

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF an application by Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. for: an order or orders granting leave to construct a natural gas pipeline and ancillary facilities in the Town of Milton, City of Markham, Town of Richmond Hill, City of Brampton, City of Toronto, City of Vaughan and the Region of Halton, the Region of Peel and the Region of York; and an order or orders approving the methodology to establish a rate for transportation services for TransCanada Pipelines Limited;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an application by Union Gas Limited for: an Order or Orders for pre-approval of recovery of the cost consequences of all facilities associated with the development of the proposed Parkway West site; an Order or Orders granting leave to construct natural gas pipelines and ancillary facilities in the Town of Milton; an Order or Orders for pre-approval of recovery of the cost consequences of all facilities associated with the development of the proposed Brantford-Kirkwall/Parkway D Compressor Station project; an Order or Orders for pre-approval of the cost consequences of two long term short haul transportation contracts; and an Order or Orders granting leave to construct natural gas pipelines and ancillary facilities in the City of Cambridge and City of Hamilton.

**MOTION RECORD OF TRANSCANADA PIPELINES LIMITED
On the motion by Union Gas Limited and Gaz Métro**

Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP
340 Albert Street, Suite 1750
Ottawa, ON, K1R 6Y7

Gordon Cameron
613-788-2222
gord.cameron@blakes.com

Lawyers for TransCanada PipeLines Limited

TO:

Norton Rose Fulbright Canada LLP

Suite 2500, 1 Place Ville Marie
Montréal, QC H3B IR1
Fax: 514.286.5474

Eric Dunberry
Tel: 514.847.4492
Eric.Dunberry@nortonrosefulbright.com

Marie-Christine Hivon
Tel: 514.847.4805
Marie-Christine.Hivon@nortonrosefulbright.com

Lawyers for Gaz Metro

AND TO:

Aird & Berlis LLP

Brookfield Place, 181 Bay Street
Suite 1800, Box 754
Ottawa, ON M5J 2T9

Fred Cass
Tel: 416.865.7742
Fax: 416.863.1515

Lawyers for Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc.

AND TO:

Ontario Energy Board

2300 Yonge Street
27th Floor
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

AND TO:

Intervenors in EB-2012-0451/EB-2012-0433/EB-2013-0074

Table of contents

1. Pre-filed evidence of TransCanada PipeLines Limited
2. Written Submissions of TransCanada PipeLines Limited

TAB 1

Pre-filed evidence of TransCanada Pipelines Limited

1 **1.0 Introduction**

2 This evidence will address TransCanada's involvement in Segment A of the Enbridge Gas
3 Distribution (Enbridge) GTA Project. The evidence begins with a brief review of the evolution of
4 the role of TransCanada's Mainline in natural gas transportation in Ontario and the impact of
5 recent regulatory and commercial changes on that role. The evidence then discusses
6 TransCanada's discussions with Enbridge and Union Gas Limited (Union) regarding the efficient
7 development of natural gas transportation infrastructure in Ontario, and the Memorandum of
8 Understanding (MOU) between TransCanada and Enbridge that resulted from those discussions.
9 Finally, the evidence speaks to the potential impacts of Union's proposed facilities on the existing
10 transportation pipeline infrastructure in Ontario.

11 **2.0 The Evolution of Natural Gas Transportation on the TransCanada Mainline**

12 The TransCanada Mainline was originally conceived as a pipeline to transport Western Canadian
13 Sedimentary Basin natural gas from Empress, Alberta to eastern markets. With the advent of the
14 Alliance and Vector pipelines in 2001 came increased market interest in sourcing gas supply at
15 Union's Dawn Hub and transporting it on the Union and TransCanada systems.

16 Since 2003, TransCanada has worked to provide eastern market customers with short-haul
17 transportation (e.g. from Dawn) in the most cost effective manner possible. Beginning in 2003
18 and continuing until 2006, TransCanada was able to provide service away from the Dawn area
19 with a combination of Union Gas M12 service and the exchange of Mainline long-haul service to
20 the Dawn area. By serving these contracts using exchanges, TransCanada was able to provide
21 firm service without adding new facilities to the Mainline, and thus provide the service at a lower
22 cost to all Mainline shippers. There was no required expansion of the Union system for these
23 requests.

