

Diane Roy

Vice President, Regulatory Affairs

Gas Regulatory Affairs Correspondence Email: gas.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com

Electric Regulatory Affairs Correspondence Email: <u>electricity.regulatory.affairs@fortisbc.com</u> **FortisBC**

16705 Fraser Highway Surrey, B.C. V4N 0E8 Tel: (604) 576-7349 Cell: (604) 908-2790 Fax: (604) 576-7074

Email: diane.roy@fortisbc.com

www.fortisbc.com

June 9, 2017

Cascadia Energy Ltd.
Suite 2 – 720 Beatty Street
Vancouver, B.C.
V6B 2M1

Attention: Mr. Nick Caumanns, President

Dear Mr. Caumanns:

Re: FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI)

Project No. 3698899

2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)

Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1

On December 19, 2017, FEI filed the Application referenced above. In accordance with the British Columbia Utilities Commission Order G-30-17 setting out the Regulatory Timetable for the review of the Application, FEI respectfully submits the attached response to Cascadia IR No. 1.

If further information is required, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

FORTISBC ENERGY INC.

Original signed:

Diane Roy

Attachments

cc (email only): Commission Secretary

Registered Parties



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 1

1 Question 1

2 Page	10-14
--------	-------

- 14 In part due to the above described balancing provisions, the amount of inventory held on FEI's
- **15 System can vary.**
 - a. Please describe whether this inventory is physical or virtual.

78 Response:

Pipeline line-pack is physical. FEI manages system supply and demand imbalances in total, taking into account line-pack, Operational Balancing Agreements (OBA), storage injections or withdrawals or gas sold in the market. Inventories held on FEI's system on behalf of transportation customers are virtual and represent an accounting of the daily and cumulative imbalance between supply and demand.

b. What is theoretically the maximum amount of inventory that the system can hold?

Response:

The following table shows the maximum theoretical line-pack of FEI's three main transmission systems (Coastal, Interior and Vancouver Island):

Region	Theoretical Maximum Line- pack (in 10³m³)
Coastal Transmission System	4748
Interior Transmission System	14789
Vancouver Island Transmission System	6434

Note that "theoretical maximum" represents inventory levels in static systems with zero demand, and is therefore practically unachievable and unsustainable. As a comparison, the next table lists the highest historical line-pack inventory seen in the same three systems in the past five years.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 2

Region	Highest Line-pack recorded from 2012-2017 (in 103m3)
Coastal Transmission System	4523
Interior Transmission System	13539
Vancouver Island Transmission System	5969

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

It is important to understand that the Interior system is subdivided into different pipeline sections that do not necessarily share common inventory due to location and/or difference in pipeline operating pressure. An example would be the Southern Crossing Pipeline (SCP). The line-pack inventory held in the rest of the Interior system cannot be transferred to the SCP due to the latter's higher operating pressure. The numbers provided above are regional totals and do not take into account these pipeline differences.

It is also important to differentiate that the numbers provided above represent highest total linepack inventory, and not usable line-pack inventory. Usable line-pack is dynamically determined on a continuous basis and therefore not tracked, and is dependent on a variety of factors such as weather conditions, system demand, pipeline operational requirements, and the operational state of interconnecting pipelines.

13

14

15 16

C. What is the minimum volume obligation FortisBC has to return inventory to customers on any given day?

17 18 19

Response:

20 FEI is not obligated to provide a minimum volume of imbalance return. Imbalance return is an 21 22

interruptible service for which FEI reserves the right to reduce or eliminate this service. FEI typically reduces or eliminates this service when colder weather occurs.

Historically, FEI has set imbalance returns to 40,000 GJ at each of the Lower Mainland and the Interior locations. With the amalgamation of the gas utilities in January 2015, transportation customers on Vancouver Island were pooled with existing groups in the Lower Mainland. If Shipper Agents choose to pool their Vancouver Island customers in a daily Lower Mainland group, then this service will be available to Vancouver Island customers as well.

28

23

24

25

26

27

29



3

4

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9. 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 3

d. What is the approximate range of physical "line-pack", in its conventionally understood meaning and stated in energy units of GJ's, that the FortisBC system has?

5 Response:

- 6 Measurement data for the period November 1, 2012 to May 15, 2017 illustrates the line-pack
- 7 operating range for each of the regions within the FEI system as follows (Minimum / Maximum /
- 8 Average measurement expressed in GJ):
- 9 1. Vancouver Island Transmission System 133,500 / 237,300 / 201,900
- 10 2. Coastal Transmission System 134,500 / 182,600 / 165,900
- 11 3. Interior Transmission System 288,700 / 552,300 / 400,600
- 12 The Interior system above is comprised of three segments including Savona to Oliver, Oliver to
- 13 East Kootenay Exchange (EKE), and the Southern Crossing Pipeline (SCP).
- 14 The line-pack for each of the systems above will vary based on operational conditions and
- 15 subject to changes in firm core load and system balancing requirements, third-party regional
- 16 pipeline capacity and maintenance driven constraints, and FEI system capacity and
- 17 maintenance driven procedures.
- 18 The line-pack is required to meet operational pressure parameters and a directional flow of gas.
- 19 Usable line-pack, or actual volume of gas that can be used as a supplement to system demand
- 20 balancing, varies and is typically less than the overall available system line-pack.



3

4

5

6

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
esponse to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 4

Question 2

2	Page	10-14
---	------	-------

28 As seen in Figure 10-5 below, gas supply frequently deviates from demand by as much as

29 50,000 GJ/day once the day comes to a close.

Given that Fortis allows up to 40,000 of inventory return is 50,000 GJ of "undersupply" causing a 10,000 GJ variance onerous over the total load?

