

vder Wright Blair & Holmes LLP

June 1, 2006

VIA SAME DAY COURIER

Ontario Energy Board 2300 Yonge Street 27th Floor Toronto, Ontario, M4P 1E4

Attention: John Zych, Board Secretary

Dear Mr. Zych

Re:

City of Kitchener - NGEIR Undertakings

Board File No.: EB-2005-0551.

Enclosed please find 10 hard copies of the responses to Undertakings by the City of Kitchener, pursuant to the Board's Procedural Order No. 7.

Yours truly,

RYDER WRIGHT BLAIR & HOLMES LLP

J. Alick Ryder, Q.C.

JAR/rg Encls.

cc:

All EB-2005-0551 Participants

333 Adelaide Street West 3rd floor Toronto ON M5V 1R5 T. 416-340-9070 F. 416-340-9250

Undertaking No. 1 - To provide a definition of the rate classes

Response:

Kitchener provides gas delivery service to its end use customers under Rates M2, M4 and M5. The eligibility criteria and rate structure for each of these rates are identical to the criteria and rate structure of Union's Rates M2, M4 and M5 in the Southern Area.

Witness: D. Quinn & J. Gruenbauer

Undertaking No. 2 – To provide determination of how much of the load was interruptible on peak days.

This Undertaking is a multi-part question. Kitchener has responded below in four parts. Part (a) provides historical monthly gas demand by rate class. Parts (b) and (c) provide information with respect to historical peak day demand and the level of curtailment of interruptible customers. Part (d) provides a description of weather normalization techniques used to develop forecasts of gas demand by Kitchener.

Part (a) Kitchener's actual monthly deliveries by rate class for the past five (5) calendar years is provided in the tables below (volumes are in 10^3 m³).

	M2	M4	M5	Total
Jan-01	38,342	3,639	2,667	44,649
Feb-01	34,138	3,209	2,417	39,764
Mar-01	32,306	3,424	2,558	38,288
Apr-01	17,461	2,486	1,775	21,721
May-01	8,144	1,982	1,644	11,769
Jun-01	6,356	1,891	1,521	9,767
Jul-01	5,564	1,467	1,379	8,410
Aug-01	5,334	1,840	1,398	8,572
Sep-01	7,185	1,875	1,454	10,515
Oct-01	15,219	2,425	1,587	19,231
Nov-01	19,825	2,771	1,871	24,467
Dec-01 _	29,485	2,623	2,140	34,247
_	219,360	29,630	22,410	271,401

Witness: D. Quinn & J. Gruenbauer

	M2	M4	M5	Total	
Jan-02	34,558	3,278	2,431	40,267	
Feb-02	32,236	3,077	2,274	37,587	
Mar-02	32,111	3,596	2,231	37,938	
Apr-02	19,741	2,921	1,814	24,476	
May-02	14,237	2,826	1,719	18,782	
Jun-02	6,266	1,992	1,471	9,728	
Jul-02	5,187	1,616	1,367	8,170	
Aug-02	5,377	2,023	1,374	8,775	
Sep-02	5,710	2,026	1,371	9,108	
Oct-02	17,053	2,762	1,825	21,640	
Nov-02	27,125	3,226	2,035	32,385	
Dec-02	36,829	3,114	2,088	42,031	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	236,430	32,457	22,001	290,887	
Jan-03	45,582	4,046	1,378	51,006	
Feb-03	35,164	2,817	7,244	45,226	
Mar-03	26,333	3,768	7,555	37,657	
Apr-03	16,809	3,308	6,643	26,760	
May-03	7,345	2,651	5,165	15,160	
Jun-03	3,683	2,199	4,229	10,111	
Jul-03	2,963	1,850	3,676	8,489	
Aug-03	2,326	2,145	3,864	8,335	
Sep-03	3,751	2,211	4,289	10,251	
Oct-03	12,223	3,011	6,027	21,261	
Nov-03	23,473	3,223	2,067	28,763	
Dec-03	32,976	3,247	2,174	38,397	
is acoustic	212,628	34,476	54,311	301,415	