24 In 2006, 2007 and 2010 both TransCanada and Union coordinated the addition of facilities to their
25 respective systems to meet new short-haul requests sourced at Dawn that were destined for
26 markets at Iroquois, the GMi EDA and the Union EDA. In addition, where possible, TransCanada
27 continued to use its existing capacity away from Parkway to meet short-haul requests.

28 In the winter of 2008/2009, TransCanada determined that it could no longer rely on long-haul
29 nominations to the Dawn/Niagara/Chippawa area to effect the exchanges required to meet some
30 of its short-haul requirements. As a result TransCanada, after discussion with its stakeholders
31 (including Union Gas and Enbridge) at the Tolls Task Force, implemented use of a temporary
32 "must-nominate" service to Dawn ("DOS-MN") and then eventually contracted for firm capacity
33 between St. Clair and Emerson on the Great Lakes Gas Transmission ("GLGT") system along
34 with additional "Dawn to Dawn" service with Union Gas to ensure physical transportation of gas
35 away from Dawn when required. TransCanada's goal—which was achieved with these
36 arrangements—continued to be to provide the service at the lowest possible cost to shippers.

37 In 2010, TransCanada and Union Gas worked together to facilitate the transportation of Marcellus
38 shale gas sourced at the Niagara receipt point on the TransCanada system to Eastern Canadian

1 markets. TransCanada contracted for Union M12 capacity between Kirkwall and Parkway to
2 transport some of this gas, which began to flow in November 2012.

3 **3.0 Events in 2012**

4 In 2012, while TransCanada was preparing for a new open season to test interest in transporting
5 additional Marcellus shale volumes to market via Niagara and Chippawa, Union Gas and
6 Enbridge Gas Distribution (“EGD”) proposed their “Parkway Extension” project to bypass the
7 TransCanada Mainline between Parkway and the Maple compressor station. The Parkway
8 Extension project came as a surprise to TransCanada. Union was aware that TransCanada was
9 preparing an open season to attract Marcellus shale volumes and that TransCanada wanted to
10 coordinate that open season with Union. However, TransCanada proceeded with its open
11 season as originally planned and offered expansion capacity away from Parkway. Union and
12 Gaz Metropolitain (Gaz Métro) bid successfully into TransCanada’s open season.

13 TransCanada initially proposed to have the facilities to provide this service available for a 2014 in-
14 service date, but subsequently amended the in-service date in the Precedent Agreements to
15 2015 because TransCanada was in discussions with Enbridge to coordinate our respective
16 expansions, and Enbridge had delayed the in-service date of its facilities. Also, the revised in-
17 service date of the TransCanada expansion was realistic in light of TransCanada’s experience
18 (with its 2012 expansion) with the challenges of adding pipeline infrastructure in built-up areas of
19 Ontario.

20 At the same time, TransCanada participated in Union’s EB-2011-0210 proceeding. The purpose
21 of TransCanada’s intervention was to explore the necessity of Union’s proposed Parkway West
22 compressor, which Union indicated was to provide Loss of Critical Unit (LCU) protection to M12
23 shippers delivering gas through Parkway. TransCanada stated in its evidence that more dialogue
24 was needed with Union in this regard so that the best solution for Ontario gas consumers could
25 be found. The OEB concurred with TransCanada in its Reasons for Decision, and suggested that
26 Union, Enbridge and TransCanada should all be having more coordinated discussion with
27 regards to infrastructure in Ontario:

28 *The Board is concerned with the apparent lack of cooperation and*
29 *consultation between Union, Enbridge and TCPL that came to light in*
30 *this proceeding. The Board is concerned that this may have adverse*
31 *consequences for Ontario ratepayers – result in higher rates and costs*
32 *than would otherwise be the case, contribute to the uneconomic bypass*
33 *of existing natural gas infrastructure, create asset stranding, encourage*
34 *the proliferation of natural gas infrastructure, and lead to the*
35 *underutilization of existing natural gas infrastructure.*

36 *The Board agrees that the consideration of the Parkway West facilities requires a wider*
37 *perspective. The Board therefore encourages Union to engage TCPL, Enbridge and*
38 *shippers in a consultative process, the purpose of which is to jointly consider the need for*
39 *the Parkway West project, explore reasonable alternatives (including the repurposing of*
40 *existing facilities) in order to maximize the benefit to Ontario ratepayers. The result of this*

1 *process would then be filed with Union's Leave to Construct application for the Parkway*
2 *West facilities.*

3 **4.0 TransCanada and Ontario LDC coordination**

4 Subsequent to the EB-2011-0210 proceeding, TransCanada, Enbridge and Union met several
5 times to discuss the optimal infrastructure requirements to serve the Greater Toronto Area
6 ("GTA") market and eastern markets downstream of Parkway.

7 Enbridge's intention prior to discussions with TransCanada was to build Segment A directly from
8 its connection with Union at Parkway and into the Enbridge franchise area. Prior to discussions
9 with Enbridge, TransCanada's intention had been to expand for the requests received in its May
10 2012 new capacity open season by building facilities between Parkway and Maple. In an effort to
11 collaborate and build the most efficient expansion to meet market needs, TransCanada and
12 Enbridge came together to discuss joint ownership of Segment A to provide both economic and
13 environmental benefits. Union also had discussions with TransCanada and Enbridge and all
14 three companies subsequently met to coordinate the expansion of this infrastructure.

15 Through those discussions, it was agreed that TransCanada and Enbridge would collaborate on
16 the infrastructure to serve the GTA and markets downstream of Parkway, which led to the
17 development and execution of the MOU. It was also agreed that Union would construct the
18 Parkway West compressor for loss of critical unit protection and such further compression as
19 might be needed to meet new firm contractual requirements.

20 TransCanada intended to utilize its share of capacity on the new Segment A and new
21 TransCanada facilities from Albion to west of Maple (TransCanada's King's North project) to
22 satisfy the capacity requirements in the precedent agreements with Union and Gaz Métro.

23 TransCanada and Enbridge intended to have joint ownership of Segment A. Ultimately,
24 however, it was decided that the same result could be achieved more practically if Enbridge built
25 and owned Segment A and charged TransCanada an amount equal to what would have been
26 TransCanada's ownership equity contribution, but in the form of a long term transportation
27 contract. This avoided the complication of having two regulators responsible for the same
28 facilities. The intention remained that this would be an Enbridge / TransCanada project, with
29 access to the facilities being provided by TransCanada using its portion of the capacity on
30 Segment A to serve eastern markets in a fair, non-discriminatory way. As noted in Schedule D of
31 the MOU, the contractual arrangement between TransCanada and Enbridge was to replicate as
32 much as was commercially practicable, the same commercial effect as if Segment A was jointly
33 owned by the parties.

34 It was never the intention of the parties for Enbridge to become a transmission provider in the
35 normal sense. Enbridge will use its space on the line solely for local distribution purposes. The
36 TransCanada portion of capacity on Segment A will be used by TransCanada to meet its
37 contractual obligations to transport gas for its customers.

1 In this regard it is important to note the following distinction between the contractual and
2 operational features of the MOU. Contractually, TransCanada will deliver gas to Enbridge at
3 Bram West (the inlet to Segment A). However, operationally, Segment A will act as a loop of the
4 TransCanada Mainline between Parkway and Maple, with a physical delivery to Enbridge at
5 Albion. The flows onto Segment A will be controlled by TransCanada.