7 8 9

Response:

- 10 Imbalance return is a service which FEI provides to Shipper Agents in order for them to access 11 their banked supplies on the system. This service provides a benefit to Shipper Agents as the 12 gas from imbalance returns is added to their physical supply brought onto the system, which
- 13 can help to reduce the potential for balancing charges.
- 14 When transportation customers oversupply or request imbalance return service to draft the
- 15 system, FEI uses midstream resources, including upstream and downstream storage,
- 16 Westcoast OBA, or the buying and/or selling of gas on the day, in order to provide either of
- 17 these services.
- 18 While FEI has historically allowed the withdrawal of banked inventory using imbalance return to
- 19 a maximum of 40,000 GJ, the actual amount used on the day is typically less.
- 20 Regardless of the cause of the variance, a swing of 50 TJ on a given day is significant and
- requires FEI to bring the system back into balance. 21

22 23

24

What is the maximum amount of over supply? b.

25 26 27

Response:

- 28 The maximum amount of oversupply that the FEI system can absorb on a daily basis is different 29 between the three major regional load centers, the Coastal Transmission System (CTS) that 30 serves the Lower Mainland, the Vancouver Island Transmission System that serves Vancouver 31 Island (VI System) and the Interior Transmission System (ITS) that serves the B.C. Interior.
- 32 Based on historical data, the CTS has an approximate maximum usable line-pack space of
- 33 46,000 GJ that can potentially be used to absorb oversupply. Similarly, the approximate
- 34 maximum usable line-pack space on the VI System is 75,000 GJ, while the ITS has 247,000 GJ
- 35 for that purpose.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 5

When do under-supply situations occur in terms of peak or non-peak days? C. Response: On normal, non-peak days throughout the year, both over and undersupply situations can occur. On peak days, Shipper Agents tend to oversupply to avoid charges. However, there is no guarantee of an oversupply on peak days. FEI has observed that some Shipper Agents have undersupplied on peak day occasions and incurred charges. d. When do over-supply situations occur in terms of peak and non-peak days? Response:

Please refer to the response to Cascadia-FEI IR 1.2c.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 6

1 Question 3

2 Page	1	0-	14
--------	---	----	----

- 30 These imbalances require FEI to use
- 4 31 midstream resources to withdraw or inject quantities of gas, often on an intraday basis, to
 - 32 balance the entire System.
 - a. What is the coincidence of the use of these resources by FortisBC for core market and transport customer use? In other words, are these resources used coincidentally for the two different customer groups or are they used specifically for transport customer group?

12 Response:

When system imbalances occur either from sales or transportation customers, FEI responds in a timely manner to balance the system. FEI manages and balances the system as a unified whole.

b. What are the actual costs incurred in the use of the resources in each of the last three gas years?

Response:

The annual cost of the transportation and storage resources included in FEI's midstream portfolio is approximately \$170 million. The following table provides 2015 and 2016 actual and 2017 forecast costs incurred for firm transportation and storage services. The costs do not include mitigation or commodity-related charges.

	2015A	2016A	<u>2017F</u>
Storage & Transportation Costs	160	168	170
(CADS Million per Year)	160	100	170

c. What is the incremental costs caused by the transportation customer groups for the use of these resources in each of the last three years?



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 7

Response:

- 2 Midstream resources mostly include third party transportation and storage. These resources are
- 3 held on behalf of Rate Schedule 1 to 7 customers. Transportation customers do not pay for
- 4 these resources.
- 5 Black & Veatch used a replacement cost methodology which assessed the average cost of
- 6 securing balancing resources per GJ under various balancing tolerances.. Please refer to
- 7 Appendix 10-1 in the Application.

8



d.

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 8

Question 4 1 2 Page 10-15 3 18...Under normal 4 19 circumstances, FEI requests that shipper agents holding both daily and 5 monthly balanced 6 20 groups keep to a 2 to 3 day pack/draft balancing inventory level, which FEI has deemed to be 7 8 1 reasonable to manage the System as a whole. 9 Why has FortisBC "deemed" this as a reasonable amount? a. 10 11 Response: 12 FEI adopted the 2 to 3 day guideline in order to limit excessive drafting or packing. As stated on 13 page 10-16 of the Application, the 2 to 3 day guideline is based on the average consumption of 14 the daily and monthly balanced groups divided by the total inventory held. 15 16 17 18 b. When was the 2-3 day amount determined as reasonable? 19 20 Response: 21 FEI is unable to pinpoint specifically when this guideline was developed. The guideline has been 22 in place for a number of years and Shipper Agents have generally not questioned the need or 23 rationale for this balancing requirement. 24 25 26 27 For inventories larger than 2-3 days, where is the inventory held? C. 28 29 Response: 30 Please refer to the response to Cascadia-FEI IR 1.1a. 31 32

For all inventories held, what is the risk to FortisBC for holding those inventories?



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9. 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 9

12 Response:

The risk of holding these inventories is that FEI must return this gas on a later date, and may incur the use of midstream resources to do so. As indicated in the Application, FEI currently does not recover costs from transportation customers when midstream resources are used for this purpose.

e. For all inventories held, what is the cost to FortisBC for holding those inventories?

Response:

For managing inventories on FEI system, FEI may rely on its OBA with Westcoast, sell or purchase day gas, or inject into/withdraw from gas storage. In the Application, FEI quantified the variable costs involved in moving gas in and out of storage (see Table 10-9 on page 10-37). The total annual cost of FEI's midstream portfolio to hold storage and transportation resources under the Annual Contracting Plan is included in the response to Cascadia-FEI IR 1.3b.



6

7

8

9

10

11

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 10

Question 5

2	Page	10-	16
_	ıayc	10-	ייי

- 3 **22...These provisions include the ability for FEI**
- 23 to limit or reduce inventory, to modify the shipper agent's requested quantities to limit or adjust
 - 1 its inventory accumulation, and to limit or remove a shipper agent's excess inventory and return
 - 2 it at a later date.
 - a. Given the complete control FortisBC has over the timing and amount of inventory return, why are additional restrictions needed?

