impacts to ECG for fiscal 2001 on the cost differential associated with what the Board deems to be a prudent action versus the actual actions ECG has taken.

366
3.11.6 CME stated that ECG should be required to seek Board approval prior to entering into any contracts longer than the applicable period of regulatory review. Requiring ECG to obtain Board approval for long-term contracts (ie: longer than a PBR period) would help to ensure that ECG documents its "thought processes" and rationale for pursuing certain options. Intervenors and the Board would be able to properly assess whether decisions affecting ratepayers are being made in their best.

Was page 61 367
Blank page

Was page 62 368
3.12 BOARD COMMENTS AND FINDINGS

369
Review of Prudence

370
3.12.1 While the parties described it in somewhat varying terms, in the Board's view they were in substantial agreement on the general approach the Board should take to reviewing the prudence of a utility's decision.

371
3.12.2 The Board agrees that a review of prudence involves the following:

372
- Decisions made by the utility's management should generally be presumed to be prudent unless challenged on reasonable grounds.

373
- To be prudent, a decision must have been reasonable under the circumstances that were known or ought to have been known to the utility at the time the decision was made.

374
- Hindsight should not be used in determining prudence, although consideration of the outcome of the decision may legitimately be used to overcome the presumption of prudence.

375
- Prudence must be determined in a retrospective factual inquiry, in that the evidence must be concerned with the time the decision was made and must be based on facts about the elements that could or did enter into the decision at the time.

376
3.12.3 While a party challenging the prudence of a decision made by the utility has an obligation to raise reasonable grounds for undertaking such a review, it does not need to establish a *prima facie* case that the utility's decision was imprudent; rather it must demonstrate that there is an issue to be determined on further inquiry by the Board. This is particularly true in the case of a regulated utility where it is the only party in possession of all the relevant information about how and why the decision was in fact made.

Was page 63 377
3.12.4 A party can raise reasonable grounds through such means as an examination of the outcome of the decision, the inherent conflict of interest of related parties to a transaction and relevant industry practices at the time the decision was made.

378 3.12.5 Once a party has persuaded the Board that a prudence review is warranted, or, as some have put it, the presumption of prudence has been "overcome", the onus is then on ECG to demonstrate that the decision it made was prudent at the time.

379 3.12.6 The Board does not agree with ECG's assertion that other parties have an obligation to demonstrate that another course of action would, objectively, have been better than the one taken by ECG.

380 3.12.7 There were two bases on which the intervenors challenged the presumption of prudence of ECG's decisions:

381 • that there was an inherent conflict of interest between ECG and its parent, EI; and

382 • that the outcome of the decisions appeared to have resulted in a higher cost than might otherwise have been the case.

383 3.12.8 ECG argued that since it had consented to the issue of prudence being raised in this proceeding, there was no need for the Board to make a specific finding that the intervenors had raised reasonable grounds for a prudence review.

Was page 64 384 3.12.9 Notwithstanding ECG's consent that prudence would be an issue in this proceeding, the Board finds that it would be helpful in this case to make the specific finding that there is an inherent conflict of interest between the regulated utility and its affiliate or affiliates and that such conflict of interest is sufficient grounds to inquire into the prudence of the decisions made by ECG.

385 3.12.10 The Board agrees with ECG that EI and ECG may have had a shared interest in having the pipelines built; however, their interests were not always the same. For example, the Board notes that EI's interest as an investor in the pipeline was to ensure the project's profitability in order to maximize its own profits, while ECG's interest, as a regulated utility, was to obtain transportation service at the least reasonable cost.

386 3.12.11 While the fact that EI may have profited from these arrangements is not by itself sufficient evidence to establish that the arrangements were not prudent for ECG, it is, however, sufficient evidence to overcome the presumption of prudence and invite further inquiry by the Board.

387 3.12.12 The Board agrees with the intervenors that the outcome of a decision may also overcome the presumption of prudence. The Board notes that as the Notional Deferral Account used to track the cost differences between the two transportation paths has a balance in favour of the "traditional path", this also suggests that the prudence of ECG's decision should be examined.

Was page 65 388 3.12.13 The Board finds that the presumption of prudence has been overcome and that there are reasonable grounds to inquire into the prudence of ECG's decisions to enter into long term transportation arrangements with the Alliance and Vector pipelines.

389

Alliance 1

390

3.12.14 The Board's review of prudence of ECG's decision to enter into Alliance 1 centres largely on the Otsason Memo since ECG's evidence was that it summarized the factors taken into account by ECG in making its decision.

391

3.12.15 The Otsason Memo's rudimentary financial analysis presented a range of possible financial outcomes and concluded that the Alliance transportation path was likely to be more expensive than the NOVA/TCPL alternative with which it was compared. Therefore, ECG must satisfy the Board that it had good reasons for choosing this alternative.

392

3.12.16 The Board notes that several of the advantages, such as ECG's legitimate objectives of encouraging competition with TCPL and securing alternative sources of supply, would have occurred as a result of the Alliance pipeline being built irrespective of ECG's participation in the fall of 1996. At the same time, ECG's evidence was that ECG's participation was not crucial to ensuring that the pipeline was built.

393

3.12.17 While the Otsason Memo suggests that shipping through Alliance to Chicago would provide ECG with transactional service and arbitrage opportunities, the Board notes that these opportunities would exist only if Chicago were a functioning, liquid market. This position is consistent with Mr. Stauft's evidence that ECG should have known that the Chicago market would develop by the time ECG would be in a position to ship gas through Alliance.

Was page 66 394

3.12.18 The Otsason Memo is inconsistent with ECG's witnesses testimony that the Chicago market was not, in their view, well developed and there was no way in 1996 that they could have foreseen that it would be. ECG's evidence was that at that time, the only alternatives they seriously considered were those that involved a physical transportation route from a supply source.

395

3.12.19 The Otsason Memo assumed that the ANR/MichCon/Link path would be used to complete the path from Chicago to Dawn, and ECG contracted on the basis of this assumption. However, the Otsason Memo made no comment about the likelihood of approval of the ANR/MichCon/Link path or its in-service date. In light of ECG's position that only a physical route from the supply basin was appropriate, the Board questions ECG's willingness to enter into a long term commitment with no assurances about the completion of the route.

396

3.12.20 One of the disadvantages identified in the Otsason Memo was the risk of in-service delays for the Alliance pipeline. This risk in fact materialized; the in-service date was delayed by over one year from November 1999 to December 2000.

397

3.12.21 One way ECG could have demonstrated the prudence of its decision was to provide the Board with evidence that it has considered and analyzed the full range of reasonable alternatives. Yet ECG did not provide evidence that it considered the effects of the Alliance pipeline on gas markets and other transportation alternatives. In addition, particularly in light of ECG's evidence that its participation was not required to build the Alliance pipeline, ECG has not provided the Board with evi-

dence that it evaluated the option of waiting until the Alliance pipeline was built before making a long term commitment.

Was page 67 398

3.12.22 The Board is not convinced by ECG's argument that there is an obligation on the intervenors to demonstrate that there was a better alternative available. To so require would be to allow ECG's decisions to in effect "win by default".

399

3.12.23 Based on the evidence, the Board is not satisfied that ECG's decision to enter into the Alliance 1 contract in 1996 was prudent.

400

Alliance 2

401

3.12.24 While ECG argued that it entered into Alliance 2 because it required additional capacity to meet projected market growth, it provided the Board with limited evidence to support this position. The Board's concerns with respect to Alliance 1 are equally applicable to Alliance 2.

402

3.12.25 In addition, the Board notes that at the time ECG entered into Alliance 2, there was still a measure of uncertainty surrounding the transportation of gas from the western supply basin to Ontario. The Alliance pipeline had still not been approved by the NEB, although FERC preliminary approval had been granted in August 1997. Further, it appeared that ANR/MichCon/Link was not going to proceed but EI was proposing the construction of the Vector pipeline, although no application for approval had yet been filed with the appropriate regulators.

403

3.12.26 The Board notes that AEC transferred its ownership interest in Alliance to EI at the same time that ECG increased its commitment to Alliance by a similar percentage. While ECG denied being directed by EI to assume the additional capacity, the Board remains unconvinced that ECG was not influenced by EI in some way.

Was page 68 404

3.12.27 Particularly in the absence of independent additional analysis, the Board is not satisfied that ECG's decision to enter into the Alliance 2 contracts in 1997 was prudent.

405

Vector 1

406

3.12.28 The Board acknowledged that with the demise of the ANR/MichCon/Link route ECG was faced with the requirement to complete the transportation path from Chicago to Dawn.

407

3.12.29 ECG provided evidence that it analyzed the two options reasonably available to it at the time: gas swaps between Chicago and Dawn, and a physical pipeline route. The Board also notes that in the case of Vector 1, ECG did not make a firm commitment pipeline until it had received regulatory approval.

408

3.12.30 The Board does not agree with CAC that once an imprudent decision has been made, all decisions flowing from it are also imprudent. The Board notes that ECG has an ongoing obligation to review and mitigate the consequences of all of its decisions.

409

3.12.31 Under the circumstances, the Board agrees with ECG that contracting on Vector to complete the path from Chicago to Dawn was a reasonable decision. The Board finds that ECG's decision to enter into the Vector 1 contract in 1999 was prudent.

410

Vector 2

Was page 69 411

3.12.32 While ECG advised the Board that it entered into the Vector 2 contract in order to replace expiring capacity on TCPL, it did not provide the Board with sufficient evidence and analysis, including alternatives, to justify this decision.

412

3.12.33 The Board notes that the Vector 2 decision was independent from its previous decisions to enter into the Alliance 1 and 2 and Vector 1 contracts and was not required in order to complete the single continuous transportation path from the western Canada supply basin to southern Ontario. In addition, the Board notes that the cost consequences of the Vector 2 contract were not included in the calculation of the Notional Deferral Account, which is a key element of the Board's prudence review of the Alliance and Vector arrangements.

413

3.12.34 As a result, the Board is not prepared at this time to make a determination of the prudence of ECG's decision to enter into the Vector 2 contract.

Was page 70 414

Relief and Remedies

415

3.12.35 The Board notes that the parties agreed in the 2001 Settlement Proposal to establish the Notional Deferral Account as a means, among others, of ascertaining whether the entire cost differential should be allowed for rate making purposes and, if not, the amount that should be disallowed.

416

3.12.36 The Notional Deferral Account was intended as a measure to ascertain whether the cost differential between the old and the new paths was substantial, such that it would raise the issue of whether the presumption of prudence had been overcome. It was not intended as a method of determining the cost consequences and any potential disallowance of costs if the Board were to find that entering into the Alliance and Vector agreements were not prudent.

417

3.12.37 Based on the Board's finding that the Alliance 1 and Alliance 2 contracts were not prudent, the Board is not prepared to grant ECG's request to allow the full amount of $12.4 million recorded in the Notional Deferral Account to be recovered from ratepayers.

418

3.12.38 The Board notes that ECG's evidence indicates that of the $12.4 million in the Notional Deferral Account, $11.0 million is attributable to the fact "ECG suppliers for the new path were concerned about the uncertainty of Alliance's December 1st in-service date, in light of previous delays, and so

they insisted on spot pricing rather than monthly pricing for December 2000. There was a price spike during the month that drove spot prices much higher than monthly prices. "

Was page 71 419

3.12.39 The Board notes that the "considerably higher risks of in-service delays" was one of the disadvantages of the Alliance pipeline specifically identified in the Otsason Memo. The Board is not satisfied that ECG took appropriate action to mitigate this identified risk. As a result, the Board finds that $11.0 million is an appropriate amount reasonably attributable to these delays.

420

3.12.40 The Board is not prepared to continue or expand the basis of the Notional Deferral Account as suggested by CAC: it is a one-time disallowance. The Board finds that it is neither reasonable nor practical to continue to examine the cost differential in future rates cases, as suggested by CAC.

421

3.12.41 The Board directs ECG to credit $11.0 million to the 2002 PGVA and to provide the Board with sufficient evidence of this credit when dealing with the clearance of the 2002 PGVA in the 2003 rates proceeding.

Was page 72 422

Blank page

Was page 73 423

4. SYSTEM GAS

424

4.1 BACKGROUND

425

4.1.1 As part of the 2001 Settlement Proposal, ECG undertook to conduct a study of the existing gas supply management costs which are assigned to its system gas and direct purchase customers. The study (the "2002 FAC Study") was to use the fully allocated costing methodology and was to examine, in detail, the existing cost allocation methodology which results in the assignment of gas supply management costs to system gas customers and to direct purchase customers.

426

4.1.2 In addition, ECG agreed to retain a consultant to undertake an examination of the hypothetical costs of managing system gas as a discrete business, on a stand-alone basis. The consultant was also to ascertain how these costs would vary from those costs allocated to system gas customers in 2002 FAC Study.

427

4.1.3 The Company filed both the 2002 FAC Study and the consultant's report in this proceeding.

Was page 74 428

4.1.4 Because of the link between the issues of the cost allocation of gas supply management costs (Issue 2.3) and the cost of managing system gas on a "stand-alone" basis (Issue 2.4) the Board has considered them together.

429

4.2 THE FULLY ALLOCATED COST STUDY

430

4.2.1 The Company advised the Board that the 2002 FAC Study was limited, because TPBR allowed the Company flexibility in managing its operations and maintenance ("O&M") expenditures within a total envelope approach, and as such the Company was not required to forecast or report on its O&M expenditures on an account by account basis for rate making purposes. Consequently ECG was not able to use "an account-level forecast" of its O&M expenditures for the 2002 FAC Study.

431

4.2.2 As a result, ECG based the 2002 FAC Study on 1999 data. The Company advised the Board that as a first step it adjusted the 1999 level of O&M expenditures annually in accordance with the TPBR formula up to, and including, the 2002 Test Year. Then, as a second step, ECG assigned an appropriate amount of corporate overheads, or administrative and general ("A&G") expenses, to the system gas and to the direct purchase accounts, in order for costs to be assigned on a fully allocated, rather than incremental, basis. That process resulted in the following for the 2002 Test Year:

432

	System Gas	Direct Purchase
O&M expenses	$886,758	$1,152,982

A&G expenses	$154,048	$ 200,296
FAC	$1,040,806	$1,353,278

Was page 75 433

4.2.3 ECG recognized the shortcomings of the 2002 FAC Study and proposed to file an updated study (the "2003 FAC Study") in the 2003 rates case. ECG proposed that the 2003 FAC Study would :

434
- examine the functions and tasks being performed by ECG and its affiliates to manage the system gas and direct purchase functions;

435
- determine the level of expenditures based on the 2003 cost of service budget;

436
- determine the cost drivers behind each of the expenditures;

437
- assign the appropriate level of A&G expenses; and

438
- review the existing methods of cost recovery.

439

4.3 THE STAND-ALONE STUDY

440

4.3.1 ECG retained James B. Bracken CA, of Bracken Consulting, to prepare a report entitled a "Report on Cost of Managing System Gas Supply"(the "Bracken Report") on the costs of managing system gas on a stand-alone basis. The Bracken Report was filed in this proceeding.

441

4.3.2 The main conclusion of the Bracken Report was that a hypothetical, stand-alone operation to manage system gas supply for ECG would cost $684,054 per annum. The Bracken Report identified and costed the following functional areas for gas supply and system balancing:

442
- Gas Supply Planning

443
- Gas Acquisition

444
- Risk Management

445
- Contract Management

446
- Gas Control

447
- Nominations

448

- Invoice Processing and Payment

Was page 76 449

4.4 POSITION OF PARTIES

450

4.4.1 CEED challenged ECG's cost allocation and also its fairness of treatment in managing system gas and direct purchase gas. IGUA, in its argument, generally supported CEED's position. CAC and VECC each generally supported the Company's position. CME, HVAC and Schools made no submissions on this issue.

451

4.4.2 CEED's position was that distribution customers should receive equitable distribution service regardless of whether they are supplied by ECG as a system gas supplier, or supplied by a marketer/ shipper, as in direct purchase gas supply. CEED argued that ECG uses distribution system assets to provide system gas to its customers in a manner that is preferential to the way in which these assets are available to marketers to provide gas to their direct purchase customers.

452

4.4.3 CEED asserted that the advantages conferred by the Company on system gas customers include:

453

- providing system balancing services without the risk of charges arising from out-of-balance penalties;

454

- providing system supply data to their system gas supplier, not available to the suppliers of direct purchase customers; and

455

- making storage and transportation facilities available to their system gas supplier, on a priority basis, over those available to the suppliers of direct purchase customers.

Was page 77 456

4.4.4 CEED took issue with the approach taken in the Bracken Report and contended that the Bracken Report had not identified all of the functions, and the associated costs, that would be required by a person who provided system gas on a stand-alone basis; that is, separated from distribution service *per se,* in a manner similar to direct purchase gas, instead of integrated with distribution service, as is now the case.

457

4.4.5 CEED requested that the Board require ECG to carry out the 2003 FAC Study to identify all of the resources made available to balance and bill and collect from system gas customers and ensure that the costs of these resources are fully recovered by system gas customers on a fully allocated basis.

458

4.4.6 In addition CEED requested that services provided by the Company to both system gas and direct purchase customers be made more "equivalent" and that the Board issue the following directives:

459

- that ECG keep a record of all gas purchased for and consumed by system gas customers in an annual period. Where the amount of gas purchased either exceeds or is less than the amount consumed by system gas customers, then ECG is to apply a balancing fee to such

difference (the out of balance quantity). The balancing fee is to be determined by multiplying the volume of the out of balance quantity times 20% of ECG's WACOG. The revenues resulting from the balancing fee should be used as a credit towards distribution revenues;

460

- that ECG provide all direct purchase customers, or their agents with access to all system supply planning information that it has available to purchase gas supply for system gas customers;

461

- that, prior to releasing storage and transportation assets to the "S&T business" (whether carried out within ECG or through a third party), ECG offer these assets to direct purchase customers who may make use of them to bring their Banked Gas Accounts ("BGAs") into balance; and

Was page 78 462

- that ECG not be permitted to charge balance penalties to any customer who was out of balance as a result of reporting error by ECG.

463

4.4.7 With respect to CEED's request for changes to the 2003 FAC Study, IGUA submitted that when preparing its 2003 FAC Study and stand-alone cost studies for the 2003 Test Year, ECG should include the costs associated with the additional functions, as suggested by CEED.

464

4.4.8 IGUA suggested that it would enhance the understanding of the issue if the 2003 FAC Study were provided in two formats: the first encompassing the functions which ECG asserted were appropriate for each study; and a supplemental presentation which would include and demonstrate the impact on the ECG approach of including the costs associated with the additional functions which CEED contended should be taken into account.

465

4.4.9 IGUA submitted that the "provision of the cost information in this way should provide a better information base than that which is currently available and thereby facilitate a further and better evaluation of the extent to which the principle of equivalency is being misapplied by ECG."

466

4.4.10 CAC agreed with ECG that direct purchase and system gas service are not the same type of service and accordingly they should not necessarily be priced on the same basis. CAC also did not accept the proposition that the direct purchase and system gas services should be allocated the same level of costs if those costs are not reflective of providing those different services.

Was page 79 467

4.4.11 CAC indicated that it shared the concerns of the retailers that it is important to ensure that the provision of system supply is not cross-subsidized, and that "direct purchase not be allocated costs unrelated to the provision of the service".

468

4.4.12 CAC submitted that a detailed examination of the various cost elements is required in the next proceeding. If a detailed cost study is provided, parties should be able to assess the various functions required to provide the services and determine whether ECG's allocation of the costs to provide those functions is appropriate. To the extent that parties require specific information from ECG in

order to effectively examine these issues in the next proceeding, ECG should be required to provide that information as a part of its pre-filed evidence.

469

4.4.13 VECC supported the Company's position largely on the assertion that "system gas and direct purchase are not the same thing".

470

4.5 THE COMPANY'S POSITION

471

4.5.1 ECG clarified its understanding of the term "system gas" to mean not only the gas purchased for sale to customers as sales service, which is discrete from distribution service, but also gas purchased for load balancing purposes for all customers. ECG asserted that it cannot distinguish, when procuring system gas, between gas destined for delivery and sale, including load balancing, to sales service customers, and gas destined for delivery only, as load balancing, to direct purchase customers.

Was page 80 472

4.5.2 ECG explained that, in operational terms, load balancing as it exists today, "is a distribution service provided to all of ECG's customers, both direct purchase and system, at the same rates. With equivalent rates applicable to both customer groups, no group is benefitting at the expense of the other."

473

4.5.3 ECG argued that fees charged for being out of balance are not penalties but are Board-approved rates designed to provide transportation service ("T-Service") customers, or their agents, with an incentive to manage volumetric imbalances in their BGAs. ECG described the fee as a "deterrent to the use of system gas as a swing supply because such a use is, in effect, subsidized by system gas customers and other direct purchase customers".

474

4.5.4 In ECG's view, these fees for being out of balance recognize that the actions of some direct purchase customers, or their agents, could have some bearing on costs recovered from system gas customers through the disposition of the commodity variance in the PGVA

475

4.5.5 ECG pointed out that T-Service customers or their agents have the opportunity to take appropriate action to bring themselves within the tolerance levels and that these customers make their own decisions on what actions to take. On this issue, the Company's witness, Mr. Bracken, made the following points in his testimony:

476

> This schedule doesn't give us any description at all on what the direct purchase marketers were doing and what some of the economic consequences of the decisions that they were making during the year were. They get monthly information on what actual consumption is, they can compare that to their Mean Daily Volumes ("MDV"), and they can see these imbalances building or accumulating. They have a choice to make as to how soon and when they want to react to that. This doesn't show us in here any place what decisions they've made in deferring decisions, deferring the choice to make up some imbalances and incurring some prices in market at that time.

In other words, they could have decided that they are seeing an imbalance and these prices may have been better for them than other prices they might have otherwise incurred.

Was page 81 477

4.5.6 ECG disagreed with CEED's contention that ECG, as the supplier of system gas, should be subject to the same imbalance penalties as direct purchase suppliers. ECG denied that the role, functions and obligations of ECG as a supplier of system gas are comparable to those of the suppliers of direct purchase gas.

478

4.5.7 ECG stated that with respect to load balancing, T-Service and system gas customers are different in that T-Service customers or their agents deliver their MDVs on a daily basis. When a difference occurs between actual consumption and an MDV, ECG will either supply the commodity or store/ divert any excess gas by using load balancing tools. The only obligation on T-Service customers, or their agents, is to true-up, at the end of a contract year, for any cumulative difference between the volume of gas delivered -- the sum of the MDVs - and the volume of gas consumed.

479

4.5.8 For system gas customers, ECG pointed out that as a distributor, it must ensure that the volume of gas delivered matches, on a daily basis, the volume of gas consumed. On the issue of including a notional BGA, ECG asserted that if system gas customers were to have such a notional BGA, they would be required to balance it, to zero, on a daily basis. In ECG's view, this requirement would be far more onerous than the annual balancing obligation of direct purchase customers or their agents.

Was page 82 480

4.5.9 ECG also took exception to the suggestion that billing and collection costs, as they relate to system gas, should be attributable to a stand-alone supplier of system gas solely because a marketer "internalizes" these costs. ECG argued that a stand-alone supplier of system gas is a supplier of gas to ECG, not end-use customers, because ECG still offers sales service. There is no need, in other words, for the stand-alone supplier to have a billing and collection function directly or, like all marketers to date, indirectly through ECG's agency, billing and collection ("ABC") service.

481

4.5.10 ECG submitted that it would be unfair to require ECG to forego billing and collecting the costs of providing sales service as well as distribution service per se. ECG bills in excess of 1.5 million customers per month and the related costs, for the most part, are fixed costs. To remove system gas customers prematurely, then, would expose ECG to stranded costs

482

4.5.11 In summary then, ECG's position was that the Bracken Report properly identified the functions necessary to manage system gas on a stand-alone basis. ECG therefore proposed to use functions identified in the Bracken Report for the purpose of preparing its 2003 FAC Study.

Was page 83 483

4.6 BOARD FINDINGS

484

4.6.1 The Board notes that direct purchase customers or their agents are treated differently from system gas customers. This includes different treatment with respect to the responsibility and accountability associated with balancing, fees for billing and collection, access to storage and transportation

assets for use in mitigating volumetric imbalances, and access to current information for gas supply planning.

485

4.6.2 The Board is not convinced by the Company's argument that the operational differences between system gas and direct purchase gas are, by themselves, sufficient to justify the differences in treatment by the Company.

486

4.6.3 In reviewing this issue the Board would be assisted if the 2003 FAC study were expanded to include a detailed analysis of each service received by system gas customers in comparison to direct purchase customers.

487

4.6.4 The Board directs the Company to file the 2003 FAC study in two formats, as proposed by IGUA. One format will be in the format proposed by the Company; and the second format will be in the format proposed by CEED, which would identify and quantify all of the resources used by the Company to balance, and to bill and collect from system gas customers. The Board expects that both formats will be fully costed out and appropriately presented so that the Board can make meaningful comparisons between the two approaches.

Was page 84 488

4.6.5 The Board understands that the Company intends to bring a comprehensive rate restructuring application before the Board in the near future. Further, the Board is aware that the costs of the services under review in the 2003 FAC study are only a few of the many costs being apportioned among gas distribution customers. Since the matters to be dealt with in the 2003 FAC study are an aspect of cost allocation and rate design, which is related to rate restructuring, in the Board's view the 2003 FAC study would be most appropriately dealt with as part of any Company rate restructuring proposal.

489

4.6.6 The Board denies CEED's request that the Board direct the Company to render service levels more "equivalent", as it is premature. The Board is not satisfied that there is sufficient evidence in this proceeding to support CEED's request.

Was page 85 490

5. AFFILIATE OUTSOURCING

5.1 BACKGROUND

491

492

5.1.1 ECG's outsourcing began in the mid-1990s when business services, such as human resources, insurance, taxation, capital markets, public affairs, and audit were centralized with ECG's affiliate and ultimate parent, Enbridge Inc. ("EI"). These initial outsourcing arrangements were renewed and formalized in a series of agreements dated January 1, 2000.

493

5.1.2 In this proceeding, the intervenors expressed particular concern about outsourcing arrangements with the following affiliates:

494

- Enbridge Commercial Services Inc. - customer care services;

495

- Enbridge Operational Services Inc. - operational services;

496

- Enbridge Inc. - gas services;

497

- CustomerWorks Limited Partnership - customer care services; and

498

- Accenture Inc. - customer care services.

Was page 86 499

Enbridge Commercial Services Inc.

500

5.1.3 In 1999, as part of the unbundling of competitive businesses from monopoly utility operations, ECG transferred approximately 570 full-time equivalent employees ("FTEs") and the following competitive businesses to its affiliate, Enbridge Services Inc. ("ESI"): appliance sales, furnace and hot water heater rentals, appliance repair service, home renovation, insurance and financing.

501

5.1.4 On January 1, 2000, ECG transferred approximately 1,110 FTEs and the CIS and to a new affiliate, Enbridge Commercial Services Inc. ("ECS"), and entered into an agreement to procure the following services from ECS: customer care, including customer billing, collections and the customer call centre, information technology, fleet management, and payroll, including payroll administration, maintenance of employee-related data, benefits administration and an employee service centre.

502

5.1.5 ECG did not disclose its intention to transfer these business activities to the Board and intervenors during its fiscal 2000 rates case (RP-1999-0001). As a result IGUA, CAC and VECC brought a motion dated June 29, 2000 (the "Motion") for the Board to review and vary certain aspects of its RP-1999-0001 Decision [12JLL-0:1]. In particular the moving parties requested that the Board:

503
- review and vary those portions of the Board's decision relating the determination of ECG's operational and maintenance ("O&M") expenses, rate base, depreciation and amortization expense, return on rate base, income taxes, and gross revenue deficiency for ECG's fiscal year;

504
- declare the 2000 rates interim pending final disposition of the request for review and variance;

Was page 87 505
- order ECG to make full and complete disclosure of the particulars of the outsourcing plan, including requiring ECG to record all payments made in appropriate deferral accounts;

506
- provide for a hearing and determination on the extent to which the 2000 rates ought to be adjusted as a result of the outsourcing; and

507
- direct ECG to file rate base and other cost of service information for the 2000 bridge year and the 2001 test year in the traditional cost of service format in its next rates application.

508
5.1.6 On June 29, 2000 the Board issued it decision ("Decision on the Motion"), indicating that although the Board was not convinced that ECG adequately disclosed its outsourcing plan, the Board was reluctant to reopen the Targeted O&M PBR Plan ("TPBR Plan") early in its term. The Board did, however, order that ECG record the financial impact of the outsourcing, except for O&M expenses in a deferral account. The disposition of the deferral account was dealt with as part of the settlement in the RP-2000-0040 proceeding, which set rates for ECG's 2001 fiscal year.

509
5.1.7 As discussed in greater detail below, effective January 1, 2002, ECS entered into a five year agreement ("Client Services Agreement") with CustomerWorks Limited Partnership ("CustomerWorks" or CWLP") for CWLP to provide ECG with the customer care services previously provided by ECS. CustomerWorks is a limited partnership owned 70% by EI and 30% by BC Gas Utility Inc.("BC Gas") or an affiliate of BC Gas.

Was page 88 510
5.1.8 At the oral hearing in this proceeding ECG advised the Board that as a result of EI's sale of Enbridge Services Inc.("ESI") to a division of Centrica plc, ESI had decided to repatriate the services presently being provided by ECS. Since this would result in ECG becoming ECS's only customer, ECG is also considering repatriating the services that are now outsourced to ECS.

511
Enbridge Operational Services Inc.

512
5.1.9 On October 1, 2000 ECG entered into a seven-year agreement (the "Intercorporate Services Agreement") with its affiliate, Enbridge Operational Services Inc. ("EOS"), to procure the following services from EOS at its offices in Edmonton, Alberta: gas control, nominations, and scheduling, and reconciliation services (collectively "Operational Services").

513

5.1.10 ECG first advised the Board of its decision to "centralize part of the gas supply operations functions" to Edmonton in a letter to the Board's chair, Mr. Floyd Laughren, dated August 1, 2000:

514

> An extensive evaluation of the entire operating control centre functions across the Enbridge organization was conducted with the objective of maximizing operating efficiencies. We are now moving forward to create an energy operating control centre in Edmonton that will consolidate the control centre facilities for both liquids and gas operations.
>
> By centralizing these key operating functions, in addition to operating efficiencies, we expect to achieve synergies in the form of centralized software support and consistent training and procedures. The opportunity for cross-functional training will provide additional ongoing support to the gas functions. The presence of additional employees from other control functions will provide improved support and response to medical emergency situations that could occur after-hours.

515

Enbridge Inc.

Was page 89 516

5.1.11 On July 1, 2001 ECG entered into agreements (the "Master Agreement" and "Agency Agreement"), expiring September 30, 2004, with EI to procure the following services from EI at its offices in Calgary, Alberta: gas supply planning, gas supply acquisition, risk management, contract management, transactional services (including assignments, exchanges, load balancing, loans, and off-peak storage) and regulatory support (collectively, "Gas Services").

517

5.1.12 The Agency Agreement allows EI to engage in gas acquisition, gas sales, gas supply management, and gas storage as a principal for its own account. EI is not entitled, on the other hand, to act as a principal for its own account when providing gas supply acquisition and transactional services to ECG until protocols are in place for the disclosure to, and approval by, ECG of any transaction in which EI would be ECG's counterparty.

518

5.1.13 ECG advised the Board of its decision to move its employees to Calgary to perform gas supply and transactional services in a letter to the Board Chair, Mr. Floyd Laughren, dated April 17, 2001. ECG stated that "all twelve employees ... will remain as employees of Enbridge Consumers Gas."

519

CustomerWorks Limited Partnership

520

5.1.14 Effective January 1, 2002, ECG entered into a five-year agreement (the "Client Services Agreement") with CustomerWorks to procure the following customer care services, previously provided by ECG: meter reading, billing, call centres, credit and collections, e-commerce and field work appointment scheduling such as meter exchanges (collectively, "Customer Care Services"). ECG advised the Board that in addition to ECG, CustomerWorks also provides services to ESI, BC Gas and Enbridge Gas New Brunswick Inc.

Was page 90 521

Accenture Inc.

522

5.1.15 Subsequent to the oral hearing in this proceeding, on July 19, 2002, ECG advised the Board and the intervenors that CustomerWorks entered into an agreement with an affiliate of Accenture Inc., formerly Andersen Consulting, to assume the responsibility for the performance of the Customer-Works' customer service obligations to ECG. ECG submitted that the transaction did not affect the nature of the affiliate outsourcing presented in evidence in this proceeding and should therefore have no impact on the arguments presented to the Board. In addition, ECG claimed that the existing Client Services Agreement between CustomerWorks and ECG would not change as a result of the transaction between Accenture and CustomerWorks.

523

5.2 THE ISSUE

524

5.2.1 The scope of this issue was developed through the settlement process and defined in paragraph 5.3 of the Settlement Proposal which, in part, provides as follows:

525

> The policy aspect of this issue can be stated in the form of two questions. Should the Board restrict or otherwise condition ECG's outsourcing of utility functions by including terms and conditions to this effect in its rate order? And if so, what terms and conditions would be appropriate?

526

5.3 AFFILIATE OUTSOURCING - GENERAL COMMENTS

Was page 91 527

5.3.1 CME, CEED, HVAC, IGUA, Schools and VECC each made comments raising concerns with respect to ECG's outsourcing arrangements. They are collectively referred to as "Intervenors" in this chapter. Union also made comments; however, they were in support of ECG's position.

528

5.3.2 ECG took the position that its outsourcing arrangements with affiliates are on-going and in effect. These arrangements were not and are not required to be authorized by the Board prior to their effective date or during their currency. ECG argued that this was confirmed by the Board in its Decision on the Motion.

529

5.3.3 ECG argued that the Board's jurisdiction with respect to ECG's outsourcing arrangements is limited to rate-making. Since these outsourcing fees are a component of ECG's O&M expenses and are, accordingly, included in ECG's TPBR Plan for the 2002 Test Year, the outsourcing arrangements have no impact on rates in the 2002 Test Year. ECG submitted that neither the methods that were used to determine the fees payable by ECG under its outsourcing arrangements nor the level of these fees, is an issue in this proceeding. The costs consequences of these arrangements will be examined in the context of ECG's application for Fiscal 2003 rates.

530

5.3.4 Union agreed with ECG that since ECG's outsourcing arrangements do not affect 2002 rates, the outsourcing issue is, in this sense, indistinguishable from the DPWAMS issue, which the Board has

already held would not be dealt with in this hearing. Union argued that since there is no rate issue for the Board to determine in this proceeding it is"unnecessary and inadvisable" for the Board to comment on the affiliate outsourcing issue at all.

Was page 92 531

5.3.5 Intervenors argued that the Board has both the jurisdiction and obligation to consider implications of outsourcing beyond simply its cost consequences. As a regulated utility providing monopoly services to its ratepayers, ECG cannot be permitted to circumvent regulatory oversight by creating unregulated affiliates to perform utility functions. To take ECG's argument to its logical conclusion would mean that the if the utility completely failed to fulfil its basic distribution service obligations, the Board would only have the jurisdiction to deny cost recovery in rates.rvice.

532

5.3.6 The specific concerns raised by the parties are grouped and summarized as follows:

533

- Extent and Nature of the Services being Outsourced

534

- Motives for Outsourcing

535

- Potential Consequences of Outsourcing

536

- Specific Concerns of ECG's Outsourcing Arrangements

537

- Transfer Pricing

538

- Transfer of Utility Functions

539

- Remedies and Jurisdiction

540

5.4 EXTENT AND NATURE OF THE SERVICES BEING OUTSOURCED

541

5.4.1 ECG pointed out that it has, over the years, outsourced many utility functions to unaffiliated third parties. Its more recent decisions to outsource other utility functions to affiliates simply reflects a North American trend of industry restructuring and consolidation, in order to "enhance business effectiveness and customer service and achieve operational and cost efficiencies". ECG argued that its witnesses testified that the outsourcing of critical functions, such as gas control, is common in the natural gas industry.

Was page 93 542

5.4.2 A number of Intervenors commented that although the outsourcing arose primarily because of concerns about ECG's arrangements to outsource Gas Services to EI and Operational Services to EOS, concern about this issue increased when Intervenors became aware of the extent of the outsourcing.

543 5.4.3 HVAC argued that while ECG's evidence is that the utility has been outsourcing elements of its operations for years, historically most of that outsourcing has been to "unrelated service providers" in three areas:

544 • appliance inspections and new customer connections/unlocks;

545 • construction and engineering of the pipes and related infrastructure; and

546 • discrete consulting retainers in strategic business areas such as marketing technology, communications and DSM.