6 As noted above, TransCanada was initially proposing to construct facilities in the Parkway to
7 Maple corridor (looping around Brampton and / or Vaughan) to meet its contractual and
8 operational requirements. Through the MOU, the same operational benefits accrue to
9 TransCanada without the need for duplication of facilities. That is, TransCanada's capacity on
10 Segment A, when combined with the Albion to Maple (King's North) TransCanada expansion,
11 acts as a loop of the TransCanada system.

12 Through the construction and normal operation of Segment A and TransCanada's King's North
13 expansion, Segment A will act as an integrated portion of the TransCanada system with no
14 requirement for nomination, flow measurement or other methods of control, of the TransCanada
15 portion of the flow. The pipeline flow on Segment A will vary based on Enbridge's daily nominated
16 requirements at Bramwest and the operation of other portions of the TransCanada system and
17 will be as a result of a hydraulic balance between TransCanada's existing Parkway to Maple Line
18 and Segment A. Under design day conditions, TransCanada will be utilizing its full allotment of
19 the capacity (50%) to meet its contractual obligations. Notwithstanding the above, for
20 maintenance requirements and safety circumstances Enbridge will have the ability to interrupt the
21 flow on Segment A through valves, while communicating and working with TransCanada as the
22 specific circumstance requires.

23 TransCanada will not be able to "nominate" service as it would, for example, with Great Lakes or
24 Union TBO. Gas will simply flow on Segment A past Albion, depending on flows and pressures,
25 as if Segment A were a loop of the Mainline's Parkway to Maple line (or part of such a loop, as it
26 will be when TransCanada builds north from Albion in its King's North expansion).

27 **5.0 The National Energy Board's RH-003-2011 Decision**

28 In March of 2013 the National Energy Board ("NEB") issued its decision on TransCanada's 2012-
29 2013 Mainline tolls application (the "RH-003-2011 Decision"). The RH-003-2011 Decision, which
30 was issued after the MOU was entered into, was not expected by TransCanada, and made it
31 important to TransCanada and its shippers that TransCanada achieve the long term net revenue
32 projections on which the tolls set in the RH-003-2011 Decision are based.

33 The RH-003-2011 Decision fixed all of the Mainline firm service tolls for the (approximately five
34 year) period from 2013 to 2017 (the "Fixed Tolls Period"). The tolls were fixed at levels that will
35 not recover the costs that TransCanada incurs during the Fixed Tolls Period. Instead,
36 TransCanada was ordered to defer approximately \$700 million of Fixed Tolls Period costs by
37 adding them to rate base.

38 The RH-003-2011 Decision also established a deferral account (the "Toll Stabilization Account" or
39 "TSA") to track variations between TransCanada's actual net revenue and the estimated net

1 revenue for each year of the Fixed Tolls Period. A positive balance in the TSA at the end of the
2 Fixed Tolls Period will be applied to reduce future tolls. A negative balance in the TSA will be
3 recovered from TransCanada's shippers unless this would cause a realization of "fundamental
4 risk" on the Mainline. In this latter case, TransCanada's ability to recover any of the Mainline
5 revenue requirement (from existing rate base or post-RH-003-2011 Decision capital investment)
6 will come under review by the NEB.

7 The TSA relies on a forecast of throughput on the Mainline for the Fixed Tolls Period. Long term
8 throughput forecasts come with a substantial possibility of variances between the forecasts and
9 actual throughput, and if there is a negative variance in throughput there could be a negative
10 balance in the TSA when the time comes for its disposition.

11 The RH-003-2011 Decision has had a major impact on the terms under which TransCanada is
12 able to invest in new facilities on the Mainline, for several reasons.

13 First, the NEB held that TransCanada's investments in the Mainline were not protected by a
14 "regulatory compact" or other regulatory principle that entitled TransCanada to a reasonable
15 opportunity to recover the Mainline's costs. The NEB said that it had the authority to, and would if
16 appropriate, disallow TransCanada's recovery of its prudently incurred costs. As noted, this
17 would apply to future investments as well as existing rate base.

