



BORDEN
LADNER
GERVAIS

VIA E-MAIL AND COURIER

April 23, 2007

Alberta Energy and Utilities Board
640 - 5th Avenue S.W.
Calgary, Alberta
T2P 3G4

Attention: **Mr. Gary Perkins**
Board Counsel

Dear Sir:

Re: EnCana Oil and Gas Partnership (EnCana) Application No. 1394112
Canadian Natural Resources Limited (CNRL) Application No. 1409180
Husky Oil Operations (Husky) Application No. 1481725
Cold Lake Oil Sands Area - Clearwater Deposit

Attached please find Husky's responses to information requests filed by the Board and EnCana. As explained in Husky's response to EnCana information request number 1, EnCana has once again taken the limited opportunity provided by the Board to ask information requests to attempt to file evidence in this proceeding after the close of the oral hearing.

Husky has declined to assist what Husky considers to be an abuse of the Board's hearing process by providing a response to the additional information filed. Husky respectfully asks the Board to disregard the new information improperly provided in EnCana's information request and to give it no weight.

Yours truly,

BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS LLP

RANDALL W. BLOCK, Q.C.

cc: McCarthy Tetrault LLP
Attention: Mr. Don Davies

Thackray Burgess
Attention: Mr. Patrick J. McGovern

Husky Oil Operations Limited
Attention: Ms. Susan Anderson
Attention: Gokhan Coskuner

Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
Lawyers • Patent & Trade-mark Agents
1000 Canterra Tower
400 Third Avenue S.W.
Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2P 4H2
tel: (403) 232-9500 fax: (403) 266-1395
www.blgcanada.com

Randall W. Block, Q.C.

direct tel.: (403) 232-9572
e-mail: rblock@blgcanada.com
file no: 400080/069

CALGARY • MONTREAL • OTTAWA • TORONTO • VANCOUVER • WATERLOO REGION

Imperial Oil Resources

Attention: Mr. Peter L. Miller

Attention: Ms. Cheryl L. Trudell

Canadian Natural Resources Limited

Attention: Mr. Jared Paddock

Alberta Energy Utilities Board (EUB)

Attention: Mr. Ernie Smith, Utilities Board

Husky's replies to EnCana's questions on Husky input/output files.

1a. Please advise whether Husky disagrees with any of the results shown in Table 1 and Figures 1 to 6.

1b. If Husky does disagree with any of the results, please provide Husky's own reruns of its models with each of the BHP changes referred to in (i) and (ii) and with the extended CSS cycles referred to in (iii)..

Husky Response:

Husky is disappointed, but based upon past experience not surprised, that EnCana has once again and inappropriately taken the limited opportunity provided by the Board to ask information requests of Husky in respect of the input and output files submitted by Husky on 5 April 2007 to attempt to file new evidence in this proceeding after the close of the oral hearing.

Table 1, Figures 1 to 6 and the data upon which they are purportedly based constitute new information, which is not taken from the input and output files submitted by Husky on April 5, 2007. Rather than seeking information that would enable EnCana to understand the input and output files that Husky submitted, which is the only legitimate purpose for information requests, EnCana has altered and manipulated the data Husky submitted in a transparent attempt to put on to the record information that differs from the results in the files submitted by Husky.

Husky declines to assist this abuse of the Board's hearing process by providing a response to the questions posed by EnCana. Each time that the Board has permitted EnCana a limited opportunity to supplement the hearing record in this proceeding EnCana has abused the limited right provided by adding information beyond what was specifically permitted. Regulatory certainty and fairness to all parties requires an end to this recurring practice. Husky respectfully asks the Board to disregard the new information improperly provided in EnCana's information request and to give it no weight in its deliberations.

2. Explain why a maximum liquid production rate constraint was not applied in the SAGD well in 2D HSAGD model. The maximum liquid production rate observed in the d17gc-2d-Dep200-toll model was above 8,000 m³/d and the average daily liquid production rate between 04/12/2015 and 09/12/2015 was above 7,400 m³/d (46,000 bbl/d). This value appears impractically high. Please provide information or reference to any SAGD wells in the Cold Lake area that were capable to produce at this rate..

Husky Response:

We agree with EnCana that there were 5 days where the average liquid production rate was above 8000 m³/d, but note that restricting the fluid flow in the depleted case would reduce the productivity of the depleted case further. This high liquid rate occurred over

five days, with a bitumen cut of about one-half, or 5% of the ultimate oil recovery. With a liquid rate constraint over these five days, Husky expects that this liquid production would occur later in the same cycle. Therefore, the results and the conclusion would remain the same.