547 5.4.4 HVAC submitted that what is new in this proceeding is:

548 • the scale of the outsourcing;

549 • that ECG has outsourced control and operation of its basic utility mandate; gas acquisition, distribution system control and, as an adjunct thereto, customer care; and .

550 • that these operations have essentially been outsourced as complete operations, rather than as isolated construction or consulting assignments (even with the ultimate formal accountability to utility personnel).

551 5.4.5 HVAC commented that the degree to which ECG has outsourced its core utility functions, and the fact that these have been outsourced to affiliates of ECG, will adversely affect ratepayers or competitors of EI and ECG, or both, and therefore, these outsourcing arrangements are not in the public interest.

Was page 94 552 5.4.6 Schools noted that in the last two years ECG has outsourced over 15 separate utility business functions to affiliated companies in the Enbridge Group. These arrangements have been made pursuant to a general reorganization of the Group which places many business activities in unregulated companies in the Group. Schools contends that this reorganization of business functions has meant that today 54% of ECG's O&M budget consists of contractual payments to affiliates of ECG. Employment has dropped from 4,500 in 1995-96 to 1,700 people today. Schools argued that the utility is becoming "systematically eviscerated", and will, if the current trend persists, in a few years time become a "virtual utility".

553 5.4.7 Schools suggested that the first outsourcing of a complete business function, such as billing and customer care or gas services over a multi-year period, is different from contracting with a third party on a short-term basis to do a specific task, for example a specific mains extensions. Outsourcing raises different issues than simple contracting for services, including, scale, loss of independence of action, vulnerability to failure of the partner, diminished management control of the people performing the work and therefore, the business functions and an attenuation of regulatory oversight.

554

5.4.8 IGUA argued that the fact that ECG has, over the years, outsourced many functions to unaffiliated third parties pursuant to a public tender process and ECG's contention that there is a North American industry trend to outsource the performance of utility functions to unaffiliated third parties are facts which, in IGUA's view, have little relevance to the implications of the outsourcing arrangements which are being scrutinized in this case.

Was page 95 555

5.4.9 All parties agreed that gas services are critical to the operation of the utility. Schools pointed out that ECG's evidence is that it viewed the function as too "important and too derived from its own expertise" to contemplate an unaffiliated third party providing the services". Schools argued that the gas services activity is clearly part of the core function of the utility, utilizes utility assets, and is fundamental to the safe and secure supply for all the utility's customers, both system gas and direct purchase.

556

5.4.10 Schools pointed out that ECG has agreed that the functions being transferred were monopoly utility functions, ones that could not be easily replicated, and ones that are vital to the integrity of the utility and its safe and secure operation.

557

5.4.11 Schools observed, with respect to the transfer of Operational Services to EOS that :

558

- the expertise for the gas control function was in ECG and not EOS; indeed EOS was a new company, created in part to perform functions carried on by gas control personnel at ECG;

559

- the functions has not changed, only the venue;

560

- there was no compelling reason to create the new company;

561

- ECG could easily have made the SCADA investments itself; although to the extent the expenditures were not closed to rate base prior to October 31, 2003, it would have been at risk for the expenditure under a price/revenue cap PBR regime;

562

- supervisor oversight could have been rationalized in Toronto, at about the same cost as transferring th functions to Edmonton;

563

- the costs to comply with rule changes (if there are any) have to be recovered in any event;

Was page 96 564

- the Company's evidence is that under the EOS contract it is being charged the utility's avoided costs for a seven year period and given that there are no evident market benchmarks for this monopoly service, ECG is effectively locked in to pay its avoided costs from day one over seven years;

565

- since ECG already provided similar services to St Lawrence Gas, Gas New Brunswick and Gazifere, providing services to these entities was not a reason for the transfer;

566 • to earn a return from the business activity of over 17.5% on the total capital investment in the SCADA system compared with 9.7% had ECG made the investment;

567 • the arrangements allow EOS to potentially realize some economies of scale or scope by combining the gas control centre with an enlarged liquids control centre without having to pass any of the resulting savings on to ECG;

568 • the transfer of the function allows EOS the opportunity to provide these business services to other gas distributors, and other entities in the water and electricity industries using the software, training and trained personnel provided by ECG;

569 • transferring the business to EOS forecloses a third party from bidding for ECG's gas control business; competition in the business was deemed to be imminent; and

570 • the Board was never asked to approve this initiative and this issue was never seriously discussed by the parties.

571 5.4.12 In Schools' view, the Board should not permit a business function that is so vital to the continued integrity of the utility to be performed by a third party, affiliated or otherwise, for the following reasons;

572 • the transfer compromises the independence and integrity of the utility;

573 • the financial viability of EOS is not assured;

Was page 97 574 • given the long term fixed price nature of the EOS contract, and the lack of market comparators, there is no way to precipitate lower costs and transfer part of the consequent savings to ratepayers; and

575 • there is no compelling rationale for the transfer from ECG's point of view.

576 5.4.13 IGUA agreed that the performance of Operational and Gas Services is essential and critical to the performance by ECG of the monopoly function of physically transmitting, distributing and/or storing gas and selling gas as a regulated supply service. Together EI, EOS and ECG control the physical flows of gas in and out of ECG's transmission, distribution and storage assets.

5.5 MOTIVES FOR OUTSOURCING

577

578 5.5.1 ECG submitted that its decision to outsource its Operational Services to EOS was driven by:

579 • concerns regarding system reliability and security of supply; and

580

- the opportunity to maximize operating efficiencies.

581

5.5.2 ECG argued that three specific factors influenced ECG's decision:

582

- the unique staffing requirements associated with gas control operations;

583

- the need to replace ECG's Supervisory Control And Data Administration ("SCADA") system; and

584

- EI's plans to consolidate the control functions of its liquids pipelines.

Was page 98 585

5.5.3 ECG argued that with respect to staffing requirements, it had concerns about its ability to provide back-up supervisory coverage for its 24-hour, seven days a week gas control operations in a cost effective manner. With respect to the SCADA system, ECG considered the fact that its existing system needed to be replaced at a considerable cost. With respect to EI's plans to consolidate the control functions of its liquids pipelines, ECG considered the associated opportunities for achieving synergies under a consolidated operation an advantage as there would be improved supervision of its gas control function, whereby more supervisors would manage a larger group of individuals, and the risks inherent in operating with a single supervisor would be reduced.

586

5.5.4 ECG advised the Board that its decision to outsource its Gas Services to EI was "driven by the opportunity to achieve benefits in the form of cost efficiencies and improved service quality". ECG argued that "EI can provide Gas Services more efficiently than ECG because it provides such services on behalf of three affiliates and for its own account" and that ECG is precluded from providing gas services to third parties under its current Undertakings (Undertakings of The Consumers' Gas Company Ltd. et al dated December 7, 1998.)

587

5.5.5 ECG claimed that cost efficiencies and improved service quality could be achieved as a result of the access to the specialized expertise and "market intelligence" available in Calgary and that in the Company's view, similar benefits cannot be realized in Toronto. ECG's witnesses testified about the difficulty of managing Gas Services and the benefits of being able to draw upon expertise in Calgary to manage, for example, ECG's contractual assets on the Alliance Vector pipeline systems.

Was page 99 588

5.5.6 However, a number of Intervenors questioned ECG's motive for outsourcing.

589

5.5.7 CAC noted that while outsourcing is not necessarily inappropriate, when outsourcing to affiliates is the norm, it raises questions about whether ratepayer interests are being compromised to benefit the shareholder.

590

5.5.8 CAC and IGUA both argued that ECG has provided no evidence to demonstrate that these arrangements provide benefits to ratepayers. No studies were produced to demonstrate that the provision of these services by EI or other affiliates was superior to providing them within the utility.

591

5.5.9 ECG stated that there is "no evidence that outsourcing will harm ratepayers. In fact, the evidence in this proceeding is that costs will be reduced, service quality will be enhanced and ratepayers will benefit as a result of ECG's decision to outsource Gas Services and Operational Services to EI and EOS respectively".

Was page 100 592

System Reliability and Quality of Service

593

5.5.10 ECG argued that in the Decision on the Motion the Board stated that "[u]tility customers should be indifferent as to whether...services [customer care, information technology and fleet management] are performed within the utility by utility employees, or by a third party affiliate, as long as they are performed to the requisite standard". ECG argued that there has been no suggestion that ECG's outsourcing arrangements have adversely affected the quality of service that ECG provides to its customers. The service quality indicators of the TPBR Plan ensure that service levels are maintained.

594

5.5.11 ECG argued that there is a "significant benefit to ratepayers", from not only a cost but also from a service quality perspective, in locating the Gas Service functions in the business centre of the western Canadian supply basin.

595

5.5.12 CAC noted that ECG did not provide any credible evidence to support the claims of "system reliability", "security of supply" and to "maximize operating efficiencies". CAC questioned how security of supply and reliability can be enhanced and maintained by moving key operational functions for an Ontario-based LDC to Alberta.

596

5.5.13 Schools viewed ECG's alleged difficulty in obtaining qualified personnel in Ontario as "incredulous, given the large number of gas marketing and trading companies with offices in the Toronto area. Some of the more skillful gas traders in Canada reside in the Toronto area. Even if the Company's claim were true, the Company has not explained why it could not simply plan and hire some ECG employees in a Calgary office, much as it did several years ago..."

Was page 101 597

Economies of Scale and Scope

598

5.5.14 ECG argued that it was prohibited from achieving the same degree of synergies and efficiencies that could be achieved by EOS by consolidating the gas and liquids control functions. ECG argued that "Put in the simplest of terms, hypothetically speaking, if EOS can provide services more cheaply than ECG because of economies of scale and scope than are available to ECG should not such costs efficiencies accrue to EOS? Clearly the answer is "yes".

599

5.5.15 HVAC's response to this question was "clearly no". HVAC argued that in a competitive market, where EOS would not have a utility with captive customers, the efficiencies realized by EOS would be shared, and monopoly rents that either elevate shareholder returns or provide the opportunity to allocate all efficiency gains elsewhere would be precluded, and that the Board must return to its essential mandate to act as a proxy for competition.

600

5.5.16 ECG admitted that one of the reasons for the joint venture was that ECS had excess "capability".

601

5.5.17 Schools argued that the formation of the joint venture should have lowered the overall unit costs of the entity which should have resulted in savings for both ECS and BC Gas, part of which could have been passed through to ECG and its ratepayers. Schools also noted that the British Columbia Utilities Commission ("BCUC") referred to BC Gas stating that the "fees paid by ECG for similar services are higher than those to be paid by BC Gas. It is not clear why."

Was page 102 602

Maximizing Profit to the Shareholder

603

5.5.18 Schools noted that EGC's prefiled evidence contained only a brief description of the affiliate out-sourcing arrangements and that there was no rationale or explanation as to why they would be in the interests of the utility or its ratepayers. It was not until ECG produced, on cross examination at the oral hearing, presentations to ECG's and Enbridge's executive committees that light was cast on the decisions including:

604

- that the creation of the gas purchase function in EI was to be the first step of a multi-stage process, the second phase of which would be to transfer the storage assets and business of the utility either to EI or to a separate storage company;

605

- that the return on equity in the gas storage/transactional services company, was estimated at 26% compared with the utility return of 9.7%;

606

- that the creation of a gas service division in EI would assist EI in solving its "problem" of selling its transportation capacity on the Alliance/Vector pipeline systems and/or buying gas to sell to customers, potentially including ECG, which would be transported through one or both of those pipelines;

607

- the alleged difficulty of obtaining qualified personnel in Ontario;

608

- the fear that in the future the Board would insist on competitive bids for the gas supply function;

609

- that ECG did not want an unaffiliated third party to provide the services since it would be "giving away" its expertise; and

610

- the alleged threat of the Board's disallowance of gas costs.

Was page 103 611

5.5.19 IGUA made much the same argument as Schools, that the primary objective of ECG's plans to gradually transfer the performance of critical utility functions to affiliates was to substantially enhance returns to ECG's shareholder and ultimate parent EI. IGUA also argued that the documents strongly indicate that one of the objectives of the arrangements is to divert transactional services

revenue from ECG to EI, and that an objective of the overall plan was to establish an organizational structure whereby utility information would be provided to and utility functions would be performed by an entity within the Enbridge Group which was also authorized to participate on its own account in the competitive market.

612

5.5.20 Schools argued that these inter-affiliate arrangements are reallocations of business functions to various entities within the group in a manner which maximizes the profitability of the Enbridge Group as a whole, but which do not necessarily serve the best interests of the utility and its ratepayers. In Schools' view, ECG bears a heavy onus to demonstrate that such arrangements provide benefits to the ratepayers at least equivalent to those provided to the Enbridge Group shareholders.

613

5.6 POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES OF OUTSOURCING

614

Conflict of Interest

615

5.6.1 ECG did not see the need for the Board to restrict or otherwise condition ECG's ability to outsource utility functions to affiliates, because the outsourcing arrangements do or will contain provisions or protocols that prevent the only conflicts of interest that ECG sees arising from the outsourcing arrangements. ECG did not think access to utility information of the type given by ECG to EI and EOS, or by them to one another, could impair competition even if either affiliate were active in Ontario gas markets.

Was page 104 616

5.6.2 ECG claimed that the only services in which EI could have a conflict of interest were buying gas for ECG as ECG's agent from itself as a principal, or selling a transactional service for ECG as ECG's agent to itself as a principal.

617

5.6.3 ECG argued that EI, as ECG's agent has an equitable duty to ECG to act in the best interests of ECG. ECG pointed out that EI is contractually obligated, under the Agency Agreement, to "act honestly and in good faith with a view to the best interests of [ECG]" and to "exercise that degree of care, diligence and skill that a prudent and reasonable service provider could exercise in providing the Services in comparable circumstances". ECG argued that to suggest that EI would breach its equitable and contractual duties in this regard is, "quite simply to imply bad faith on the part of EI".

618

5.6.4 HVAC countered ECG's argument with the following:

619

- it is not self evident that a "reasonable service provider" would not, and should not, prefer its own interests over that of one of its customers, or the interests of one customer over another, in the event that a choice was required;

620

- if the argument is taken to its logical conclusion the Board should never have to exercise its mandate, since by extension ECG's argument would entail positing that review by the Board of ECG's costs and rate-making policies implies that ECG is not acting in the best interests of it customers (the ratepayers). HVAC submitted that the Board does not have to

suspect *mala fides* on the part of ECG or EI, in order to justify oversight of the utility functions.

621

- EI's management is obligated, as a matter of law, to protect EI's interests even at the expense of the interests of its customer ECG. That is why the ARC exists and is why the Board might conclude that its intervention into these outsourcing arrangements is warranted.

Was page 105 622

5.6.5 Some of the Intervenors claimed that EI has a conflict of interest when EI is engaged in its own transactions regardless of whether ECG is EI's counterparty. EI is in a position to prefer its own commercial interests over ECG's interests, in terms of transactional services, and to use its access to utility assets and information to compete against other participants in the gas trading and sales business.

623

5.6.6 CAC did not accept ECG's proposition that the agency agreements, protocols negotiated within the EI family between affiliates, existing Codes and the Board's rate-making powers provide sufficient protection for ratepayers.

624

5.6.7 Schools expressed concern that EI could reserve to itself the most attractive opportunities to acquire and trade gas, whether or not it uses the utility's assets in those transactions. In a rapidly changing commodity market, the best prices may only be available for a very short time. The Agency Agreement does not require EI to provide the opportunities first to ECG. EI declined to commit that it would not expand its gas wholesale business in the future.

625

5.6.8 Schools noted that EI holds transportation capacity on the Alliance/Vector pipelines. Normally it would assign that capacity to producers/marketers who require the capacity to move their gas; however, ECG witnesses professed that they did not know what EI would do with its gas.

Was page 106 626

5.6.9 Schools submitted that EI's dual role compromises the credibility and integrity of ECG's gas services business and will affect ECG's ability to obtain the best offers from the marketplace which will ultimately harm ratepayers.

627

Lack of Separation of Utility Functions and Competitive Services

628

5.6.10 CEED pointed out that since at least 1997, the Board has insisted upon the separation of utility and competitive services "so that information available in the provision of utility services could not be used in the provision of competitive services". CEED argued that ECG has resisted this direction and has maintained the position that it should be able to provide competitive services.

629

5.6.11 CEED argued that in this case, ECG is trying to bring about the same result through different means. Instead of providing competitive services in the utility, it proposes providing utility services through a competitive affiliate. The result is the same because in either case, the same corporate entity is providing both competitive and utility services. The harm is the same, because the competitive corporate entity has access to information available in the provision of utility services.

630

5.6.12 IGUA submitted that the principles that have guided the development of the provisions of the Undertakings, the Act and the ARC have been expressed in many previous Board decisions and reports relating to the operation of the regulated natural gas transmission, distribution and storage businesses in the competitive gas commodity market and include the following:

631

- the performance of utility functions is to be physically, functionally and organizationally separated from the competitive market business activities;

Was page 107 632

- there shall be no preferences conferred on utility affiliates engaged in competitive market business activities through preferential access to utility resources or information, confidential or otherwise; and

633

- utility ratepayers shall not subsidize affiliates engaged in competitive market business activities.

634

5.6.13 IGUA questioned whether the agency arrangement between ECG and EI in which ECG specifically agrees that EI can participate as a principal on its own account in the competitive marketplace while performing critical utility functions for ECG as ECG's agent, contravenes these guiding principles. IGUA argued that it appears to be ECG's position that if the legal responsibility for the performance of utility functions rests with two different corporations, then the principle requiring functional and corporate separation of the performance of monopoly and competitive market business activities is not contravened despite the fact that the functions are actually being performed by one company.

Was page 108 635

Access to Confidential Information

636

5.6.14 A number of Intervenors expressed concern that confidential information provided by ECG to EI may be used by EI when acting as principal for its own account, and in competition with other parties who would not have the same information.

637

5.6.15 ECG advised the Board that ECG, EI, and EOS are working on amendments to the two outsourcing arrangements in order to harmonize them. The amendments will provide for the sharing of ECG's information by EOS and EI so that they each have the information, from one another as well as from ECG, that they each need to provide their respective services to ECG.

638

5.6.16 ECG admitted that much of the information about storage balances, supply demand balances in the commodity and storage services and other aggregate data which it provides to EI is not available to gas marketers and trading entities at large.

639

5.6.17 ECG argued that:

640

- its witnesses could not envision a single, real-life example of a situation where the information that is provided to EI would give EI a competitive advantage;

641

- the Agency Agreement sets out, very specifically, the provisions that pertain to the treatment of confidential information;

642

- the Agency Agreement obliges EI to do such things as are necessary to assist [ECG] to comply with the ARC;

643

- much of the information provided to EI was for the purpose of gas supply planning, rather than gas acquisitions; and

Was page 109 644

- much of the customer information that was provided to EI was either not confidential or was sufficiently aggregated that any individual customer's or marketer's information could not be identified.

645

5.6.18 HVAC argued that the aggregate or generic information provided by EI to ECG, when not available to anyone else, is as much a competitive advantage as would be the identity of particular customers and their particular service needs. Access to this information, combined with the absence of restraints on its use by EI in the agreement between EI and ECG will provide a competitive advantage to EI should it choose to enter these markets. In Schools' view, ratepayers benefit more from a competitive market for wholesale services which has a level playing field.

646

5.6.19 HVAC noted that s.2.2.5 of the Board's *Standard Supply Service Code for Electricity Distributors* contains a limitation on the permitted business scope of an electricity retailer who provides standard supply service on behalf of an electricity distributor, in addition to an express limitation on the use that such a third party supplier is permitted to make of consumer-specific information obtained by it in the course of providing standard supply service. HVAC urged that a similar restriction should be required of EI in respect of the outsourcing reviewed in this case.

647

5.6.20 HVAC submitted that the issue is not whether EI has access to "confidential" utility information; but rather whether EI has access to utility information, that is, information possessed by the utility by virtue of, and as a result of, carrying out its obligations under its monopoly franchise, that other parties do not have ready access to. If EI does have access to such utility information it has a potential competitive advantage by virtue of its dealings with the utility. Such advantages have traditionally been subject to control by monopoly regulators.

Was page 110 648

5.6.21 While ECG claimed that it appreciated the concerns of intervenors regarding the use of customer and utility information by its affiliates, ECG did not accept that the outsourcing arrangements offend the ARC, the Undertakings, or the policy intent of the government of Ontario in this regard. ECG denied, "in the strongest possible terms" that its outsourcing arrangements were intended as a vehicle to give a competitive advantage to EI to the detriment of its competitors. ECG submitted that the Customer and Utility Information EI receives from ECG and EOS does not, and cannot, advantage EI.

649

5.6.22 In order to illustrate ECG's "probity", ECG indicated that it is prepared to undertake that, on or before October 1st, (2002) all Customer Information that is provided to EI, either directly or indi-

rectly (through EOS) will be provided in a form that is sufficiently aggregated such that any individual consumer's, marketer's or other utility service customer's information cannot reasonably be identified. ECG is also prepared to undertake that the Customer Information that is provided to EI will also be provided, on requests and on a non-discriminatory basis, to individual customers or their agents in the same format that the information is provided to EI.

650

Lack of Independence

651

5.6.23 Schools suggested that having the parent conduct critical business functions creates several problems:

652

- it makes it more difficult for the Board to properly regulate these utility services; the Company has suggested that EI personnel and documents may not be available to the Board and intervenors;

653

- the utility will lose its ability to operate on a stand-alone and independent basis and will be more vulnerable to the influence of the owner over a whole host of issues;

Was page 111 654

- the utility will depend upon the good will and contractual undertakings of its owner, whose interests may vary from those of the utility. At the very least the owner will have competing interests such as maximizing the return on capital of its unregulated business;

655

- EI's financial interests are not identical to those of the utility. Schools notes that ECG's Standard& Poors debt ratings have recently been lowered, due in part, to the reduction of the ratings of EI's debt, as a result of EI's numerous acquisitions over the last two years;

656

- the utility will be providing expertise for which it is not being paid, to help the owner to solve one of its "problems", namely its need to manage its exposure to Alliance/Vector demand charges and in aid thereof, to purchase gas in Alberta for delivery through those pipelines; and

657

- the owner EI, has placed itself in a clear conflict of interest position by retaining the right to carry on the same businesses in its own right that it is to conduct on behalf of ECG.

658

5.6.24 Schools noted that there has been a tendency in recent years for gas utilities to become part of very large energy companies and this emphasizes the need for close examination of any such arrangements. Schools noted that ECG's witness, Mr. Pleckaitis, focused his testimony on EI being able to compete internationally. Schools stated while the "nexus between the issues at hand and international competitiveness is not altogether clear, the perspective, at least, is revealing. The interests of the individual parts of the EI organization, including ECG, are now subordinate to the interests of the larger entity, for better or for worse".

Was page 112 659

5.6.25 Schools also pointed out that "EI is the owner of ECG. ECG senior personnel report to EI personnel, and presumably some ECG executives aspire to one day being executives of the parent company. None of this bodes well for independence of action of the utility"

660

Loss of Regulatory Oversight

661

5.6.26 A number of Intervenors expressed concern that the Board may lose regulatory oversight of utility functions when a utility no longer performs them.

662

5.6.27 ECG argued that the Board's regulatory oversight is not affected by ECG's outsourcing arrangement to its affiliates, any more than it has been affected by many of ECG's outsourcing to non-affiliated third parties in the past. ECG submitted that Gas Services, Operational Services and customer care services will continue to be subject to the Board's scrutiny, pursuant to the provisions of the Act, as they have in the past. ECG will be responsible for providing the Board with the information it requires to carry out its responsibilities under the Act and the ARC. The Board will continue to exercise its regulatory jurisdiction over ECG and ECG will continue to attorn to such jurisdiction. In the meantime ECG's management should be free to organize its business as it sees fit, provided that ratepayers are held harmless.

663

5.6.28 HVAC pointed out that ECG argues that, quite apart from whether the Board has the jurisdiction to exercise oversight in respect of these arrangements, it need not, since the subject contracts provide ample ratepayer and market protection. HVAC concluded that regulatory intervention cannot be supplanted by the contractual terms relied on by ECG. Those terms do not address the concerns raised regarding the outsourcing arrangements.

Was page 113 664

5.6.29 CAC submitted that although ECG is claiming that the outsourcing of these functions to EI and EOS was undertaken largely to achieve cost efficiencies and improve service quality, CAC is of the view that these initiatives were undertaken as part of a larger strategy to benefit EI and in an attempt to do so reduce regulatory oversight of utility functions.

665

5.6.30 Schools submitted that the Board should regulate ECG's outsourcing activities to ensure the Board can properly regulate the conduct of the monopoly utility business in the future.

666

5.6.31 CME submitted that while ECG takes the position that "the Board cannot seek to extend its jurisdiction indirectly, through ECG, to companies over which it has no jurisdiction, other than under a rule made pursuant to clause 44(1)(g)[12JF7-0:368] of the Act, CME submitted that likewise, ECG cannot avoid the jurisdiction of the Board by transferring functions, particularly Gas Services, to another entity. The Board has a broad mandate under the Act, and arguably has the ability to ensure that a franchisee fulfills its legal obligations, particularly when the entity that the functions have been outsourced to is an affiliate of the utility. To decide otherwise would enable ECG to escape the regulatory framework that the province has set out for utilities, such as ECG by simply outsourcing most functions.

667

5.7 SPECIFIC CONCERNS OF ECG'S OUTSOURCING ARRANGEMENTS

668

Contractual Provisions and Protocols

Was page 114 669

5.7.1 ECG advised the Board that the agreements contain a number of provisions to protect ratepayers, such as the Protocols and that ECG has a duty to its ratepayers to ensure compliance with the Protocols and, if necessary, to take appropriate action.

670

5.7.2 In Schools' view the contracts that underpin the affiliate transactions do not adequately protect the interests of ECG and its ratepayers for a number of reasons.

671

5.7.3 Some of Schools' noted a number of specific concerns about the Client Services Agreement between ECG and CustomerWorks.

672

- The agreement contains a right of first refusal, which provides that at the end of the term of the agreement ECG has the right to tender, but CWLP has the right to match any offer. This deters other parties from bidding and confers a significant benefit on the original service provider. As a practical matter CWLP is "virtually guaranteed" repeated extensions of this contract beyond the initial five year term. Schools pointed out that the BCUC was highly critical of a similar feature in BC Gas's contract with CWLP and suggested having truly competitive bids at the expiration of the contract regardless of the contract.

673

- CWLP does not have a strong incentive to perform at the highest possible level under the contract. The fees payable to CWLP by ECG are either a flat fee per month or a flat fee per transaction, and CustomerWorks is not obliged to reduce its charges to ECG if it develops better processes, deploys new technologies or has economies of scale.

674

- While the agreement provides some obligation on CustomerWorks to bring forward for consideration anything it might find out which could increase efficiency or improve service, that obligation is limited to "reasonable commercial efforts", a standard that, in Schools' opinion "admits much judgment".

Was page 115 675

- ECG does not have formal responsibilities under the agreement to continue to examine opportunities to reduce costs or enhance service levels and to bring these to the attention of CustomerWorks.

676

- The agreement does not contain a definition of "material default", except to exclude from its ambit failure to meet the performance requirements and time frames included in the schedules to the agreement. Schools questioned that if failure to meet performance standards is not a material default, what is?

677

5.7.4 Schools pointed out that BC Gas's contract with CustomerWorks has the same right of first refusal but with some protection for ratepayers through a requirement that in the event BC Gas decides not to tender at the end of the term the rates for the services in any renewal year, CustomerWorks cannot increase over the previous year's rates by more than 50% of the rate of inflation. Events of default are also specified in the agreement.

678

5.7.5 Schools concluded that the lack of clear definition of when CustomerWorks is in default taken together with the right of first refusal shows that the agreement is not a true arm's length agreement, but rather "was structured to advance and protect the interests of the service provider Customer-Works at the expense of the utility and its ratepayers."

679

5.7.6 Schools noted a number of deficiencies in the Intercorporate Services Agreement and Agency Agreement with EOS:

680

- EOS is a start-up company and neither its obligations nor its financial viability are guaranteed by EI or any substantive entity in the Enbridge Group.

Was page 116 681

- EOS is conducting a function indispensable to the safe and secure operation of the utility however, there is no financial information available to the Board on EOS.

682

- Although there is an obligation to make available to ECG terms equal to those subsequently agreed to in a contract with any other affiliate of EOS, that right does not extend to terms offered to unaffiliated third parties.

683

- There are no performance standards set out in the agreement, and they are apparently still being worked on notwithstanding that the agreement is dated October 1, 2000 and that it requires the development of formal performance standards by July 31, 2001.

684

- There are no default provisions in the agreement and no remedies in the event of default, even if EOS is bankrupt or insolvent or fails to meet the yet-to-be developed performance standards.

685

- The Agency Agreement contains a price adjustment clause to the effect that if the Minster of National Revenue for Canada issues an assessment that would impose any liability for tax on the basis that the fair market value of the services is different than the amount charged and if the parties agree that the fair market value is different than the service charge, then the service charge shall be varied by the amount agreed upon by the parties. Schools pointed out that the parties are not required to change the service charge, if challenged by National Revenue, but may agree to continue to charge the price stipulated in the agreement.

686

- There is no price adjustment clause in the agreement. While there is a provision for parties to renegotiate pricing every two years to reflect "market pricing benchmarks" there is no

indication of how one would go about determining what these are for an activity only carried out by distributors that are monopoly transporters of gas.

Was page 117 687

5.7.7 Schools expressed concern that the Master Agreement and Agency Agreement between ECG and EI contained many of the same weaknesses as the agreements between ECG and EOS, although Schools acknowledged that EI is a substantial entity. Schools expressly noted the following:

688

- The agreement places EI in a conflict of interest and the appearance thereof by permitting it to act in two capacities at once, as a contractor employed by ECG to provide it with various gas supply, planning and acquisition, transportation planning, storage planning, transaction services and contract management services, and as a provider of some or all of the same services to third parties. The agreement even permits EI to bid on some of the tenders that it is putting to the market on behalf of ECG.

689

- Since EI has no fiduciary obligation to ECG when it offers its own gas supply and transactional service businesses in the marketplace, it can take the better opportunities to itself, and ECG has no recourse.

690

- There are no performance standards set out, even though the contract went into effect on July 1, 2001. There are no default provisions and in the event of a dispute, the sole remedy is arbitration.

691

- The protocols, which the Company stressed were there to protect ratepayers, address only the situation where EI has been asked to tender to itself, for either gas supply or transactional service; they do not apply at all to the situation where EI takes the best opportunities for itself.

692

- There is no price adjustment clause in the contract.

693

5.7.8 Schools noted that the "protocols" do not address the issue of the nature of ECG's opportunity costs foregone, they only address the narrower issue of when EI is tendering services itself. Schools pointed out that EI can and may reserve to itself the most attractive opportunities as EI is not required to provide the opportunities first to ECG and that the Agency Agreement explicitly states that EI does not have a fiduciary obligation to ECG.

Was page 118 694

5.7.9 Some Intervenors expressed concern that no third party can enforce compliance with the contractual provisions and Protocols that pertain to a situation where EI acts as principal for its own account and is ECG's counterparty.

695

5.7.10 Some Intervenors also expressed concern that the Protocols would apply only to transactions in which ECG and EI are counterparties and that the Protocols are not yet available for review.

696

5.7.11 CAC questioned the extent to which these Protocols, negotiated between affiliates within the EI group of companies can ensure that ratepayer interests are not compromised in favour of shareholder interests. CAC also wondered what assurances there were that the protocols are complied with and how the Board could be satisfied that system supply is not negatively affected.

697

5.7.12 ECG responded that the Protocols protect ECG's ratepayers in a situation where EI acts as a principal for its own account and is a counterparty to ECG. ECG pointed out that EI is obligated under the Agency Agreement to comply with these Protocols. Until these Protocols are in place, EI is precluded from acting as principal for its own account when ECG would be EI's counterparty.

698

5.7.13 Some Intervenors expressed concern that contractual provisions and Protocols could be amended at any time.

Was page 119 699

5.7.14 While ECG agreed that it may amend the outsourcing agreements, with the concurrence of its counterparty, ECG noted that "such amendments would be subject to the Board's scrutiny and direction but only to the extent that they were relevant to the exercise of the Board's regulatory jurisdiction under the Act or otherwise", for example compliance with the ARC.

700

5.7.15 Some of the Intervenors believed that the contractual provisions are not capable of adequately addressing their concerns about the outsourcing arrangements and, therefore, they believed that a Board order is necessary to impose appropriate terms and conditions to prevent conflicts of interests and other harm to customers.

701

Long Term Financial Viability

702

5.7.16 Schools pointed out that the Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Canada ("OSFI") has set out Guidelines, Outsourcing of Business Functions by Federally Regulated Financial Institutions ("FRFIS"), dated January 2000 (the "Guidelines"). The Guidelines contain specific requirements with respect to the financial stability of any company to which a regulated institution may outsource a function critical to its operations. The Guidelines provide that outsourcing agreements must include audits of service providers, clear default procedures, remedies, sharing of gains and short falls, and incentives to reduce costs.

703

5.7.17 Schools noted that neither EI has guaranteed the performance or the financial viability of EOS or CustomerWorks and the Board has been provided with no information on the financial status of these corporations.

704

Effect on Incentive Regulation

Was page 120 705

5.7.18 Some Intervenors have concerns that ECG is outsourcing utility functions in advance of rebasing its revenue requirement for an incentive regulation plan

706

5.7.19 In Schools' view, ECG's outsourcing activities represents a major change in the way in which ECG conducted its regulated utility business up until that time. In Schools' submission, the transfer of customer care services in January 1, 2000 was a direct response to the commencement in October 1999 of the TPBR regime.

707

5.7.20 Schools argued that the real reason for the change is the savings opportunity provided by the PBR regime. For example, if ECG had retained the customer care function within the utility, any savings made through reduced staffing or improved processes or technology would, under a comprehensive PBR plan with an earnings sharing feature, be shared with ratepayers. On the other hand, where the function is outsourced pursuant to a contract such as the one between ECG and CustomerWorks that provides for a flat monthly rate or flat per transaction charges, any savings realized through more efficient operation or innovation accrue to the shareholder.

708

5.7.21 Schools argued that this is counter to the intent of performance based rate-making plans, which are to incent the utility to try to reduce its costs by operating more efficiently, to try harder to discover and implement process improvements and technical innovations which lower its costs of doing business, and/or to offer new and better services.

709

5.7.22 Schools argued that the proponents of PBR did not envisage that the utilities and their parent companies would transfer functions to unregulated affiliates pursuant to long term fixed price contracts where the contract prices would not be reduced during the term of the PBR, or at rebasing, to reflect cost savings realized by the unregulated service provider, and where savings can be hidden by the unregulated affiliates' refusal to disclose costs and revenues.

Was page 121 710

5.7.23 Even if the Board accepts the propriety of outsourcing a particular business function, and there are precautions taken against the export of savings, Schools argued that the Board must ensure, particularly in the case where the party performing the business function is an affiliate, that the process by which the contracts were awarded and the specific contractual arrangements under which the utility purchases services from the affiliate are fair to utility ratepayers and comply with the letter and the spirit of the *Affiliate Relationships Code for Gas Utilities* [12JF4-0:1] (the "ARC" or the "Code").

711

5.7.24 Schools argued that large scale outsourcing to affiliates in the context of a PBR plan (whether price cap, revenue cap, or otherwise) can lead to "the export of savings", that is, the realization of PBR driven O&M savings and additional revenues in unregulated affiliates, which savings then accrue to the shareholder alone, rather than in the regulated utility, where traditionally the savings are shared with ratepayers pursuant to earnings-sharing arrangements.

712

5.7.25 IGUA pointed out that the outsourcing arrangements do not transparently reveal the extent to which EI's returns are increasing as a result of "savings" achieved through outsourcing.

713

5.8 TRANSFER PRICING

Was page 122 714

5.8.1 Paragraphs 2.3.2 [12JF4-0:64] and 2.3.3 [12JF4-0:65] of the ARC provide:

715

2.3.2 In purchasing service, resource or product from an affiliate, a utility shall pay no more than the fair market value. For the purpose of purchasing a service, resource or product a valid tendering process shall be evidence of fair market value.

2.3.3 Where a fair market value is not available for any product, resource or service, utilities shall charge no less than a cost based price, and shall pay no more than a cost based price. A cost based price shall reflect the costs of producing the service or product, including a return on invested capital. The return component shall be the higher of the utility's approved rate of return or the bank prime rate.