18 Second, tolls will be fixed from 2013 to 2017, so (absent an exception being made by the NEB)
19 there will be no way to adjust tolls during that period so as to recover any costs associated with
20 new facilities. The estimates that the NEB used to set the benchmark net revenues for the period
21 did not include any amount for new facilities. Accordingly, any costs not recovered in tolls that
22 are incurred constructing new facilities during this period would have a negative impact on the
23 TSA balance and thus increase the possibility that the NEB will disallow some part of
24 TransCanada's future revenue requirements.

25 As a result of the RH-003-2011 Decision: (1) TransCanada requires greater assurances than it
26 has had in the past that it will recover its investment in any new facilities and its existing rate base
27 from customers; and (2) TransCanada must recover its investment in the Mainline in a way that
28 does not exert a negative pressure on the TSA balance and, by doing so, put the recovery of the
29 entire Mainline revenue requirement in issue.

30 One consequence of the RH-003-2011 Decision is that TransCanada decided not to build
31 facilities to serve the 2012 open season precedent agreement with Gaz Métro or the service
32 request from Union, given that those arrangements were entered into under the pre-RH-003-2011
33 Decision regime, when TransCanada believed that the National Energy Board would at least give
34 TransCanada a reasonable opportunity to recover its prudently incurred costs.

35 Despite the disincentives to invest in new capacity on the Mainline that arise from the RH-003-
36 2011 Decision, TransCanada is in discussions with the eastern LDCs to find a way to expand
37 TransCanada's capacity in the Eastern Triangle in a manner that meets the incremental
38 requirements of the LDCs while providing TransCanada with a reasonable expectation that it will
39 recover its existing and future investments. In addition to discussions with the eastern LDCs,

1 TransCanada has recently posted a new capacity open season for short-haul and long-haul
2 capacity to eastern markets. TransCanada will invest capital in the Mainline as long as doing so
3 does not expose the company to increased risk that it will not recover its revenue requirement.

4 TransCanada intends to apply to the NEB by the end of 2013 for approval to construct the
5 interconnections required to accommodate Segment A of Enbridge's GTA Project and the
6 facilities associated with TransCanada's King's North Project.

7 **6.0 Item 14 of the OEB Filing Guidelines**

8 Item 14 of the OEB Filing Guidelines on the Economic Tests for Transmission Pipeline
9 Applications states:

10 "Any project brought before the Board for approval should be supported
11 by an assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed natural gas
12 pipelines on the existing transportation pipeline infrastructure in Ontario,
13 including an assessment of the impacts on Ontario consumers in terms
14 of cost, rates, reliability, and access to supplies."

15 TransCanada is providing the following comment in support of this guideline.

16 The decision of Union and Gaz Métro to decontract TransCanada long-
17 haul capacity and replace it with short-haul capacity has two major
18 impacts on Ontario gas users. The first major impact is that
19 TransCanada loses substantial long-haul revenue—approximately \$150
20 million—with a potential consequential impact long-term on all
21 TransCanada tolls paid by Ontario gas users. The second major impact
22 is that Ontario gas users incur additional costs as a result of constructing
23 facilities to accommodate the new short-haul capacity. TransCanada
24 will continue to analyze these impacts in comparison to the savings that
25 Ontario gas consumers could realize by sourcing more gas through
26 short-haul transportation services.

TAB 2

Written Submissions of TransCanada PipeLines Limited

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS OF TRANSCANADA PIPELINES LIMITED
ON THE MOTION BY UNION GAS LIMITED AND GAZ MÉTRO

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

1. It is the position of TransCanada Pipelines Limited (TransCanada) that the Memorandum of Understanding between TransCanada and Enbridge Gas Distribution Inc. (Enbridge) dated January 28, 2013, as amended (the MOU) is a valid and binding legal agreement that promotes the efficient development of natural gas transportation infrastructure in Ontario, to the benefit of Ontario gas users and in Ontario's public interest.
2. The principles underpinning the MOU will result in the intent of the Storage and Transportation Access Rule (the STAR or the Rule) being fully met, such that the transportation arrangements that will result from the MOU approval of Enbridge's request for transportation tariff terms as applied for, if necessary by way of an exemption pursuant to section 1.7.1 of the STAR.