12 **Response:**

- The tools within the tariffs are in place for FEI to help manage specific Shipper Agents on both a group and individual basis as necessary.
- 15 FEI is proposing amendments to existing balancing tolerances. FEI observes that some Shipper
- 16 Agents manage their customer portfolio differently than others under the existing balancing
- 17 provisions. Given this, and the reasons explained in the Application, the proposed changes of
- 18 tightening the existing balancing provisions and establishing exclusive daily balancing will place
- 19 all transportation customers under the same set of rules and achieve an equal playing field for
- 20 all.

21 22

23 24

b. What control does FortisBC not have under the present rules and structures that the proposed changes will provide?

252627

Response:

FEI is unable to predict or control the behavior of Shipper Agents. However, the proposed changes provide incentives for Shipper Agents to manage their gas supply more closely and tightly.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 11

1 Question 6

2	Dogo	40	40
_	Page	יטו:	- 10

21 Balancing Tolerance: There are no daily balancing requirements applicable to monthly 22 balanced customers whereas daily balanced transportation customers are held to a 20%

23 tolerance level.

a. Are there any times when this is not true, such as during supply restrictions?

Response:

Yes, during a supply restriction all transportation customers including both daily and monthly balanced customers must adhere to a 5 percent balancing tolerance.

12

3

4

5

6

7



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9. 2017
3 11 (11)	, , ,
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 12

1 Question 7

2	Page	10	-19
_	ıauc	I U	- 13

- 7 10.4.1 Balancing Provisions
- 4 8 Monthly balanced customers do not incur the same charges that daily balanced customers are
 - 9 subject to, which does not accord with Principle 3 or Principle 8. Monthly balanced customers
 - 10 can incur significant daily imbalances, with no charges or tolerance limits.
 - a. Please confirm that the transportation contract is between FortisBC and the individual transportation service customer.

Response:

The Transportation Agreement is between FEI and the individual transportation service customer; however, as part of the transportation agreement the customer appoints a Shipper Agent to act as their agent for all matters relating to gas supply and transportation service on the FEI system.

b. Please describe, generally, the differences between small volume transport customers accessing rates 23, 25, 27 and large volume customers using rate 22, in terms of resources, gas market sophistication, awareness of daily loads and other relevant factors.

Response:

Customers served under Rate Schedules 23, 25, and 27 essentially have access to the same data that is available to RS 22 customers. Both current and historical daily consumption data is available to all of these customers through their account online, and daily consumption is also included on their monthly invoices. The gas market sophistication of individual customers varies; however, the Shipper Agent's role is to manage gas purchases and transportation service on the FEI system on behalf of their customers on a pooled basis. Forecasting loads based upon weather forecasts or requesting load forecasts from customers with process loads is part of that role. Today, when the customer appoints their Shipper Agent, they acknowledge that, if they are included in a group that has an RS 22 customer that the group as a whole will be subject to the group nominations and daily balancing of RS 22.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 13

3 4

5

c. Please describe the potential impact of a Rate 23, 25, or 27 customer in terms of daily imbalance on the operations of the utility?

What effect does limiting small volume customers to daily balancing match

6 7

Response:

- FEI observes that, today, many Shipper Agents pool monthly balanced customers under Rate Schedules 23, 25, and 27 with a RS 22 customer. By doing this, the group as a whole must adhere to daily balancing provisions and rules, including the 20 percent tolerance.
- FEI recognizes that exclusive daily balancing provisions may incent Shipper Agents to overdeliver in order to avoid potential charges. If the proposed changes are implemented, FEI will continue to monitor and work with Shipper Agents to ensure that imbalances are maintained within the 2 to 3 day limit to minimize the impact on the utility.

15

16 17

18 19

20

d.

21 Response:

FEI has interpreted "small volume customers" to be those under RS 23.

Principle 5, Principle 4, Principle 3?

- The proposed changes in this Application aim to make customers of all sizes pay for their fair share of the costs (Principle 2), and provide the price signals to incent the proper behavior of balancing more tightly (Principle 3). Leveling the playing field by requiring all customers to be daily balanced aligns with Principle 5. Regarding customer understanding and acceptance (Principle 4), FEI expects that over time all customers will learn and understand the changes in the model. Shipper Agents can, and should, also assist in achieving improved understanding of
- 29 the new rules by direct communication with their customers.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 14

1 Question 8

)	Page	10-	12
<u> </u>	гачс	-טו	ıo

24 FEI understands that customers are capable of balancing to a tighter tolerance level and

25 that numerous other jurisdictions require tighter tolerance levels.

a. Please provide support for your statement of tighter tolerances in other jurisdictions?

7 8 9

3

4

5

6

Response:

Please refer to the jurisdictional research and comparison in Appendix 10-1, Black & Veatch Transportation Service Model Review.

12 13

14 15

b. Please provide a listing of other jurisdictions and their balancing provisions delineated by customers size and class.

16 17 18

Response:

Please refer to the jurisdictional research and comparison in Appendix 10-1, Black & Veatch Transportation Service Model Review.

21 22

23

24

25

c. Why does FortisBC believe that the precedent in "other jurisdictions" make a relevant template for, or justify how, balancing tolerances or provisions should be set in British Columbia?

262728

Response:

- 29 It is reasonable and relevant to look at the business models adopted by LDCs in other 30 jurisdictions in order to gain knowledge of the operating rules used by other utilities, and to 31 understand which practices are common or typical in the industry.
- The industry as a whole has changed since the inception of FEI's transportation model in the early 1990s. The marketplace for trading and nominating gas has matured over time, which has led the industry to balance pipeline systems on a daily basis, among other changes.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 15

FEI has sought feedback and input from industry in the stakeholders' workshops held in 2016 for this rate design application. In addition to the jurisdictional data, FEI considered the analytical work and consultation from Black & Veatch. All of the above, combined with the history and experience of FEI staff themselves, have together formed the basis for the proposed changes in this Application.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 16