716

5.8.2 ECG argued that issues regarding the proper methods of determining transfer prices and the recovery of such costs are not for this proceeding.

717

5.8.3 ECG advised the Board it endeavours to establish market prices for all affiliate transactions. Where there is a viable market for comparable services, ECG uses a number of sources of information in order to validate pricing, "including but not limited to articles and reports, consultants' reports, past experience, and tendering" In some cases, due to the nature of the service, it is not possible to establish a comparable market price. For such services, ECG established cost based prices relying on its historic internal costs. ECG argued that since is uses market based prices where available and costs based prices where a market price cannot be determined, ECG is in compliance with the transfer pricing provisions of the ARC.

Was page 123 718

5.8.4 At the oral hearing ECG provided the following chart to demonstrate its basis for determining the proper transfer pricing:

719

Service Provider	Service	Transfer Pricing Basis
ECS	Desktop Support	Market
ECS	Network & Telecommunications	Market
ECS	Application Maintenance	Market
ECS	Document Reproduction	Market
ECS	Fleet & Equipment	Market
ECS	Asset & Revenue Protection	Cost
ECS	Labour Relations	Cost
ECS	Learning & Leadership	Cost
ECS	Employee Communications	Cost
ECS	Consulting & Professional IT	Market

EI	Audit	Market
EI	Tax	Market
EI	Risk Management	Cost
EI	Supplier Management	Cost
EI	Government Relations	Cost
EI	Management Fee	Cost
EI	Treasury Fee	Cost
CWLP	Call Centre	Market & Cost
CWLP	Credit and Collections	Market & Cost
CWLP	Meter Reading	Market&Cost

Was page 124

CWLP	Billing Support Services	Market & Cost
EI	Gas Supply Management	Cost
EI	Gas Control & Nominations	Cost

720

5.8.5 Union submitted that the cost based price referred to in this paragraph is the utility's cost base, not the affiliates', for the following three reasons: 721

- the Board has no jurisdiction over an affiliate or what it can charge for goods and services; 722
- the language of the ARC does not extend to the affiliates' costs; and 723
- the contrary interpretation would effectively prohibit affiliate transactions altogether. 724

5.8.6 Union argued that as a statutory tribunal the Board has only the powers and jurisdiction conferred on it by statue and that rules made under the Board's rule-making powers cannot expand the Board's statutory jurisdiction. Such rules may only enhance the effectiveness of the exercise of the powers the Board already has, not add to those powers. *Ainsley Financial Corp. v. Ontario (Securities Commission)* (1994) O.R (3rd) 104 (C.A.). 725

726

5.8.7 Union argued that the Board's only relevant source of jurisdiction over what a corporation can charge for products and services in Ontario is section 36 [12JF7-0:266] of the Act - the power to make orders approving of fixing just and reasonable rates for the sale of gas and for the transmission, distribution and storage of gas. That authority extends only to gas transmitters, gas distributors and storage companies. It is in regard to those entities and those entities alone that the Board may make orders approving or fixing just and reasonable rates. If an affiliate is not selling, transmitting, distributing or storing gas, the Board has no jurisdiction over that affiliate.

Was page 125 727

5.8.8 Union argued that the power to add conditions to the Board's order found in section 36(4) [12JF7-0:273] of the Act is restricted to conditions relating to an order approving the rates charged by a gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company. Union argued that the Board has no authority to determine what an affiliate may charge for a product or service to a utility in Ontario. The Board's only jurisdiction is to determine whether the recovery of the utility's cost of that product or service in rates is just and reasonable. Union argued that to the extent that the language of the ARC seeks to go beyond that, it is *ultra vires*.

728

5.8.9 Union also argued that the words of the ARC should be read so as not to extend the term "cost based price" to the costs of the affiliate, but rather, should apply only to the costs of the utility. The affiliate is not, by definition, regulated. Its costs are not relevant to any issue. The purpose of the ARC is to ensure that, if there is no market value for a product or service, the ratepayer pays no more than the utility's cost - in other words, to ensure that the ratepayer is held harmless in any affiliate transaction. In Union's view, the reference to the utility's approved rate of return emphasizes this point. The utility's regulated rate of return is utterly irrelevant to the operational parameters, pricing, business plans and operations or hurdle rate for investment of the affiliate. Reference to the utility's rate of return therefore has nothing to do with the affiliate.

Was page 126 729

5.8.10 Union submitted that under cost of service regulation, the Board has never based its assessment of utility costs on the costs of the parent or shareholder. For example, the utility's cost of capital has always been assessed on a stand alone basis. The effect of the parent's credit worthiness or perceived investment risk , positive or negative, on the utility's cost of capital has never been incorporated as part of the utility's recoverable cost.

730

5.8.11 Union suggested that pricing outsourced services on the basis of the affiliate's costs would also create a serious mismatch between risk and return for the affiliate. An affiliate may have a totally different risk profile from the utility, yet, under this interpretation of the ARC, it would receive only the utility rate of return. This mismatch cannot have been contemplated when the ARC was put in place. Cost based price, therefore, must mean utility cost plus utility return or affiliate cost plus affiliate return and cannot mean affiliate cost and utility return.

731

5.8.12 Union further argued that if the Board interprets paragraph 2.2.3 [12JF4-0:59] of the ARC to mean that the costs of the affiliate (plus the utility return on capital) is the relevant cost for determining a cost based price:

732

- there would be no benefit to a distribution utility being part of a larger corporate group; and

733

- ratepayers would be denied any benefits of economies of scale, etc. that can be achieved through association with a larger corporate group, in the form of avoided escalating utility costs to provide that services.

Was page 127 734

5.8.13 If "cost based price" means the affiliate cost then the Board would effectively be "expropriating" from the affiliate all of the benefits of infrastructure efficiencies and economies of scale that the affiliate brings to the table. If this were the result, no affiliate would offer these services to a regulated distribution company. Thus, the utility would be obliged, unlike most other businesses, to continue to operate on a stand alone basis, providing for itself all necessary services, with limited or no opportunity to take advantage of efficiencies of scope or scale. This would have the effect of disqualifying the utility industry from participating in business arrangements used commonly by unregulated businesses to derive efficiencies and enhance value to shareholders. It would be saying to utility owners or potential owners than any economies of scale achievable for a utility company as a result of its affiliates' size and scope would be "appropriated" to the utility's ratepayers. Union asserted that "No owner would offer services to the utility on those terms".

735

5.8.14 Union continued that "the Board is well aware that premiums over book value are frequently paid for utility companies or their owners. One of the reasons for these premiums is the "market expectation" that further efficiencies can be derived from economies of scale and scope (i.e. consolidation/ affiliate outsourcing). The Board has always been careful to recognize that both the risk and reward associated with these premiums are for the shareholders' account, not the ratepayers'. If all savings resulting from economies of scale must be passed on to ratepayers, the Board might reasonably be concerned about the implication this would have for utility ownership. Large, efficient, well-financed corporate groups would look elsewhere for investment. Utilities will be owned and operated by smaller, perhaps riskier and less well financed entities as stand alone entities, with little or no prospect for innovation and benefit to be derived from membership in a larger corporate undertaking."

Was page 128 736

5.8.15 Union pointed out that the reality is that utilities with the potential for significant savings are not likely to get valid bids for services even where a competitive market exists. This is because potential bidders will know that the tendering process is likely to represent nothing more than a price-setting or bench-marking exercise for services that will, ultimately, be provided by the affiliate in any event. As a practical matter, the utility and its affiliate may well have matter limited alternatives for pricing beyond section 2.2.3 [12JF4-0:59] of the ARC. An interpretation of this section that leads to the appropriation of all of the benefits of economies of scale and scope to the ratepayer is, therefore additionally punitive because of limited access to competitive quotes as a means of pricing services even where a competitive fair market value exists.

737

5.8.16 Union concluded that "[a]ppropriating all of the benefits of affiliate relationships to the ratepayer is tantamount to prohibiting outsourcing affiliate relationships altogether. Union does not believe this was the Board's intent in promulgating the ARC, nor was it within the Board's powers to do so. The Board's power is limited to making rules "governing the conduct" of a gas distributor in relation to its affiliates. These powers do not extend to prohibiting affiliate relationships altogether. The power to regulate does not include the power to prohibit, in this case, because the very concept of governing conduct as it relates to affiliates assume that here will be affiliate relationships.

738

5.8.17 CAC submitted that with respect to pricing, ECG simply claimed that because a market price is not available for these services the fees have been determined on the case of the fully allocated cost of ECG providing these services. CAC noted that the services were not publicly tendered. Because the fees are O&M expenses under the TPBR Plan, ECG has refused to disclose the level of fees or provide evidence to justify them. ECG's reluctance to provide the fee levels should give the Board concern. Because these arrangements have been entered into during the term of the TPBR Plan, there has been no opportunity for the Board and intervenors to test whether or not the fee structures are consistent with the ARC. CAC noted that inappropriate pricing can, in effect, result in an overpayment by the utility to the affiliate. Full disclosure of the fees is the only way to ensure that cross-subsidization is not occurring.

Was page 129 739

5.8.18 HVAC also noted that ECG has highlighted the price adjustment clauses found in the various outsourcing agreements at issue. HVAC argued that those clauses provide that prices paid by the utility may be reset based on market comparators. These clauses do not, however, address those instances where market comparators are not available and utility fully allocated avoided costs have been used. Thus these clauses do not in fact address the real pricing concerns raised. If the costs incurred by EI and EOS in providing services to ECG are less than ECG's avoided costs, ratepayers benefits or "profits" will be lost.

740

5.8.19 HVAC noted that this is the first time that ECG has made it clear on the public record that the Company has interpreted the transfer pricing requirements of the ARC as allowing the utility to pay an affiliate service provider the equivalent of the utility's avoided costs, on a fully allocated basis, for outsourced services. Any efficiencies gained in the cost required to provide the outsourced functions accrues to the affiliate, or the shareholder, or perhaps another customer of the affiliate, but in any event not to the utility and thus its ratepayers.

Was page 130 741

5.8.20 HVAC noted that the other side of the concern regarding loss of ratepayer "profits" it that, to the extent that the affiliate, the common shareholder, or any customer of the affiliate operate competitive businesses, ECG ratepayers will be cross-subsidizing such competition. In the case of CWLP, ESI may pay CWLP less than ECG pays for the same billing services because the common service provider, CWLP, can recover a disproportionately higher share of its costs from the utility ratepayers, and therefore can afford to reduce prices in order to attract and retain other customers. In unregulated industries, this risk of the ability to extract monopoly rents is subject to oversight by the Federal Commissioner of Competition. In the Ontario natural gas industry, vigilance in respect of this risk falls under the purview of the Board, and , in particular, under the auspices of the ARC.

742

5.8.21 HVAC submitted that the proper interpretation of this provision is that the costs referred to as the requisite benchmark for a transfer price for procurement of a service by the utility from an affiliate are the costs of the affiliate to provide the service. ECG's interpretation, that the benchmark costs are those avoided by the utility in not having to undertake provision of the service internally, is unsustainable for the following reasons:

743

- if the Board had intended that in the case of procurement of a service by the utility from an affiliate the relevant costs were those avoided by the utility it could have easily drafted the rule this way;

744

- a plain reading of the rule indicates that it is the "costs to produce" the service, rather than the costs avoided in nor producing the service, that are apt; and

745

- only this interpretation renders the provision a "proxy for competition" (the general role of the regulator). If the affiliate transaction were subject to open competition, the pricing would be set at the level of the service provider's costs plus the required return in order to attract the capital necessary for the service to be provided. The costs that would be incurred by the service recipient to provide the functions internally might be relevant to the service recipient's decision about whether to self-provide or to procure the service, but would not be determinative of the price at which the service provider was willing to provide te service.

Was page 131 746

5.8.22 HVAC argued that ECG is in breach of the ARC's transfer pricing guidelines and the affiliate is, through the utility holding distribution ratepayers to "ransom".

747

5.8.23 Schools argued that the ARC strongly implies that any contract with affiliates should only be signed after a competitive bidding process, and secondly that if it is not possible to obtain competitive bids, and therefore genuine evidence of market prices for that business function or service, that a cost plus arrangement could be struck. The ARC does not contemplate methods other than competitive bids in determining market value because of the uncertainty and unreliability of such methods. The cost in question is the contractor's cost, with the contractor entitled to a return that is the higher of the utility's rate of return or the then current prime rate. Schools questioned how ECG can reconcile its view that the utility's avoided cost is what is being referred to in section 2.2.3 [12JF4-0:59] of the ARC with the alternative allowable rates of return.

748

5.8.24 Schools argued that section 2.3.2 [12JF4-0:64] of the ARC requires that a utility, in purchasing a service from an affiliate, pay no more than the fair market value. There is an obligation on the utility to make a determination of the fair market value for the service. The section continues: "For the purpose of purchasing a service, resource, or product, a valid tendering process shall be evidence of fair market value". Schools argued that this section makes it clear that the fair market value shall be the price obtained in a competitive tender. The ARC does not contemplate that fair market value can be determined in any other manner. Schools argued that if it did, then the provision would read [... shall be the best evidence... of fair market value].

Was page 132 749

5.8.25 Therefore, Schools argued, unless the utility tenders, it must pay no more than a cost based price. Section 2.3.3 continues: " A cost based price shall reflect the cost of producing the service or product, including a return on invested capital. The return component shall be the higher of the utility's approved rate of return or the bank prime rate." Schools submitted that the costs referred to in section 2.3.3 [12JF4-0:65] of the ARC are the costs of the service provider. Schools noted that sections 2.8.2 [12JF4-0:96] and 2.8.3 [12JF4-0:100] of the ARC enable the Board to ask for a substantial amount of information concerning the affiliate costs.

750

5.8.26 In Schools' view ECG is in violation of the ARC in at least two respects:

751

- by transferring its gas services function to its affiliate and purchasing gas services pursuant to cost-based fee, in circumstances where alternative suppliers of the services exist, it is

skirting the competitive tender rules. ECG wants to keep this function in the Enbridge family but in an unregulated affiliate, since it has developed valuable expertise. It can do this only by keeping the activity within the utility; and.

752

- the cost based standard that ECG purports to apply, the avoided cost of the utility if it were to continue to provide the service, is wrong, and would deny utility ratepayers a share of the benefits from any increases in efficiency of the service provider over time.

Was page 133 753

5.8.27 Schools concluded that if ECG's views were to prevail, then the utility would be able to completely frustrate the intent of the PBR regime by signing fixed price contracts with affiliates to provide large parts of the utility's functions. Any savings realized would not be passed on to customers, either during the term of the PBR, through sharing of the increased earnings that would flow from the decreased payments und the contract, or even at rebasing. The cost base would remain the utility's avoided cost", that is the current level of the contract payment, forever.

754

5.8.28 VECC argued that from the point of view of the ratepayers it represents, this transaction raises serious questions about value for money with respect to the fees paid by ECG for such services and the compliance with section 2.3.3 [12JF4-0:65] of the ARC.

755

5.8.29 VECC noted that these issues cannot be examined until ECG's 2003 rates application. It is, therefore incumbent upon ECG to file comprehensive, complete and timely information about the customer care arrangements and their value for money in ECG's 2003 rates application. VECC suggested that the Board should direct that CustomerWorks and Accenture personnel be available to the Board and prepared to testify to these matters during the proceeding.

756

5.8.30 IGUA pointed out that the new arrangements raise an issue of the manner in which the transfer pricing provisions of the ARC are to apply to an affiliate which has subcontracted to a third party. IGUA noted that ECG argued that to comply with the transfer pricing provisions of paragraph 2.3.3 [12JF4-0:65] of the ARC the amounts paid by ECG's ratepayers to CWLP should be limited to the amounts being paid by CWLP to Accenture's subsidiary. Any amounts being paid by Accenture's subsidiary to CWLP will include costs associated with Accenture's use of CWLP assets to provide the services. IGUA argued that any enhancements in return being realized as a result of CWLP's arrangements with Accenture's subsidiary, effective August 1, 2002, must be accounted for in the utility, rather than in CWLP, in order for there to be compliance with the provisions of paragraph 2.3.3 [12JF4-0:65] of the ARC.

Was page 134 757

5.9 TRANSFER OF UTILITY FUNCTIONS

758

5.9.1 ECG contended that it can appoint its affiliate and ultimate parent to perform critical utility functions as its agent without leave of the Board.

759

5.9.2 IGUA pointed out that subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] of the Act provides that:"No authority given by the Board under this or any other Act shall be transferred or assigned without leave of the Board."

760

5.9.3 IGUA argued that if the appointment of EI and EOS as ECG's agents to perform critical utility functions on behalf of ECG does not fall within the ambit of subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] of the Act, then, in theory, regulated utilities would be able to eliminate the Board's regulatory oversight over those companies actually providing physical transmission, distribution and storage services by having them performed by unregulated agents. ECG and other regulated Ontario utilities would be able to reduce their staff levels to one contract administrator and the Board's regulatory power would be limited to either approving or disapproving the costs which the shell utility seeks to recover in rates. IGUA argued that ECG's contention that the Board's regulatory oversight is not affected by ECG's outsourcing arrangements is untenable.

Was page 135 761

5.9.4 IGUA submitted that the Agency Agreement whereby ECG confers authority on EI to provide Gas Services which are integral to the physical transmission, distribution and storage functions constitutes a transfer or assignment of ECG's authority to perform these functions as an enfranchised gas distributor pursuant to the *Public Utilities Act*, the *Municipal Franchises Act* and the Act and accordingly the Agency Agreement falls squarely within the ambit of subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] of the Act.

762

5.9.5 IGUA further submitted that ECG's contract with EOS whereby EOS is retained as an independent contractor to provide Operational Services which are integral to the monopoly functions of physically transmitting, distributing and storing gas, is a contract which transfers or assigns ECG's authority to perform these functions and therefore it falls within the ambit of subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] of the Act.

763

5.9.6 IGUA supplemented its submission in a letter dated July 24 2002 from its counsel to the Board Secretary. The letter referred to the Board's Decision with Reasons dated June 23, 2000 pertaining to an application by Union for a renewal of a franchise within the City of Kingston. IGUA stated that the issue in dispute in that case was the "ambit of the Board's power over the renewal of the ‘right to operate' Union's gas distribution works". IGUA went on to argue that "it cannot reasonably be disputed" that the authority to obtain "the right to operate" transmission, distribution, and storage assets stems from the Board's power found in the Act with respect to leave to construct transmission and distribution lines and "other powers pertaining to storage assets".

Was page 136 764

5.9.7 Schools pointed out that subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] of the Act requires the Board's approval to transfer a Board "authority" to do something from the party so authorized to another party. Schools argued, this requirement does not affect either the need for the Board's approval of rates and charges under section 36 [12JF7-0:266] of the Act nor its right to attach conditions to its order approving rates, or, as part of the order, prescribing practices relating to the distribution and sale of gas where appropriate. In Schools' view subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] of the Act must remain subject to section 36 [12JF7-0:266] of the Act, which is the "jurisdictional heart of the Act". Moreover, in Schools' view, the fact that the party to whom the party which has received Board authority to do a certain act wishes to transfer that authority is an agent of the transferring party, does not remove the requirement for approval under section 18 [12JF7-0:125] of the Act.

765

5.9.8 Schools argued that although the agreement between EI and ECG is called an "Agency Agreement" EI is not an agent of ECG in law for several reasons.

766

- The degree of supervision to be exercised by ECG over EI is limited to broad oversight In several areas, in particular transactional services and gas acquisitions, ECG's oversight of EI's activities is not consistent with the degree to which an agent is normally supervised by its principal. EI has broad independence of action, within only very general guidelines to execute all transactional services transactions without referring them to ECG for approval. With respect to gas acquisitions EI may contract for gas supply up to $50 million per transaction, or any dollar amount provided the term is less than one year, without ECG's consent. ECG apparently plans to have only one employee oversee the totality of the gas services activities of EI, which means that such oversight will be general in nature.

767

- EI has the right to conduct its own business in the same areas in which it is acting on behalf of ECG , and has no duty to ECG higher than that of an independent contractor, in that regard.

Was page 137 768

- EI has no fiduciary obligation to ECG, the normal legal obligation, which every agent has to its principal.

769

5.9.9 Schools also pointed out that the agency relationship has no particular significance in the regulatory context. EI is a separate legal entity from ECG, but it is an unregulated entity, whereas ECG is a regulated utility. Even if EI is at law in some respects an agent of ECG that would not remove the need for Board approval for the transfer of any "authority" it had previously given to ECG. Schools argued that the Board's approval is required for ECG to transfer to EI the ability to use utility assets to conduct transactional issues.

770

5.9.10 ECG responded that the proposition that IGUA is advancing is unclear. In its main submission, IGUA argued that the Board "authority" that is transferred to EI and EOS under the outsourcing arrangements is the outsourcing agreements themselves; that is the Agency Agreement and the Intercorporate Services Agreement. The letter from its counsel appears to recant this argument in favour of a "novel" idea: that the "right to operate" gas transmission, distribution, and storage assets is granted by the Board pursuant to its powers to authorize the construction of pipelines and other unspecified powers pertaining to storage assets.

771

5.9.11 ECG took issue with IGUA's arguments regarding the applicability of subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] for two reasons:

772

- the activities, comprising such services, are not activities that are authorized by the Board under the Act or any other legislation; and.

773

- even if such activities were authorized by the Board, the Intercorporate Services Agreement does not have the effect of transferring or assigning any authorization to EOS.

Was page 138 774

5.9.12 ECG pointed out that the Board does not have exclusive jurisdiction under the Act or any other legislation to regulate the construction and operation of distribution, storage and transmission facil-

ities. The Legislative Assembly of Ontario has divided jurisdiction in this regard among the Board and the following other "regulators":

775 • the Board has jurisdiction under sections 90 [12JF7-0:885] and 91 [12JF7-0:890] of the Act to grant leave to construct hydrocarbon transmission lines and, only on an application, hydrocarbon distribution lines;

776 • the Board has jurisdiction under section 8 of the *Municipal Franchise Act* (the "MFA") to approve the construction of "any works to supply" gas within a particular municipality;

777 • municipal corporations have jurisdiction under the MFA and the *Public Utilities Act* to pass by-laws authorizing " any... person to construct operate any part of a ... public utility in the municipality" and in addition, authorizing any "company incorporated for the purpose of supplying any public utility" to "exercise any of its powers within the municipality";

778 • the Board must first approve the by-law "granting ... the right to construct or operate works for the distribution of gas" under section 9 of the MFA;

779 • the utility is required under the *Oil and Gas Pipelines Systems* O. Reg. 210/01, sections 5 and 6, promulgated pursuant to the *Technical Standards and Safety Authority, 2000* ("TSSA") to obtain not only a licence from the director under the TSSA before distributing or transmitting gas, but also a certificate before installing any pipeline;

780 • the Board has jurisdiction under sections 36.1 [12JF7-0:283] and 38 [12JF7-0:292] of the Act to designate an area as a gas storage area and similarly to authorize a person to "inject gas into, store gas in and remove gas from a designated storage area"; and

781 • the storage operator must obtain a licence from the director under the TSSA before storing gas.

Was page 139 782 5.9.13 ECG argued that in the result none of the activities carried out by EOS, on behalf of ECG, are activities authorized by the Board under the Act or any other legislation. The legislative scheme provides the Board with a shared jurisdiction to authorize the construction, but not the operation, or distribution and transmission facilities. It also provides the Board with a shared jurisdiction to authorize the construction and operation of storage facilities.

783 5.9.14 ECG further argued that quite apart from the fact that none of the activities comprising Operational Services are ones that are authorized by the Board (other than for rate-making purposes), there has been no transfer or assignment to EOS of ultimate authority over Operational Services. ECG argued that "ultimate accountability and responsibility for Operational Services remains with ECG". All operational services performed by EOS are performed on behalf of ECG. ECG retains the accountability and the responsibility for the operation of it distribution system. ECG claimed that ECG supervises EOS, "just as it supervises the work of other contractors and service providers that it employs".

784

5.9.15 ECG also took issue with IGUA's arguments regarding the applicability of subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] to Gas Services provided under the Agency Agreement. ECG argued that all of the activities performed by EI on behalf of ECG, other than the storage-related Transactional Services (E.B.O. 190 Order), are not authorized by the Board under the Act or any other legislation. ECG submitted that, even if these activities were authorized by the Board, the Agency Agreement does not have the effect of transferring or assigning any such authorization to EI. EI is ECG's agent, under the Agency Agreement, and as such performs all such activities on behalf of ECG by "standing in ECG's shoes".

Was page 140 785

5.9.16 ECG pointed out that EI does provide storage-related services on behalf of ECG, but only in the sense that transactional services include peak and off-peak storage. ECG noted that the term "authority" as it is found in subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] of the Act, is not defined in the Act but, nevertheless, would be interpreted to include an order of the Board made under subsection 38(1) [12JF7-0:293] of the Act authorizing a person to engage in gas storage. However, while the transfer or assignment of functions to an affiliate that require the use of storage assets would require the Board's prior approval, under subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126], ECG argued that the Board's approval is not required "unless the transferee or assignee were acting as ECG's agent". For example, ECG pointed out that it has operated the storage assets of its affiliate Tecumseh Gas Storage Limited, without the requirement of Board approval.

786

5.10 REMEDIES AND JURISDICTION

787

5.10.1 ECG submitted that its outsourcing arrangements with affiliates continue to have absolutely no adverse effect on:

788

- the Board's regulatory oversight and its ability to carry out its responsibilities under the Act and the ARC;

789

- the security, safety, and reliability of ECG's distribution system;

790

- the costs and quality of customer services; or

791

- the the Board's regulatory oversight and its ability to carry out its responsibilities under the Act and the ARC; competitive market for the sale of gas to users in Ontario.

792

5.10.2 Schools suggested that :

793

- the Board, as a condition of approval of ECG's 2002 rates, require that the business activities transferred to EI and EOS be repatriated to ECG within 6 months;

794

- the Board make it clear that in the future it will expect that prior to transferring utility business activities pursuant to multi-year contracts to third parties, affiliate or otherwise, the

utility will obtain the Board's approval, in a preceding rate case, customer review process or specific application;

Was page 141 795

- the Board direct ECG to prepare a set of Outsourcing Guidelines, which should be filed as part of the evidence in the next rate case. In preparing the guidelines the Board should direct ECG to have regard to the OSFI Guidelines, as appropriate;

796

- the Board direct ECG to file as part of its 2003 rates case and as part of the rebasing exercise for the ECG's second generation PBR plan, in addition to the material it has already agreed to file, detailed information on the costs incurred by EI (gas services division) EOS, CustomerWorks and ECS, in providing services to ECG , under various agreements so that the Board and intervenors are able to determine a suitable baseline in respect of these utility business activities for the comprehensive PBR plan, and direct ECG to produce witnesses from these companies to answer questions relating to their costs and related matters in that case;

797

- that the Board clarify that the costs referred to in section 3.3 of the ARC are the costs of the unregulated affiliate, and that the test for purchases for an affiliate in the case where there was no competitive bids be the lower of "market based" price or costs of the affiliate including a return as set out by Dr. Bauer in his evidence in 497-01;

798

- that the Board clarify the intent of the ARC to be that competitive bids should be used in the outsourcing of business activities in all cases, and that only in the event that a successful tender cannot be completed can the utility arrange a transfer to a party on a "cost-plus basis"; and

799

- that in the event the Board decides not to order the repatriation of gas services business functions to ECG, that it condition its approval of ECG's 2002 rates on EI agreeing to exit the business of gas services for its own account and permit ECG if it deems such provision necessary to provide EI the specific assistance the latter requires with respect to the management of its transportation capacity and residual gas requirements for the Alliance/Vector systems.

Was page 142 800

5.10.3 Schools also requested that with respect to CustomerWorks, ECG and EI outsourcing agreements the Board as a condition of approval of 2002 rates:

801

- direct the Company to provide full affiliate costing data and related information in the 2003 rates case;

802

- direct ECG to remove the right of first refusal from the CustomerWorks Agreement as it is demonstrably not in the interests of ratepayers and is anti-competitive;

803

- direct ECG to file the performance standards for all three agreements - CustomerWorks, EI (gas services) and EOS (gas control) with the 2003 rates case;

804

- direct ECG to file any proposals for scope/fee changes for any of the agreements in a rates case or customer review for Board approval in advance of making the proposed change, including supporting evidence to show how the proposed changes will benefit ratepayers; and

805

- direct ECG to review the contracts to include clear default and remedy provisions and specific obligations on ECG to take all feasible steps to seek out improvements in service and/ or fee reduction over time and a specific procedure for ensuring these measures are implemented.

806

5.10.4 CAC suggested that a comprehensive review of ECG's outsourcing by the Board is essential. The review is required as soon as possible given the fact that the storage application, the O&M rebasing proceeding and the likely introduction of comprehensive PBR are imminent. With respect to such a review, ECG's affiliates, to the extent they are performing utility functions, must be prepared to disclose any information relevant to the Board's consideration of these issues. They should be prepared to appear before the Board and present evidence on the same basis as the utility.

Was page 143 807

5.10.5 With respect to relief in this proceeding, CAC submitted that given ECG's reluctance to justify the fees it is currently paying to its affiliates, those fees should be held in a deferral account for future disposition. From CAC's perspective, the onus is on ECG to justify the arrangements it has with its affiliates, the basis for the fees and the extent to which they are consistent with the ARC. ECG has failed to provide adequate evidence in this regard.

808

5.10.6 CAC submitted that ECG should be require to present evidence in its next rate proceeding to demonstrate that its outsourcing arrangements:

809

- are not benefitting ECG's shareholder at the expense of its ratepayers;

810

- are not impairing competition in the Ontario natural gas market; and

811

- are not contrary to the public interest.

812

5.10.7 If ECG is unable to do so, CAC suggested that the arrangements should be prohibited or subject to specific conditions by the Board.

813

5.10.8 IGUA submitted that the new facts pertaining to the manner in which customer care services will be provided to ratepayers effective August 1, 2002 should influence the findings that the Board makes in its Decision With Reasons in this proceeding and the provisions of the order that is issued to conclude these proceedings as follows:

814

- the Board should find and state that by failing to disclose any information pertaining to ECG's role in the CWLP/ Accenture arrangements, during the evidentiary phase of these proceedings and in its written Argument-in Chief dated July 8, 2002 McGill and ECG

breached the disclosure obligations which the Board took pains to articulate in its Decision on the Motion;

Was page 144 815

- the Board's order should contain provisions which will limit the amounts being paid by ECG to CWLP on and after August 1, 2002 to amounts being paid by CWLP to Accenture's subsidiary; and

816

- the Board should require ECG to file evidence in its fiscal 2003 rates application to demonstrate that its arrangements with CWLP have been adjusted to comply with the "service provider costs" approach specified in the provisions of paragraph 2.2.3 [12JF4-0:59] of the ARC.

817

5.10.9 HVAC disagreed with ECG's position that there is nothing that the Board should do in this proceeding, as the costs underpinning the service arrangements are captured within the utility's TPBR Plan. HVAC submitted that the Board does note need to wait until next year to correct this transgression. If a Board rule is being breached, the Board has the jurisdiction to require the cessation of the offending activity, including the right to levy fines for such breaches.

818

5.10.10 HVAC argued that in any event the Board should, in its decision, direct ECG that upon rebasing, the evidence in support of the cost of any procurement of goods or services from an affiliate are those of the affiliate. If sufficient evidence of those costs is not tendered and properly tested, the Board will be left in an untenable position. It will not have the evidence required to approve the utility O&M costs associated with these outsourcing arrangements. The Board should provide ECG with notice of its views on this issue now, to avoid being faced with the dilemma presented by ECG's likely argument that it is unreasonable to disallow all costs, and arbitrary to disallow a portion of them.

Was page 145 819

5.10.11 ECG submitted that the Board has limited jurisdiction over competition. This mandate is enunciated in section 2 [12JF7-0:20] of the Act as an objective of the Board to "facilitate competition in the sale of gas to users". ECG argued that this competition mandate is limited in three ways:

820

- section 2 [12JF7-0:20] refers to gas to "users" and by itself does not confer any powers on the Board and accordingly must be interpreted in the light of those sections of the Act that deal with such sales and that do confer powers; namely section 46 [12JF7-0:421] -55 [12JF7-0:494] and pertain to gas marketing. ECG argued that the Board's competition objective pertains to competition in the sale of gas to "low-volume consumers" and thus is limited to jurisdiction to the retail gas market;

821

- section 2 [12JF7-0:20] refers only to the sale of gas to users. The section does not refer to "energy services", "competitive services", "competitive businesses", "competitive markets", competitive energy activities" or "competitive wholesale services" all of which CEED refers to in its argument.

822

- the Board's mandate is limited by the principle of territorial incompetence. A tribunal has no powers that its legislature does not have. A legislature may confer upon a tribunal only

> those powers that it may exercise itself. Accordingly a provincial tribunal, such as the Board does not have the power to make decisions regarding persons, activities, or things wholly outside the province.

823

5.10.12 ECG argued that the Board is restricted to exercising its powers under the Act in a manner that facilitates competition in the retail commodity market and then only in Ontario. ECG further argued that Intervenors, and particularly CEED, seek to have the Board exercise regulatory oversight over the wholesale markets and other energy services without regard to territorial limitations, which would, in ECG's view, be beyond the Board's express and implied jurisdiction.

Was page 146 824

5.10.13 ECG submitted that all of the Board's powers must be found in its enabling legislation. There are no powers in the Act that expressly allow the Board to prohibit outsourcing or to direct ECG to "repatriate" the outsourced services, amend the outsourcing agreements, or otherwise change the manner in which it has decided to manage its business. If the Board has the power to do this, if must be pursuant to the doctrine of jurisdiction by implication. In other words, such powers must be necessary and incidental to the exercise of one or more of the Board's express powers. The question of statutory interpretation is: did the legislature intend the Board to have a supervisory jurisdiction over and beyond its specific powers to issue orders for leave to construct and authorizing rates and storage services?

825

5.10.14 HVAC argued that the issue is whether the outsourcing by ECG has now reached the point where the Board must, in order to ensure the proper fulfillment by the franchisee of its legal obligations, condition any recovery of costs on certain outsourcing and/or reporting parameters, and thereby essentially direct certain basic organizational requirements.

826

5.10.15 In support of this position HVAC quoted the Board's decision in RP-1999-0058 where the Board stated:

827

> The Board acknowledged that ECG has the right to organize its financial affairs in an efficacious manner and to contract with ECS to perform customer care services, including billing and the operation of the call centre. However, the Board is not convinced by ECG's argument that because it has contracted with its affiliate, ECS to perform the customer care services, it is absolved of responsibility to comply with the ARC. This argument is particularly weak when the Board considers that ECG and ECS are affiliates, each controlled by the same parent, Enbridge Inc.

Was page 147 828

5.10.16 HVAC submitted that the same reasoning applies to ECG's responsibilities in respect of the basic obligations of its franchise. The Board retains the power to oversee the fulfillment of these obligations, regardless of where they may be outsourced to, and particularly where the entity to whom the functions have been outsourced, is an affiliate of the utility and controlled by the common parent.

829

5.10.17 ECG submitted that none of the provisions cited by the Intervenors expressly empower the Board to grant any of the relief sought by the Intervenors. ECG argued that the question is "whether these provisions confer the necessary power when taken together and viewed in the purposive sense, hav-

ing regard to statutory objectives, the expertise of members of the Board and the nature of the issue".

830 5.10.18 ECG argued that:

831
- section 2 [12JF7-0:20] of the Act enumerates five natural gas objectives but confers no powers on the Board and the only objective relevant in this case is the facilitation of competition in the sale of gas to users;

832
- section 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] is not relevant for the reasons discussed elsewhere;

833
- subsection 19(2) [12JF7-0:133] that "[T]he Board ... shall make any determination in a proceeding by order" confers no jurisdiction and simply sets out the required form of any determination made by the Board; and

834
- while section 23 [12JF7-0:167] does confer a power to condition any order, where the Board seeks to condition an order under subsection 36(2) [12JF7-0:269] fixing rates the Board's general conditioning power in section 23 is circumscribed by its specific conditioning power under subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] and consequently the Board cannot attach just any condition to a rate order; rather conditions must be applicable to the rate-making consequences of the sale, transmission, distribution or storage or gas, since there must be a reasonable nexus between the Board's power to condition a rate order issued under subsection 36(2) of the Act and the order so conditioned.