BACKGROUND TO THE MOU

3. TransCanada participated in Board's EB-2011-0210 proceeding concerning Union's 2013 rates, the application for which included Union's plans for the proposed Parkway West compressor, which Union indicated was to provide Loss of Critical Unit (LCU) protection to M12 shippers delivering gas through Parkway. TransCanada stated in its evidence that more dialogue was needed with Union regarding the need for these facilities so that the best solution for Ontario gas consumers could be found. The OEB concurred with TransCanada in its Reasons for Decision, and suggested that Union, Enbridge and TransCanada should all be having more coordinated discussion with regards to infrastructure in Ontario:

The Board is concerned with the apparent lack of cooperation and consultation between Union, Enbridge and TCPL that came to light in this proceeding. The Board is concerned that this may have adverse consequences for Ontario ratepayers – result in higher rates and costs than would otherwise be the case, contribute to the uneconomic bypass of existing natural gas infrastructure, create asset stranding, encourage the proliferation of natural gas infrastructure, and lead to the underutilization of existing natural gas infrastructure.

The Board agrees that the consideration of the Parkway West facilities requires a wider perspective. The Board therefore encourages Union to engage TCPL, Enbridge and shippers in a consultative process, the purpose of which is to jointly consider the need for the Parkway West project, explore reasonable alternatives (including the repurposing of existing facilities) in order to maximize the benefit to Ontario ratepayers. The result of this process would then be filed with Union's Leave to Construct application for the Parkway West facilities.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.2

4. Subsequent to the EB-2011-0210 proceeding, TransCanada, Enbridge and Union met several times to discuss the optimal infrastructure requirements to serve the Greater Toronto Area ("GTA") market and eastern markets downstream of Parkway.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.3

5. Enbridge's intention prior to discussions with TransCanada was to build Segment A directly from its connection with Union at Parkway and into the Enbridge franchise area. Prior to discussions with Enbridge, TransCanada's intention had been to expand for the requests received in its May 2012 new capacity open season by building facilities between Parkway and Maple. In an effort to collaborate and build the most efficient expansion to meet market needs, TransCanada and Enbridge came together to discuss joint ownership of Segment A to provide both economic and environmental benefits. Union also had discussions with TransCanada and Enbridge and all three companies subsequently met to coordinate the expansion of this infrastructure.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.3

6. Through those discussions, it was agreed that TransCanada and Enbridge would collaborate on the infrastructure to serve the GTA and markets downstream of Parkway, which led to the development and execution of the MOU. It was also agreed that Union would construct the Parkway West compressor for loss of critical unit protection and such further compression as might be needed to meet new firm contractual requirements. As a result of the MOU, both Enbridge and TransCanada will build fewer facilities than originally planned.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.3

THE INTENT AND EFFECT OF THE MOU

7. Originally, TransCanada and Enbridge intended to have joint ownership of what is referred to in Enbridge's leave to construct application as Segment A. Ultimately, however, it was decided that the same result could be achieved more practically if Enbridge built and owned Segment A and charged TransCanada an amount equal to what would have been TransCanada's ownership equity contribution, but in the form of a long term transportation contract. This avoided the complication of having two regulators responsible for the same facilities. The intention remained that this would be an Enbridge / TransCanada project, with access to the facilities being provided by TransCanada using its portion of the capacity on Segment A to serve eastern markets in a fair, non-discriminatory way. As noted in Schedule D of the MOU, the contractual arrangement between TransCanada and Enbridge was to replicate as much as was commercially practicable, the same commercial effect as if Segment A was jointly owned by the parties.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.3

8. It was never the intention of the parties for Enbridge to become a transmission provider in the normal sense. Enbridge will use its space on the line solely for local distribution purposes. The TransCanada portion of capacity on Segment A will be used by TransCanada to meet its contractual obligations to transport gas for its customers.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.3