Question 9

2	Page 10-19
3	In addition to tightening the tolerance to 10%, FEI is proposing to amend the
4 5	31 balancing charges to provide an incentive to encourage more efficient use and discourage
6 7	32 inefficient use of the FEI System resources, in accordance with Principle 3. As discussed
8 9	33 below, FEI is proposing a tiered charge whereby charges increase as tolerance ranges are
10	34 exceeded, which achieves Principle 5.
11	And
12	Page 10-25
13	10.6.2.3 Balancing Option 3 – Daily Balancing
14 15	20 The third option would be to remove the monthly balancing provisions entirely and move all
16 17	21 transportation customers to daily balancing. Based on the principle of fairness, this option
18	22 would treat all customers and shipper equally.
19 20 21	a. Please detail which resources are being used inefficiently?
22	Response:

FEI uses midstream resources contracted on behalf of sales customers to balance the system as a whole, including imbalances arising from transportation customers. In doing so, transportation customers receive the benefits from these midstream resources which are paid for by sales customers; however, transportation customers do not pay a midstream charge. Given this, the midstream resources are being used inefficiently, since there is insufficient incentive for transportation customers not to rely on these midstream resources and no cost recoveries are collected and applied back to the midstream to compensate sales customers.

30

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

31

32 33

What is the expected cost savings of this change? b.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 17

Response:

Please refer to the response to CEC-FEI IR 1.56.1.

c. Please describe how application of the same balancing provisions for small unsophisticated transport customers and large volume more sophisticated customers accords to Principle 8, where the basic fairness test is equal and reasonable access to a similar type of service (transportation service)?

Response:

All transportation customers have equal and reasonable access to transportation service, and, under FEI's rate design proposals, would be subject to the same balancing rules, which would enhance interclass equity. Transportation customers with both small and large volumes receive benefits from pooling and the experience of Shipper Agents to best manage customers' supply and demand. It is the role of the Shipper Agent to help manage the gas supply needs of transportation customers, regardless of their size, market understanding or sophistication.

d. How would an individual Rate 23 transportation customer deal with daily balancing and a 10% tolerance?

Response:

It is the responsibility of the Shipper Agent representing its customers to discuss and deal with the proposed changes. The role of the Shipper Agent is to manage the customer's business and manage to the Tariff as part of the transportation service model. Today, some Shipper Agents have already chosen to pool RS 23 customers in daily balanced groups.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 18

Question 10

2	Preamble:
3 4 5 6 7 8	All customers in the FortisBC service area are captive to FortisBC. In dealing with core market customers, FortisBC has access to core market resources, including information resources, to manage load swings. Some of these resources are captured by midstream charges, however some are part of costs paid for by all customers who pay transport charges. These resources are excluded from access by transportation customers.
9 10 11	For example, FortisBC has real-time access to system flows for all of it's customers. Transport customers do not have access to their own flow information which could potentially help them manage peak-day and other constrained events.
12	Page 10-24
13 14	The combination of improved technology and increased nomination cycles has resulted in
15 16	2 greater ability for market participants to match supply and demand more closely on a daily
17 18	3 basis. The examples provided here show that shipper agents with both large and small
19 20	4 customer groups are able to manage and balance within a tighter tolerance. FEI's upstream
21 22	5 and downstream pipelines have operational requirements to balance daily and, as such,
23	6 balancing transportation service daily would align better operationally.
24 25	7 Transportation customers have access to tools to amend gas requirements on the day to reflect
26	8 changes in load.
27 28 29	a. Please describe the changes in technology over the past 5 years that give customers better ability to understand "changes in load".

Response:

31 Please refer to the response to BCUC-FEI IR 1.56.1.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 19

1 2 3	b.	How has FortisBC transportation volumes reporting (i.e. burn reports) changed over the last 5 years? 10 years?
4	Response:	
5	Please refer to	o the response to BCUC-FEI IR 1.56.1.
6 7		
8 9 10 11	C.	What changes has FortisBC proposed to match increased load information with the proposed tighter tolerances?
12	Response:	
13 14	•	oposing any changes to the load information made available in WINS or SCADA. the responses to Absolute-FEI IR 1.1 and BCUC-FEI IR 1.56.1.
15 16		
17 18 19 20 21	d. Response:	In proposing to tighten tolerances, how will Fortis increase the timeliness of the flow information provided customers?
22 23 24	Please refer to	o the response to Cascadia-FEI IR 1.10c.
25 26 27 28 29	e. Response:	In proposing to tighten tolerances, how will Fortis increase the accuracy of the flow information provided customers?
30 31 32	Please refer to	o the response to Cascadia-FEI IR 1.10c.
33 34 35	f.	In proposing to tighten tolerances, can Fortis provide SCADA data for all customers subject to those new tight tolerances?



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 20

Response:

Real-time SCADA data is currently only available for large gas users, namely RS 22 customers that are primarily served off the transmission pressure system. Gas Control has no need to have SCADA data at all customer sites as many are too small individually, and are mostly served off of the distribution system. FEI does not intend to offer SCADA for all customers on the system.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 21

1 Question 11

2	Page	10-25
_	ı uuc	10 20

FEI is held to daily balancing at the major interconnecting points at the Lower
Mainland

33 and Interior, and in the interest of fairness, FEI proposes that daily balancing provisions apply

34 equally across all regions.

a. Please explain why this is a relevant argument in favour of similar rules for FortisBC transport customers?

11 Response:

FEI has made numerous points as to the benefits and justification to move to exclusive daily balancing, one of which is that FEI is held to daily balancing at its interconnects with upstream pipelines. The fact that FEI is held to daily balancing is consistent with the conclusion that the general industry practice is daily balancing. It also shows that, to the extent that transportation customers do not balance daily, FEI is correcting for those imbalances as part of balancing the system on a daily basis. It is reasonable that transportation customers, who represent approximately 40% of the annual throughput, should be held to the same standard as FEI.

b. Does FortisBC postulate that typical transport customers have similar resources and access to the market that FortisBC does?

Response:

No. FEI expects Shipper Agents to have the resources and tools in place to manage the needs of their customers. FEI is not aware of the commercial arrangements that each Shipper Agent has made on behalf of its customers.

c. Does the 'principle of fairness" apply between the utility and it's customers?