Was page 148 835 5.10.19 ECG argued that none of the conditions sought by the Intervenors in connection with the outsourcing of Gas Services can reasonably be related to the rate-making consequences of the " sale.. or storage of gas" within the meaning of subsection 36(4) [12JF7-0:273]. ECG reiterated that EI purchases gas, as ECG's agent, but does not sell gas on behalf of ECG. ECG sells gas directly to its customers as a sales service. Similarly EI does not store gas on behalf of ECG; ECG stores its own gas. EI simply "optimizes" ECG's storage assets by providing transactional services, as agent, on behalf of ECG.

836 5.10.20 ECG further argued that none of the conditions sought by the Intervenors in connection with the outsourcing of Operational Services can be reasonably interpreted to be applicable to the rate-making consequences of the transmission or distribution of gas. There is no nexus between the Board's rate-making powers and a condition that would compel ECG to repatriate Operational Services or amend the Intercorporate Services Agreement.

837 5.10.21 ECG compared the Board's jurisdiction under the Act with the broad powers of BCUC under the *Utilities Commission Act* (the "BCUC Act").

838 5.10.22 ECG argued that the Board's rate-making powers in respect of the sale, transmission, distribution, and storage of natural gas are set out in section 36 [12JF7-0:266] of the Act. The Board may make orders approving or fixing just and reasonable rates (subsection 36(2) [12JF7-0:269]) and in so

doing may include "conditions, classifications or practices applicable to the sale, transmission, distribution or storage of gas, including rules respecting the calculation of rates" . The Board also has a general power when making an order to "impose such conditions as it considers proper". (section 23 [12JF7-0:167])

Was page 149 839

5.10.23 ECG argued that it is an accepted principle of statutory interpretation that general enactments should received general construction, unless the application of the relevant interpretative criteria gives some ground for restricting their meaning. Whenever there is a general enactment in a statute, which, if taken in its most comprehensive sense, would override a particular enactment in the same situation, the particular enactment must be operative, or in other words, " the particular ousts the general".

840

5.10.24 ECG argued that applying this principle to the question of the Board's power to condition an order made under subsection 36(2) [12JF7-0:269] leads the conclusion that the Board's general conditioning power under section 23 [12JF7-0:167] is circumscribed by its specific conditioning power under subsection 36(4) [12JF7-0:273]. In other words the Board cannot attach just any condition an order issued under subsection 36(2) ; and conditions must be "applicable to the sale, transmission, distribution or storage or gas".

841

5.10.25 ECG's position was that subsection 36(2) [12JF7-0:269] is not sufficiently broad to empower the Board to impose conditions in a rate order that would, in effect, compel or direct ECG's non-regulated affiliates in some fashion. "The Board cannot seek to extend its jurisdiction indirectly through ECG, to companies over which it has no such jurisdiction, other than under a rule made pursuant to clause 44(1)(g) [12JF7-0:368] of the Act. Clause 44(1)(g) is the only power that the Board has to compel or direct a gas distributor's affiliates.

Was page 150 842

5.10.26 ECG also argued that there is the practical difficulty of requiring ECG to compel or direct affiliates in circumstances where ECG has no power to do so. The contracts between ECG and its affiliates for the provision of services to ECG comprise ECG's only "levers" in this regard.

843

5.10.27 ECG argued that a power will not be implied unless there is a "jurisdictional foundation" to support such as power (ie an express power) and, moreover, there is a practical necessity to do so in order to accomplish the object of the legislation in question. A power will not be implied where the enabling legislation has prescribed an alternative mechanism for dealing with the matter at issue.

844

5.10.28 ECG argued that the applicable "jurisdictional foundation" is subsection 36(4) [12JF7-0:273] of the Act. Additional conditioning powers could only be implied if these were determined to be necessary to accomplish the legislative objective; in this case the setting of just and reasonable rates.

845

5.10.29 Union argued that while some intervenors have been quite explicit in advancing the position during the hearing that the Board should prohibit the outsourcing of so-called "core" utility functions, Union submitted that there is no jurisdictional basis upon which the Board could act on this argument. If an affiliate was operating as a gas distributor, transmitter or storage company in the province of Ontario, the Board would have the jurisdiction over it to approve or fix just and reasonable rates, adopting any method or technique the Board considered appropriate to do so. If the affiliate

is not operating as a gas distributor, transmitter or storage company in the province of Ontario, however, the Board has no jurisdiction.

Was page 151 846

5.10.30 Union pointed out that the two major utilities in this province are privately-owned business corporations. They have management, including officers and directors, which is charged with the prudent management of the business and affairs of the corporation. It is management's job to organize and conduct the business affairs of the corporation. It is up to the Board to ensure that the prices the utility charges for gas distribution, transmission and storage services are just and reasonable.

847

5.10.31 Union takes a very narrow view of the Board's jurisdiction. Union argued that these are two very different roles and two very different responsibilities. Although they are not inconsistent and may very well lead to similar results, these responsibilities do not overlap. If an action by management results in an imprudently incurred cost, the Board has the opportunity to review that action and to determine whether the cost may be recovered in rates charged for the service. The Board does not have, however, the authority to take over the "reins of power" and direct how management should organize the business and affairs of the company. In support of this position, Union cites the British Columbia Court of Appeal decision in *British Columbia Hydro & Power Authority v. British Columbia (Utilities Commission)* (1996), 20. B.C.L.R. 106 (B.C.C.A). The BCUC issued a document entitled "Integrated Resource Planning Guidelines" intended to provide guidance on the BCUC's expectations of the IRP planning process to be developed by BC Hydro. The BCUC denied recovery of BC Hydro's costs of planning in a subsequent rate application and ordered that BC Hydro comply with several directions relating to the integrated resource planning guidelines. The BC Court of Appeal overturned this decision, holding that the directions in the BCUC order relating to the integrated resource planning guidelines were beyond the statutory powers of the BCUC and were, accordingly unenforceable. In coming to this conclusion the BC Court of Appeal found that no section of the *Utilities Commission Act* enabled the BCUC to impose by order its chosen forum of IRP planning.

Was page 152 848

5.10.32 Union submitted that any attempt by the Board to order the manner in which a utility's affairs are planned and managed, including the decision to outsource certain business functions, would fall afoul of these principles and be outside the powers conferred on the Board by the Act. Union argued that the Board should limit its enquiry to the particular outsourcing agreements in issue in this case, and that it would be inappropriate and unnecessary for the Board to issue pronouncements about outsourcing or affiliate transactions generally.

849

5.10.33 Schools noted that the Board has broad jurisdiction over the distribution, transmission, storage, and sale of gas in Ontario. In Ontario, the Board's practice has been to allow the distribution utilities to "pass through" their gas costs, both commodity and the costs of upstream transportation to their customers "at cost" with no mark-up assuming that the costs were prudently incurred. The price of gas embedded in the sales rates is in the aggregate, equal to the utility's costs of gas.

850

5.10.34 In Schools' view this authority includes conditions and practices relating not only to the sale of gas, but also by necessary implication, to its procurement, including whether the gas can be purchased for the distributor by a third party affiliate, and any other matters critical to the efficient and effective purchase and distribution and sale (by the distributor) of gas. In addition, as the cost of gas

is part of the bundled distribution rate, the Board can condition its approval of distribution rates upon the distributor retaining the gas services function.

Was page 153 851

5.10.35 Schools argued that the Board may condition its orders approving distribution rates by conditions relating to the method of distribution, including whether the gas control, scheduling and nomination functions, which are critical to the efficient and safe operation of a distribution system, need to be carried out by the distributor itself, or can be carried out by a third party, affiliated or otherwise.

852

5.10.36 Schools further argued that the same provisions authorize the Board to set rules with respect to the ability of the distributor to contract with a third party, affiliated or otherwise, to provide any activity or business function normally performed by a distributor. The business activities of gas procurement, gas control, and customer care are clearly part of the distributor's normal business. Section 35(4) permits the Board to prescribe practices applicable to the distribution of gas. One such practice is the degree to which and the manner in which the distributor can contract with third parties to carry out business activities on its behalf.

853

5.10.37 Schools submitted that the Board's interest in the degree to which the distributor can transfer business activities to third parties, including affiliates, is clear. It derives not only from the cost implications of the transfer but from the decisions on the integrity, safety and security of the distributor's business. Schools argued that the interests of the Board in unregulated companies providing key parts of a distributor's business activities closely parallels the interests of the OSFI in the practices of the entities it regulates.

854

5.10.38 Schools also noted that under clause 44(1)(a) [12JF7-0:359] of the Act the Board may make rules governing the conduct of a gas distributor as such conduct relates to its affiliates. Clause 44(1)(g) [12JF7-0:368] allows the Board to require an affiliate of a gas distributor to make returns, statements, or reports relating to the sale or distribution of gas by the distributor, in such form, and containing such matters and verified in such manner as the rule may provide. "Sale of gas" in this context means, in Schools' view the entire process by which gas is acquired, transported and sold by the distributor, and entitles the Board to obtain detailed information with respect to the operation of those activities of a distributor's affiliate that pertain to the distribution and sale of gas by the distributor.

Was page 154 855

Blank page

Was page 155 856

5.11 BOARD COMMENTS AND FINDINGS

857

General Comments

858

5.11.1 The Board acknowledges that since the outsourcing fees are a component of ECG's O&M and accordingly included in ECG's TPBR Plan, the outsourcing arrangements have no cost consequences for rates for the 2002 Test Year. The Board notes that it issued the final rate order for 2002 Test Year rates on July 25, 2002.

859

5.11.2 The Board also notes that this proceeding did not involve a prudence review of ECG's affiliate outsourcing arrangements. Indeed, such a review was not possible, since the outsourcing fees are included in ECG's TPBR Plan and ECG refused to disclose the fees in this proceeding.

860

5.11.3 In the Decision on the Motion, the Board indicated that ECG was not required to obtain the approval of the Board prior to outsourcing its customer care, information technology and fleet management functions to its affiliate. However, the Decision on the Motion should not be interpreted as encouraging or condoning outsourcing arrangements. Each arrangement must be considered on its own merits and must be considered with respect to the best interests of the utility.

861

5.11.4 The Board notes that in the past the Board has approved the cost consequences of utility outsourcing arrangements. This is particularly true when the utility is contracting with independent third parties pursuant to a public tender process for routine functions, such as appliance inspection and pipeline construction.

Was page 156 862

5.11.5 However, the Board agrees with the Intervenors that ECG's affiliate outsourcing arrangements raise a number of serious concerns. The Board's concerns are not limited to the cost consequences of ECG's decision to outsource critical utility functions to its affiliates.

863

Extent and Nature of Services being Outsourced

864

5.11.6 The degree to which ECG has outsourced its core utility functions, as complete operations, to its affiliates is of great concern to the Board. The Board is not convinced by ECG's argument that these outsourcing arrangements are no different than continuing the utility's historical practices of contracting for services from unrelated third party providers.

865

Motives for Outsourcing

866

5.11.7 The Board shares the Intervenors' skepticism concerning ECG's motives in entering into these affiliate outsourcing arrangements.

867

5.11.8 While ECG claimed that outsourcing its Operational Services to EOS was driven by concerns regarding system reliability and security of supply, the Board notes that these concerns have not previously been raised before the Board. ECG has an obligation to bring critical operational issues, such as concerns about system reliability and security of supply, to the attention of the Board.

Was page 157 868

5.11.9 If these were legitimate concerns, ECG did not present evidence in this proceeding that it considered and analyzed other alternatives to resolve these problems. In particular, ECG did not present evidence that it considered and rejected an "in house" solution to these issues.

869

5.11.10 While ECG alleged that there are "unique staffing requirements associated with gas control operations", the Board does not consider the requirement for supervisory coverage for 24-hours, seven-

days a week to be unique. This is, and has always been, a requirement of gas control operations, previously performed by the utility.

870

5.11.11 With respect to the need to replace the SCADA system the Board notes that the capital requirements of the utility are not covered by its TPBR Plan; and consequently were an issue to be determined in this proceeding. ECG did not present evidence of the cost consequences of replacing the SCADA system. The Board may have determined that the costs of replacing the SCADA system were a legitimate utility expense, and should be included in the capital budget and included in rate base. The analysis of this option was not put before the Board.

871

5.11.12 The Board is particularly concerned that the evidence indicated that EOS did not in fact have the requisite skill to operate the SCADA system and that ECG personnel were required to provide EOS employees with training.

872

5.11.13 The fact that EI intended to consolidate its control of its liquids pipelines operations in EOS is not by itself sufficient justification for the Company to outsource its Operational Services to EOS, unless the Company can demonstrate that there were direct benefits to the utility in doing so.

Was page 158 873

5.11.14 With respect to the Company's decision to outsource Gas Services to EI, while the Company argued that this decision was "driven by the opportunity to achieve benefits in the form of cost efficiencies and improved service quality", ECG did not produce any concrete examples of how these cost efficiencies and improvements in service quality would be achieved. In particular the Board is not convinced by ECG's argument that "specialized expertise" and "market intelligence", available in Calgary, cannot be obtained in Toronto. The Board notes that the Company's witness, Ms Holder, and her group, effectively performed these functions from Toronto for a number of years. The Board also notes ECG's evidence that most employees performing gas supply functions refused to be relocated to Alberta. As a result the utility has lost the benefit of the history, knowledge and expertise of these employees.

874

5.11.15 The Board notes in ECG's letter to Floyd Laughren dated April 17, 2001 ECG indicated that it was intending to move its employees to Alberta. Not until the evidence in this proceeding did ECG correct this impression and advise the Board that its plans had changed and that it was intending to outsource Gas Services to EI. In addition, the Board agrees with the Intervenors that even if the Company's claims were true, ECG has not presented sufficient evidence that it analyzed the alternative options.

875

5.11.16 The Board agrees with Intervenors that in a competitive market the economies of scale and scope would not be realized solely by the service provider, but rather would be shared among those procuring the service. ECG's arguments are, to a certain extent, inconsistent. While ECG has argued that ECG ratepayers will benefit from economies of scale and scope, it is also arguing that the cost efficiencies would accrue to EI and EOS and not to ECG.

Was page 159 876

5.11.17 The Board shares the concerns raised by Intervenors that in long term outsourcing arrangements ECG has an obligation to act in the best interests of the utility, including its ratepayers. While the Board is not inherently opposed to EI or EOS profiting from their relationship with ECG, it is essen-

tial that ECG must be able to establish that such arrangements also provide tangible benefits to ECG and its ratepayers. The interests of ECG are in no manner subordinate to the interests of the Enbridge Group as a whole.

877

5.11.18 ECG's argument that there is "no evidence that outsourcing will harm ratepayers" is not compelling to support these arrangements. ECG must demonstrate not only that the arrangements will not harm ratepayers, but also that there will be a significant and tangible benefit to ratepayers.

878

5.11.19 ECG has correctly pointed out that in the Decision on the Motion the Board stated that utility customers should be indifferent as to whether customer care, information technology and fleet management are performed by utility employees or a third party affiliate as long as they are being performed to the requisite standard. ECG has claimed that service quality will improve with these outsourcing arrangements.

879

5.11.20 The Board is not satisfied that merely maintaining the service quality indicators of the TPBR Plan is sufficient evidence to demonstrate improved quality of service sufficient to justify ECG's affiliate outsourcing arrangements.

Was page 160 880

Potential Consequences of Outsourcing

881

5.11.21 As the indicated in Chapter 3 [155], dealing with Alliance and Vector, the Board is concerned when a utility engages in transactions where a related entity is a counterparty. Because of the nature of the relationship, there is the possibility of a conflict of interest. The Board is not convinced that the agreements and protocols between ECG and its affiliates are sufficient protection. As a result, the utility has the obligation to establish to the satisfaction of the Board that the transactions are in the best interests of the utility and its ratepayers.

882

5.11.22 The Board notes the concerns raised by some Intervenors concerning the advantages of separation of utility functions from competitive services and in particular the concern with respect to the potential sharing of confidential information. The Board shares these concerns and notes that the Gas Distribution Access Code contains provisions concerning the requirements of a distribution utility with respect to confidential information. It will be incumbent on ECG to establish, to the satisfaction of the Board, that it has maintained the confidentiality of information and has not provided its affiliates with information to the detriment of either ratepayers or the competitive market.

883

5.11.23 The Board also shares the concerns expressed by many Intervenors concerning the potential for lack of independent action on behalf of ECG. As discussed in greater detail below, the Board reminds the management of ECG that it has an obligation to act independently from its shareholder with a view to acting in the best interests of the utility and its ratepayers.

Was page 161 884

5.11.24 While the Board is comforted by ECG's assurances that the outsourcing arrangements will not affect the Board's regulatory oversight over the actions of the utility, the Board cautions ECG that the Board is concerned regarding all aspects of utility functions, whether they are provided directly by ECG or by an affiliate under an agency agreement.

885

5.11.25 In the past, the Board has not generally closely examined ECG's arrangements to enter into discrete contracts with unrelated third parties to provide services such as pipeline construction and appliance inspection. However, as the Board has previously noted, due to the extent and nature of the services being outsourced, the Board has a number of concerns with respect to ECG's outsourcing arrangements. The Board expects ECG and all of its affiliates to co-operate fully with the Board and intervenors in providing all necessary information to enable the Board to continue proper regulatory oversight of the utility.

886

Specific Concerns of ECG's Outsourcing Arrangements

887

5.11.26 Even if outsourcing is an appropriate course of action, the Board shares the concerns raised by the Intervenors about some of the contractual provisions and protocols governing these arrangements. The Board specifically notes the concerns raised by Schools about the specific provisions of the agreements. The Board is not convinced by ECG's arguments that the contractual provisions, including the protocols, provide the Board with sufficient comfort that the concerns raised by the Intervenors have been appropriately dealt with.

Was page 162 888

5.11.27 The Board is aware of the concerns expressed by Intervenors and notes that in consideration of any incentive regulation proposal by ECG, the Board will be mindful of, and take into account, the impact of any outsourcing arrangements.

889

Transfer Pricing

890

5.11.28 In any analysis of transfer pricing it is important to start with the basic regulatory principle that all rates charged by a regulated utility must be just and reasonable and, correspondingly, only just and reasonable costs incurred by the utility will be included in a utility's revenue requirement.

891

5.11.29 When services are being performed for a utility by third parties, and fees for these services have been negotiated at arm's length, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the Board has confidence that the utility will ensure that the arrangements are prudent and that the costs incurred are just and reasonable.

892

5.11.30 However, when transactions occur between or among affiliates, the Board will not presume prudence and the onus is on the utility to establish, to the satisfaction of the Board, that the transaction is prudent and that the corresponding costs to the utility associated with the transactions are fair.

893

5.11.31 Section 2.3.2 [12JF4-0:64] of the ARC provides that in purchasing a service, resource or product from an affiliate, the utility "shall pay no more than the fair market value". Therefore the onus is on the utility to establish the "fair market value" for the service, resource or product.

Was page 163 894

5.11.32 Section 2.3.2 [12JF4-0:64] of the ARC continues to state that "a valid tendering process shall be evidence of fair market value". The Board notes that the tendering process must be "valid". The Board agrees with the argument raised by Schools that because of arrangements negotiated between

the utility and its affiliate, such as the right of first refusal, that any tendering process may be flawed and may not result in a "fair market value" for the services being tendered. In addition, the Board notes that the ARC states that the valid tendering process is merely "evidence" of a fair market value and is not necessarily determinative of the fair market value.

895

5.11.33 The Board notes that ECG's evidence was that there are many entities that are capable of providing Gas Services and Operational Services to ECG. Indeed EI's strategy appears to be to develop the capability to provide these services on a competitive basis to a number of parties and thereby benefit from economies of scale.

896

5.11.34 However, the Board notes that ECG did not conduct a competitive tender for these services. The Company's management has an obligation to ensure that the utility procures services for the most reasonable costs. While the Board is not prepared, at this time, to require the utility to carry out a competitive tender before outsourcing services, the Board notes that the lack of a competitive tender process will make it more difficult for ECG to convince the Board that the fees it is paying for the outsourced services are just and reasonable.

897

5.11.35 The Board notes that ECG has advised the Board that it "endeavours to establish market prices for all affiliate transactions". The Board expects ECG in its next rates case to provide data and analysis to establish market based prices of all affiliate transactions.

Was page 164 898

5.11.36 The Board notes that ECG has also advised the Board that "in some cases, due to the nature of the service, it is not possible to establish a comparable market price". If market based data is not available the Board expects ECG to provide evidence that legitimate attempts have been made to establish market-based prices.

899

5.11.37 Section 2.3.3 [12JF4-0:65] of the ARC continues to provide that where a fair market value is not available the utility "shall pay no more than a cost-based price". It is important to note that the cost-based price is the maximum amount to be paid by the utility to its affiliate.

900

5.11.38 Section 2.3.3 [12JF4-0:65] of the ARC provides that "A cost based price shall reflect the costs of producing the service or product, including a return on invested capital. The return component shall be the higher of the utility's approved rate of return or the bank prime rate."

901

5.11.39 Much of the argument from Union and the other Intervenors centered around the meaning of "cost based price" and whether this provision should be interpreted as being based on the utility's avoided costs or the costs of the affiliate providing the service.

902

5.11.40 While the Board agrees with Union's argument that in a rates hearing the Board has no jurisdiction over what an affiliate can charge for goods or services, the Board has jurisdiction to determine whether the costs charged by the affiliate for performing these services will be included in rates. Merely because the affiliate is not regulated does not mean that its costs are not relevant.

Was page 165 903

5.11.41 The Board interprets the meaning of "cost based price" as the affiliate's cost of performing the services and not the avoided costs of the utility, for a number of reasons.

904

5.11.42 Section 2.2.3 [12JF4-0:59] of the ARC provides that the cost based price shall reflect the costs of producing the service or product. The ARC does not refer to the "costs the utility would have incurred in producing the service or product" or the "utility's avoided costs". The cost based price can only refer to the actual costs being incurred in providing the product or services and in an affiliate outsourcing arrangement these costs are in fact being incurred by the affiliate and not by the utility.

905

5.11.43 The utility must establish not merely that the affiliate outsourcing arrangements are cost neutral to the utility, these arrangements must in fact be of benefit to the utility. In other words it would not make business sense for a utility to enter into outsourcing arrangements with an affiliate, or a third party, unless the costs incurred for the same quality of service, would be less than those incurred directly by the utility performing the service. This is particularly true when, as discussed above, the outsourcing arrangements raise a number concerns that do not directly relate to the costs of the product or service, such as loss of expertise and loss of independence.

906

5.11.44 The Board agrees with Union' position that reference to the utility's regulated rate of return may not be relevant to the operational parameters, business plans and operations or hurdle rate for investment of the affiliate, and that this would create a mismatch between risk and return to the affiliate. However, as Union has also pointed out, the Board does not regulate the affiliate and consequently the Board is not and should not be concerned with the manner in which the affiliate conducts its business.

Was page 166 907

5.11.45 Union's argument that a cost based price would mean that the utility would be effectively "expropriating from the affiliate all of the benefits of infrastructure efficiencies and economies of scale" is totally without merit. In fact the Board is concerned that the opposite has occurred; expertise and infrastructure that were previously with the utility have been transferred without appropriate compensation to the affiliate.

908

5.11.46 The Board notes that the interpretation of the transfer pricing provisions suggested by ECG and Union would mean that the utility and its ratepayers would not benefit from the efficiencies gained as a result of the outsourcing arrangements. The Board questions why a utility would enter into such an arrangement if benefits would not directly accrue to the utility or its ratepayers.

909

5.11.47 ECG has contended that the utility and its ratepayers would benefit from economies of scale and scope. One of the benefits that the utility brings to an outsourcing relationship is the scale and scope of the services that it requires. This is of benefit to any service provider in that it can leverage the scale and scope provided by the utility and offer similar services to others at a lower average cost than could otherwise be achieved without the utility's business.

910

5.11.48 If the regulated utility is required to pay its avoided costs, and if these avoided costs are more than the average cost to the affiliate of performing the services, then to the extent that the affiliate provides services to other third parties, the utility would in fact be cross-subsidizing such competitive

businesses. In other words, if the affiliate service provider can recover a disproportionate amount of its costs from the regulated utility, it can reduce fees paid by other third parties to attract and retain new business. While the Board does not directly regulate the competitive market, to the extent that the regulated utility purchases services from an unregulated affiliate, the Board has an interest in ensuring that those services are competitively priced. The Board should not condone actions of the regulated utility which might lead to cross-subsidization and delay the development of a competitive market.

Was page 167 911

5.11.49 The Board notes that the general role of the regulator is to act as a proxy for competition. In pricing services in a competitive market the relevant costs would be the costs incurred by the service provider in providing the service, plus an appropriate return in order to attract the capital necessary to provide the service. While the utility's avoided costs may be relevant to the utility's decision whether to outsource the procurement of the services or to provide the services directly, they are not relevant in determining the price at which the services should be provided by another party.

912

5.11.50 Utility ratepayers should not be disadvantaged as a result of the utility's decision to outsource to its affiliate. If the utility performed the services directly, rates payable by ratepayers would take into account not only the utility's costs for performing the services but also the utility's rate of return.

913

5.11.51 The Board is not convinced of the dire consequences predicted by Union if the Board interprets the ARC as being based on the affiliate's costs.

914

5.11.52 The matter is quite simple. The provisions in the ARC are to ensure that the ratepayers benefit from the affiliate's lower costs in producing goods or providing services, while an the same time protecting ratepayers from paying rates based on a higher rate of return than would be included if the utility performed the services directly. If, based on these restrictions, the affiliate decides that it would not be in the affiliate's business interest to provide services to the regulated utility, then so be it.

Was page 168 915

5.11.53 However, while the prudence of these arrangements is not at issue in this proceeding, the Board notes that in its next rates case, in order for the fees paid by ECG to its affiliates for performing these services to be included in the calculation of the revenue requirement, it will be incumbent on ECG to establish to the satisfaction of the Board that the fees have been prudently and reasonably incurred and that the calculation of the fees is in accordance with the ARC.

916

5.11.54 The Board notes that in calculating just and reasonable rates, subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] of the Act specifically provides that the Board is not "bound by the terms of any contract". While the contractual arrangements between ECG and its affiliates is evidence that may be of assistance to the Board, it is in no manner determinative of the amounts that will be included by the Board in the calculation of rates.

917

Transfer of Utility Functions

918

5.11.55 Subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] of the Act provides:

919

> No authority given by the Board under this or any other Act shall be transferred or assigned without leave of the Board.

920

5.11.56 Subsection 36 (1) [12JF7-0:267] of the Act provides:

921

> No gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company shall sell gas or charge for the transmission, distribution or storage of gas except in accordance with an order of the Board, which is not bound by the terms of any contract.

Was page 169 922

5.11.57 In addition, subsection 43(1) [12JF7-0:332] of the Act provides:

923

> No gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company, without first obtaining from the Board an order granting leave, shall
>
> (a) sell, lease or otherwise dispose of its gas transmission, gas distribution or gas storage system as an entirety or substantially as an entirety;
>
> (b) sell, lease or otherwise dispose of that part of a system described in paragraph (a) that is necessary in serving the public...

924

5.11.58 The Board agrees with ECG that the Board does not directly "authorize" a utility to operate in the Province of Ontario in the same manner that the Director of Licensing licences electricity transmission and distribution utilities.

925

5.11.59 However, a gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company can only sell gas or charge for the transmission, distribution or storage of gas in accordance with an order of the Board. While a Board order may not technically be required to operate a gas utility in Ontario, an order of the Board is required in order to charge for selling gas or performing transmission, distribution, or storage of gas.

926

5.11.60 It is not clear to the Board, based on the evidence in this proceeding, where the central management and control of the utility rests. In other words, it is not clear whether ECG or EI is in fact controlling the operation of the utility.

927

5.11.61 Even at the oral hearing, ECG witnesses were sometimes confused as to whether a particular action was authorized by the Company or EI's senior management.

Was page 170 928

5.11.62 The Board notes that directors and officers of a utility have a statutory duty to act in the best interests of the utility, not of its shareholder. Section 134 of the *Ontario Business Corporations Act* provides that :

929

> Every director and officer of a corporation in exercising his or her powers and discharging his or her duties shall,
>
> (a) act honestly and in good faith with a **view to the best interests of the corporation**; and
>
> (b) exercise the care, diligence and skill that a reasonably prudent person would exercise in comparable circumstances. (emphasis added)

930

5.11.63 While the Board has no desire to "micromanage" the operations of the utility nor to take over the "reins of power", to use Union's terminology, the utility has a responsibility to convince the Board that it is being operated in the best interests of the utility.

931

5.11.64 The Board appreciates that there may be intense personal pressure on individuals within ECG to be "team players" within the "Enbridge Family", and while the maximization of shareholder profits and shareholder value may be the objective of "Enbridge Family" members who are competitive corporations, they are not and should not be the objective of the management staff of ECG, a regulated monopoly utility. The Board is concerned that utility employees are spending time and effort, at the ratepayers expense, trying to leverage the monopoly advantage of the utility for the benefit of its shareholder.

932

5.11.65 ECG management must be able to establish to the satisfaction of this Board that it has put the interests of the utility first. This is particularly true with a regulated monopoly. Because ratepayers are captive customers of the utility, its management has a high standard to act in the best interests of the utility, including its ratepayers.

Was page 171 933

5.11.66 The Board also has an overriding obligation to ensure that the utility acts in the public interest. The Board has always recognized that part of the public interest is to ensure that the utility shareholder has the opportunity to earn a fair, but only fair, rate of return on its investment. Unlike other competitive businesses, the obligation of ECG's officers and directors is not to maximize the return to the shareholder by complex schemes including outsourcing to affiliates. EI appears to have treated utility assets as exclusively its own for the purpose of maximizing its own profits.

934

5.11.67 The Board shares the concerns raised by Intervenors that ECG , as on Ontario-based regulated utility cannot, through the use of agency arrangements with an unregulated entity outside the province, eliminate or avoid the Board's regulatory oversight. The Board's regulatory oversight is not limited to either approving or disapproving the rate consequences of these arrangements.

935

5.11.68 ECG and the Intervenors have agreed that Gas Services and Operational Services are integral and critical to the physical transmission, distribution and storage functions. The collective impact of the outsourcing arrangements are that ECG may no longer control critical elements of the gas transmission and distribution system that are necessary in serving the public.

936

5.11.69 The Board is concerned that ECG may have breached paragraph 43 (1)(b) of the Act. The purpose of paragraph 43(1)(b) [12JF7-0:334] of the Act is to ensure that a gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company cannot "sell, lease or otherwise dispose of" any part of the gas transmission, distribution or storage system that is "necessary in serving the public". The Board notes that the wording of this provision is very broad and prohibits the utility from not only selling or leasing but "otherwise disposing" of any part of the system necessary in serving the public.

Was page 172 937

5.11.70 The Act does not define a "gas transmission system", or a " gas distribution system"; however, the Act defines a gas distributor as "person who delivers gas to a consumer" and a gas transmitter means " as a "person who carries gas by hydrocarbon transmission line".

938

5.11.71 A gas transmission system and gas distribution system clearly means more than the physical transmission and distribution system assets, such as pipelines, compressors and related facilities. It includes all aspects that are necessary in serving the public. This would include the SCADA system necessary for Gas Operations as well as the experience and expertise of personnel to conduct Gas Operations and Gas Supply.

939

5.11.72 It is clear that prior to entering into the outsourcing arrangements with its affiliates, ECG itself had all of the assets, including expertise, to operate a gas transmission and gas distribution system. It is unclear to the Board whether this is still the case. It is the Board's view that if ECG does not in fact have the ability to operate the gas transmission and gas distribution system on a stand alone basis, then it has "otherwise disposed" of part of its system, necessary in serving the public, contrary to the provisions of paragraph 43(1)(b) [12JF7-0:334] of the Act.

940

5.11.73 The Board is extremely concerned with maintaining the safety, security and reliability of the delivery of gas in Ontario. Based on the evidence in this proceeding the Board is not convinced that ECG, as a separate regulated utility, has retained the necessary control and management to operate the utility.

941

Remedies and Jurisdiction

Was page 173 942

5.11.74 The Board is not convinced by ECG's argument that the Board has limited jurisdiction over competition. Subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] of the Act provides that "No gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company shall sell gas ... except in accordance with an order of the Board". One of the objectives set out in Section 2 [12JF7-0:20] of the Act is to facilitate "competition in the sale of gas to users". While sections 46 [12JF7-0:421] -55 [12JF7-0:494] of the Act deal with the sale of gas to low volume consumers, in the Board's view there is nothing in section 36(1) to limit the objectives set out in section 2 [12JF7-0:20] to merely refer to low volume consumers.

943

5.11.75 In the Board's view, in order to fulfil the statutory objective of facilitating competition in the sale of gas to users, the Board must take into account all stages in the distribution chain. Merely because neither section 2 [12JF7-0:20] nor subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] specifically refer to "energy services", "competitive services", "competitive businesses", "competitive markets", "competitive energy activities" or "competitive wholesale services", does not mean that the Board should not be

aware of these activities and take them into account when overseeing the regulated utility activities of ECG.

944

5.11.76 The Board is also not persuaded by ECG's argument concerning the application of the principle of territorial incompetence. While the Board may not have the power to regulate the decisions of persons, activities or things wholly outside the province, the Board does have the power to take into account activities outside the province that may have an impact on competition inside the province. While the Board does not have regulatory oversight over the wholesale markets and other energy services outside the province, the Board clearly has jurisdiction over the activities of ECG, a regulated utility, which may have an effect on competition in the sale of gas to users in Ontario.

Was page 174 945

5.11.77 The Board's authority relating to the sale of gas by a utility, by necessary implication, includes its procurement. For example, the Board is concerned with ECG's risk management policies and procedures relating to the procurement of gas. The fact that these policies are currently being reviewed is indicative of the Board's concern.

946

5.11.78 In reviewing the Board's jurisdiction under section 36 [12JF7-0:266] it is important to look at the framework of this provision as a whole.

947

5.11.79 Subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] of the Act provides that :

948

> No gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company shall sell gas or charge for the transmission, distribution or storage of gas, except in accordance with an order of the Board, which is not bound by the terms of any contract.

949

5.11.80 Subsection 36(2) [12JF7-0:269] of the Act provides that:

950

> The Board may make orders approving or fixing just and reasonable rates for the sale of gas by gas transmitters, gas distributors and storage companies and for the transmission, distribution and storage of gas.

951

5.11.81 Subsection 36(4) [12JF7-0:273] of the Act provides that an order under section 36 [12JF7-0:266] may "include conditions, classifications or practices applicable to the sale, transmission, distribution or storage of gas, including rules respecting the calculation of rates".

952

5.11.82 While historically the Board has referred to an order granted under section 36 [12JF7-0:266] as a "rate order", there is nothing in this provision that limits the Board's jurisdiction to only setting rates. Subsections (1) [12JF7-0:267] and (2)[12JF7-0:269] of section 36 are separate and distinct provisions, requiring separate and distinct orders from the Board: subsection 36(1) provides in effect that if a gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company sells gas or charges for the transmission, distribution or storage or gas, it requires an order of the Board; and subsection 36(2) pro-

vides that the Board may make an order approving or fixing just and reasonable rates for the transmission, distribution or storage of gas.

Was page 175 953

5.11.83 The Board notes that while the requirements of subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] are mandatory, the provisions of subsection 36(2) [12JF7-0:269] are permissive. In other words, a gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company is prohibited from selling gas or charging of the transmission, distribution or storage of gas without an order of the Board authorizing these activities. However, subsection 36(1) is silent on the rate that the utility may charge for selling gas or performing these transmission, distribution or gas storage services. Subsection 36(2) is permissive and provides that the Board may make orders approving or fixing just and reasonable rates. Ironically what is the point? the legislation does not mandate the Board to approve or fix rates that the utility may charge for selling gas or performing transmission, distribution or storage services; however, if the Board does exercise its discretion and make an order under subsection 36(2), the rates it approves or fixes must be "just and reasonable".

954

5.11.84 ECG's argument would lead to the interpretation of subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] as meaning that a gas distributor, transmitter or storage company shall only charge rates approved by the Board for the sale, distribution, transmission or storage of gas.

955

5.11.85 The Board's interpretation of subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] of the Act is that an order of the Board is required for a gas transmitter, gas distributor, or storage company to sell gas or charge for the transmission, distribution or storage of gas. The Board has authority to regulate the activity of selling gas, transmitting, distributing or storing gas, not merely to regulate the fees charged for performing these activities.

Was page 176 956

5.11.86 The Board's authority for approving or fixing just and reasonable rates for the sale of gas by a gas transmitter, gas distributor or gas storage company and for the transmission, distribution and storage of gas, is found in subsection 36(2) [12JF7-0:269] of the Act. ECG's interpretation of section 36 [12JF7-0:266] would render the authority of the Board to grant an order under subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] as meaningless, since the Board would in fact be limited only to granting rate orders under subsection 36(2).