9. In this regard it is important to note the following distinction between the contractual and operational features of the MOU. Contractually, TransCanada will deliver gas to Enbridge at Bram West (the inlet to Segment A). However, operationally, Segment A will act as a loop of the TransCanada Mainline between Parkway and Maple, with a physical delivery to Enbridge at Albion. The flows onto Segment A will be controlled by TransCanada.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.4

10. As noted above, TransCanada was initially proposing to construct facilities in the Parkway to Maple corridor (looping around Brampton and / or Vaughan) to meet its contractual and operational requirements. Through the MOU, the same operational benefits accrue to TransCanada without the need for duplication of facilities. That is, TransCanada's capacity on Segment A, when combined with the Albion to Maple (King's North) TransCanada expansion, acts as a loop of the TransCanada system.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.4

11. Through the construction and normal operation of Segment A and TransCanada's King's North expansion, Segment A will act as an integrated portion of the TransCanada system with no requirement for nomination, flow measurement or other methods of control, of the TransCanada portion of the flow. The pipeline flow on Segment A will vary based on Enbridge's daily nominated requirements at Bramwest and the operation of other portions of the TransCanada system and will be as a result of a hydraulic balance between TransCanada's existing Parkway to Maple Line and Segment A. Under design day conditions, TransCanada will be utilizing its full allotment of the capacity (50%) to meet its contractual obligations. Notwithstanding the above, for maintenance requirements and safety circumstances Enbridge will have the ability to interrupt the flow on Segment A through valves, while communicating and working with TransCanada as the specific circumstance requires.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.4

12. TransCanada will not be able to "nominate" service as it would, for example, with Great Lakes or Union TBO. Gas will simply flow on Segment A past Albion, depending on flows and pressures, as if Segment A were a loop of the Mainline's Parkway to Maple line (or part of such a loop, as it will be when TransCanada builds north from Albion in its King's North expansion).

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.4

13. For these reasons, TransCanada's transportation services agreement (TSA) with EGD for the gas that is moved on Segment A will bear no relation to a typical transportation contract. The TSA will be a surrogate for what would have been TransCanada's 50% ownership interest in Segment A, and Segment A will operate as a passive loop of the TransCanada system. TransCanada will not be able to nominate volumes on Segment A, as it would be able to do under a typical transportation contract, but will simply receive into its system, at the Albion end of Segment A, such gas as EGD does not take at Albion.
14. TransCanada will use its portion of the capacity on Segment A to serve its customers, as it uses its TBO capacity on Union and Great Lakes. TransCanada is regulated by the National Energy Board and required by the *National Energy Board Act* to offer services in a manner that is not unduly discriminatory. Accordingly, the objectives of the STAR will be met without the need for Enbridge to hold an open season for transportation capacity on Segment A.

MEETING ONTARIO'S PRESENT AND FUTURE GAS TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

15. Despite the disincentives to invest in new capacity on the Mainline that arise from the RH-003-2011 Decision, TransCanada is in discussions with the eastern LDCs to find a way to expand TransCanada's capacity in the Eastern Triangle in a manner that meets the incremental requirements of the LDCs while providing TransCanada with a reasonable expectation that it will recover its existing and future investments. In addition to discussions with the eastern LDCs, TransCanada has recently posted a new capacity open season for short-haul and long-haul capacity to eastern markets. TransCanada will invest capital in the Mainline as long as doing so does not expose the company to increased risk that it will not recover its revenue requirement.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.5

16. TransCanada intends to apply to the NEB by the end of 2013 for approval to construct the interconnections required to accommodate Segment A of Enbridge's GTA Project and the facilities associated with TransCanada's King's North Project.

Reference: TransCanada pre-filed evidence, Motion Record Tab 1, p.6

All of which is respectfully submitted this 9th day of July, 2013

Gordon Cameron

Gordon Cameron

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP

Solicitors for TransCanada PipeLines Limited