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 22

Response:

- 2 The reference to the "interest of fairness" in the question preamble above reflects that it is fair to
- 3 have daily balancing provisions apply equally to all transportation customers across all regions
- 4 as described in section 10.6.3 of the Application.

5 6

1

7 8

9

10

d. If yes to c, should FortisBC only be allowed access to its own flow data two days after the fact and that data be based on unverified estimates as a matter of "fairness"?

11

12

Response:

With respect to how FEI forecasts load requirements for sales customers, please refer to the response to BCUC-FEI IR 1.56.1.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 23

1 Question 12

2	Page	1	0-28
_	. ugc		~~

Table 10-5 & 10-6

a. Please provide the relevant dates and amount and type of reduction for the time period indicated.

Response:

Table 10-5 provided the number of days that imbalance return was either reduced or eliminated during the period from 2008 to 2015. Attachment 12a provides the dates, type and amount of the imbalance return reduced or eliminated for the corresponding days in Table 10-5 of the Application.

b. Please update the table to include the most recent winter.

Response:

Tables 10-5 and 10-6 have been updated below to include the 2016/17 winter.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 24

Table 10-5 (Updated): Days of Reduction or Elimination of Imbalance Return by Location

YEAR	Inte	erior	Lower N	Mainland
YEAR	Reduced	Eliminated	Reduced	Eliminated
2008	76	50	76	50
2009	16	12	17	12
2010	2	20	2	20
2011	7	20	7	20
2012	0	17	0	16
2013	18	15	18	15
2014	12	27	12	27
2015	0	17	0	27
2016	17	32	17	32
2017	12	27	12	27
Total	160	237	161	246
Total Reduced & Eliminated	3	97	4	07

Table 10-6 (Updated): Days of Supply Curtailment by Region

YEAR	Interior	Lower Mainland
2008	9	9
2009	0	0
2010	3	3
2011	2	2
2012	3	3
2013	4	4
2014	11	11
2015	0	0
2016	7	7
2017	12	12
Total Curtailment	51	51



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 25

Please explain the difference between Table 10-5 and Table 10-6 on page 10-30.

C.

Response:

Table 10-5 provides the number of days that imbalance return was reduced or eliminated in the past.

Table 10-6 provides the number of days for which FEI issued supply restrictions. Typically, when a supply restriction is in effect, imbalance return has already been eliminated and all customers during the restricted time period must balance daily and adhere to a 5 percent balancing tolerance. If under-deliveries occur, customers may be subject to unauthorized overrun charges.

d. Please detail the dates to which imbalance return, or any other restrictions applied to Rate 7 or Rate 14 customers during the date ranges shown in the tables.

Response:

Imbalance return or supply restrictions do not apply to RS 7 customers on the days provided in Tables 10-5 and 10-6. RS 14A customers are managed under FEI's transportation model, and therefore, they are treated the same way as other transportation customers. Given FEI does not have a daily balanced group under RS 14A, they are not impacted by the changes to imbalance return listed in Table 10-5; however, similar to all other Shipper Agents, FEI is impacted by supply restrictions on the same days as indicated in Table 10-6.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 26

Question 13.1

Page 10-30 & onwards

a. Please describe, in summary the jurisdictions where all conditions of:
 a low balancing tolerance (<20%) AND daily balancing AND suspension of balancing were simultaneously in effect.

Response:

Please refer to the jurisdictional research and comparison in Appendix 10-1, Black & Veatch Transportation Service Model Review.

Question 13.2

From 10-1 Black & Veatch Transportation Service Model Review Page 2

Daily balancing is required by many LDCs, typically depending on proximity to major market hubs,

a. Please discuss how the BC Gas system and its proximity to either Stn 2, or Sumas market hubs, and the very limited supply options its transport customers have, comports to this description , i.e closer to major market hub= tendency to daily balancing?

Response:

The gas supply business is conducted on a day-out basis whereby supply is ordered a day ahead to meet the next day's demand. However, on the actual gas day, the forecast demand may undergo changes due to various reasons including temperature changes. Customers closer to major market hubs are likely to be daily balanced because they have several ways to contract for their daily gas supply requirements. For instance, customers in Alberta have access to the AECO/NIT marketplace, which has multiple natural gas price indices that customers can transact on to meet their changing needs within a gas day. By comparison, customers in B.C. rely on the Station 2 and Sumas marketplace, which do not have the same characteristics as the AECO/NIT marketplace, mainly because lower amounts of gas are transacted at these hubs. The Station 2 and Sumas market hubs have few same-day gas transactions, which is reflected in the fact that these two hubs do not have a recognized intraday index.

Customers in B.C. are also affected by the limited transportation pipeline capacity available in the region, as they are heavily dependent on supply from one pipeline system (Westcoast's T-



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 27

In how many jurisdictions studied did the utility have 'carte blanche' allowance to

- 1 South pipeline). Therefore, even if there was a daily index or a market to buy the gas at Station
- 2 2, it would be challenging to move the gas on the day, given that Westcoast's T-South pipeline
- 3 is currently fully contracted, and runs at maximum throughput throughout the winter.
- 4 Given these circumstances within the region, customers in B.C. may need to hold physical
- 5 assets in the region to be daily balanced. The physical assets in the region include
- 6 transportation capacity on third-party pipeline systems and storage in the market area (i.e. Mist
- 7 and JPS). There are fixed costs for securing these assets.

8

10

11

b.

12 13 14

Response:

- 15 FEI does not have 'carte blanche' allowances to limit or curtail customers on FEI's system. FEI
- 16 conducts its business with respect to supply restrictions and/or curtailment orders in accordance
- with the terms and conditions approved by the Commission.
- 18 Generally, the utilities included in the jurisdictional review have provisions governing differences
- in their operating practices under normal and restriction/curtailment conditions.

limit or curtail such as FortisBC has?