957

5.11.87 The Board agrees with Intervenors that to interpret this provision otherwise would lead to the absurd conclusion the utility would be able to sell gas or transmit, distribute or store gas in any manner that it chose and the Board's only recourse would be to limit the cost recovery in rates.

958

5.11.88 If the Board were to find that EI, EOS or any combination of affiliates of ECG, are in fact acting as a gas transmitter, gas distributor or storage company and charging for the transmission, distribution or storage of gas without an order of the Board, contrary to subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] of the Act, and without the leave of the Board, pursuant to subsection 18(1) [12JF7-0:126] of the Act transferring the authority to charge for such services from ECG, then the Board will take appropriate action.

959

5.11.89 The Board notes that the conditions, classifications or practices that may be included in the order apply to the activities of the sale, transmission, distribution or storage of gas and are not limited to

the rates charged with respect to the carrying out those activities. Indeed, the phrase "including rules respecting the calculation of rates" indicates that the specific authority to include conditions, classifications and practices is broader than merely setting rules respecting the calculation of rates. ECG's interpretation of the section would limit the Board's authority to setting rules respecting the calculation of rates and would ignore the broader statutory mandate that precedes it.

Was page 177 960

5.11.90 The authority of the Board under subsection 36(4) [12JF7-0:273] to include conditions, classifications or practices applicable to the sale, transmission, distribution or storage of gas deals with an order under section 36 [12JF7-0:266], which would include an order under subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] and is not limited to a rate order under subsection 36(2) [12JF7-0:269].

961

5.11.91 Section 23 [12JF7-0:167] of the Act provides that "The Board in making an order may impose such conditions as it considers proper, and an order may be general or particular in its application." First, there is nothing in section 23 [12JF7-0:167] to indicate that the general power to impose conditions is in any way limited or circumscribed by the Board's power under subsection 36(4) [12JF7-0:273] of the Act. Secondly, subsection 36(4) is in fact broader than section 23 and provides that an order of the Board under section 36 [12JF7-0:266] may include not only conditions but also "classifications or practices" applicable to the sale, transmission, distribution or storage of gas, including "rules" respecting the calculation of rates.

962

5.11.92 The Board agrees with ECG that there must be a reasonable "nexus" between the order granted and the conditions imposed. The Board notes that while the conditions requested by the Intervenors do not necessarily deal with the rates imposed by the Board under subsection 36(2) [12JF7-0:269] of the Act, they do deal with the activities of the utility, selling gas or transmitting, distributing or storing gas that are authorized under subsection 36(1) [12JF7-0:267] of the Act.

963

5.11.93 The Board is not sympathetic to ECG's argument concerning the "practical difficulty or requiring ECG to compel or direct affiliates in circumstances where ECG has no power to do so". The Board did not require ECG to enter into these outsourcing arrangements with its affiliates: it did so voluntarily. ECG was or should have been aware at the time of entering into these arrangements that the Board was concerned in general about the relationship between a regulated utility and its affiliates.

Was page 178 964

5.11.94 The Board finds that it has the jurisdiction to impose conditions, such as those requested by the Intervenors.

965

5.11.95 However, the Board is not convinced that it is necessary in this proceeding to grant Schools' request that the Board order that the business activities transferred to EI and EOS be repatriated to ECG. First, it is unclear whether ECG has in fact transferred the control and management of these activities to EI and EOS. Secondly, if the benefits of improved efficiencies and quality of service are realized, as claimed by ECG, utility ratepayers may indeed benefit from these affiliate outsourcing arrangements.

966

5.11.96 The Board notes with interest the OSFI Guidelines filed by Schools in this proceeding. Consideration should be given to including similar guidelines in the ARC.

967

Conclusion

968

5.11.97 ECG has not convinced the Board that these outsourcing arrangements are beneficial to the utility. The Board notes that Intervenors have raised a number of legitimate concerns regarding the potential negative impact on the utility and its ratepayers.

Was page 179 969

5.11.98 The Board expects ECG in the next rates case to provide clear and quantifiable evidence demonstrating that its outsourcing arrangements have in fact resulted in benefits to the utility in terms of economies of scale and scope and improvements in system reliability, security of supply, cost efficiencies and service quality.

970

5.11.99 It will also be incumbent on ECG in the next rates case to adduce sufficient evidence to satisfy the Board that:

971

- ECG management retains and exercises independent decision-making authority to ensure that ECG is being operated in the best interests of the utility; and

972

- the outsourcing arrangements have not in any manner threatened the ability of ECG to perform its business objective, which is to ensure the safe, secure and reliable delivery of gas in the Province of Ontario.

Was page 180 973

Blank page

Was page 181 974

6. ADDITIONAL MATTERS

975

6.1 DISCLOSURE

976

6.1.1 A number of intervenors expressed concern that in this proceeding ECG had repeatedly breached its disclosure obligations, as articulated by the Board in the Decision on the Motion.

977

6.1.2 Intervenors noted generally the following areas of concern:

978

- the quality of the pre-filed evidence;

979

- the quality of responses to written interrogatories;

980

- the quality of responses to questions posed in cross-examination; and

981

- post-hearing disclosure.

982

Alliance Vector

983

6.1.3 With respect to disclosure on the issue of the prudence of ECG's decisions to contract for capacity of the Alliance Vector pipelines intervenors noted that ECG did not initially disclose the business case for the prudence of its decisions during the discovery phase of Alliance Vector issue. In the second tranche of interrogatories, ECG played what CAC described as a "cat and mouse game" in its responses, giving the intervenors, in a number of instances, answers that were incomplete, and therefore misleading. Throughout the process, the intervenors not able to elicit all of the relevant supporting information which "hampered" the ability of intervenors to examine the issue and to be able to cross-examine on the basis of it.

Was page 182 984

6.1.4 CAC believed that without the intervention of the Board in asking for the production of further and better information during the oral hearing, ECG would not have disclosed to the intervenors the full story of the Alliance and Vector contracts.

985

6.1.5 Intervenors expressed concern that ECG used the presumption of prudence as a excuse for not providing information and relying solely on the criticism of the evidence of others. Intervenors indicated that it was apparent that ECG did not believe that it had an obligation to provide all relevant information in support of its application and that the Company would supply only that information which it regarded as helpful to its own case.

986

6.1.6 Intervenors noted that while greater reliance is being placed on the adversarial model with intervenors raising issues and eliciting information that will allow the Board to make its decision, there is a

significant imbalance between the resources available to ECG and to the intervenors in the presentation of their respective cases and intervenors must rely almost entirely on ECG's willingness to provide information. In particular, CAC submitted that it is apparent that ECG believes that its objective is not to meet its statutory obligations but rather to "defeat" the intervenors by using tactics that would be unacceptable under the rules of conventional civil litigation.

Was page 183 987

6.1.7 Intervenors also expressed concern with respect to ECG's record keeping practices with respect to the Alliance Vector contracts. Intervenors noted that documentation created contemporaneously with the decision-making process is necessary in order to assist the Board in ensuring that ECG is held accountable for its decisions. Inadequate record-making practices on the part of ECG had an impact on the ability of intervenors and the Board to assess the prudence of entering into the Alliance Vector contracts. Although ECG witnesses admitted that they "clearly knew" that they would be in front of the Board one day explaining what they did; nonetheless, ECG did not create a proper "paper trail" or evidentiary record so that it could provide objective evidence to intervenors and the Board. Intervenor's noted that since staff inevitably leave the utility and knowing that memories fade with time, ECG should have been documenting its decision-making process.

988

Affiliate Outsourcing

989

6.1.8 Intervenors reminded the Board that even though the had been considering outsourcing operations to its affiliates since 1998, it did not initially disclose its outsourcing plans to the Board in brief letters to the Board Chair until August 2000 for Operational Service and April 2001 for Gas Services. Nothing further was disclosed to the Board or intervenors until the prefiling of evidence in these proceedings on September 25, 2001.

990

6.1.9 On the issue of the disclosure of the CustomerWorks/ Accenture transaction after the close of the oral hearing, intervenors noted that as part of its pre-filed evidence, ECG referred to the agreement with CustomerWorks; however, at no time prior to the press release on July 19, 2002 , did ECG advise the Board or the intervenors that the pre-filed evidence should be amended, or read in light of the proposed agreement with Accenture.

Was page 184 991

6.1.10 Intervenors noted that in the Decision on the Motion the Board made it clear that the provision of customer care services to ratepayers is an important aspect of utility services and plans to materially change the manner in which customer care services are to be provided to ratepayers must be disclosed by ECG in a timely manner, even though prior Board approval for the arrangements may nor be required. At the most basic level, ECG was under an obligation to advise the Board and the parties of material changes in its pre-filed evidence. It did not do so.

992

6.1.11 Intervenors argued that since the arrangements between CustomerWorks and Accenture may have an impact on the provision of services by ECG to its ratepayers and on the rates which those ratepayers pay, ECG was under an obligation to disclose the agreement, particularly in the course of a hearing in which outsourcing arrangements are an issue being considered by the Board.

993

6.1.12 With respect to the testimony of Mr. McGill and his subsequently filed affidavit sworn July 26, 2002, (the "McGill Affidavit") , intervenors expressed concern that Mr. McGill, testified at the oral

hearing about the benefits to ECG of acquiring services from CustomerWorks, while at the same time he was aware of the negotiations with Accenture and that ECG's consent was required to the assignment of the agreement. Consequently Mr. McGill's testimony created the misleading impression that the agreement with CustomerWorks would continue. Neither Mr. McGill nor ECG asserted that the failure to disclose the fact that a new arrangement to provide customer care services to ratepayers was under consideration was an oversight. Intervenors's therefore claimed that there had been a deliberate withholding of information without justification.

Was page 185 994

6.1.13 Mr. McGill should either not have testified or he should have disclosed to the Board, in advance, the constraint he felt he was under and obtained direction from the Board on whether he could testify and, if so, on what terms.

995

6.1.14 Intervenors claimed that the confidentiality acknowledgement signed by Mr. McGill in favour if EI is not a defence to Mr. McGill's actions, for several reasons since:

996

- a commercial arrangement does not override the legal obligations created when a witness swears an oath;

997

- ECG and its witnesses have an obligation to disclose to the Board information that affects their pre-filed evidence and which is relevant to an issue before the Board;

998

- Mr. McGill could have, but apparently did not, sought permission from EI to waive the constraints ostensibly placed on him by the confidentiality acknowledgement;

999

- the confidentiality acknowledgement, by its terms, did not preclude disclosure to ECG's regulator of information which ECG's regulator has ruled ECG has an obligation to disclose;

1000

- EI cannot "muzzle" ECG employees and preclude them from fulfilling their disclosure obligations by publishing a generic brochure governing business conduct.

1001

6.1.15 Intervenors noted that neither Mr. McGill nor the Company sought to disclose any information to the Board in confidence pursuant to the Board's *Rules of Practice and Procedure*, rather, they took it upon themselves to remain silent throughout the evidentiary phase in these proceedings and in the submission of the Argument-in-Chief.

Was page 186 1002

6.1.16 IGUA submitted that ECG has an obligation to make detailed and timely disclosure of it plans, prior to their implementation, regardless of whether prior Board approval is required if the plans:

1003

- will materially change the way the Company performs utility functions, whether or not there is any immediate impact on rates;

1004

- will have a long-term effect on rates; or

1005
- if they raise issues with respect to the policy framework that the Board has established.

1006
6.1.17 IGUA urged the Board to find that ECG's disclosure of its plans to outsource the performance of utility functions, being after the fact, piecemeal, and incomplete was both untimely and inadequate. The quality of disclosure provided by ECG constituted a breach of its obligation to keep the Board and intervenors informed in a timely manner of changes in the Company's business plans which, if implemented, would materially alter the way the utility performs its utility obligations.

Was page 187 1007
The Company's Position

1008
6.1.18 ECG summarized the issues with respect to disclosure as follows:

1009
- Does a regulated utility have a duty to disclose management decisions that do not require regulatory approval?

1010
- If there is a duty to disclose such decisions, when does it arise?

1011
- If there is a duty to disclose, what exactly needs to be disclosed?

1012
- Did ECG breach its obligation in respect of the disclosure of decisions to outsource utility functions?

1013
6.1.19 ECG's position on these issues was as follows:

1014
- as a matter of courtesy and having regard to the Board's rate-making responsibilities it "behooves" a utility to inform the Board of material and significant management decisions that affect the business of the utility, even if such decisions do not require prior Board approval and have no current rate-making implications;

1015
- if no regulatory approval is required, ECG's responsibility to inform the Board does not require it to do so in advance of decisions becoming final; and.

1016
- if no prior regulatory approval is required, the information to be provided to the Board is within the sole discretion of ECG. ECG claimed that it should, and that it will, endeavour to provide the Board with sufficient detail to enable the Board to respond to general inquiries about the utility's actions, from the government, from the public, and from ratepayers.

Was page 188 1017
6.1.20 It was ECG's position that it did not breach its responsibility to disclose management decisions to outsource utility functions. ECG argued that the management of ECG is required to ensure the provision of safe and reliable service in a cost effective manner. In this regard, it is accountable to the Board and to ratepayers. Accountability, however, requires responsibility. ECG argued that it cannot be held to account if the Board and ratepayers "micromanage" ECG's business.

1018
6.1.21 ECG argued that intervenors appear to suggest three possible sources of such a duty:

1019
- the Board's "right to know";

1020
- an intervenors's right to know and be "consulted"; and

1021
- the Decision on the Motion wherein the Board referred to ECG's duty of "full, true and plain disclosure".

1022
6.1.22 ECG argued that suggestions that the Board has an inherent right to know about significant ECG plans and decisions appear to stem from the idea that the Board's regulatory oversight is plenary and that "without perfect and complete information about every aspect of ECG's business", this oversight responsibility will be compromised.

1023
6.1.23 The Board does not have "perfect and complete information" about rate-making which is clearly within the Board's mandate. ECG argued that this aspect of the disclosure issue is directly linked to the issue of the Board's jurisdiction. ECG reiterated its argument that the Board's jurisdiction is not plenary and it has no statutory mandate to oversee or supervise the business of the utility.

Was page 189 1024
6.1.24 ECG argued that if the Board does not require particular information to carry out the its mandate (which ECG limited to leave to construct, approving rates, and ensuring compliance with rules made under section 44[12JF7-0:357] of the Act) it is difficult to understand how ECG could have a duty to disclose such information.

1025
6.1.25 ECG acknowledged that courtesy would have it inform the Board of material and significant management decisions that affect the business of the utility, even if such decisions do not require Board approval and have no current rate-making implications. In this regard, ECG pointed out that it did inform the Board, through letters to its chairman, of decision to outsource Operational Services, and subsequently, Gas Services.

1026
6.1.26 ECG accepted that intervenors are entitled to the information that is relevant in a particular application or proceeding, and ECG also recognized the value in consulting with the intervenors in order to resolve issues outside the hearing room. ECG did not accept, however, that "intervenors have any rights to, in effect, micromanage the utility".

1027
6.1.27 ECG argued that the Decision on the Motion must be read in its proper context and that it is not precedent for an open-ended obligation to disclose decisions or plans, when there are no rate-making implications, let alone no need for Board approval.

1028
6.1.28 ECG submitted that the obligation to disclose a"material change", as requested by some intervenors, usually means the obligation to disclose something significant that has occurred. In support of this interpretation, the Company sited the Ontario securities laws as they pertain to "continuous disclosure".

Was page 190 1029

6.1.29 ECG argued if ECG were required to disclose plans which the utility is contemplating it would prejudice ECG's ability to carry out its intentions whether acting alone or with a third party. ECG suggested that premature disclosure ECG, could require premature disclosure of a third party, including EI under Ontario and other securities laws. "Securities regulators typically frown on premature disclosure".

1030

6.1.30 ECG noted that the Company and EI, as reporting issuers, are subject to Ontario securities laws. ECG expressed concerns about intervenors' suggestions that ECG disclose intentions or plans to intervenors since, at that time, under Ontario securities laws, ECG would be guilty of premature disclosure

1031

Remedies

1032

6.1.31 Intervenors suggested the following remedies:

1033

- the Board should impress on ECG its obligation to be forthcoming in response to the written interrogatories that are delivered to it;

1034

- the Board should remind ECG of its obligation is to meet certain statutory tests and not "win" some imagined contest with intervenors;

1035

- ECG should be told with respect to questions asked in cross-examination and with respect to the written interrogatories it is inappropriate to "parse" the interrogatories in order to determine the minimum level of information necessary to provide in response. Where ECG is uncertain about the nature and extent of the information that is being sought, it should be instructed to contact the person who has delivered the written interrogatory to ask for clarification;

Was page 191 1036

- the Board should order that ECG is not entitled to recover in rates its costs, both external and internal, in the presentation of the Alliance/Vector portion of the application;

1037

- the Board should find and state in its Decision With Reasons that by failing to disclose during the evidentiary phase of these proceedings and in its written Argument-in-Chief any information pertaining to ECG's role in the CWLP/Accenture arrangements, Mr. McGill and ECG breached the disclosure obligations which the Board articulated in its Decision on the Motion;

1038

- the Board's order should contain provisions which will limit the amounts being paid by ECG to CWLP on and after August 1, 2002 to the amounts being paid by CWLP to Accenture's subsidiary;

1039

- the Board's order concluding these proceedings ought to require ECG to file evidence in its fiscal 2003 rates application to demonstrate that its arrangements with CWLP have been

adjusted to comply with the "service provider cost" approach specified in the provisions of paragraph 2.3.3 [12JF4-0:65] of the ARC;

1040

- the Board should impose a sanction on ECG, in the form of disallowing some or all of ECG's costs for this proceeding, since without a sanction, ECG will continue to ignore its obligation to disclose; and

1041

- the Board should set out rules governing the production of evidence.

Was page 192 1042

6.2 BOARD COMMENTS

1043

6.2.1 ECG's obligation to disclose was discussed in the Decision on the Motion, where the Board stated:

1044

> The Company has an affirmative obligation to provide the Board with the best possible evidence and it is not incumbent on the intervenors to ensure, through cross examination of the Company's witnesses, that the record is adequate and complete. The Company cannot shirk its responsibilities as a regulated entity by submitting evidence that is vague and incomplete.

1045

6.2.2 In the Decision on the Motion, the Board also quoted its previous decision in E.B.R.O. 452, when it stated:

1046

> The system required the regulator to act on faith with the utility, bearing in mind the prospective nature of the evidence. The regulator expects the utility, in return, to provide the best possible forecast data that can be made available, on a timely basis.

1047

6.2.3 ECG's obligation to disclose starts with the filing of its application. It is important that the application be filed on a timely basis. The Board notes that over the past few years ECG has been increasingly late in filing its application. For example, in this proceeding the application was not filed until September 25, 2001, less than one week prior to the beginning of the 2002 Test Year. It is difficult, if not impossible, for the Board to issue a decision and ultimately a rate order in a timely fashion, and avoid the possibility of retroactivity, if the original application is not filed well in advance of the beginning of the test year.

Was page 193 1048

6.2.4 It is also important that the application be complete and include all of the supporting evidence and documentation, including statements of underlying assumptions and analysis. The Board notes that in this proceeding, ECG's original application was "vague and incomplete" and that the Company continued to supplement and update evidence and file new evidence well into the oral phase of the proceeding, almost nine months after the original application was filed.

1049
6.2.5 ECG controls not only the relevant information but also the timing and manner of its disclosure. As the Board has previously stated, as a regulated utility, ECG has an affirmative obligation to disclose all information relevant and necessary for the evidence to be tested and for the Board to make the necessary determinations and findings.

1050
6.2.6 The information must also be presented in a manner that is clear, concise and easily understandable to those experienced and knowledgeable in the field. It is not of assistance to the Board to present the information in a manner that tends to obfuscate its relevance to the proceeding.

1051
6.2.7 It appears that ECG is not providing the "best possible evidence" in its original application but has a strategy of waiting for Board staff and intervenors to elicit additional evidence through interrogatories and cross examination before providing it to the Board. This approach is not acceptable.

1052
6.2.8 It would be helpful if ECG were to review standard interrogatories that have been filed in previous rates hearings and to include this information in its pre-filed evidence. This approach might reduce the time and resources devoted to the interrogatory process by all parties.

Was page 194 1053
6.2.9 If ECG files its evidence in a timely fashion the Board expects intervenors to do likewise.

1054
6.2.10 While the Board appreciates that, to a certain extent, a rates hearing is an iterative process, it is critical that all relevant material should be filed as soon as possible, to give the Board and the parties the opportunity to properly review and analyze it in a timely manner during the course of the proceeding.

1055
6.2.11 For example, critical information, such as the Otsason Memo concerning the Alliance and Vector pipelines, was not included in ECG's pre-filed evidence and was not disclosed until May 27, 2002, just before the oral phase of the hearing. This approach did not give the Board and intervenors the opportunity to review and analyze the information in order to properly prepare for the oral phase of the proceeding.

1056
6.2.12 As well, information such as the business case for DPWAMS, even though requested in the intervenors interrogatories, was not filed until just prior to the Settlement Conference. Again, this approach made it difficult for the Board to properly analyze and review the information in order to make an informed decision on the issue.

1057
6.2.13 The lack of timely and complete disclosure is evidenced by the large number of exhibits filed and undertakings given during the course of the oral proceeding. While the Board appreciates the efforts by ECG's witnesses to attempt to respond to undertakings given during the oral hearing in a timely manner, the Board notes that many undertaking responses were not given until near the end of the oral hearing. This afforded the Intervenors and the Board no time to review and analyze the material, ask for clarification and, if necessary, further information prior to completion of the evidentiary phase of the proceeding.

Was page 195 1058

6.2.14 ECG's general approach to disclosure in this proceeding has not been helpful. In order for the Board to fulfill its mandate, it must first understand the operations of the utility and the business model it is operating within. This can only be accomplished by the utility providing the Board with clear and concise explanations of its operations and business processes. Without full and complete disclosure it is difficult for the Board to understand the business of the utility and to be "lighthanded" in the Board's regulatory approach.

1059

6.2.15 Likewise the Board reminds intervenors that all intervenors evidence, including discussion papers, should be properly introduced by appropriate witnesses and should not be provided to the Board for the first time in argument.

1060

6.2.16 The Board is also concerned that ECG failed to disclose that it was considering consenting to the assignment of the contract to provide customer care services from CWLP to Accenture. In this case, the Board and the Intervenors were left with the distinct impression that it was the intention of ECG that customer care services would be performed for the utility during the 2002 Test Year by CWLP. At no time did ECG's witness indicate that its intention might be otherwise, even though it is clear, with information disclosed after the completion of the oral phase of the hearing, that ECG witnesses were involved in the proposal to assign the CWLP agreement to Accenture. Indeed this information was not disclosed to the Board until the same time as a press release was issued.

Was page 196 1061

6.2.17 The Board is not convinced by ECG's arguments that its employee, Mr. McGill, was unable to disclose this information because he had signed a confidentiality agreement with EI. The Board stresses that a regulated utility and its affiliates cannot circumvent the utility's obligation to provide full disclosure to the Board by signing self-serving documents. The obligation to disclose to the regulator overrides any contractual obligation that an employee might have not only to the utility, but also to any third party, including its ultimate parent. ECG could, and should, have availed itself of using the Board's *Rules of Practice and Procedure* to disclose the material in confidence to the Board.

1062

6.2.18 Likewise a utility's obligation to disclose its plans for the test year to the Board is not subordinate to the requirement of timely disclosure to securities regulators. Parties dealing with regulated utilities, such as ECG, should be aware that regulated utilities may have an obligation to disclose information to its regulator that an unregulated business could retain in confidence.

1063

6.2.19 While ECG has argued that the entity who performs customer care services is not relevant for rate-making purposes for the 2002 Test Year, once affiliate outsourcing arrangements became an issue in this proceeding, ECG had an affirmative obligation not to mislead the Board. It has failed in fulfilling that obligation.

1064

6.2.20 It is crucial for the integrity of the regulatory process that the Board is able to rely on the utility to be honest, forthcoming and complete in its evidence before the Board. The utility has an affirmative obligation not to make a false or misleading representation to the Board. The Board notes that, in determining whether the impression is false or misleading, the Board must take into account the general impression conveyed by the representation, as well as its literal meaning. In other words,

the evidence of a utility may be literally accurate, yet leave the Board with a general impression that is false.

Was page 197 1065

6.2.21 The Board has always relied on the good faith of the utilities in making timely, complete and accurate disclosure of all information relevant to the operations of the utility, whether of not the specific information has a direct impact on the Board's rate-making function. If this is no longer the case, the Board will have no alternative but to consider other regulatory tools available to it, such as: including conditions regarding disclosure in orders, requiring the preparation of evidence pursuant to subsection 21(1) [12JF7-0:146] of the Act, and making rules pursuant to paragraphs 44(1)(f) [12JF7-0:367]or(g) [12JF7-0:368] of the Act.

1066

6.2.22 Finally, the Board notes that additional evidence and supplemental arguments were sent to the Board well after the applicable filing deadlines had expired. At some point the filing of information and arguments must stop. Constant bickering about who gets the last word only lengthens the regulatory process. The parties must rely on the Board to determine the weight and relevance of the material submitted.

1067

6.2.23 The Board is aware that timeliness of decisions is an issue for not only ECG and the Intervenors but also for the Board. The Board would be greatly assisted in its obligation to issue decisions in a timely fashion, if all parties acted on these comments.

Was page 198 1068

6.3 OTHER COMMENTS

1069

6.3.1 In the past the Board has been impressed with and greatly assisted by the quality of the arguments and the professional approach of the parties. However, the Board is deeply concerned about the general deterioration of tone in this proceeding.

1070

6.3.2 The Board reminds the parties that it is essential for all parties to show respect and professional courtesy throughout the course of the proceeding, including the argument phase. Inflammatory rhetoric and gratuitous remarks may impress clients; however, they hinder the regulatory process and detract the Board from its ability to carefully review and analyze the merits of the case in coming to its decision.

1071

6.3.3 The Board is confident that the parties will heed these remarks and will return to their usual respectful demeanour in future proceedings.

Was page 199 1072

7. COSTS AWARDS

7.1 SUBMISSIONS

1073

1074 7.1.1 The Board received submissions and claims for costs from the following parties:

- 1075 CME
- 1076 HVAC Coalition
- 1077 IGUA
- 1078 VECC
- 1079 Schools
- 1080 CEED
- 1081 CAC
- 1082 Pollution Probe
- 1083 GEC

1084 7.1.2 In a letter to the Board, dated November 4, 2002, ECG stated that it had no objection to the cost claims requested.

1085 7.1.3 The Board notes that some of CEED's cost claims relate to its participation in the RP-1999-0001 proceeding. At that time, the Board anticipated that there would be a second phase of the proceeding, dealing with issues of particular interest to CEED. Accordingly CEED did not make any cost claims for its participation in the first phase of the RP-1999-0001 proceeding. Since the second phase of the RP-1999-0001 proceeding did not take place, the Board has agreed that CEED may include its cost claims for the RP-1999-0001 proceeding along with its cost claims in this proceeding.

Was page 200 1086

7.2 COST AWARDS

1087 7.2.1 The Board awards the following parties 100% of the reasonably incurred costs in connection with their participation in this proceeding, subject to assessment by the Board's Cost Assessment Officer.

1088 • CME

1089 • HVAC Coalition

1090 • IGUA

1091 • VECC

1092 • Schools

1093 • CEED

1094 • CAC

1095 • Pollution Probe

1096 • GEC

1097 7.2.2 The Board directs the Cost Assessment Officer to review the costs claimed and to make adjustments as necessary to ensure that they are consistent with the Board's Cost Assessment Guidelines.

1098 7.2.3 The Board orders that the eligible costs of the intervenors, as assessed by the Board's Cost Assessment Officer, shall be paid by Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc.

Was page 201 1099 7.2.4 The Board's costs of and incidental to the proceeding shall be paid by Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. upon receipt of the Board's invoice.

DATED December 13, 2002

Sheila K. Halladay
Presiding Member

A. Catherina Spoel
Member

Bob Betts
Member

Appendix A Enbridge Consumers Gas (ECG) Fiscal 2002 Rates

ISSUES LIST

1102

GAS VOLUME BUDGET

1103

1.1 ECG's gas volume forecast for the 2002 Test Year, including estimated average uses and the forecasting methodology (*per* Issue 1.1 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1104

GAS COSTS AND TRANSPORTATION

1105

2.1 ECG's Alliance and Vector transportation arrangements, including the cost consequences of the notional deferral account (*per* Issue 2.1 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1106

2.2 Underutilization of Link pipeline, including related cost consequences.

1107

2.3 Cost allocation of gas supply management costs (*per* Issue 2.2, Cost Allocation, of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1108

2.4 Cost of managing system gas on a "stand-alone" basis (*per* Issue 2.2, Cost Allocation, of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1109

2.5 Implications of the Quarterly Rate Adjustment Mechanism (QRAM) and outsourcing arrangements on ECG's Risk Management Program (study to be filed in Jan/02 *per* Issue 2.3 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1110

2.6 Changes to the QRAM adjustment to include the introduction of Large Corporations Tax and Capital Tax.

1111

COST OF CAPITAL

1112

3.1 Establishment of the return on equity for fiscal 2002 using the Board's existing Return On Equity (ROE) Guidelines.

1113

3.2 ECG's proposal for a review of the ROE Guidelines. NOTE: Issue deferred to a separate phase of the proceeding.

1114

3.3 ECG's estimates of the cost of short-term and long-term debt for the 2002 Test Year.

1115

RATE BASE

1116

4.1 ECG's Capital Budget for the 2002 Test Year.

1117

4.2 ECG's Distribution Plant Work and Asset Management Solution (DPWAMS) information technology project.

1118

ASSET SHARING ARRANGEMENTS AND AFFILIATE SERVICES

Was Appendix A, page 2 1119

5.1 ECG's disposition of previously shared assets since October 1, 2000.

1120

5.2 ECG's sharing of utility-owned assets with affiliates: methodology and non-O&M cost consequences, including the independent consultant's assessment report (*per* Issue 5.1 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1121

5.3 ECG's affiliate services arrangements, including the implications of outsourcing Gas Services and Operational Services, as defined in Exh A Tab 14 sch 3, to affiliates and their personnel located in Alberta.

1122

PBR O&M

1123

6.1 Review of the specific results of the Company's Service Quality Indicators for fiscal year 2001 (*per* Board direction, Para. 3.0.22, E.B.R.O. 497-01).

1124

6.2 ECG's proposed inputs to the formula for the derivation of the 2002 Test Year O&M expense, including a review of the 2002 consensus forecast of inflation.

1125

6.3 Symmetry in ECG's budgeting for Z-factors (*per* Issue 6.4 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1126

TRANSACTIONAL SERVICES

1127

7.1 ECG's forecast of Net Revenue for Transactional Services for the 2002 Test Year.

1128

DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT (DSM)

1129

8.1 ECG's DSM Plan for the 2002 Test Year, including the O&M budget, the volume target and the level of the proposed Shared Savings Mechanism (SSM) incentive rate.

1130

8.2 Scope of the Demand Side Management Variance Account-Operating (*per* Issue 8.1of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1131

8.3 Clearance of balances recorded in the 2000 Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account (2000 SSMVA) and the 2000 Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism (2000 LRAM) (*per* Issue 8.3 and 11.1 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1132

CUSTOMER INFORMATION SYSTEM (CIS)

1133

9.1 Appropriateness of CIS as a Z-factor in the 2002 Test Year.

1134

9.2 ECG's proposed CIS Z-factor in the 2002 Test Year.

1135

DEFERRED TAXES

1136

10.1 ECG's proposal to establish a Deferred Income Tax Deferral Account to recover $50 million in deferred taxes through to 2010.

1137

10.2 ECG's proposal to record in the account $10 million (after tax) in deferred taxes in the 2002 Test Year.

Was Appendix A, page 3 1138

10.3 ECG's proposed pre-conditions for clearing the account.

1139

DEFERRAL AND VARIANCE ACCOUNTS

1140

11.1 Amounts and disposition of balances in the fiscal 2001 deferral and variance accounts.

1141

11.2 ECG's request to continue or establish deferral and variance accounts for fiscal 2002, including new accounts such as the Late Payment Plan Deferral Account (2002 LPPDA).

1142

RATE DESIGN

1143

12.1 ECG's proposal to change the allocation and recovery of carrying costs related to gas in inventory.

1144

12.2 ECG's proposed changes to Rider A and Rate 125.

1145

12.3 Rate retroactivity in the 2002 Test Year.

1146

LATE PAYMENT PENALTY

1147

13.1 ECG's proposal to revise its late payment policy.

1148

AFFILIATE/INTERCORPORATE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

1149

14.1 Affiliate/intercorporate financial transactions.

Appendix B SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL

1151

May 17, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Was Appendix B, page 6 1156

This Settlement Proposal is filed with the Ontario Energy Board ("the Board") in connection with the application of The Consumers' Gas Company Ltd., carrying on business under the trade name Enbridge Consumers Gas, for an order or orders approving or fixing rates for the sale, distribution, transmission, and storage of gas in Fiscal 2002 (the "Test Year"). A Settlement Conference was conducted on April 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26 and on May 2, 3, 9, and 13, 2002 in accordance with Rule 38 of the Board's Rules of Practice and Procedure and the Board's Settlement Conference Guidelines ("Settlement Guidelines"). The Settlement Proposal arises from the Settlement Conference.

1157

The following parties participated, in whole or in part, in the Settlement Conference: Enbridge Consumers Gas ("ECG"); the Ontario Energy Board's technical staff ("Board Staff"); Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters ("CME"); Coalition for Efficient Energy Distribution ("CEED"); Consumers' Association of Canada ("CAC"); Green Energy Coalition ("GEC"); Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning Contractors Coalition Inc. ("HVAC"); Industrial Gas Users Association ("IGUA"); Pollution Probe Foundation ("Pollution Probe"); Ontario Association of School Business Officials ("Schools"); TransCanada PipeLines Limited ("TCPL"); and Vulnerable Energy Consumers Coalition ("VECC").

1158

The Settlement Proposal deals with all of the issues on the Board's Issues List, even if there was no agreement to settle a particular issue or if there was an agreement but not unanimity, such that each issue could fall within one of the following three categories:

1159

1. an issue for which there is a complete settlement, because ECG and all of the other parties who discussed the issue either agree with the settlement or take no position on the issue;

1160

2. an issue for which there is a partial settlement, because ECG and certain of the other parties who discussed the issue agree with the settlement, or take no position on the issue, but one or more of the other parties disagree(s) with the settlement; and

1161

3. an issue for which there is no settlement, because ECG and the other parties who discussed the issue are unable to reach an agreement to settle the issue.

1162

A complete or a partial settlement could be conditional in nature; for example, such a settlement may enumerate the condition(s) on which the settlement would be implemented. Each conditional settlement would be so labelled.

1163

There are complete settlements for 26 issues, in the result, and only the following four of them are conditional: Issue 2.2 (Link pipeline at pp. 12-13), Issue 6.3 (budgets for Z-factors at pp. 29-30), and Issues 9.1 and 9.2 (CIS at pp. 38-39). There are no agreements to settle the following eight issues: Issue 2.1 (Alliance and Vector at pp. 11-12), Issue 2.3 and 2.4 (cost allocation of gas supply management costs and cost of managing system gas on a "stand-alone" basis at pp. 13-14), Issue 4.2 (DPWAMS at pp. 22-23), Issue 5.3 (affiliate outsourcing at pp. 25-27), and Issues 10.1, 10.2, and 10.3 (deferred taxes at pp. 39-41).

Was Appendix B, page 7 1164

This Settlement Proposal was prepared in accordance with Rule 39 and the Settlement Guidelines. It lists the parties who participated in the discussion of each issue, other than Board Staff, prior to indicating whether or not there is an agreement to settle the issue. Board Staff has been excluded from the issue-by-issue lists because Board Staff participated in the discussion of all issues, for the purposes described in the Settlement Guidelines, and there is accordingly no need to include Board Staff in each such list. Board Staff takes no position on any issue and, as a result, is not a party to this Settlement Proposal.

1165

The Settlement Proposal describes the agreements reached on the settled issues, including the rationale for each of them, and delineates for reference purposes the scope of the dispute over the issues for which there is no settlement or, when required by any conditional settlement of an issue, the scope of the conditional aspect(s) of the settlement; identifies the parties who agree and who disagree with each settlement, including the latter's grounds for disagreement, or alternatively who take no position on the settled issue; and provides a direct and transparent link between each settlement and the supporting evidence in the record to date. In this regard, the parties who agree with the individual settlements are of the view that the evidence provided is sufficient to support the Settlement Proposal in relation to the settled issues and, moreover, that the quality and detail of the supporting evidence, together with the corresponding rationale, will allow the Board to make findings on the settled issues. This is the case with all settlements, whether conditional or not, and whether complete or partial.