Witness: D. Quinn & J. Gruenbauer Answer: June 2, 2006 Docket: EB-2005-0551

	M2	M4	M5	Total	
Jan-04	47,026	3,976	1,817	52,818	
Feb-04	35,641	3,943	2,176	41,761	
Mar-04	30,731	3,478	2,164	36,373	
Apr-04	19,145	2,884	1,899	23,927	
May-04	10,054	2,489	1,731	14,275	
Jun-04	5,920	2,358	841	9,119	
Jul-04	5,217	1,928	641	7,786	
Aug-04	5,620	2,257	665	8,542	
Sep-04	5,743	2,430	1,316	9,490	
Oct-04	13,641	2,772	1,602	18,016	
Nov-04	23,312	3,298	1,870	28,479	
Dec-04	37,683	3,510	2,017	43,210	
	239,733	35,323	18,739	293,795	
Jan-05	44,958	3,747	2,227	50,931	
Feb-05	35,145	3,206	2,009	40,360	
Mar-05	34,491	3,336	2,118	39,944	
Apr-05	18,460	2,539	1,776	22,775	
May-05	12,095	2,092	1,683	15,869	
Jun-05	5,477	1,935	1,382	8,793	
Jul-05	4,885	1,519	981	7,385	
Aug-05	5,346	2,056	1,384	8,785	
Sep-05	5,640	2,070	976	8,686	
Oct-05	13,727	2,562	1,515	17,804	
Nov-05	24,579	3,170	1,760	29,510	
Dec-05	39,348	3,554	1,988	44,890	
	244,149	31,785	19,799	295,733	

Witness: D. Quinn & J. Gruenbauer Answer: June 2, 2006 Docket: EB-2005-0551

Part (b)
Historical Peak Days – Five Highest Days

Five Peak Days in last 5 years

	Volume (GJ)	Volume (m3)	<u>Date</u>	Curtailed	Volume m3
1	82,908	2,196,820	Saturday, January 22, 2005	No	
2	80,199	2,125,040	Thursday, January 15, 2004	Yes	93,105
3	80,033	2,120,641	Friday, January 21, 2005	No	
4	79,701	2,111,844	Monday, January 17, 2005	No	
5	78,852	2,089,355	Thursday, January 27, 2005	No	

Part (c)

Historical Peak Days - Peak Day in Each of Last Five Years

		Peak Da	Volume			
<u>Volume</u> (GJ)		Volume (m3)	<u>Date</u>	Curtailed	m3	
1	82,908	2,196,820	Saturday, January 22, 2005	No		
2	80,199	2,125,040	Thursday, January 15, 2004	Yes	93,105	
3	76,505	2,027,147	Thursday, January 23, 2003	Yes	93,105	
4	59,454	1,575,358	Friday, January 18, 2002	No		
5	64,597	1,711,626	Tuesday, January 02, 2001	No		

Witness: D. Quinn & J. Gruenbauer

Part (d)

Weather Normalization

Kitchener uses an aggregate weather normalization technique to develop demand forecasts and has been doing so since 2003. Prior to 2003, Kitchener developed its demand forecast based on a hybrid of a number of months of past experience. However, Kitchener does not normalize its actual delivery volumes to adjust them for weather variations.

With respect to the role of weather normalization to develop a reasonable forecast of gas demand, in RP-2003-0063, Union Gas submitted an annual demand forecast of 286,000 $10^3 \,\mathrm{m}^3$ for Kitchener (2004 test year forecast). Union developed this forecast by taking the average of Kitchener's actual aggregate demand over the previous 3 years and adding 1% for growth. As noted in the record of that proceeding, Kitchener took issue both with Union's methodology and Kitchener's lack of input into the forecast. Kitchener provided Union with its weather-normalized forecast in a letter dated July 14, 2003. Kitchener produced this demand forecast by a simple regression analysis of the last 10 years of monthly volumes projected using the last 28 years of degree day history (30 years was not available in our records at that time). The forecast provided by Kitchener is embedded in the chart below.

In Kitchener's view, its methodology provided a better forecast than the use of a 3 year average actual demand plus 1% which neglected weather and the robust customer growth in Kitchener's service territory. Pursuant to the Board's direction in RP-2003-0063, Kitchener met with Union and reached agreement on the forecast approach. Based on this agreement on methodology, Kitchener accepted Union's weather normalization modeling for use in <u>forecasting</u> its gas demand (but Kitchener currently does not use that model, or any other model, to normalize actual volumes for weather).

The result was an agreed upon forecast that Kitchener has also included in the table below for the years 2005-2007 (volumes are in 10^3 m³).

Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
20041	51784	44590	37988	23478	14887	10270	7900	8502	12565	20847	29854	43769	306433
2005	49711	44313	38494	26375	15192	10354	8728	8476	10910	21466	31361	42569	307947
2006	51200	45433	39342	26847	15516	10503	8850	8547	11050	21853	31954	43529	314625
2007	52734	46582	40209	27328	15848	10654	8974	8619	11192	22248	32557	44510	321455

Witness: D. Quinn & J. Gruenbauer

¹ The 2004 forecast is derived from Kitchener's methodology. The remaining years forecast was provided using the revised Union Gas / Kitchener methodology.