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

22

Question 13.3

Page 5

3.2 BASE CASE – REPLACEMENT COST OF BALANCING RESOURCES

The aggregate total of all shipper agents' annual balancing costs (consisting of reservation and commodity charges in the base case) was divided by the total transportation throughput on the System (72,381,734 GJ for 2015) to arrive at the average cost of securing balancing resources per GJ under various threshold cases (5-20%).

a. Did the cost study consider the benefits of the extra gas supply from transportation customers available to the utility on peak days when customers typically oversupply expected demand to avoid penalties and such gas is available to the utility by default?



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 28

Response:

FEI did not consider the extra gas supply from transportation customers on a peak day as FEI is unable to rely on this gas as a source of supply. FEI expects Shipper Agents to bring on sufficient supply to meet their customer demand in order to avoid charges. FEI presumes the Shipper Agents over-supply in some cases to manage their costs, but FEI does not know the specific business reasons that have led the Shipper-Agent to over-supply.

b. What is the option analysis value of this implicit resource?

Response:

There was no value assigned as FEI is unable to rely on the occasions on which Shipper Agents over-supply. Please refer to the response to Cascadia-FEI IR 13.3a.

Response:

C.

21 There were no costs calculated as this supply is not factored into the replacement cost analysis.

Were the costs calculated as incremental or stand alone?

22 Please refer to the response to Cascadia-FEI IR 13.3a.

d. If stand-alone, why? Why would an incremental cost analysis not be more realistic and fair?

Response:

30 Please refer to the response to Cascadia-FEI IR 13.3c.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 29

Question 13.4

2	Page	a
_	raue	y

4.1 REVIEW OF SHIPPER AGENTS' BALANCING HISTORY

Given the shipper agents' different strategies, FEI sought to determine if some strategies allow shipper agents to consistently balance their load to specific thresholds, namely 20% (the current threshold on the system), and 10%. The goal was to be able to assess the feasibility of balancing to these thresholds: if several shipper agents are currently balancing to a 10% or 20% level, it is reasonable to suggest that it is feasible for shipper agents not currently balancing to these thresholds to change their nomination patterns to also meet these thresholds.

An analysis of balancing data from 2014 and 2015 found that nearly half of the shipper agent pools are consistently balancing to 10% and 20% thresholds, while the other pools are frequently out of balance, in some cases by a large margin.

Preamble: This study is in the vacuum of Fortisbc enforcing the current authorities they have with regard to managing balancing and inventories.

a. Please detail how many times and in what manners customers have been warned in regards to nomination practices.

Response:

Since the Monthly Balancing Gas Decision, and in particular over the last winter, FEI has issued approximately 10 warnings per week, both verbally and in writing to Shipper Agents to correct nominating practices. On about five occasions over the last winter, FEI physically amended the nominations of Shipper Agents. These warnings and actions were issued to correct both oversupply and under-supply situations.

b. Please detail cases where restrictions, outside of normal notices, were enforced to correct poor nomination practices by customers.

Response:

No restrictions outside of the operational practices as allowed within the Terms and Conditions of the Transportation Tariffs have been exercised.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 30

2 c. Has FortisBC ever suspended inventory return to enforce inventory levels or nominating practices?

4 5 Response:

- 6 FEI interprets the meaning of "inventory return" to mean imbalance return.
- 7 As discussed in Section 10.7.1 of the Application, FEI has limited or eliminated imbalance return
- 8 in order to force Shipper Agents with daily balanced groups to nominate appropriately and bring
- 9 on sufficient physical supply to meet daily demand. These restrictions typically occur during
- 10 colder weather.
- 11 In the last several years, FEI has not suspended the use of imbalance return to a specific
- 12 Shipper Agent, nor has FEI withheld a Shipper Agent's inventory to return at a later date.

13 14

15 16

d. Detail ANY ways in which FortisBC has EVER attempted to enforce what it considers reasonable nominating practice.

17 18 19

Response:

20 Please refer to the previous response to Cascadia-FEI IR 1.13.4a.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 31

Question 14

2	Page 6-30)
3	1	6.5.1 R:C Ratios – The Range of Reasonableness
4 5	2 es	R:C ratios are assessed based on whether or not they fall within an tablished "range of
6 7	3 fo	reasonableness". FEI believes that the appropriate range of reasonableness revaluating its
8 9	4 10	R:C ratios is 90 per cent to 110 per cent. In theory, the R:C ratio should equal
10 11	5 wo	rate schedule, indicating that the revenues recovered from each rate schedule buld equal the
12 13	6 pr	indicated cost to serve them. However, achieving unity implies a level of ecision that does not
14 15	7 es	exist with any COSA. As a COSA study necessarily involves assumptions, timates,
16	8	simplifications, judgments and generalizations, a range of reasonableness is

- 9 accepted when evaluating the appropriateness of the R:C ratios.
- a. The total annual costs in the COSA study exceed \$780,000,000. The range of reasonableness for R:C ratios is given as 90-110 percent, or a 20% band. Given that the 20% band on the total costs is \$156,000,000 how is this broad level of cross subsidy warranted?

Response:

warranted and

17

18

19

20

21

22

2324

32 33

- The range of reasonableness refers to a band of plus or minus 10% around the allocated costs of a particular rate class. There is no band of plus or minus 10% around the total cost of service. The rates of all rate schedules in aggregate are designed to collect 100% of the cost of service (or revenue requirement) of the utility.
- For the reasons discussed in section 6.5.1 of the Application, it is not accurate to describe the range of reasonableness as a cross subsidization. Please refer to the response to BCUC-FEI IR 1.14.1 for further discussion of the range of reasonableness.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 32

b. Even if inaccuracies exist to prevent exact cost assignments, what is the rationale for not using the derived values as representing the best available data and methodology?

Response:

6 Please refer to Section 6.5.1 of the Application and the response to BCUC-FEI IR 1.14.1.

> c. Rate 27 Customers and Rate 22 Customers pay 7 and 18 times their costs of service respectively. Given the range of 110-90 % described above, how is this justified.