1166

The supporting evidence for each settled issue is identified individually by reference to its exhibit number in an abbreviated format; for example, Exhibit A, Tab 8, Schedule 1 is referred to as A-8-1. A concise description of the content of each exhibit is also provided. In this regard, ECG's response to an interrogatory is described by citing the name of the party and the number of the interrogatory (e.g., Board Staff Interrogatory #1), whereas another party's response to an interrogatory is described by citing the names of both parties and the number of the interrogatory (e.g., CAC Response to ECG Interrogatory #1).

1167

Exhibit N2, Tab 1, Schedule 1 and Exhibit N2, Tab 2, Schedules 2 through 7 demonstrate the effect of the Settlement Proposal on Rate Base, Cost of Service, Utility Income, and Capital Structure for the Test Year. Exhibit N2, Tab 2, Schedules 8 and 9 provide the proposed revenue recovery by rate class and a revenue comparison (current vs. proposed). The "N2" series of exhibits is intended to assist the Board in its review of the financial consequences of the Settlement Proposal.

1168

According to the Settlement Guidelines (p. 3), the parties must consider whether a settlement proposal should include an appropriate adjustment mechanism for any settled issue that may be

affected by external factors. ECG and the other parties who participated in the Settlement Conference, including Board Staff, consider that no settled issue requires an adjustment mechanism.

Was Appendix B, page 8 1169

This Settlement Proposal is a package insofar as the settled issues are concerned and, as such, no agreement to settle a particular issue can be considered as acceptable to ECG or the other parties, or both, in isolation from the agreements to settle the other issues in the package. No particular settlement, then, can be construed as representing the position that ECG or the other parties, or both, would take on the appropriate resolution of the corresponding issue in the absence of the other settlements. The individual settlements are inextricably linked to one another, in other words, and so neither ECG nor the other parties can withdraw from the Settlement Proposal except in accordance with Rule 40.02.

1170

The Settlement Guidelines prescribe the following three conditions for the Board's acceptance of a settlement proposal as a package (p. 8):

1171

- the evidence supports the settlement proposal;

1172

- the settlement proposal is in the public interest; and

1173

- all evidence relevant to the issues is available to all parties, and to the Board, both in the settlement proposal itself and as part of the public record.

1174

ECG and the other parties are confident that this Settlement Proposal satisfies these conditions and, in consequence, they expect the Board to accept it as a package insofar as the settled issues are concerned. They recognize, though, that the Board may not accept this Settlement Proposal in its entirety. In this event, according to the Settlement Guidelines, "the Board will reject the settlement proposal as a whole and will proceed to a hearing of all of the issues on the issues list" (p. 8).

1175

ECG and the other parties would prefer, however, that the Board take an intermediate step in this event. Rule 39.04 allows the Board to "direct the parties to make reasonable efforts to revise the settlement proposal" when the Board holds either of the views specified in the rule. ECG and the other parties would like to have an opportunity to elaborate on the rationale for the package, if it is inadequate, or to improve the quality and detail of the supporting evidence. ECG and the other parties would like the Board to make findings on the settled issues, by accepting the Settlement Proposal, prior to hearing evidence and argument on the unsettled issues.

GAS VOLUME BUDGET

1177

1.1 ECG's gas volume forecast for the 2002 Test Year, including estimated average uses and the forecasting methodology (per Issue 1.1 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1178

(Complete Settlement)

1179

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1180

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1181

- ECG's forecasts of gas sales and transportation volumes, or throughput, for the Test Year, as set out in its pre-filed evidence (A-8-1, updated on 2002-01-25), totalled 11 776.3 $10^6 m^3$. These forecasts were based on a forecast of degree days for the Test Year that were prepared using the methodology developed by Dr. de Bever in the EBRO 464 proceeding (A-24-1). This methodology forecasts annual degree-days by means of a regression model that uses a constant and a five-year weighted average of the Environment Canada degree days, as explanatory variables, estimated over the full cycle length. The five-year weighted average included data up to and including Fiscal 2000; in other words, it incorporated a two-year lag necessitated by the absence of actual weather data for Fiscal 2001 and the Test Year.

1182

- ECG subsequently updated its forecast of degree days for the Test Year (A-24-1, 2002-04-18) to include actual degree-day data for Fiscal 2001. The updated forecast reduced the lag in the five-year weighted average of the Environment Canada degree days from two years to one year.

1183

- The effect of ECG's degree-day update was to: (i) reduce the throughput forecast by 52.8 $10^6 m^3$, from 11 776.3 $10^6 m^3$ to 11 723.5 $10^6 m^3$; (ii) decrease revenues by approximately $10.9 million and gas costs by $7.4 million; and (iii) increase the gross revenue deficiency by approximately $3.5 million (A-24-1, p. 9 of 15).

1184

- ECG's Test Year forecasts of average uses for residential customers (Rate 1) and general service customers (Rate 6) were developed using a methodology that was first used in Fiscal 2001. This methodology develops average uses based upon econometric (i.e., regression) models for not only the heating and water heating residential revenue class, but also the other residential revenue classes and all of the general service revenue classes in the apartment, commercial, and industrial sectors (C-4-1 for Rate 1 and C-4-2 for Rate 6).

1185

- ECG claims that normalized average uses for the Test Year on a six-month actual and six month forecast basis, assuming normal weather for the latter, are 2 962 m^3 for Rate 1 and 22 101 m^3 for Rate 6. Budgeted figures are 2 970 m^3 and 22 125 m^3, respectively, for the Test Year.

 1186

- In the agreement to settle Issue 1.1 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal, the other parties expressed their concern about the new average uses forecasting methodology, in general, and the accuracy of the new models, in particular, and reserved their right to examine the methodology in ECG's next rates case. The RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal accordingly required ECG to file evidence, in this proceeding, on results that its forecasting models would have generated for Fiscal 2001 using actual data for all driver variables. These results allow parties to assess the models' performance for Fiscal 2001 (A-25-3) and, as they indicate, the average use models are good objective predictors of average uses and do not exhibit any systematic bias.

1187

- Given the limited experience with ECG's econometric models for forecasting average uses, however, the other parties believe that it is too soon to pronounce definitively on whether these models are working well, or not, at this point. ECG nevertheless proposes, and the other parties nevertheless accept, the results that these models produce for the Test Year -- 11 776.31 10^6m^3 -- as the throughput forecast for the Test Year.

1188

- The other parties do not accept ECG's updated throughput forecast of 11 723.5 10^6m^3, based on the inclusion of actual degree day data for Fiscal 2001, as the update was seen by them to be untimely. ECG therefore proposes, and the other parties accept, that the throughput forecast for the Test Year -- 11 776.31 10^6m^3 -- will not be adjusted for the consequential effects of decreases in gas savings in the 2002 DSM plan (see Issue 8.1 at pp. 32-34), increases in customer additions (see Issue 6.2 pp. 28-29), and increases in the average use for Rate 6 customers.

1189

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1190

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1191

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1192

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1193

A-8-1	Gas Volume Budget
A-22-1	Economic Outlook
A-24-1	Budget Degree Days
A-25-1	Average Use Model for Rate 1
A-25-2	Average Use Model for Rate 6
A-25-3	Average Use Models, RP-2000-0040 Settlement Agreement Commitment Issue 1.1
C1-2-1	Customers, Volumes and Revenues by Rate Class, 2002 Budget
C1-2-2	Comparison of Average Customer Numbers by Rate Class, 2002 Budget and 2001 Actual

 1194

C1-2-3	Comparison of Gas Sales and Transportation Volume by Rate Class, 2002 Budget and 2001 Actual

C1-2-4	Comparison of Gas Sales and Transportation Volume by Rate Class, 2002 Budget and 2001 Actual
C1-2-5	Comparison of Gas Sales and Transportation Revenue by Rate Class, 2002 Budget and 2001 Actual
C2-2-1	Customers, Volumes and Revenues by Rate, Class, 2001 Actual
C2-2-2	Comparison of Customer Numbers by Rate Class, 2001 Actual and 2000 Actual
C2-2-3	Comparison of Gas Sales and Transportation Volume by Rate Class, 2001 Actual and 2000 Actual
C2-2-4	Comparison of Gas Sales and Transportation Volume by Rate Class, 2001 Actual and 2000 Actual
C2-2-5	Comparison of Gas Sales and Transportation Revenue by Rate Class, 2001 Actual and 2000 Actual
C2-2-6	Comparison of Gas Sales and Transportation Volume by Rate Class, 2001 Actual and 2001 OEB Approved
C3-2-1	Customers, Volumes and Revenues by Rate Class, 2000 Actual
C3-2-2	Comparison of Gas Sales and Transportation Volume by Rate Class, 2000 Actual and 2000 OEB Approved
C3-2-3	General Service System-Wide Total Normalized Average Use
C3-2-4	General Service Average Uses, Historical Normalized and OEB Approved
I-1-4 to 6	Board Staff Interrogatories #4 to 6
I-2-3 to I-8, 45, 58	CAC Interrogatories #3 to 8, 45,58
I-4-2 to 10, 28 to 30	CME Interrogatories #2 to 10, 28 to 30
I-8-9, 24	IGUA Interrogatories #9, 24
I-11-2 to 4, 40 to 49, 55, 56	VECC Interrogatories #2 to 4, 40 to 49, 55, 56.

GAS COSTS AND TRANSPORTATION

1196

2.1 ECG's Alliance and Vector transportation arrangements, including the cost consequences of the notional deferral account (per Issue 2.1 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1197

(No Settlement)

1198

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, TCPL, and VECC.

1199

ECG and the other parties are unable to reach an agreement to settle this issue. The following delineates, from their perspective, the scope of the dispute over the issue.

1200

This issue arises from the agreement to settle Issue. 2.1 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal that, in effect, deferred the issue to this proceeding on the terms and conditions specified therein. ECG and the other parties disagree on the prudence or the imprudence, as the case may be, of ECG's Alliance and Vector transportation arrangements. They also disagree on the basis for and the amount of any cost disallowance vis-à-vis the notional deferral account or otherwise.

1201

The following evidence is relevant to this issue:

Was Appendix B, page 12 1202

A-14-1	Gas Costs
A-14-4	Alliance and Vector Transportation Arrangements
A-14-7	Rebuttal Evidence of W.G. Foster
A-14-8	Rebuttal Evidence of R.G. DeWolf
A-14-9	Reply Evidence of ECG
D1-2-1	Summary of Gas Cost to Operations, Fiscal 2002
D1-2-2	Summary of Storage and Transportation Costs, Fiscal 2001-2002
D2-2-1	Summary of Gas Cost to Operations, Fiscal 2001
D2-2-2	Summary of Storage and Transportation Costs, Fiscal 2000 – 2001
D2-2-4	Transportation Cost Differential
D3-2-3	Summary of Gas Cost to Operations, Fiscal 2000
D3-2-4	Summary of Storage and Transportation Costs, Fiscal 1999 – 2000
I-2-26 to 41, 63 to 95	CAC Interrogatories #26 to 41, 63 to 95
I-4-29, 30	CME Interrogatories #29, 30
I-8-30	IGUA Interrogatory #30
I-11-25, 27 to 32, 66 to 72	VECC Interrogatories #25, 27 to 32, 66 to 72
L-2-1	Evidence of M.P. Stauft for CAC
I-12-1 to 20	CAC Responses to ECG Interrogatories #1 to 20
M1-1-1	Impact Statement No. 1
M1-2-7	Summary of Gas Costs to Operations, Fiscal 2002

1203

2.2 Underutilization of Link pipeline, including related cost consequences.

1204

(Complete Conditional Settlement)

1205

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, TCPL, and VECC.

1206

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1207

- ECG originally proposed to continue the 50:50 sharing ratio of the net cost of ECG's underutilization of its service entitlement with Niagara Gas Transmission Limited -- an affiliate -- for the Link pipeline, as between customer and shareholder, notwithstanding the continual low level of ECG's actual utilization relative to budget. The other parties oppose ECG's proposal because they believe ECG's service entitlement for the Link pipeline is now redundant by virtue of ECG's low actual utilization of it.

1208

- ECG has reconsidered its proposal, in the light of this opposition and its estimated utilization of its service entitlement for the Link pipeline in the foreseeable future, and has decided to withdraw the proposal. ECG's shareholder will accordingly bear the cost consequences of ECG's underutilization of its service entitlement for the Link pipeline.

1209

- There is no corresponding adjustment of ECG's revenue requirement, though, but rather a year-end calculation of the cost consequences of underutilization in ECG's Purchased Gas Variance Account ("PGVA") for the Test Year. This calculation would usually occur at the time of clearing the PGVA. A calculation now, on the other hand, would require numerous consequential calculations including, ultimately, ECG's revenue requirement as well as the preparation of another impact statement.

Was Appendix B, page 13 1210

- ECG proposes to follow the usual timing for calculating the cost consequences of underutilization in the PGVA and, in addition, to hold the customer whole vis-à-vis interest on the amount attributable to underutilization that would otherwise be recorded in the PGVA. The other parties accept ECG's proposal as a practical solution for a timing problem.

1211

- ECG also proposes to eliminate the underutilization entries in the PGVA for Fiscal 2003 and thereafter subject, however, to the condition that ECG can apply to reinstate them in the future when its utilization of the Link pipeline increases markedly from the current actual level. The other parties accept ECG's proposal subject, however, to the condition that they can oppose any such application.

1212

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1213

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1214

The following parties take no position on the issue: TCPL.

1215

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1216

A-14-1	Gas Costs
A-12-1	Deferral and Variance Accounts
I-2-24	CAC Interrogatory #24
I-11-26	VECC Interrogatory #26

1217

2.3 Cost allocation of gas supply management costs (per Issue 2.2, Cost Allocation, of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1218

- and -

1219

2.4 Cost of managing system gas on a "stand-alone" basis (per Issue 2.2, Cost Allocation, of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1220

(No Settlement)

1221

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CEED, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1222

ECG and the other parties are unable to reach an agreement to settle these issues. The following delineates, from their perspective, the scope of the dispute over the issues.

Was Appendix B, page 14 1223

Both issues arise from the agreement to settle Issue 2.2 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal. The settlement of Issue 2.2 included, as one component, “the methodology used to allocate gas supply management costs to system gas customers, on the one hand, and to direct purchase customers on the other”. ECG undertook to conduct a cost allocation study, using the fully allocated costing (“FAC”) methodology, for this purpose. ECG also undertook “to retain a consultant to ascertain the costs of managing system gas as a discrete business, on a so-called ‘stand-alone’ basis, and how these costs would vary from the costs allocated to system gas customers in the study”.

1224

ECG prepared the FAC study for the Test Year (G2-3-4) but, for the reasons given in ECG’s prefiled evidence (G1-1-2), ECG did not use an account-level forecast of operations and maintenance ("O&M") costs for the Test Year in the study. ECG has undertaken to prepare another FAC study, using an account-level forecast of O&M costs for Fiscal 2003, and will file the study as part of ECG's rates application for Fiscal 2003.

1225

ECG also retained a consultant for the purpose described earlier -- the costs of managing system gas on a stand-alone basis -- and he prepared a “Report on Cost of Managing System Gas Supply” (A-14-6). ECG proposes to use the functions identified in this report in preparing the FAC study for Fiscal 2003.

1226

Some of the other parties contend that the consultant’s study has not identified all of the functions -- and the associated costs -- that would be required by a person who provides system gas on a stand-alone basis; that is, separated from distribution service per se, in a manner similar to direct purchase gas, instead of integrated with distribution service as is now the case. These parties also contend that, if the Board finds there are additional functions, the Board should direct ECG to include them in the FAC study for Fiscal 2003 and, in addition, the Board should consider requests for other relief in this proceeding.

1227

The following evidence is relevant to these issues:

1228

A-14-6	Cost of Managing System Gas Supply
G1-1-2	Allocation of Gas Supply Management Costs

I-1-14	Board Staff Interrogatory #14
I-2-51	CAC Interrogatory #51
I-3-56 to 75, 85 to 87	CEED Interrogatories #56 to 75, 85 to 87
I-4-15	CME Interrogatory #15
I-11-24, 50	VECC Interrogatories #24, 50.

1229

2.5 Implications of the Quarterly Rate Adjustment Mechanism (QRAM) and outsourcing the arrangements on ECG's Risk Management Program (study to be filed in Jan/02 per Issue 2.3 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1230

(Complete Settlement)

Was Appendix B, page 15 1231

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CEED, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1232

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1233

- The agreement to settle Issue 2.3 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal provided that ECG would form a working group to examine the principles that underpin ECG's Risk Management Program. The working group comprised members from ECG and the following other parties: CME, CEED, CAC, IGUA and VECC. (There were also members from A.E. Sharp Limited and Toronto Hydro Energy Services Inc.)

1234

- The members of the working group decided, after examining the objectives of the program as well as the underlying principles, that change at this time is neither necessary nor desirable for either the objectives or the underlying principles. They also decided to combine the objectives of the program, after revising them for this purpose, into a single objective.

1235

- ECG nevertheless retained a consultant, with the concurrence of the working group's other members, to review ECG's Gas Supply Risk Management Policies and Procedures Manual, and to recommend any requisite changes, in the light of two recent events: Enbridge Inc.'s role as a provider of risk management services to ECG; and ECG's implementation of its QRAM procedures. The consultant -- Peyton Feltus of Randolph Risk Management -- has completed his work.

1236

- ECG proposes to update this manual in due course, having regard to the consultant's recommendations, and to file the updated manual for examination in ECG's next rates case. The other parties accept ECG's proposal because, under the circumstances, there is no apparent need for an earlier update and examination.

1237

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1238

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1239

The following parties take no position on the issue: CEED.

1240

The following evidence supports the settlement:

A-14-5	Gas Supply Risk Management
I-1-9, 12, 13, 77	Board Staff Interrogatories #9, 12, 13, 77
I-2-52	CAC Interrogatory #52
I-4-34	CME Interrogatory #34
I-11-23, 73	VECC Interrogatories #23, 73

 1242

2.6 Changes to the QRAM adjustment to include the introduction of Large Corporations Tax and Capital Tax.

1243

(Complete Settlement)

1244

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1245

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1246

- The agreement to settle Issue 2.2 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal presented a new methodology for adjusting the utility price -- ECG's forecast price for rate-making purposes during a test year -- and clearing ECG's Purchased Gas Variance Account on a quarterly basis when the specified thresholds for, respectively, adjustment and clearance are met. The acronym "QRAM" is used to describe this quarterly rate adjustment mechanism.

1247

- The Board approved the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal, including the settlement of Issue 2.2, at the end of a one-day hearing on May 30, 2001. The QRAM procedures did not contemplate, at the time, adjustments to give effect to changes in ECG's forecast of Large Corporation Tax (federal) and Capital Tax (provincial).

1248

- ECG's initial application to the Board under the QRAM procedures, under file No. EB-2001-0790 (RP-2001-0032), nevertheless included adjustments for both taxes. The gas cost decrease had the effect of reducing these two taxes, and thus ECG's revenue requirement as well, by a total of $500,000 on an annualized basis. The following excerpt from Exhibit Q2-2, Tab 2, Schedule 1 explains ECG's rationale in this regard:

1249

> 6. Exhibit Q2-3, Tab 2, Schedule 3, represents a small change to improve the gas cost unit rate change process. Elements affecting the year-end value of the components of the Company's taxable capital calculation have been included. The value of rate base at the end of the fiscal period and the changes represented by working cash and GST level changes will affect the Company's forecast of Large Corporations Tax ("LCT") and Capital Tax. These taxes are levied at rates of 0.225% for the Federal LCT and 0.3% for Provincial Capital Tax. Further, Capital Tax is deductible in the determination of taxable income whereas LCT is not. The calculations shown at Schedule 3 quantify the reduction to the Company's forecast of LCT and Capital tax as a result of this decline in the purchased cost of gas.

1250

- ECG did likewise with its second QRAM application, under file no. EB-2002-0213 (RP-2001-0032), and the effect was a reduction of $400,000 in these two taxes, and thus in ECG's revenue requirement as well, on an annualized basis. ECG's rationale was the same as in the prior QRAM application.

 1251

- ECG's rationale is accepted by the other parties and, as a result, so too is ECG's ad hoc and unilateral modification of its QRAM procedures. ECG and the other parties accordingly ask the Board to approve this modification on a nunc pro tunc basis.

1252

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1253

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1254

The following parties take no position on this issue: none.

1255

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1256

(EB-2001-0790)	
Q2-2-2-1	Annualized Impact of Q2 Adjustment on Fiscal 2002 Revenue Requirement
Q2-3-2-1	Impact on Revenue Requirement
Q2-3-2-3	Impact on Capital and Large Corporation Taxes
(EB-2002-0213)	
Q3-2-2-1	Annualized Impact of Q3 Adjustment Fiscal 2002 on Revenue Requirement
Q3-3-2-1	Impact on Revenue Requirement
Q3-3-2-3	Impact on Capital and Large Corporation Taxes

COST OF CAPITAL

1258

3.1 Establishment of the return on equity for fiscal 2002 using the Board's existing Return On Equity (ROE) Guidelines.

1259

-and-

1260

3.2 ECG's proposal for a review of the ROE Guidelines. NOTE: Issue deferred to a separate phase of the proceeding.

1261

(Complete Settlement)

1262

The following parties participated in the discussion of these issues: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1263

There is an agreement to settle these issues on the following basis:

1264

- By letter dated August 16, 2001 to the Board, ECG requested the Board to initiate, as soon as possible, a "comprehensive and generic examination" of its Draft Guidelines on a Formula-Based Return on Common Equity for Regulated Utilities ("ROE Guidelines") dated March 1997. Some of the other parties responded to ECG's request in their own letters to the Board.

1265

- By letter dated October 5, 2001 to the Board, ECG withdrew its earlier request for a generic proceeding and requested, instead, that the Board hear and decide ECG's proposal for a review of the ROE Guidelines in this proceeding. By letter dated November 16, 2001 to ECG, the Board advised that a review of the ROE Guidelines would follow in a separate phase of this proceeding. Procedural Order No. 1 contains a provision to this effect (para. 2) and so too does the Issues List attached to Procedural Order No. 2 as Appendix "A".

Was Appendix B, page 18 1266

- By letter dated April 10, 2002 to the Board, ECG asked for confirmation that Fiscal 2002 rates, determined in accordance with the Board's decision in this phase of the proceeding, would be interim and would remain so until the Board's decision in the ROE phase of this proceeding. By letter dated April 15, 2002 to ECG, the Board responded that the "retroactive application of any change in ROE resulting from a review of the ROE guidelines is an issue to be determined in the ROE phase of the hearing".

1267

- ECG's responses to interrogatories indicate that, when applying the ROE Guidelines and using the September 2001 spread between the interest rates for 10-year and 30-year Government of Canada bonds, the resultant ROE would be 9.66% for the Test Year. The other parties accordingly propose, and ECG accepts, 9.66% as the allowed ROE for the Test Year, on an interim basis, pending the Board's decision in the ROE phase of this proceeding. ECG and the other parties consider that the use of the September 2001 spread here is consistent with the use of prior information, instead of updates, in the settlement of Issue 6.2 (inputs to the formula for O&M expense at pp. 28-29).

1268

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1269

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1270

The following parties take no position on the issues: none.

1271

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1272

A-10-2	Evidence of K.C. McShane
A-10-3	Update to Evidence of K.C. McShane
I-1-15, 16	Board Staff Interrogatories #15, 16
I-8-6, 7	IGUA Interrogatories #6, 7
I-11-6, 57	VECC Interrogatories #6, 57

1273

3.3 ECG's estimates of the cost of short-term and long-term debt for the 2002 Test Year.

1274

(Complete Settlement)

1275

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1276

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

Was Appendix B, page 19 1277

- ECG's financing plan for the Test Year was reflected in its initial and updated pre-filed evidence (A-10-1, updated 2002-01-18 and 2002-04-23; M1-2-8, filed 2002-04-18). The following were elements of this financing plan:

1278

  - • maintaining an average common equity base of 35% of total capitalization through the use of internal cash flows;

1279

  - • raising funds through the following three Medium-Term Note ("MTN") issues:

1280

    - $200 million on September 27, 2001 at an actual effective cost rate of 4.715 %;

1281

    - $100 million on November 1, 2001 at an actual effective cost rate of 3.19 %; and

1282

    - $150 million on February 1, 2002 at an estimated cost rate of 6.725%;

1283

  - • increasing ECG's bank facility by $360 million, from $290 million to $650 million, as a result of the requirement of credit rating agencies that companies with an R-1 (low) credit rating must maintain fully committed bank facilities equal to the size of their commercial paper programs; the cost, in the Test Year, of the $650 million bank facility comprises an annual stand-by cost of $521,300 ("Commitment Fee"), payable in quarterly instalments, and a one-time, non-amortizable, upfront fee of $410,000 ("One-Time Fee") paid in December 2001;

1284

  - • incurring short-term unfunded debt at a cost rate of 14.77% (M1-2-8) based on ECG's interest rate forecast for 90-day commercial paper, weighted by the short-term borrowing pattern projected for Fiscal 2002, and the annual Commitment Fee and the One-Time Fee, calculated as follows:

1285

[(Weighted Average Cost of Borrowing Short-Term Unfunded Debt x Short-Term Debt Component of Rate Base) + Commitment Fee & One-Time Fee]

_____

Short-Term Debt Component of Rate Base

= [(2.83% x $7,800,000) + $521,300 + $410,000]

$7,800,000

= 14.77 %; and

1286

- redeeming, at par, $100 million of outstanding preference shares and re-issuing $100 million of new, 5-year fixed-rate preference shares, in July 2002, at an estimated effective cost rate of 5.49% because the re-issuance is unavoidable in order to prevent another downgrade in ECG's credit rating.

Was Appendix B, page 20 1287

- The other parties do not accept, as part of ECG's financing plan, the $150 million MTN issue in the light of ECG's advice that this MTN issue was not made in February 2002, as previously forecast, and may not be made within the Test Year. In these circumstances, ECG agrees to remove the $150 million MTN issue from ECG's financing plan for the Test Year and to increase the short-term debt component of its capital structure by a corresponding amount.

1288

- The other parties do not accept the Commitment Fee and the One Time Fee as a cost of short-term debt but, instead, they agree to the recovery of both fees in ECG's cost of service. ECG will treat the Commitment Fee and the One-Time Fee accordingly. This change will reduce the effective cost rate of ECG's short-term debt from 14.77% to 2.83%.

1289

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1290

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1291

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1292

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1293

A-10-1	Cost of Capital
E1-1-6	Fiscal 2002 Calculation of Short-term Unfunded Debt
I-4-11	CME Interrogatory #11
I-8-14	IGUA Interrogatory #14

I-11-7, 8, 58, 59	VECC Interrogatories #7, 8, 58, 59
M1-1-1	Impact Statement No. 1
M1-2-4	Ontario Utility Capital Structure, 2002 Test Year
M1-2-9	Alternate Short-Term Debt Cost Rate Treatment.

RATE BASE

1295

4.1 ECG's Capital Budget for the 2002 Test Year.

1296

(Complete Settlement)

1297

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1298

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1299

- ECG proposed a Capital Budget of $271.4 million for the Test Year (A-11-1, B1-2-1). This budget is $21.6 million or 8.6% above the Fiscal 2001 actual expenditure of $249.8 million. Capital expenditure increases in the Capital Budget for the Test Year are driven by higher capital requirements for system improvements and upgrades, computers and communication equipment, and underground storage capital and are partially offset by a decrease in customer related distribution plant.

Was Appendix B, page 21 1300

- Of the $271.4 million in proposed capital spending, $111.8 million is for customer-related capital expenditures, $108.5 million is for system improvements and upgrades, $37.6 million is for general and other plant, and $13.5 million is for underground storage plant. The forecast average capital cost per customer addition is $2,331 based on a forecast of 47,772 customer additions. This forecast compares with an actual average capital cost per customer addition of $2,279 in Fiscal 2001, based on 53,688 actual customer additions.

1301

- Of the $271.4 million in proposed capital spending the Test Year, $27.8 million is for computer and communication equipment expenditure and, of that, $13.0 million is for ECG's proposal to develop a distribution plant work and asset management solution ("DPWAMS") as part of its routine and cyclical information technology expenditures. The portion of ECG's proposed capital budget attributable to DPWAMS is considered separately in Issue 4.2 (DPWAMS at pp. 22-23).

1302

- ECG will reduce the non-DPWAMS portion of its Capital Budget for the Test Year by $13.4 million, from $258.4 million to $245 million, as a means of accommodating the concerns of the other parties about ECG's actual capital expenditures relative to its budget in Fiscal 2001. The consequential effect of this reduction in capital expenditures is a reduction of rate base on a half-year effective average of averages basis of $6.7 million and, based on an interrogatory response (I-8-15), a reduction of $1.3 million (approx.) in ECG's revenue requirement for the Test Year.

1303

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1304

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1305

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1306

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1307

A-11-1	Capital Budget
A-19-1	Summary of Capital Requisitions Policy
A-20-1	Schedule of Depreciation Rates
B1-1-1	Utility Rate Base – Comparison of 2002 to 2001
B1-2-1	Comparison of Utility Capital Expenditures, 2002 Budget and 2001 Actual
B1-2-2	2002 Capital Expenditures by Project (Projects Exceeding $500,000)
B1-2-3	Gross Customer Additions and Average Cost per Customer Addition, 2002 Budget and 2001 Actual

Was Appendix B, page 22 1308

B1-2-4	M1-2-2 System Expansion Monitoring, 2002 Budget
B1-2-5	2002 Forecast of New Major Projects Exceeding $500,000 Discounted Cash Flow Analysis and Net Present Value Results
B2-2-1	Comparison of Utility Capital Expenditures, 2001 Actual and 2001 OEB Approved
B2-2-2	2001 Capital Expenditures by Project (Projects Exceeding $500,000),
B2-2-3	Gross Customer Additions and Average Cost per Customer Addition, 2001Actual and 2001 OEB Approved
B2-2-4	System Expansion Monitoring, 2001 Actual
B2-2-5	Net Book Value of Property, Plant & Equipment Being Transferred to Affiliates as of October 1, 2000
B2-2-7	2001 New Major Projects Exceeding $500,000
B3-2-1	Comparison of Utility Capital Expenditures, 2000 Actual and 2000 OEB Approved
B3-2-2	2000 Capital Expenditures by Project (Projects Exceeding $500,000), 2000 Actual and 2000 OEB Approved
B3-2-3	Gross Customer Additions and Average Cost per Customer Addition, 2000 Actual and 2000 OEB Approved
B3-2-4	System Expansion Monitoring, 2000 Actual
B3-2-5	Net Book Value of Property, Plant and Equipment Being Transferred to an Affiliate or Separated from the Utility at October 1, 1999
B3-2-7	2000 Actual Results of New Major Projects Exceeding $500,000 Discounted Cash Flow Analysis and Net Present Value Results
B3-2-8	Summary of EBLO/PL Capital Costs, Attachments, and Volumes - Budget vs. Actual as at December 31, 2000
I-1-17 to 21, 29 to 31, 33	Board Staff Interrogatories #17 to 21, 29 to 31, 33
I-2-2, 9 to 15, 47, 59 to 62	CAC Interrogatories #2, 9 to 15, 47, 59 to 62
I-4-12, 17	CME Interrogatories #12, 17
I-8-15, 16	IGUA Interrogatories #15, 16
I-11-9 to 12, 33	VECC Interrogatories #9 to 12, 33
M1-1-1	Impact Statement No. 1
M1-2-2	Ontario Utility Rate Base, 2002 Test Year

1309

4.2 ECG's Distribution Plant Work and Asset Management Solution (DPWAMS) information technology project.

1310

(No Settlement)

1311

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, HVAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1312

ECG and the other parties are unable to reach an agreement to settle this issue. ECG is prepared to respond to interrogatories from the other parties. ECG will use its best efforts to file responses to these interrogatories prior to the commencement of the Board's oral hearing.

1313

The following evidence is relevant to this issue:

1314

A-11-1	Capital Budget
A-11-2	IT Capital Budget

Was Appendix B, page 23 1315

I-1-22 to 28	Board Staff Interrogatories #22 to 28
I-2-16 to 19, 96 to 111	CAC Interrogatories #16 to 19, 96 to 111
I-4-13, 80 to 89	CME Interrogatories #13, 80 to 89
I-7-1 to 8	HVAC Interrogatories #1 to 8
I-8-46 to 50	IGUA Interrogatories #46 to 50
I-10-1 to 13	Schools Interrogatories #1 to 13
I-11-13, 78 to 89	VECC Interrogatories #13, 78 to 89.

ASSET SHARING ARRANGEMENTS AND AFFILIATE SERVICES

1317

5.1 ECG's disposition of previously shared assets since October 1, 2000.

1318

-and-

1319

5.2 ECG's sharing of utility-owned assets with affiliates: methodology and non-O&M cost consequences, including the independent consultant's assessment report (per Issue 5.1 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1320

(Complete Settlement)

1321

The following parties participate in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, HVAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1322

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1323

- Issue 5.1 is no longer an issue because there has been no disposition of assets that were previously shared with ECG's affiliates since October 1, 2000.

1324

- With respect to utility-owned assets that are shared with affiliates in the Test Year, ECG proposes to follow the rate base elimination approach that was used in the agreement to settle Issues 5.1, 5.2, and 5.3 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal. Under this approach, the forecast lease revenue to be collected from affiliates for the Test Year is eliminated as a revenue item and the value of the shared assets are eliminated from rate base. ECG's affiliates in this context are Enbridge Inc., Enbridge Commercial Services Inc., Enbridge Services Inc., and CustomerWorks Limited Partnership.

1325

- In the agreement to settle Issue 5.1 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal, ECG agreed to retain an independent consultant to assess and report on the basis for allocating rate base asset values to affiliates, and the accuracy of the allocated asset values, for Fiscal 2002. ECG retained CB Richard Ellis and filed its report (A-16-3) in this proceeding.

1326

- The primary area of concern of CB Richard Ellis was with the rate base allocation methodology for non-building assets, which includes computer infrastructure, communication infrastructure, and office furniture. CB Richard Ellis recommended that ECG quantify each of these asset categories and adopt an allocation methodology as follows: computer infrastructure, based on the number of computer workstations – 48.9%; communication infrastructure, based on the number of handsets – 42.3%; and office furniture, based on the number of office workstations – 49%. ECG updated its evidence to reflect the rate base allocation methodology recommended by CB Richard Ellis for non-building asset categories. The update resulted in an increase of $2.0 million in the rate base non-utility elimination and, based on an interrogatory response (I-2-53), a reduction of $0.5 million (approx.) in ECG's revenue requirement for the Test Year.

Was Appendix B, page 24 1327

- In its pre-filed evidence (A-16-1), ECG initially proposed a rate base non-utility elimination of $37.8 million. This amount was subsequently increased to $40.2 million, an increase of $2.4 million. Of this amount, $0.4 million was due to the impact of Fiscal 2001 actuals on rate base and $2.0 million was a result of ECG's acceptance of the recommendations of CB Richard Ellis, as described above.

1328

- The following is a breakdown of the $40.2 million of rate base value attributable to non-utility activities in the Test Year:

1329

Type of Asset	Rate Base Value	Allocation Factor	Non-Utility Allocation %	Portion Attributable to Non-utility Activities
Server Infrastructure	$ 0.0	Server Capacity Utilization	0.0%	$ 0.0
Computer Infrastructure	$ 1.1	Number of Computer Workstations	48.9%	$ 0.5
Communications Infrastructure	$ 8.7	Number of Handsets	42.3%	$ 3.7
Buildings	$ 74.1	Space (ft^2)	40.8%	$ 30.3
Office Furniture	$ 9.9	Number of Office Workstations	49.0%	$ 4.9
NGV Refueling Facilities	$ 1.6	NBV of Identified Sites	52.1%	$ 0.8
Total	$ 95.4			$ 40.2

1330

- The other parties are concerned that ECG has underforecast the rate base non-utility elimination in respect of affiliate leases of office space from ECG. In particular, the other parties claim that the rate base value of the 28,539 ft.2 of building space relinquished by an affiliate on March 31, 2002 should not be added back to rate base for the balance of the Test Year.

1331

- ECG agrees to eliminate an estimated rate base value, for the Test Year, of $2.6 million associated with the 28, 539 ft.2 of vacated building space. The estimated impact on the 2002 revenue requirement of treating the vacated space as non-utility is $0.5 million (I-8-33).