Response:

As discussed in Section 6.5.2, page 6-35 of the Application, RS 22 is predominantly interruptible and RS 7/RS 27 are fully interruptible rate schedules. These rate schedules do not drive system capacity additions and consequently are not allocated any demand-related costs of the FEI system. This is the reason that their R:C ratios are exceptionally high. It is important to note that the charges within these rate schedules are set based on a discount from the firm service rates and not from their allocated costs from the COSA model. Therefore, the R:C ratios for these rate schedules are not considered for rate design.

d. Given that residential customers underpay their costs by 6.9% on \$510 Million (or about \$35 Million while Rate 22 Customers overpay by 1764% on \$806K costs, or about \$13 Million, why should these two rate classes not be rebalanced?

Response:

Please refer to the response to Cascadia-FEI IR 1.14c regarding the reason for higher R:C ratios for RS 22 customers. FEI has discussed the final R:C ratios for residential customers after proposed rate design changes and rebalancing in Section 12 of the Application. Table 12-3 shows the final R:C ratio for Residential customers to be 96.4 percent which is within the 90 percent to 110 percent range of reasonableness.



4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company)	Submission Date:
2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 33

Question 15

2 Page 6-35

3 **RS 22 is**

> 17 predominantly interruptible and RS 7/RS 27 is fully interruptible. These rates do not drive

> 18 system capacity additions, and consequently are not allocated any demandrelated costs.

FortisBC does not build capacity for these clients. What is the avoided cost of a. that capacity? In other words, if FortisBC had built the capacity to make these customers firm, what would the incremental cost be, on a total and per GJ basis, be? What is the VALUE of interruptibility that FortisBC gets from these clients?

If any interruptible customer wishes to upgrade to full firm service, are they

required to pay for or contribute to the system upgrades required, and in what

Response:

- 14 Regarding the avoided cost associated with providing interruptible service versus firm service
- 15 on a total cost and a per GJ basis, please refer to Exhibit B-1, Section 9.6.4 and Appendix 9-3.
- 16 FEI itself does not receive any value from customers who receive interruptible service; however,
- 17 FEI's firm customers have slightly lower rates than they otherwise would if interruptible service
- 18 was not made available to RS 7/27 and RS 22.

ways, specifically?

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27

28

29

30

Response:

b.

- FEI does not presently anticipate that any interruptible customers would want to switch to fully firm service, as the interruptible Delivery Charge for RS 7/27/22 is priced at a discount from the average firm RS 5/25 rate, and the customers on interruptible service have already made the capital investments necessary to be able to have the ability to switch to higher cost alternative fuels during peak weather conditions when interrupted by FEI.
- 31
- 32 Within the FEI tariff, when a customer wishes to switch from interruptible to firm sales or
- 33 transportation service, the customer agrees within their service agreement to reimburse FEI for
- 34 any costs that are reasonably incurred to provide such service after receiving an estimate from
- 35 FEI.



FortisBC Energy Inc. (FEI or the Company) 2016 Rate Design Application (the Application)	Submission Date: June 9, 2017
Response to Cascadia Energy Ltd. (Cascadia) Information Request (IR) No. 1	Page 34

If Interruptible customers to not drive system capacity additions, and if they must

pay for such additions if they were to become fully firm, why are they not

Bypass customers pay firm rates that are in some cases as low as the rates

interruptible customers should pay based on the COSA. Are interruptible

customers charged higher rates simply because they are 'captive' and they have

considered marginal customers and charged the marginal cost of service rates?

1

3 4 5

C.

6 7 8

Response:

9 Please refer to the response to BCUC-FEI IR 1.32.5.

no other choice?

10 11

12

13

14 15

15 16

17 18 19

Response:

d.

- 20 Bypass customer rates are based on what the customer's cost would be to build, own and
- operate their own pipeline; it is a competitive alternative to the utility's charges for the service being provided. With the Bypass rate the customer is indifferent between receiving service from
- FEI or building its own pipeline and interconnecting with the upstream pipeline, and FEI retains
- revenue that would otherwise have been lost and would have to be recovered from all other
- 25 non-bypass customers.
- 26 The setting of RS 7/27 Interruptible rates is a separate determination that results in rates that
- 27 are priced at a discount from the RS 5/25 General Firm Service rates as described in FEI's
- 28 Application Exhibit B-1, Section 9.6.
- 29 Large industrial customers are not captive and have alternative fuel choices. Examples of this
- 30 are cement plants fuel switching from gas to burn coal, and greenhouses or sawmills switching
- 31 from gas to burn biomass.



			Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)		Imbalance Returi Reduction (GJ/d)	
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2008	1/1/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/2/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/15/2008	Reduced	26,500	17,150	13,500	22,850
2008	1/16/2008	Reduced	26,500	18,150	13,500	21,850
2008	1/17/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/18/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/19/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/20/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/21/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/22/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/23/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/24/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/25/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/26/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/27/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/28/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/29/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/30/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	1/31/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	2/1/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	2/2/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	2/3/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	2/4/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	2/5/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	2/6/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	2/7/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	2/8/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	2/9/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/10/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/11/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/12/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/13/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/14/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/15/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/16/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/17/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/18/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/19/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/20/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	2/21/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	6/10/2008	Reduced	15,000	15,000	25,000	25,000
2008	6/11/2008	Reduced	15,000	15,000	25,000	25,000

			Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)			
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2008	6/12/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	6/13/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	6/14/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	6/15/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	6/16/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	6/17/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/17/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	6/18/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/19/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/20/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/21/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/22/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/23/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/24/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/25/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/26/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/27/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/28/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/29/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	6/30/2008	Reduced	5,000	5,000	35,000	35,000
2008	7/1/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/2/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/3/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/4/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/5/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/6/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/7/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/8/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/9/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/10/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/11/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/12/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/13/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/14/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/15/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/16/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/17/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/18/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/19/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/20/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/21/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/22/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000

			Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)		Imbalance Return Reduction (GJ/d)	
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2008	7/23/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/24/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/25/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/26/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/27/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/28/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/29/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/30/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	7/31/2008	Reduced	25,000	25,000	15,000	15,000
2008	8/1/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/2/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/3/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/4/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/5/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/6/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/7/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/8/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/9/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/10/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/11/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/12/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/13/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	8/14/2008	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2008	12/13/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/14/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/15/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/16/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/17/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/18/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/19/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/20/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/21/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/22/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/23/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/24/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/25/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/26/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/27/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/28/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/29/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/30/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2008	12/31/2008	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000

	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)		Imbalance Return Reduction (GJ/d)	
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2009	1/1/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/2/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/3/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/4/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/5/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/6/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/7/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/8/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/9/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/10/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/11/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/12/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/24/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	1/25/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	1/26/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	1/27/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	1/28/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/29/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/30/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	1/31/2009	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2009	11/9/2009	Reduced		39,999	40,000	1
2009	12/8/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	12/9/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	12/10/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	12/11/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	12/12/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	12/13/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	12/14/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2009	12/15/2009	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/20/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/21/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/22/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/23/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/24/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/25/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/26/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/27/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/28/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/29/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	11/30/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	12/1/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	12/2/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000

			Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)		Imbalance Return Reduction (GJ/d)	
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2010	12/3/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	12/4/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	12/5/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	12/6/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	12/7/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	12/8/2010	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2010	12/9/2010	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2010	12/30/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2010	12/31/2010	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/1/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/2/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/3/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/4/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/5/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/6/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/7/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/8/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/9/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/10/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/11/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/12/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	1/18/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	2/19/2011	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2011	2/20/2011	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2011	2/21/2011	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2011	2/22/2011	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2011	2/23/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	2/24/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	2/25/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	2/26/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	2/27/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	2/28/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	3/1/2011	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2011	11/19/2011	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2011	11/20/2011	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2011	11/21/2011	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2012	1/13/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	1/14/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	1/15/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	1/16/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	1/17/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	1/18/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000

			Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)		Imbalance Return Reduction (GJ/d)	
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2012	1/19/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	1/20/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	1/21/2012	Eliminated	0		40,000	40,000
2012	12/20/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	12/21/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	12/22/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	12/23/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	12/24/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	12/25/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	12/26/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2012	12/27/2012	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	1/10/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	1/11/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	1/12/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	1/13/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	1/14/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	1/15/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	1/16/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	1/17/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	1/18/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	1/19/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	1/20/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	1/21/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	1/22/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	1/23/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	1/24/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	11/21/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	11/22/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	11/23/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	11/24/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	12/3/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	12/4/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	12/5/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	12/6/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	12/7/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	12/8/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	12/9/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	12/10/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	12/11/2013	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2013	12/12/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	12/13/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	12/14/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000

			Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)		Imbalance Return Reduction (GJ/d)	
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2013	12/15/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2013	12/16/2013	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	2/1/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	2/2/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	2/3/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/4/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/5/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/6/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/7/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/8/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/9/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/10/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/11/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	2/12/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	2/22/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/23/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/24/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/25/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/26/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/27/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	2/28/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	3/1/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	3/2/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	3/3/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	3/4/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	11/13/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	11/14/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	11/15/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	11/16/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	11/17/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	11/18/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	11/19/2014	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2014	11/29/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	11/30/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	12/1/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	12/2/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	12/3/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	12/4/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	12/29/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	12/30/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2014	12/31/2014	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	1/1/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000

			Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)		Imbalance Return Reduction (GJ/d)	
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2015	1/2/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	9/23/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	9/24/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	9/25/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	9/26/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	9/27/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	9/28/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	9/29/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	9/30/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	10/1/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	10/2/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	11/24/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	11/25/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	11/26/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	11/27/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	11/28/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	11/29/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	11/30/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	12/24/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	12/25/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	12/26/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	12/27/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	12/28/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	12/29/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	12/30/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2015	12/31/2015	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	1/1/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	1/2/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	1/3/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	1/4/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	1/5/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	1/6/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	1/7/2016	Eliminated Reduced	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	1/8/2016		20,000 20,000	20,000	20,000 20,000	20,000
2016	1/9/2016	Reduced	,	20,000	•	20,000
2016 2016	1/10/2016 1/11/2016	Reduced Reduced	20,000 20,000	20,000 20,000	20,000 20,000	20,000 20,000
2016	1/11/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	6/20/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	6/20/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	6/21/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	6/22/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
7010	0/23/2010	reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000

			Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)		Imbalance Return Reduction (GJ/d)	
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2016	6/24/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	6/25/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	6/26/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	6/27/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	8/31/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	9/1/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	12/5/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/6/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/7/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/8/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/9/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/10/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/11/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/12/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/13/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/14/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/15/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/16/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/17/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/18/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/19/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/20/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/21/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/22/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/23/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/24/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/25/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/26/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/27/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2016	12/28/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	12/29/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	12/30/2016	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2016	12/31/2016	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/1/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/2/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/3/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/4/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/5/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/6/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/7/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/8/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/9/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000

			Imbalance Return Available (GJ/d)		Imbalance Return Reduction (GJ/d)	
Year	GAS_DAY	Type of Reduction	INT	LML	INT	LML
2017	1/10/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/11/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/12/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/13/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/14/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/15/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/16/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/17/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	1/18/2017	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2017	1/19/2017	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2017	1/20/2017	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2017	1/21/2017	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2017	1/22/2017	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2017	1/23/2017	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2017	1/24/2017	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2017	1/25/2017	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2017	1/26/2017	Reduced	30,000	30,000	10,000	10,000
2017	1/31/2017	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2017	2/1/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/2/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/3/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/4/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/5/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/6/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/7/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/8/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/9/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/10/2017	Eliminated	0	0	40,000	40,000
2017	2/11/2017	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
2017	2/12/2017	Reduced	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000