Was Appendix B, page 25 1332

- The other parties are satisfied with ECG's response to the recommendations of CB Richard Ellis as contained in its report (A-16-3).

1333

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, HVAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1334

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1335

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1336

The following evidence supports the settlement:

A-16-1	Asset Sharing Arrangements
A-16-3	Review and Analysis of the Allocation of Rate Base Asset Values to Affiliates
I-1-34 to 36, 79	Board Staff Interrogatories #34 to 36, 79
I-2-53 to 55	CAC Interrogatory #53 to 55
I-4-14, 35	CME Interrogatories #14, 35
I-8-32 to 34, 45	IGUA Interrogatories #32 to 34, 45
I-11-34 to 36, 74, 75	VECC Interrogatories #34 to 36, 74, 75.

1338

5.3 ECG's affiliate services arrangements, including the implications of outsourcing Gas Services and Operational Services, as defined in Exhibit A, Tab 14, Schedule 3, to affiliates and their personnel located in Alberta.

1339

(No Settlement)

1340

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CEED, CAC, HVAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1341

ECG and the other parties are unable to reach an agreement to settle this issue. The following delineates, from their perspective, the scope of the dispute over the issue.

1342

Enbridge Operational Services Inc. (“EOS”) provides the following services to ECG under an outsourcing arrangement effective October 1, 2000: Gas Control, Nominations and Scheduling, and Reconciliations (A-14-3, I-3-54). EOS is an affiliate of ECG.

1343

Enbridge Inc. (“EI”) provides the following services to ECG under an outsourcing arrangement effective August 1, 2001: Gas Supply Planning, Gas Supply Acquisition, Risk Management, Contract Management, Transactional Services, and Regulatory Support (A-14-3, I-3-44). EI is an affiliate and the ultimate parent of ECG.

1344

Notwithstanding ECG's outsourcing arrangements with EI, however, EI is entitled to engage in the following businesses as a principal for its own account: gas acquisition, gas sales, gas supply management, and gas storage. EI is not entitled, on the other hand, to act as a principal for its own account when providing Gas Supply Acquisition and Transactional Services to ECG until protocols are in place for the disclosure to, and approval by, ECG of any transaction in which EI would be ECG's counterparty. ECG claims that these services are the only two in which EI could have a conflict of interest: buying gas for ECG as ECG's agent from itself as a principal, for example, or selling a Transactional Service for ECG as ECG's agent to itself as a principal.

Was Appendix B, page 26 1345

Some of the other parties claim that EI has a conflict of interest when EI is engaged in transactions of its own regardless of whether ECG is EI's counterparty. These parties claim that EI is in a position to prefer its own commercial interests over ECG's interests, in terms of Transactional Services, and to use its access to utility assets and information to compete against other participants in the gas trading and sales business.

1346

ECG, EI, and EOS are working on amendments of the two outsourcing arrangements in order to harmonize them. The amendments will provide for the sharing of ECG's information by EOS and EI so that they each have the information, from one another as well as ECG, that they each need to provide their respective services to ECG (I-3-55).

1347

The policy aspect of this issue can be stated in the form of two questions. Should the Board restrict or otherwise condition ECG's outsourcing of utility functions by including terms and conditions to this effect in its rate order? And, if so, what terms and conditions would be appropriate?

1348

Some of the other parties believe that contractual provisions are not capable of adequately addressing their concerns about the outsourcing arrangements and, therefore, they believe that a Board order is necessary to impose appropriate terms and conditions to prevent conflicts of interest and other harm to customers. These parties note that, unlike a Board order, the contractual provisions and protocols (when made) comprising ECG's outsourcing arrangements may be amended at any time by ECG and its affiliates (or their assigns) and, in addition, no other person can enforce compliance with the contractual provisions or protocols.

1349

Some of the other parties also consider that the protocols contemplated by ECG's outsourcing arrangement with EI do not address their concerns about this arrangement for two reasons. One is that the protocols would apply only to transactions in which ECG and EI are counterparties and, as a result, the protocols do not even address the other types of conflict of interest that these parties see arising from this outsourcing arrangement. The other reason is that the protocols are not yet available for review, according to ECG, and so these parties can only speculate at this point on whether the protocols would address their concerns about transactions in which ECG and EI are counterparties.

1350

Some of the other parties have concerns about the broader implications of the outsourcing of utility functions to an affiliate or otherwise. There is a concern, in ECG's case, that ECG is outsourcing utility functions in advance of rebasing its revenue requirement for an Incentive Regulation Plan. There is also a concern that the Board may lose regulatory oversight of utility functions when a utility no longer performs them.

Was Appendix B, page 27 1351

ECG does not see a need for the Board to restrict or otherwise condition ECG’s ability to outsource utility functions to affiliates, by acquiring services from them, because the outsourcing arrangements do or will contain provisions or protocols, as the case may be, that prevent the only conflicts of interest that ECG sees arising from the outsourcing arrangements. ECG does not think access to utility information of the type given by ECG to EI and EOS, or by them to one another, could impair competition in the sale of gas or otherwise even if either affiliate were active in Ontario markets. ECG accordingly does not consider regulatory oversight of an outsourcing arrangement, other than the cost consequences, is either necessary or practical.

1352

The jurisdictional aspects of this issue involve the Board's power under the Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998 to restrict or otherwise condition a utility's outsourcing arrangements. ECG and the other parties do not consider it useful to delineate the scope of the jurisdictional aspects prior to examining the issue during the Board's oral hearing.

1353

The following evidence is relevant to this issue:

1354

A-16-2	Affiliate Services
I-1-2, 11, 37 to 40	Board Staff Interrogatories #2, 11, 37 to 40
I-3-35 to 55, 81 to 84, 88	CEED Interrogatories #35 to 55, 81 to 84, 88
I-4-31	CME Interrogatory #31
I-8-23, 26 to 29	IGUA Interrogatories #23, 26 to 29
I-9-2	OAPPA Interrogatory #2
I-11-22, 33	VECC Interrogatories #22, 33.

PBR O&M

1356

6.1 Review of the specific results of the Company's Service Quality Indicators for fiscal year 2001 (per Board direction, Para. 3.0.22, E.B.R.O. 497-01).

1357

(Complete Settlement)

1358

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1359

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1360

- The specific results of ECG's Service Quality Indicators ("SQIs") for Fiscal 2001 are accepted by the other parties, for the reasons given in the supporting evidence, and there is accordingly no need for the Board to take remedial action in this regard.

Was Appendix B, page 28 1361

- There are no proposed changes in the targets for ECG's SQIs during the Test Year.

1362

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1363

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1364

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1365

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1366

A-26-1	Service Quality Indicators
A-26-2	Performance Measures - Service Quality Indicators
I-1-41	Board Staff Interrogatory #41
I-4-33	CME Interrogatory #33.

1367

6.2 ECG's proposed inputs to the formula for the derivation of the 2002 Test Year O&M expense, including a review of the 2002 consensus forecast of inflation.

1368

(Complete Settlement)

1369

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1370

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1371

- ECG's proposed customer growth and inflation factors, respectively, are 3.03% and 2.2%. The forecast customer growth factor is based upon an increase of 46,433 in the average number of bills based on forecast customer additions of 47,772. The inflation factor was derived from a consensus forecast of the Ontario consumer price index that was prepared in December 2001; the forecasters are those approved by the Board in the EBRO 497-01 proceeding.

1372

- ECG’s proposed customer growth factor of 3.03% for the Test Year is accepted by the other parties, without regard to the higher actual customer growth through March 2002, and ECG’s O&M expenses for the Test Year will be calculated accordingly.

1373

- ECG’s proposed inflation factor of 2.2% for the Test Year is also accepted by the other parties, without regard to the lower March 2002 consensus forecast of the Ontario consumer price index, and ECG’s O&M expenses for the Test Year will be calculated accordingly.

1374

- ECG and the other parties did not use updated information for these two factors because one update tends to offset the other and, in any event, they consider that the use of prior information here is consistent with the use of September 2001 information in the settlement of Issues 3.1 and 3.2 (ROE at pp.17-18).

Was Appendix B, page 29 1375

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1376

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1377

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1378

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1379

A-9-1	PBR O&M
A-9-2	Rate Hearing Expense Z-factor
D1-1-1	Cost of Service, 2002 Test Year

D1-1-2	Cost of Service, Comparison of Utility Cost and Expenses, 2002 Budget and 2001 Actual
D2-1-1	Cost of Service, 2001 Actual
D2-1-2	Cost of Service, Comparison of Utility Costs and Expenses, 2001 Actual and 2000 Actual
D2-1-3	Cost of Service, Comparison of Utility Costs and Expenses, 2001 Actual and 2001 OEB Approved
D3-1-1	Cost of Service, 2000 Historical
D3-1-2	Cost of Service, Comparison of Utility Costs and Expenses, 2000 Actual and 2000 OEB Approved
I-1-42, 43	Board Staff Interrogatories #42, 43
I-2-46	CAC Interrogatory #46
I-4-18, 19, 21, 32	CME Interrogatories #18, 19, 21, 32
I-8-10 to 12	IGUA Interrogatories #10 to 12.

1380

6.3 Symmetry in ECG's budgeting for Z-factors (per Issue 6.4 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1381

(Complete Conditional Settlement)

1382

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, HVAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1383

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1384

- The settlement of Issue 6.4 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal included ECG's undertaking to give management a directive, in its budget letters, to be alert for savings as well as costs in the budgeting process for Z-factors. Management's response to the directive is subject to examination in this proceeding.

1385

- ECG's budget letter for the Test Year, which also included Fiscal 2003, contains the following directive as the means of discharging ECG's undertaking (A-5-1, p. 4):

1386

> It is important to note that z-factors can be either a significant increase or decrease to your operating budget. Z-factors can arise from federal and provincial tax changes, accounting changes, regulatory requirements or orders, environmental exposure, decommissioning costs, hazardous waste clean-up or other specific liabilities or catastrophic events. All identified z-factors will be discussed at your business unit budget review meeting.

Was Appendix B, page 30 1387

- The other parties concur that ECG has discharged its undertaking for the Test Year subject, however, to the condition that ECG undertakes to give its management a similar directive whenever a budget would include Z-factors. ECG undertakes to do so.

1388

- The settlement of Issue 6.4 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal also articulated a principle, to which ECG and the other parties subscribed, that "no party should benefit at the expense of the others on the amount of the Board's costs allocated and billed to ECG" by the Ministry of Energy, Science and Technology ("MEST"). ECG accordingly undertook to develop, for examination in this proceeding, " a mechanism whereby ECG would recover only the Board's costs that are allocated and billed by MEST to ECG."

1389

- ECG developed such a mechanism as an integral part of the Z-factor for rate hearing expense (A-9-2). ECG's mechanism is accepted by the other parties, for the reasons given in the supporting evidence, and ECG has accordingly discharged its undertaking.

1390

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, HVAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1391

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1392

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1393

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1394

A-5-1	Budget Letter
I-2-1, 44	CAC Interrogatories #1, 44.

TRANSACTIONAL SERVICES

1396

7.1 ECG's forecast of Net Revenue for Transactional Services for the 2002 Test Year.

1397

(Complete Settlement)

1398

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, TCPL, and VECC.

1399

- ECG's pre-filed evidence (A-13-1) forecasts a Gross Margin of $10.010 million and marginal O&M costs of $0.783 million. ECG's update (December 14, 2001) forecasts the same Gross Margin but lower marginal O&M costs of $0.656 million.

1400

- ECG claims that billed and signed business is $8.8 million, for the first six months of the Test Year, and forecast business is an additional $0.4 million by the end of the Test Year. ECG claims that total business, then, will be $9.2 million for the Test Year.

Was Appendix B, page 31 1401

- ECG's historical performance, on the other hand, indicates to the other parties that ECG will achieve better-than-forecast results. In Fiscal 2001, for example, the following were the forecast (as settled) and the actual results ($ million):

1402

	forecast	actual
Gross Margin	$10.700	$14.112
Marginal O&M	0.638	0.504
Net Revenue	$10.062	$13.068

1403

- ECG claims that the Test Year will more likely be closer to forecast than last year's actual value and, as well, that the marginal O&M costs for the Test Year will more likely be closer to forecast than last year's actual value, having regard to the reasons for the Fiscal 2001 results (I-4-26). The other parties are skeptical because, based on historical performance, the Test Year results could be considerably higher than forecast. The sharing ratio of 75:25 (customer: shareholder) for the clearance of a credit balance in the Transactional Services Deferral Account for the Test Year ("2002 TSDA"), in this event, would operate to ECG's benefit.

1404

- The other parties would accordingly prefer a higher Gross Margin and lower marginal O&M costs so that, for rate-making purposes, there would be a higher Net Revenue subject to the sharing ratio of 90:10 (customer: shareholder). In response to these concerns, ECG proposed a sharing ratio of 90:10 for the clearance of a credit balance in the 2002 TSDA for the Test Year. ECG also accepted lower marginal O&M costs of $0.550 million as proposed by the other parties.

1405
- ECG and the other parties accordingly agree on the following forecasts for the Test Year:

1406
  - Gross Margin $10.010 million

1407
  - Marginal O&M expense 0.550 million

1408
  - Net Revenue $ 9.466 million

1409
- ECG and the other parties also agree on the following sharing ratios for the Test Year:

1410
  - 90:10 (customer: shareholder) to allocate, for rate-making purposes, the forecast Net Revenue;

1411
  - 90:10 (customer: shareholder) to clear a credit balance in the 2002 TSDA; and

1412
  - 0:100 (customer: shareholder) to clear a debit balance in the 2002 TSDA.

Was Appendix B, page 32 1413
The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1414
The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1415
The following parties take no position on the issue: TCPL.

1416
The following evidence supports the settlement:

1417

A-12-1	Deferral and Variance Accounts
A-13-1	Transactional Services
I-2-21 to 23	CAC Interrogatories #21 to 23
I-3-1 to 26, 28 to 34, 76 to 80, 85	CEED Interrogatories #1 to 26, 28 to 34, 76 to 80, 85
I-4-26, 27	CME Interrogatories #26, 27
I-8-20 to 22	IGUA Interrogatories #20 to 22
I-11-19, 62	VECC Interrogatories #19, 62.

DEMAND SIDE MANAGEMENT (DSM)

1419

8.1 ECG's DSM Plan for the 2002 Test Year, including the O&M budget, the volume target and the level of the proposed Shared Savings Mechanism (SSM) incentive rate.

1420

(Complete Settlement)

1421

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, GEC, IGUA, Pollution Probe, Schools, and VECC.

1422

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1423

- ECG's pre-filed evidence on the DSM Plan for the Test Year (A-15-1) included an operations and maintenance budget ("Budget") of $13.5 million, as a Z-factor, and a forecast of gas savings ("Savings Target") of 80 10^6m^3. ECG subsequently updated its evidence (2001-12-07) by reducing the Budget from $13.5 million to $13.03 million. This amount was based on a new Savings Target of 100 10^6m^3. The manner in which the revised Budget was derived differed from previous years. Previously, Budget was established by estimating the level of expenditure required to meet ECG's Savings Target. For the Test Year, however, the Budget was derived on the basis of the Savings Target by setting: (i) the fixed costs component at the level of the actual fixed costs for Fiscal 2001 (i.e., $4.07 million); and (ii) setting the variable costs at the ratio of Fiscal 2001 actual variable costs to the actual gas savings achieved in Fiscal 2001 (i.e., $0.09/$m^3$ on a Savings Target of 100 10^6m^3 or $9.0 million).

1424

- Subsequently, ECG reduced the Savings Target from 100 10^6m^3 to 96.30 10^6m^3 to reflect the removal of the filter alarm measures from the residential DSM programs. The decision to remove the filter alarm measures was made in response to the concerns of some parties that these measures resulted in few savings and were, accordingly, not cost-effective. Indeed, Union Gas Limited intends to discontinue the promotion of furnace filter alarms, as part of its DSM programs, for this very reason.

Was Appendix B, page 33 1425

- ECG's original pre-filed evidence (A-15-1), filed on 2001-09-25, assumed a continuation of the Shared Savings Incentive Mechanism ("SSM") that was accepted by the Board in the EBRO 497-01 proceeding. Under the SSM, an incentive for exceeding the target for gas savings is calculated in accordance with the following formula:

1426

  - Incentive=0.35 x eligible amount

1427

  Where:

1428

  - the value of the eligible amount is equal to the difference between the value of the actual net benefits and the value of the pivot point for the fiscal year;

1429
- the value of the actual net benefits for the fiscal year is equal to the net present value of resource benefits based on the Total Resource Cost ("TRC") Test using the Company's actual performance for the fiscal year; and

1430
- the value of the pivot point for the fiscal year is equal to the net present value of resource benefits, based on the TRC Test, using ECG's DSM plan and budget, approved in a rates case proceeding, for each fiscal year.

1431
- In its 2001-12-07 update, ECG proposed a reduction in the marginal incentive rate of 0.15, from 0.35 to 0.20, of the net benefits calculated in accordance with the TRC Test. The reduction would only apply to the Test Year.

1432
- The other parties support ECG's proposed reduction of the marginal incentive rate under the SSM to 0.20, for the Test Year only, but they do not accept ECG's proposed Budget and Savings Target. Some of them are concerned with the level of the Budget and the manner in which it was established. Others are concerned that the Savings Target is not high enough. These competing concerns have resulted in the following agreement as a compromise: a Budget of $10.85 million, comprising $4.00 million in fixed costs and $6.85 million in variable costs, and a Savings Target of 94 $10^6 m^3$.

1433
- ECG and the other parties agree that ECG's DSM Plan for the Test Year shall be as described in ECG's updated pre-filed evidence (A-15-1, updated 2001-12-07), as amended to: (i) reflect the removal of the filter alarm measures from the residential DSM programs and the agreement on the Budget and Savings Target, as described above; and (ii) the following four changes to programs in the residential and business market sectors, which changes are made in response to the findings of the Independent Auditor in respect of ECG's DSM Monitoring and Evaluation Report for Fiscal 2000 (A-15-4):

Was Appendix B, page 34 1434
  - **residential:** inclusion of a $10.0 unit installation charge in respect of showerheads delivered through the water utilities; no impact on the Budget and Savings Target;

1435
  - **residential:** inclusion of a $50 unit charge in respect of construction heaters; no impact on the Budget and Savings Target;

1436
  - **business markets:** removal of the volumetric savings attributable to electricity and water savings, from the savings target of the commercial education program; no impact on the Budget and Savings Target; and

1437
  - **business markets:** use of the specific avoided cost "load types" for the commercial and multi-residential programs (e.g., combined space heating and water heating, water heater, and space heating); no impact on the Budget and Savings Target.

1438

- The other parties agree that ECG will not be required to change any other program elements or assumptions underpinning its 2002 DSM Plan, absent a corresponding change in the Budget or the Savings Target, or both, if applicable.

1439

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, GEC, IGUA, Pollution Probe, Schools, and VECC.

1440

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1441

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1442

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1443

A-15-1	Demand Side Management
A-15-3	Avoided Gas Costs
A-15-5	Fiscal 2002 DSM Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
I-1-44 to 60	Board Staff Interrogatories #44 to 60
I-4-22 to 25, 36 to 79	CME Interrogatories #22 to 25, 36 to 79
I-6-1 to-6	GEC Interrogatories #1 to 6
I-8-31	IGUA Interrogatory #31
L-6-1	Evidence of Chris Neme for GEC

 1444

8.2 Scope of the Demand Side Management Variance Account-Operating (per Issue 8.1 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1445

(Complete Settlement)

1446

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, GEC, IGUA, Pollution Probe, Schools, and VECC.

1447

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1448

- The other parties agree with ECG's proposal to limit the use of the 2002 DSMVA to recording differences between forecast and actual variable costs only, up to 20% of the forecast variable costs. ECG and the other parties also agree that overages in variable costs should be subject to recovery through the Demand Side Management Variance Account-Operating for the Test Year ("2002 DSMVA"), if and when ECG achieves more than 89 $10^6 m^3$ of DSM-related volumetric savings up to the usual cap of 20% of the variable component of the agreed Budget; that is, 20% of $6.85 million or $1.37 million. ECG will require prior Board authorization to accumulate, in the 2002 DSMVA, amounts in excess of $1.37 million. Put another way, the parties agree that the volumetric target, for the purpose of the commencement of recording all differences between forecast and actual variable costs (the "DSMVA Savings Target"), will be different than the volumetric Savings Target used for the purpose of calculating the incentive available under the SSM; that is, 89.0 $10^6 m^3$ vs. 94.0 $10^6 m^3$.

1449

- For further clarity, the parties also agree that overages in variable costs will be subject to recovery through the DSMVA, up to the 20% cap, on the basis of the ratio of the variable cost component of the Budget ($6.85 million) to the DSMVA Savings Target (89 $10^6 m^3$); that is, $\$0.077/m^3$.

1450

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, GEC, IGUA, Pollution Probe, Schools, and VECC.

1451

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1452

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1453

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1454

A-15-1 Demand Side Management
A-15-3 Avoided Gas Costs
A-15-5 Fiscal 2002 DSM Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

I-1-44 to 46, 48 to 54, 56 to 60	Board Staff Interrogatories #44 to 46, 48 to 54, 56 to 60
I-4-22 to 24, 36 to 79	CME Interrogatories #22 to 24, 36 to 79
I-6-1 to 6	GEC Interrogatories #1 to 6
I-8-31	IGUA Interrogatory #31
L-6-1	Evidence of Chris Neme for GEC.

Was Appendix B, page 36 1455

8.3 Clearance of balances recorded in the 2000 Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account (2000 SSMVA) and the 2000 Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism (2000 LRAM) (per Issue 8.3 and 11.1 of the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal).

1456

(Complete Conditional Settlement)

1457

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, GEC, HVAC, IGUA, Pollution Probe, Schools, and VECC.

1458

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1459

- The EBRO 497-01 Settlement Proposal established the monitoring and reporting requirements for ECG's annual DSM Plan. The RP-1999-0001 Settlement Proposal modified these requirements in order to implement an independent evaluation, verification, and audit ("Independent Audit") of ECG's DSM Plan, including the amount initially claimed by ECG for the Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account ("SSMVA"). In the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal (per Issues 8.3 and 11.1), ECG accepted the proposal of other parties to synchronize the clearance of the Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism for Fiscal 2000 ("2000 LRAM") with the clearance of the SSMVA for Fiscal 2000 ("2000 SSMVA").

1460

- ECG’s Monitoring and Evaluation Report for Fiscal 2000(A-15-4) was first made available to the Audit Subcommittee of the DSM Consultative on December 27, 2001, some eight months after ECG first promised intervenors it would be available. After a preliminary review of the Draft Audit Report prepared by the Independent Auditor and of the Interim Reconcilliation Report prepared by Kai Millyard Associates, it was determined that there were serious data omissions and errors, as well as questions with respect to assumptions. As a result, ECG is unable to file its audited SSM claim for Fiscal 2000 until a later date. Resolution of these issues may have a material impact on the amounts, positive or negative, that are ultimately recorded in the 2000 SSMVA and the 2000 LRAM. It has not been possible for ECG and the other parties to resolve these issues in time to agree, for the purpose of this Settlement Proposal, on the amounts that are to be cleared from the 2000 SSMVA and the 2000 LRAM.

1461

- In order to permit the issues to be resolved and the Independent Auditor to complete its work, ECG and the other parties agree to defer the disposition of this issue. The other parties further agree to work with ECG to complete the tasks that are prescribed in Appendix A, by the dates therein specified. The Independent Auditor shall finalize the Independent Audit and issue a Final Audit Report, in accordance with the instructions of the Audit Subcommittee.

Was Appendix B, page 37 1462

- Where there is no consensus among the members of the DSM Audit Subcommittee regarding the assumptions and the data inputs that should be used in calculating the recommended SSM claim, the Independent Auditor will be instructed, by the Audit Subcommittee, to: (i) include, in the Final Audit Report, the sensitivity of results arising from the use of alterna-

tive assumptions and data inputs; and (ii) recommend, where possible, the assumptions and data inputs that should be used to calculate the SSM claim.

1463

- The Final Audit Report will be circulated to ECG and the other parties in the week of June 24, 2002, in accordance with Appendix A. ECG will finalize the amounts to be recorded in the 2000 SSMVA and the 2000 LRAM by July 31, 2002 in accordance with Appendix A (pp. 51-53). A settlement conference for this issue will be convened following the delivery of the position papers by the other parties. Resolved and unresolved issues will be presented to the Board in the proceeding established to examine ECG's rates application for Fiscal 2003, or earlier, if the schedule permits.

1464

- If there is no consensus among members of the Audit Subcommittee on the recommendations to be made to ECG and the other parties in respect of the Final Audit Report, then Tasks 8 and 9 in Appendix A will be foregone and ECG will bring forward its revised SSM claim for consideration by the other parties in the settlement conference.

1465

- ECG and the other parties agree that the DSM Consultative will consider, in the context of considering ECG's DSM Monitoring and Evaluation Report for Fiscal 2001, the necessity, feasibility, and advisability of broadening the Independent Auditor's mandate and terms of reference to include a “value for money audit”. Appendix B (pp. 54-56) is a general description, which was prepared by one of the other parties (at the request of some of the other parties who are not familiar with the concept), of what could be involved in a value for money audit. ECG and the other parties confirm that there is no agreement, at this time, on the value for money audit issues. If consensus on these issues cannot be reached by the DSM Consultative, any party may bring the issue before the Board for resolution.

1466

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, GEC, HVAC (value for money audit only), IGUA, Pollution Probe, Schools, and VECC.

1467

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1468

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1469

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1470

A-15-1	Demand Side Management
A-15-4	2000 DSM Monitoring and Evaluation Report
I-1-47, 50, 55	Board Staff Interrogatories #47, 50, 55
I-4-25	CME Interrogatory # 25
I-8-31	IGUA Interrogatory #31
L-6-1	Evidence of Chris Neme for GEC.

CUSTOMER INFORMATION SYSTEM (CIS)

1472

9.1 Appropriateness of CIS as a Z-factor in the 2002 Test Year.

1473

- and-

1474

9.2 ECG's proposed CIS Z-factor in the 2002 Test Year.

1475

(Complete Conditional Settlement)

1476

The following parties participated in the discussion of these issues: ECG, CME, CAC, HVAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1477

There is an agreement to settle these issues on the following basis:

1478

- ECG proposed a CIS Z-factor of $8.604 million (A-18-1) to recover fees that are payable by ECG for CIS services, adjusted for related offsetting credits, during the Test Year. ECG's pre-filed evidence on CIS (A-18-1) and responses to certain interrogatories (e.g., I-1-61) explain the rationale for treating CIS as a Z-factor in the Test Year. This evidence also explains that one of the offsetting credits is designed to negate CIS-related costs that are embedded in the O Base under ECG's Targeted Performance Based Regulation ("TPBR") Plan.

1479

- ECG also filed the report on CIS prepared by MICON Inc. in November 2000 (A-18-2); this report was previously filed in the RP-2000-0040 proceeding. The MICON report provides a detailed assessment of the functional capabilities and value of ECG's CIS service arrangement relative to other comparable hosted CIS service arrangements employed by energy distribution utilities. The report indicates that "the service level targets and associated cost of service that ECG is paying for the CIS solution are reasonable and competitive".

1480

- The other parties do not accept ECG's proposal to recover the cost consequences of CIS service for the Test Year, as an O&M expense under the TPBR Plan, by means of a Z-Factor. They do recognize, however, that the CIS service provided to ECG has ongoing value to ECG in providing service to customers.

1481

- ECG is prepared to withdraw the CIS Z-factor for the Test Year, in the light of the other settlements in the "package", notwithstanding that ECG will continue to pay for the CIS services received during the Test Year.

1482

- The settlement of this issue is subject to the following condition: the cost consequences associated with all aspects of customer care, including the cost of supporting customer information systems, will be examined for the purpose of setting ECG's cost of service for Fiscal 2003 that, in turn, will be the base under ECG's forthcoming proposal for an Incentive Regulation Plan.

Was Appendix B, page 39 1483

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, HVAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1484

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1485

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1486

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1487

A-18-1	Customer Information System
A-18-2	Evidence of S.S. Dick
I-1-61 to 64	Board Staff Interrogatories #61 to 64
I-4-20	CME Interrogatory #20
I-8-36 to 38	IGUA Interrogatories #36 to 38
I-11-38, 39	VECC Interrogatories #38, 39.

DEFERRED TAXES

1489

10.1 ECG's proposal to establish a Deferred Income Tax Deferral Account to recover $50 million in deferred taxes through to 2010.

1490

- and -

1491

10.2 ECG's proposal to record in the account $10 million (after tax) in deferred taxes in the 2002 Test Year.

1492

- and -

1493

10.3 ECG's proposed pre-conditions for clearing the account.

1494

(No Settlement)

1495

The following parties participated in the discussion of these issues: ECG, CME, CAC, HVAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1496

ECG and the other parties are unable to reach an agreement to settle these issues. The following delineates, from their perspective, the scope of the dispute over the issues and, as well, a procedural framework to examine the issues.

1497

ECG claims that its proposals are based on the notional utility account that the Board established in its E.B.O. 179-14/15 Decision with Reasons (March 31, 1999).The amount of the notional utility account is $50 million and, therefore, ECG proposed to establish a Deferred Income Tax Deferral Account ("DITDA") to recover the entire $50 million over 10 years. ECG also proposed to record $10 million for Fiscal 2000 and 2001 combined in the DITDA, in this proceeding, for subsequent recovery in accordance with proposed pre-conditions for clearing the DITDA. ECG claims that current cash taxes payable for these years exceed $10 million (A-17-1).

Was Appendix B, page 40 1498

The other parties claim that ECG has not satisfied the conditions established by the Board for a draw down of the notional utility account, for either Fiscal 2000 or Fiscal 2001, and that events subsequent to the Board's decision raise the issue of whether ECG can draw down any amount of the notional utility account for recovery from customers. One of the subsequent events is the recent sale of the shares of Enbridge Services Inc. (“ESI”) by Enbridge Consumers Energy Inc. (“ECE”) to an affiliate of Centrica plc. ESI is the corporation to which ECG transferred its rental business on October 1, 1999 and one of ESI's subsidiaries, 3696669 Canada Inc. ("Enbridge Canada"), is the corporation to which ESI transferred ECG's former rental business on December 23, 1999 (A-17-1). The other parties claim that ESI and Enbridge Canada together expanded ECG's former rental business after October 1, 1999 rather than winding it down.

1499

The other parties contend that they require tax and accounting information from ESI and Enbridge Canada, among other things, and also a copy of the agreement(s) whereby Enbridge Inc. (“EI”) and ECE effectively sold ESI’s rental business to an affiliate of Centrica plc by selling the shares of ESI. The other parties have requested ECG to provide this information in order to obtain and file information to support their opposition to ECG's proposals. ECG did not provide the requested information, however, because ECG's affiliates declined to make it available to ECG and, in any event, ECG is not a party to the agreement(s) with Centrica plc. (I-1-79, I-8-43). The other parties contend that they and the Board require this information in order to properly examine these issues.

1500

ECG and the other parties agree that these issues should not be examined in the first phase of this proceeding, or in the subsequent ROE phase, but rather in a separate phase or in a new proceeding established for the purpose of examining these issues. ECG and other parties note in this regard that, even if approved, ECG’s proposal would not affect ECG’s revenue requirement and thus rates for the Test Year. The other parties also note that, prior to the Board examining these issues, there will

be a number of procedural matters that must be resolved, including the following, and that the resolution of these matters may give rise to related issues:

1501

- a motion by one or more of the other parties seeking disclosure of all relevant information from ESI and its subsidiary as the corporations that owned, operated, and expanded ECG's former rental business after October 1, 1999; and

1502

- a motion by one or more of the other parties seeking disclosure from the corporations that are party to the agreement(s) related to the sale of the shares of ESI to an affiliate of Centrica plc.

1503

Two of these corporations - - ESI and Enbridge Canada -- are no longer affiliates of ECG as a result of the closing of the share transaction on May 7, 2002. Two others -- ECE and EI - - are still affiliates of ECG.

Was Appendix B, page 41 1504

ECG and the other parties accordingly request the Board to establish a separate phase of this proceeding or a separate proceeding by issuing a procedural order to this effect. ECG and the other parties are not seeking such an order now but, rather, the Board's confirmation that it will issue such an order in due course.

1505

The following evidence is relevant to these issues:

1506

A-12-1	Deferral and Variance Accounts
A-17-1	Deferred Tax
I-1-65, 78, 79	Board Staff Interrogatories #65, 78, 79
I-2-54, 56, 57	CAC Interrogatories #54, 56, 57
I-8-8, 17, 18, 35, 43, 44	IGUA Interrogatories #8, 17, 18, 35, 43, 44
I-11-37, 61, 76, 77	VECC Interrogatories #37, 61, 76, 77.

DEFERRAL AND VARIANCE ACCOUNTS

1508

11.1 Amounts and disposition of balances in the fiscal 2001 deferral and variance accounts.

1509

(Complete Settlement)

1510

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1511

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1512

- ECG filed a summary of the actual deferral account and variance account balances for Fiscal 2001 (A-12-3, updated 2002-04-22); the summary is reproduced in Appendix C [1724] (pp. 57-58). ECG proposes to recover, from customers, $41.8 million in principal and $5.0 million in interest, based upon the March 31, 2002 balances, for Fiscal 2001. Of these amounts, $0.9 million in principal and $0.4 million in interest relates to non-gas supply accounts and $40.9 million in principal and $4.6 million in interest relates to gas supply related accounts.

1513

- The balances recorded in the following deferral and variance accounts established for Fiscal 2001, and the proposed clearance of such balances, are accepted by the other parties for the reasons given in the supporting evidence:

1514

Non-Gas Supply Accounts

1515

- 2001 Class Action Suit Deferral Account

1516

- 2001 Deferred Rebate Account

1517

- 2001 Debt Redemption Deferral Account

1518

- 2001 Customer Communication Plan Deferral Account

1519

Gas Supply Related Accounts

Was Appendix B, page 42 1520

- 2001 Transactional Services Deferral Account

1521

- 2001 Purchased Gas Variance Account ("2001 PGVA").

1522

- Appendix D (pp. 59-60) is a reconciliation of the forecast and the actual balance recorded in the 2001 PGVA. It explains the large variance between the two.

1523 • The interest calculated on the balances recorded in the following non-gas supply deferral accounts, established for Fiscal 2001, and the proposed clearance of interest (only) on such balances, are accepted by the other parties for the reasons given in the supporting evidence:

1524 • 2001 Electronic Regulatory Filings Deferral Account;

1525 • 2001 Customer Information Systems Deferral Account; and

1526 • 2001 Unbundling Business Activities Deferral Account.

1527 • ECG does not seek to clear, in the Test Year, the $8.6 million in principal and the $0.3 million in interest, unless otherwise indicated, that is recorded in the following non-gas supply deferral and variance accounts:

1528 • 2001 Demand-Side Management Variance Account-Operating ("2001 DSMVA");

1529 • 2001 Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism ("2001 LRAM");

1530 • 2001 Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism ("2000 LRAM");

1531 • 2001 Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account ("2001 SSMVA");

1532 • 2001 Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account ("2000 SSMVA");

1533 • 2001 Electronic Regulatory Filings Deferral Account ("2001 ERFDA") principal only;

1534 • 2001 Unbundling Business Activities Deferral Account (“2001 UBADA”) principal only;

1535 • 2001 Working Group-Risk Management Program Deferral Account (“2001 WG-RMPDA”);

1536 • 2001 Customer Information Systems Deferral Account ("2001 CISDA") principal only;

1537 • 2001 Independent Consultant Assessment and Report Deferral Account ("2001 ICARDA");

1538 • 2002 Demand-Side Management Variance Account-Operating;

1539
- 2002 Deferred Rebate Account; and

1540
- 2002 Class Action Suit Deferral Account.

Was Appendix B, page 43 1541
- The clearing of the 2000 LRAM and the 2000 SSMVA will be deferred in accordance with the settlement of Issue 8.3 (clearance of the 2000 SSMVA (pp. 36-38).

1542
- The clearing of the 2001 LRAM and the 2001 DSMVA will be synchronized with the clearing of the 2001 SSMVA in accordance with the settlement of Issue 11.3 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal.

1543
- The principal amounts recorded in the 2001 ERFDA, 2001 CISDA, and 2001 UBADA are not being cleared because they are being amortized in accordance with previous decisions or orders of the Board.

1544
- ECG is not proposing to clear the 2001 ICARDA and the 2001 WG-RMPDA, in this proceeding, as a result of the potential cost consequences of participation by the consultant(s) or others in the Board's oral hearing.

1545
The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1546
The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1547
The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1548
The following evidence supports the settlement:

1549

A-12-1	Deferral and Variance Accounts
A-12-2	Proposed Clearing of the 2001 Deferral Accounts
A-12-3	Deferral and Variance Accounts (March 31, 2002)
I-1-66, 70 to 74	Board Staff Interrogatories 66, 70 to 74
I-2-25, 48, 50	CAC Interrogatories # 25, 48, 50
I-4-16	CME Interrogatory #16
I-8-19	IGUA Interrogatory #19
I-9-1	OAPPA Interrogatory #1

1550

11.2 ECG's request to continue to establish deferral and variance accounts for fiscal 2002, including new accounts such as the Late Payment Plan Deferral Account (2002 LPPDA).

1551

(Complete Settlement)

1552

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1553

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

Was Appendix B, page 44 1554

- ECG's proposal to continue the following deferral and variance accounts for the Test Year, including the accounting methodology, is accepted by the other parties for the reasons given in the supporting evidence:

  1555
  - 2002 Union Gas Deferral Account;

  1556
  - 2002 Deferred Rebate Account;

  1557
  - 2002 Generic Regulatory Hearings Deferral Account;

  1558
  - 2002 Class Action Suit Deferral Account;

  1559
  - 2002 Debt Redemption Deferral Account;

  1560
  - 2002 Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism ("2002 LRAM");

  1561
  - 2002 Electronic Regulatory Filings Deferral Account;

  1562
  - 2002 Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account; ("2002 SSMVA");

  1563
  - 2002 Customer Communication Plan Deferral Account; and

  1564
  - 2002 Market Restructuring Deferral Account.

1565

- ECG's proposal to continue the 2001 ICARDA and the 2001 WG-RMPDA for Test Year, including the accounting methodology, is accepted by other parties for the reasons given in the supporting evidence. The continuation is limited, however, to the period ending on the completion of the initial phase of this proceeding.

1566
- ECG's proposal to continue the Purchased Gas Variance Account for the Test Year, including the change in the accounting methodology arising from the agreement to settle Issue 2.2 (Link pipeline, pp. 12-13), is accepted by the other parties for the reasons given in the supporting evidence.

1567
- ECG's proposal to continue the Transactional Services Deferral Account for the Test Year, including the accounting methodology and the revised sharing ratio for a credit balance arising from the agreement to settle Issue 7.1 (Transactional Services, pp. 30-32), is accepted by the other parties for the reasons given in the supporting evidence.

1568
- ECG's proposal to continue the Demand Side Management Variance Account-Operating for the Test Year ("2000 DSMVA"), including the change in the accounting methodology arising from the agreement to settle of Issue 8.2 (DSMVA, pp. 35-36), is accepted by the other parties. The clearance of the 2002 DSMVA and the 2002 LRAM will be synchronized with the clearance of the 2002 SSMVA in accordance with the agreement to settle Issue 11.3 in the RP-2000-0040 Settlement Proposal.

1569
- ECG proposes to establish the Unaccounted for Gas Variance Account for the Test Year ("2002 UAFVA") in order to record the gas costs associated with variances between forecast and actual unaccounted for ("UAF") gas. UAF gas represents the difference between customer-metered consumption and total sendout, as determined by invoices from suppliers, and injections/withdrawals of gas in storage. UAF is the result of meter differences, billing differences, line leakage, unmetered uses, and other factors. The UAF gas forecast is calculated using a regression model that uses adjusted deliveries as its primary explanatory variable (A-12-5). Despite a high R2 of 0.95 and despite numerous attempts to improve the model, the in-sample forecast error remains high. In Fiscal 2001, for example, the Board-approved UAF level was 13 746 10^3m^3 compared with an actual level of 53 283 10^3m^3. In Fiscal 2000, the actual UAF level was 142 576 10^3m^3 higher than the Board-approved level of 97 565 10^3m^3. The major reason for these large variances is thought to be the result of metering inaccuracies upstream of ECG's transmission and distribution systems that are beyond ECG's control. The other parties remain concerned about ECG's UAF forecasting methodology and the impact that the 2000 UAFVA would have on ECG's incentive to control UAF. They are, however, prepared to support ECG's proposal to establish a UAFVA, on a trial basis, in order to record the gas costs associated with the volumetric difference between ECG's UAF forecast, for the Test Year, 85 056 103 m^3 (D-10-3, updated 2002-01-18) and the actual UAF for the Test Year.

Was Appendix B, page 45 1570
- ECG's proposal to establish a Late Payment Penalty Deferral Account for the Test Year, and later a Late Payment Penalty Variance Account instead, is considered in the context of Issue 13.1 (late payment penalty at pp. 48-50).

1571
- ECG's proposal to establish a Deferred Income Tax Deferral Account for the Test Year is considered in the context of Issues 10.1, 10.2, and 10.3 (deferred taxes, pp. 39-41).

1572
The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1573

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1574

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1575

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1576

A-12-1	Deferral and Variance Accounts
A-12-3	Actual Balances of Deferral and Variance Accounts (March 31, 2002)
A-12-4	Deferral and Variance Accounts Supplemental Evidence
A-12-5	Unaccounted for Gas Variance Accounts
D1-3-1	Unbilled and Unaccounted for Gas Volumes, 2002 Budget
D2-3-1	Unbilled and Unaccounted for Gas Volumes, 2001 Actual 2001 OEB Approved
D3-2-1	Unbilled and Unaccounted for Volumes 2000 Actual vs. 2000 OEB Approved
I-1-69, 70, 71, 74 to 76	Board Staff Interrogatories #69, 70, 71, 74 to 76
I-22-20, 48, 49	CAC Interrogatories #20, 48, 49
I-8-17, 18	IGUA Interrogatories #17, 18.
I-11-14 to 17, 60	VECC Interrogatories #14 to 17, 60.

RATE DESIGN

1578

12.1 ECG's proposal to change the allocation and recovery of carrying costs related to gas in inventory.

1579

(Complete Settlement)

1580

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1581

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1582

- ECG's proposal is intended to achieve a better matching between costs and revenues, and thus to promote fairness, among the rate classes by means of two changes. One is the use of storage space to allocate these costs, instead of winter delivery volumes, because the proposed allocation factor is more reflective of the use of storage space by each rate class. The other change is an extension of the period -- 12 months instead of four -- over which the allocated costs are recovered. The allocated costs would continue to be recovered in the Delivery Charge, for general service customers, and otherwise in the Gas Supply Load Balancing Charge.

1583

- The impact of the proposal, in percentage terms, on Rates 1 and 6 is de minimus. These two are the only rate classes that are affected adversely by the proposal.

1584

- ECG’s proposal is accepted by the other parties, for the reasons given in the supporting evidence, and ECG's PGVA methodology and its QRAM procedures will be modified accordingly.

1585

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1586

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1587

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1588

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1589

H1-1-2	Rate Design - QRAM
I-1-80	Board Staff Interrogatory # 80
I-8-39 to 41	IGUA Interrogatories #39 to 41
M1-1-1	Impact Statement No. 1
M1-2-11	Proposed Revenue Recovery by Rate Class
M1-2-12	Revenue Comparison, Current Revenue vs. Proposed Revenue.

1590

12.2 ECG's proposed changes to Rider A and Rate 125.

1591

(Complete Settlement)

Was Appendix B, page 47 1592

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1593

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1594

- ECG proposes to revise Rider A -- the Transportation Service Rider -- and Rate 125 in order to rectify an oversight in the applicability of the T-service credit and the Direct Purchase Administration Charge ("DPAC"). The proposal is intended to place Rate 125 customers on the same footing as the other two unbundled distribution rates -- 300 and 305 -- in terms of both the T-service credit and the DPAC. ECG would do so by removing the reference to Rate 125 from Rider A and by incorporating, in Rate 125 itself, the reference to the DPAC.

1595

- The other parties accept ECG’s proposal, for the reasons given in the supporting evidence, such that Rider A and Rate 125 will be revised accordingly.

1596

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1597

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1598

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1599

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1600

H2-1-3	Proposed Changes to Rider A and Rate 125
H2-6-1	Rate Handbook
I-8-41	IGUA Interrogatory #41.

1601

12.3 Rate retroactivity in the 2002 Test Year.

1602

(Complete Settlement)

1603

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1604

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1605

- ECG filed its application in this proceeding September 25, 2001 and expected, at the time, to reach the settlement process by the end of the year or shortly into the new year. This expectation, as it happens, was not realized.

1606

- ECG is nevertheless mindful, and so are the other parties, of the Board's concerns about retroactive rate-making as they were expressed in the RP-2000-0040 Reasons for Decision (para. 2.2.8, p. 12):

1607

> "[T]he Board cautions the parties that, because retroactive rates do not give accurate price signals in the market and may result in inter-generational subsidization, the Board does not generally endorse retroactive rate-making. In the future, the Board expects the Company to provide cogent evidence and rationale as to the reasons why rates should be retroactive.

Was Appendix B, page 48 1608

- The Board's concerns arose, in part, from the need for a retroactive adjustment as a one-time credit or debit, as the case may be, based on the billed volumes prior to the implementation date of the final rates in the RP-2000-0040 proceeding. There is a similar need in this proceeding because the circumstances are similar notwithstanding ECG's efforts, and the efforts of the other parties, to achieve a more timely rate-making process.

1609

- ECG and the other parties consider that the Board could assist ECG in getting back on track, as it were, by issuing Partial and then Final Decisions with Reasons in this proceeding. The partial decision would dispose of the two unsettled issues that could affect ECG's revenue requirement for the Test Year; namely, Issue 2.1 (Alliance and Vector at pp. 11-12) and Issue 4.2 (DPWAMS at pp. 22-23). ECG could then reflect the effect of the partial decision in its rates application for Fiscal 2003 sooner than would otherwise be the case. The final decision would dispose of the other unsettled issues; namely, Issues 2.3 and 2.4 (cost allocation of gas supply management costs and cost of managing system gas on a "stand-alone basis at pp. 13-14), Issue 5.3 (affiliate outsourcing at pp. 25-27), and Issues 10.1, 10.2, and 10.3 (deferred taxes at pp. 39-41). ECG and the other parties accordingly request the Board to confirm that it is willing to issue two such decisions in this proceeding.

1610

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1611

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1612

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1613

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1614

I-1-3 Board Staff Interrogatory #3.

LATE PAYMENT PENALTY

1616

13.1 ECG's proposal to revise its late payment penalty.

1617

(Complete Settlement)

1618

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1619

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

Was Appendix B, page 49 1620

- By letter dated October 4, 2001 to ECG, the Board directed ECG to review its late payment penalty ("LPP") in the context of this proceeding. ECG was proposing, at the time, to establish a Late Payment Plan Deferral Account for the Test Year ("2002 LPPDA").

1621

- The Ontario Court of Appeal decided on December 3, 2001 that "the Board will need to address an alternative mechanism for applying late payment penalties forthwith": Garland v. Consumers' Gas Co. (2001), 57 O.R. (3d) 127 at 152. By letter dated December 14, 2001 to the Board, ECG provided details of two alternative approaches to revising the LPP and, in addition, proposed a target implementation date of February 1, 2002 for a revised LPP.

1622

- The Board issued Procedural Order No. 1 on January 4, 2002 under file no. EB-2001-0837 (RP-2001-0032). This order directed ECG to file a proposal to revise its LPP by January 10, 2002 and established a written proceeding to examine ECG's proposal. The order also established February 1, 2002 as the implementation date for the revised LPP.

1623

- ECG filed its proposal on January 10, 2002. The proposal presented two options and, in either case, modification of the wording on the face of the Enbridge bill. One option was to simply reduce the percentage for the one-time LPP from 5% to 2% and the other, to adopt a revolving credit style interest charge. ECG recommended the first option as an interim measure effective in the February 2002 billing cycle. ECG nevertheless indicated that a time-based charge -- the second option -- may be the preferred LPP option and, therefore, that ECG may make a proposal to this effect in its rates application for Fiscal 2003.

1624

- ECG also proposed to establish an LPP Variance Account for the Test Year ("2002 LPPVA") to capture the variances between actual and forecast LPP revenues together with the implementation costs of the revised LPP. The 2002 LPPVA would replace the earlier proposal of a 2002 LPPDA.

1625

- The Board accepted ECG's recommendation for one-time penalty of 2%, on an interim basis, in its Decision and Interim Order dated January 31, 2002. The Board did not approve, though, ECG’s proposed 2002 LPPVA.

1626

- ECG proposed in its recent QRAM application, under Board no. EB-2002-0213 (RP-2001-0032), to revise Part III of its Rate Handbook -- “Terms and Conditions Applicable to All

Services" -- to incorporate the one-time penalty of 2% in "Section F – Payment Conditions". The Board approved this proposal in its Decision and Interim Rate Order dated March 22, 2002. ECG and the other parties agree that the Board should do likewise in its final rate order, after the ROE phase, in this proceeding.

1627

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

Was Appendix B, page 50 1628

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1629

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1630

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1631

A-27-1	Revised Late Payment Penalty Proposal - January 2002
H1-1-4	Rate Handbook
I-1-67 to 69	Board Staff Interrogatories #67 to 69
I-LPP1-1 to 23	Board Staff LPP Interrogatories #1 to 23
I-LPP2-1 to 17	CAC LPP Interrogatories #1 to 17
I-LPP11-1 to 7	VECC LPP General and Specific Comments # 1 to 7
Q3-3-4-7	Rate Handbook (EB-2002-0213).

AFFILIATE/INTERCORPORATE FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

1633

14.1 Affiliate/intercorporate financial transactions.

1634

(Complete Settlement)

1635

The following parties participated in the discussion of this issue: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1636

There is an agreement to settle this issue on the following basis:

1637

- The issue was described as a "place-holder" on Issues Day for the following reason: "[i]ntervenors are awaiting responses to at least one interrogatory that deal with affiliate and intercorporate financial transactions …" (Tr. 85).

1638

- The principal interrogatory at the time, was VECC Interrogatory #1. ECG's response to this interrogatory (I-11-1) is accepted by the other parties.

1639

The following parties agree with the settlement: ECG, CME, CAC, IGUA, Schools, and VECC.

1640

The following parties disagree with the settlement: none.

1641

The following parties take no position on the issue: none.

1642

The following evidence supports the settlement:

1643

I-11-1 VECC Interrogatory #1.

Enbridge Consumers Gas DSM Consultative Audit Subcommittee Draft Workplan for Completion of Audit Review of F2000 DSM Monitoring and Evaluation Report and SSM Claim

1645

Draft Workplan for Completion of Audit Review of F2000 DSM Monitoring and Evaluation Report and SSM Claim (please refer to the attached schedule),

1646

Task 1: Residential Issues

1647

a. The Audit Subcommittee will review the findings of the draft Audit Report, the Company's response and any subsequent additional investigation by the auditor.

1648

Task 2: Business Market Issues

1649

The Audit Subcommittee will make recommendations to the DSM Consultative on the following issues:

1650

a. the removal of electricity and water savings from the CM5 Schools program, consistent with the outcome of the 1999 DSM audit process, and

1651

b. the issue of unintended effects resulting from the present methodology, whereby incremental equipment costs in the business markets are treated differently in the screening of budget and actual program results for the TRC test.

1652

Task 3: Incremental Costs in Business Markets

1653

Through the audit process it was found that many custom project files in the business markets included missing or incorrect information regarding incremental costs.

1654

a. The Company will provide missing data and correct other data for the auditor.

1655

b. Using the methodology approved by the auditor, the Company will examine the files and update the incremental cost information.

1656

c. The auditor will review the Company's work on a spot check basis.

1657

d. The Company will present the results to the Audit Subcommittee.

1658

Task 4: Detailed Review of Additional Custom Projects and related Business Market Issues

1659

The revised Terms of Reference for the audit of the F2000 results called for a detailed review of a small sample of custom projects. In the first phase of the audit, 13 custom projects were examined and 5 chosen for detailed review. The Audit Subcommittee and the auditor acknowledge that this small sample is insufficient to use as the basis for adjustments to the following aspects in the business markets:

1660

- installation rates,

1661

- free ridership,

1662

- documentation,

1663

- savings calculation, and

1664

- attribution among parties.

1665

This phase of the audit will expand the review of custom projects with the intent of developing a sample that is statistically valid and stratified by market sector.

1666

a. The auditor will develop a second sample of custom projects for detailed review.

1667

b. The auditor will review the projects, using the same methodology as in Phase 1 of the audit and develop a report for the Audit Subcommittee.

Was Appendix B, page 52 1668

c. The Company will review the report results and provide comments. The Audit Subcommittee will meet to review the Auditor's Report on the custom projects and the Company's response.

1669

Task 5: Draft Auditor's Report Updated

1670

The auditor updates the draft audit report based upon findings in Task One to Four. Kai Millyard Consulting will update the reconciliation spreadsheet based upon findings in Task One to Four.

1671

Task 6: Audit Subcommittee Reviews Auditor's Updated Draft Report

1672

The Audit Sub-Committee will meet to review the updated draft audit report and Company's responses. The Audit Sub-Committee will provide feedback to the auditor to enable preparation of final Audit Report.

1673

Task 7: Preparation of Final Auditor’s Report

1674

The auditor finalizes the final audit report.

1675

Task 8: Audit Subcommittee Develops Recommendations For DSM Consultative

1676

The Audit Subcommittee will develop recommendations on residential findings, business market issues, incremental costs in business markets, and custom projects (Tasks One to Four) to forward to the DSM Consultative. Kai Millyard Consulting will update the reconciliation spreadsheet based on the Audit Subcommittee recommendations, and prepare the Final F2000 Reconciliation Report.

1677

Task 9: DSM Consultative Review of Audit Sub-Committee Report and Audit Report

1678

The DSM Consultative will review the final audit report, the final F2000 reconciliation report, and the recommendations of the Audit Subcommittee. The DSM Consultative develops recommendations for the Company.

1679

Task 10: Preparation of Revised SSM Claim

1680

The Company will consider the recommendations of the DSM Consultative and submit a SSM claim, within the timelines of the 2003 Rate Case, in accordance with those recommendations that the Company accepts.

Was Appendix B, page 53 1681

ECG DSM Consultative Audit SubCommittee Schedule

		Task	Lead	April		May				June				July			
				22	29	6	13	20	27	3	10	17	24	1	8	15	22
1	Residential Issues																
	a.	Review Draft Audit Report, Company's response and any additional work by auditor	Audit Subcommittee			Mtg											
2	Other Business Market Issues		Audit Subcommittee														
	a.	Removal of electricity and water savings from Education sector															
	b.	Principles re. incremental costs in custom projects															
3	Incremental Costs in Business Markets																
	a.	Provide missing information and correct data	ECG														
	b.	Review of ECG's work (spot check)	Kenergy														
	c.	Present of results	ECG & Kenergy						Mtg								
4	Detailed Review of Additional Custom Projects																
	a.	Select second sample	Kenergy	Mtg													
	b.	Review custom projects	Kenergy														
	c.	Review results and comment	ECG														
	d.	Review Auditor's report and ECG response	Audit Subcommittee								Mtg						
5	Update Draft Audit Report																
	a.	Update Draft Report based on Tasks 1-4	Kenergy														
	b.	Update Spreadsheet based on Tasks 1-4	K Millyard Consulting														
6	Review Updated Draft Audit Report		Audit Subcommittee									Mtg					
7	Prepare and Circulate Final Auditor's Report		Kenergy														
8	Develop Recommendations for DSM Consultative																
	a.	Develop recommendations	Audit Subcommittee											Mtg			
	b.	Update Spreadsheet and prepare Final Reconciliation Report	K Millyard Consulting														
9	Review Audit Subcommittee Report & Audit Report		DSM Consultative														
	a.	Develop recommendations for the Company															
10	Prepare Revised SSM Claim		ECG														

Value for Money Audit

1683

GENERAL

1684

Three common types of audits are:

1685

- Financial;

1686

- Compliance;

1687

- Value for money.

1688

FINANCIAL AUDIT

1689

Financial audits are usually conducted annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. The objective is to ensure that an organization's financial statements fairly present the financial situation and the results of operations.

1690

During this kind of audit, it is a current practice to evaluate internal control. Following the study and assessment of this control and at other audit stages, significant weaknesses are pointed out, following discussions, to the managers who then make comments.

1691

COMPLIANCE AUDIT

1692

Certain rules, like provincial statutes and regulations, policies and other regulations, govern good business administration. It is recognized that, even when there are no specific statues, the audit of financial statements must, to a certain degree, ensure that business has been run in accordance with applicable rules.

1693

VALUE FOR MONEY AUDIT

1694

A value for money audit aims to assess to what degree:

1695

- resources are managed with respect to economy, efficiency and effectiveness;

1696

- the responsibility links are reasonably supported in order to respect the obligation of accountability; and

1697

- whether or not an organization is giving value for the money it spends.

Was Appendix B, page 55 1698

Key areas examined include determining whether:

1699

- the management, control and other available data systems are adequate;

1700

- information provided to the administrators and managers, for decision-making, is appropriate and whether operations are carried out according to the rules;

1701

- there are clear definition of objectives and targets;

1702

- accurate and reliable management information is available on a timely a basis;

1703

- there are performance measures and indicators for benchmarking and evaluating performance;

1704

- policies and programs are evaluated, including post implementation review; and

1705

- there is identification of resource consumption and accountability.

1706

The Auditor:

1707

- investigates and reports to the designated authority whether there is a lack of sufficient, relevant and reliable financial and other data available and whether critical underlying assumptions were made explicit when the policy objectives or decisions were made, for further inquiry by the designated authority;

1708

- considers the authority upon which the policy objectives have been determined, and policy decisions taken;

1709
- considers whether there are satisfactory arrangements for considering alternative options in the implementation of policy;

1710
- considers whether established policy aims and objectives have been properly implemented;

1711
- considers whether there is a conflict between different policy aims or objectives, or between the means chosen to implement them;

1712
- considers how far policy aims and objectives have been translated into operational targets and measures of performance and whether the costs of alternative levels of service and other relevant factors have been considered, and are reviewed as costs change; and

1713
- examines and reports on the appropriate allocation of fixed costs (e.g., intermingling of marketing and DSM);

Was Appendix B, page 56 1714
- examines affiliate transactions/single source services;

1715
- examines and assesses the extent to which there are overlapping and/or mutual benefits e.g., DSM benefits and benefit to supplier (e.g., hot water heater turn temperature turn downs).

Updated: 2002-04-22
RP-2001-0032
Exhibit A
Tab 12
Schedule 3
Page 1 of 2

ENBRIDGE CONSUMERS' GAS COMPANY LTD.
DEFERRAL & VARIANCE ACCOUNTS AS AT MARCH 31, 2002
ACTUAL BALANCES

Col. 1	Col. 2		Col. 3	Col. 4
Line No.	Account Description		Principal (000's)	Interest (000's)
	Non-Gas Accounts			
1.	Deferred Rebate Account ('2001 DRA')	Note (3)	1,449.1	278.5
2.	Deferred Rebate Account ('2002 DRA')		0.4	-
3.	Demand-Side Management V / A - Operating (2002 DSMVA)		(1,261.5)	(7.9)
4.	Demand-Side Management V / A - Operating ('2001 DSMVA')		1,785.9	62.5
5.	Generic Regulatory Hearings Deferral Account ('2001 GRHDA')		-	-
6.	Class Action Sut Deferral Account ('2002 CASDA')		28.5	0.1
7.	Class Action Sut Deferral Account ('2001 CASDA')		151.5	7.0
8.	Debt Redemption Deferral Account ('2001 DRDA')		(741.8)	(15.7)
9.	Last Revenue Adjustment Mechanism ('2001 LRAM')	Note (1)	300.6	13.8
10.	Last Revenue Adjustment Mechanism ('2000 LRAM')	Note (2)	(15.0)	6.5
11.	Electronic Regulatory Filings Deferral Account ('2001 ERFDA')		65.7	2.4
12.	Customer Information Systems Deferral Account (' CISDA')		1,800.0	103.0
13.	Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account ('2000 SSMVA')	Note (2)	2,500.0	184.6
14.	Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account ('2001 SSMVA')	Note (1)	2,500.0	35.4
15.	Unbundling Business Activities Deferral Account ('UBADA')		828.2	39.0
16.	Independent Consultant Assessment & Report D / A ('2001 ICARDA')		44.0	0.0
17.	Customer Communication Plan Deferral Account ('2001 CCPDA')		16.8	-
18.	Market Restructuring Systems Development Deferral Account ('MRSDDA')		-	-
19.	Deferred Tax National Amount - Variance Account ('DTNAVA')		-	-
20.	Ontario Energy Board Costs Variance Account ('2001-OEBCVA')		-	-
21.	Working Group - Risk Management Program - Deferral ('2001 WGRMP-DA')		-	-
22.	Sub-total Non-Gas Accounts		9,452.4	709.6
	Gas Supply Related			
23.	2001 Purchased Gas Variance Account ('2001 PGVA')		40,297.9	4,612.5
24.	2001 Heating Value Differential Account ('2001 HVDA')		-	-
25.	2001 Transactional Services Deferral Account ('2001 TSDA')		(2,058.0)	(33.4)
26.	2001 Union Gas Deferal Account ('2001 UGDA')		-	-
27.	2002 Purchased Gas Variance Account ('2002 PGVA')		28,406.8	(51.9)
28.	Sub-total Gas Deferral & Variance Accounts		69,646.7	4,527.2
29.	Total Gas and Non-Gas Deferal & Variance Accounts		79,799.1	5,236.8

Note 1: Results of the fiscal 2001 SSM / LRAM claim subject to final audit adjustment.
Note 2: Results of the fiscal 2000 SSM / LRAM claim subject to final audit adjustment.
Note 3: A box denotes those amounts that the Company is requesting to clear.

Updated: 2002-04-22
RP-2001-0032
Exhibit A
Tab 12
Schedule 3
Page 2 of 2

ENBRIDGE CONSUMERS' GAS COMPANY LTD.
DEFERRAL & VARIANCE ACCOUNTS AS AT MARCH 31, 2002
ACTUAL BALANCES

Col. 1	Col. 2		Col. 3	Col. 4
Line No.	Account Description		Principal (000's)	Interest (000's)
1.	Total Gas and Non-Gas Accounts (from page 1, line 29)		78,799.1	5,236.8
Amounts not subject to clearing at this time				
2.	Demand-Side Management V/A- Operating ("2002 DSMVA")		1,261.5	7.9
3.	Demand-Side Management V/A- Operating ("2001 DSMVA")		(1,785.9)	(62.5)
4.	Deferred Rebate Account ("2002 DRA")		(0.4)	-
5.	Class Action Suit Deferral Account ("2002 CASDA")		(28.5)	(0.1)
6.	Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism ("2001 LRAM")	Note (1)	(300.6)	(13.6)
7.	Lost Revenue Adjustment Mechanism ("2000 LRAM")	Note (2)	15.0	(6.5)
8.	Electronic Regulatory Filings Deferral Account ("2001 ERFDA")		(65.7)	
9.	Customer Information Systems Deferral Account (" CISDA")		(1,800.0)	
10.	Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account ("2001 SSMVA")	Note (1)	(2,500.0)	(35.4)
11.	Shared Savings Mechanism Variance Account ("2000 SSMVA")	Note (2)	(2,500.0)	(184.6)
12.	Unbundling Business Activities Deferral Account ("UBADA")		(828.2)	
13.	Independent Consultant Assessment & Report D / A("2001 ICARDA")		(44.0)	(0.3)
14.	Sub-total Non-Gas Deferral/Variance Accounts		(8,576.8)	(295.1)
15.	2002 Purchased Gas Variance Account ("2002 PGVA")		(28,406.8)	51.9
16.	Sub-total PGVA amounts - not subject to clearing at this time		(28,406.8)	51.9
17.	Total amounts proposed for clearing		41,815.5	4,993.6

Note 1: Results of the fiscal 2001 SSM / LRAM claim subject to final audit adjustment.
Note 2: Results of the fiscal 2000 SSM / LRAM claim subject to final audit adjustment.

2001 PGVA Reconciliation

	2001 Forecast	2001 Actual
	$220,812,038 [1]	$220,721,453
2000 PGVA Balance Carried Forward	-	2,694,901
2000 Rider C Differential	-	(5,117,720)
TCPL Toll Change	-	5,343,909
Curtailment Revenue	-	(2,037,460)
Adjustment for Amortization of Link	-	(509,118)
Inventory Re-evaluation Adjustment	-	(44,931,908) [2]
	$220,812,038	$176,164,057
Rider "C" Forecast - September	(3,138,299)	(3,586,821)
	$217,673,739	$172,577,236 [3]
Year-End Adjustments		(5,159,870)
Rider "C" Forecast		
October	(9,987,151)	(8,677,850)
November	(21,473,706)	(14,455,048)
December	(33,758,869)	(19,737,869)
January	(44,088,111)	(30,212,542)
February	(45,748,609)	(28,299,164)
March	(52,718,845)	(22,737,022) [4]
	$ 9,898,447	$ 43,297,871

1719

1. EB-2001-0419, P3-1-2, p. 2

1720

2. ECG verifies the volumetric sendout monthly using invoices from TCPL and Union as well as information from its own storage operations. To calculate gas costs requires disinquishing between sales sendout and T-Service sendout. Prior to Fiscal 2001 the only way to make any distinction was to assume that the monthly billed T-Service deliveries represented the monthly T-Service consumption (cycle vs. calendar) and the remaining deliveries was all sales. The difference between deliveries and consumption is the basis for determining gas in storage balances. In a typical year, (when there are no price changes), there is no financial impact because of the month to month differences between billed deliveries and calendar consumption.

1721

In Fiscal 2001, ECG experienced a number of events such as multiple price changes and unusual weather patterns. During examination of its monthly financial results ECG realized that these events, along with the timing difference between the billed deliveries and calendar consumption for

T-Service, had a significant impact on the gas in storage balances. ECG had overstated the storage withdrawals for sales customers thereby undervaluing the inventory re-evaluation adjustments. ECG then recalculated the inventory balances and made the correcting entry to the PGVA.

Was Appendix B, page 60 1722

3. RP-2001-0032, A-12-3, p. 1 (2001-12-07).

1723

4. Excludes March consumption billed in April totalling $14,272,000. This amount would reduce the 2001 Actual from $43,297,871 to $29,025,871.

Appendix C Financial Schedules

ENBRIDGE CONSUMERS GAS

UTILITY RATE BASE

FOR THE YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2002

($ Millions)

	Per Company (1)	Settlement Adjustment	Additional Board Adjustment	Per Board
Utility Plant				
Gross Plant at Cost	3,742.1	(9.8)		3,732.3
Accumulated Depreciation	(1,152.6)	0.6		(1,152.0)
Net Utility Plant	2,589.5	(9.2)	0.0	2,580.3
Allowance for Working Capital				
Accounts receivable merchandise finance plan	2.0			2.0
Accounts receivable rebillable projects	1.1			1.1

Materials and Supplies	20.8			20.8
Mortgages Receivable	0.9			0.9
Customer security deposits	(18.5)			(18.5)
Prepaid Expenses	1.4			1.4
Gas In Storage	415.2			415.2
Working Cash Allowance	15.9			16.1
Total Working Capital	438.8	0.2	0.0	439.0
Ontario Utility Rate Base	3,028.3	(9.0)	0.0	3,019.3

Footnote:

(1) as filed in Exh M2/Tab 2/Sch 2 dated June 7, 2002

Was Appendix C, page 2 1726

RP-2001-0032

Appendix C

Page 2 of 5

ENBRIDGE CONSUMERS GAS

UTILITY INCOME

FOR THE YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2002

($ Millions)

	Per Company (1)	Settlement Adjustment	Additional Board Adjustment	Per Board (2)
Revenue				
Gas Sales	1,529.3	0.0		1,529.3
Transportation of Gas	697.4			697.4
Transmission, Compression and Storage	2.3			2.3
Other Operating Revenue	18.1	0.1		18.2
Other Income	0.8			0.8
Total Revenue	2,247.9	0.1	0.0	2,248.0
Costs and Expenses				
Gas Costs	1,454.9	0.0		1,454.9
Operations and Maintenance	270.6	(10.7)		259.9
Depreciation and Amortization	160.3	(0.5)		159.8
Separation Expenses	0.2			0.2
Recovery of 1/10th Not'l Def Tax Acc't	0.0			0.0
Committed line of credit costs	0.0	0.9		0.9
Municipal and Other Taxes	47.7	(0.2)		47.5
Total Costs and Expenses	1,933.7	(10.5)	0.0	1,923.2

Utility Income	314.2	10.6		324.8
Before Income Taxes				
Income Taxes				
Excluding interest shield	131.0	4.1		135.1
Tax shield on interest expense	(55.8)	1.8		(54.0)
Total Income Taxes	75.2	5.9	0.0	81.1
Utility Income	239.0	4.7	0.0	243.7

Footnote:

(1) ref: Exh M2/Tab 2/ Sch 3 dated June 7, 2002

(2) ref: Exh N2/Tab 2/ Sch 4/p.1 dated June 7, 2002

ENBRIDGE CONSUMERS GAS

CALCULATION OF TAXABLE INCOME AND INCOME TAX EXPENSE

FOR THE YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2002

($ Millions)

PER BOARD

	Federal	Ontario	Total
Utility Income Before Taxes	324.8	324.8	
Plus Depreciation & amortization	159.8	159.8	
Amortization adjustment for non-util capital	(0.2)	(0.2)	
Large CorporationTax	7.4	7.4	
Other Non-Deductible Items	1.1	1.1	
	492.9	492.9	
Less Capital Cost Allowance	113.9	113.7	
Less Other Deductions	31.4	31.4	
	145.3	145.1	
Taxable Income	347.6	347.8	
Income Tax Rates	25.50%	12.50%	
Income Tax Amounts	88.6	43.5	
Total Income Tax Amount			132.1
Part VI.1 tax			3.1
Investment Tax Credit			(0.1)
Taxes excluding tax shield on interest expense			135.1
Interest Expense	142.2		

Tax Rate	38.00%	
Interest Tax Shield		54.0

Was Appendix C, page 4 1728

ENBRIDGE CONSUMERS GAS

CAPITALIZATION AND COST OF CAPITAL

FOR THE YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2002

($ Millions)

PER COMPANY

	Capital Structure	Ratios	Cost Rate	Return Component	Return
Long-term Debt	1,844.9	60.92%	7.88%	4.80%	145.4
Short-term Debt	24.4	0.81%	6.65%	0.05%	1.6
Preference Capital	99.1	3.27%	5.00%	0.16%	5.0
Common Equity	1,059.9	35.00%	11.25%	3.94%	119.2
	3,028.3	100.00%		8.95%	271.0

PER SETTLEMENT

	Capital Structure	Ratios	Cost Rate	Return Component	Return
Long-term debt	1,751.6	58.01%	7.94%	4.61%	139.1

Short-term debt	111.8	3.70%	2.83%	0.10%	3.2
Preference shares	99.1	3.29%	5.00%	0.17%	5.0
Common equity	1,056.8	35.00%	9.66%	3.38%	102.1
	3,019.3	100.00%		8.26%	249.4

PER BOARD

	Capital Structure	**Ratios**	**Cost Rate**	**Return Component**	**Return**
Long-term debt	1,751.6	58.01%	7.94%	4.61%	139.1
Short-term debt	111.8	3.70%	2.83%	0.10%	3.2
Preference shares	99.1	3.29%	5.00%	0.17%	5.0
Common equity	1,056.8	35.00%	9.66%	3.38%	102.1
	3,019.3	100.00%		8.26%	249.4

Exhibit ref: N2/T2/S5

ENBRIDGE CONSUMERS GAS

DETERMINATION OF REVENUE EXCESS / (DEFICIENCY)

FOR THE YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2002

($ Millions)

	Per Company	**Per Company After Settlement**	**Per Board**
Utility Income	239.0	243.7	243.7

Utility Rate Base	3,028.3	3,019.3	3,019.3
Indicated Rate of Return	7.89%	8.07%	8.07%
Requested Rate of Return	8.95%	8.26%	8.26%
Excess/ (Deficiency) in Rate of Return	-1.06%	-0.19%	-0.19%
Net Revenue Excess/ (Deficiency)	(32.1)	(5.7)	(5.7)
Provision for Income Taxes [1]	(19.7)	(3.5)	(3.5)
Revenue Excess/ (Deficiency)	(51.8)		
Gross Revenue Excess/ (Deficiency)	**(51.8)**	**(9.2)**	**(9.2)**

Footnotes:

1 Income Tax Rate at 38.00%