



**TRANS MOUNTAIN EXPANSION PROJECT
Technical Working Group (TWG)
Report Update**

NEB Condition 49

April 13, 2018



TABLE OF CONCORDANCE

Condition 49 is applicable to the following legal instruments: OC-064 (CPCN). Table 1 describes how this report addresses the Condition requirements applicable to Condition 49.

TABLE 1

LEGAL INSTRUMENT CONCORDANCE WITH NEB CONDITION 49: TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG) REPORT UPDATE

NEB Condition 49	OC-064 (CPCN)
Trans Mountain must file with the NEB, at least 4 months prior to commencing construction, and every 6 months thereafter until after commencing operations, a report describing the activities undertaken by the TWGs during the reporting period and the outcomes of these activities. The reports must include, at a minimum:	See below
a) A list of all members of each TWG;	Section 1.2
b) The methods, dates and location of all TWG activities or meetings;	Section 3.0
c) A summary of all issues or concerns raised or addressed during the TWG activities;	Section 4.0
d) A description of outcomes or measures that were or will be implemented to address the issues identified or concerns raised; or, if any measures will not be implemented, a rationale for why not; and	Section 4.0
e) A description of any unresolved issues or concerns, and a description of how these will be addressed, or a rationale for why no further measures will be required.	Section 4.0

Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1	About This Document.....	1
1.2	TWG Members.....	1
2.0	FEEDBACK REGARDING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	8
3.0	TWG MEETINGS AND ACTIVITIES.....	10
4.0	ISSUES AND CONCERNS.....	14
4.1	Local Government Permitting	14
4.2	Status Update	14
4.3	New Issues and Concerns	14
5.0	APPENDICES OVERVIEW	80
5.1	Appendix A: Project Update Letter – February 2018.....	80

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	LOCAL GOVERNMENTS INVITED TO FORM TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS.....	2
Table 1.2	LOCAL GOVERNMENTS YET TO RE-ENGAGE IN TWG MEETINGS	4
Table 2.0	TWG CONTACTS BY COMMUNITY	4
Table 3.1	STATUS OF OUTSTANDING LOCAL GOVERNMENT-SPECIFIC TOR	8
Table 3.2	ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK REGARDING LOCAL GOVERNMENT-SPECIFIC TOR.....	9
Table 4.0	METHODS, DATES AND LOCATIONS OF TWG ACTIVITIES	10
Table 5.1	UPDATE ON ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN BC UP TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2017.....	15
Table 5.2	UPDATE ON ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ALBERTA UP TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2017	69
Table 6.1	NEW ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN BC	74
Table 6.2	NEW ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ALBERTA.....	79

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 About This Document

Trans Mountain Pipeline ULC (Trans Mountain) and Kinder Morgan Canada Inc. (KMC) have long standing relationships with local governments along the Trans Mountain Pipeline System (TMPL) corridor. Trans Mountain has been building on these relationships along the Project corridor in the development of the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (“TMEP” or “Project”), and will continue to do so through construction and eventual operation. Technical Working Groups (TWGs) continue to serve as the preferred vehicle for gathering technical information from affected local governments, address specific technical and construction issues raised by local governments, and discuss relevant permitting needs. TWG meetings provide an opportunity for Project technical teams to work directly with local government staff to gather information and input necessary to move forward with Project plans. Trans Mountain is committed to ongoing engagement with the local governments identified in this Report through regular dialogue.

The purpose of this document is to present a TWG Report update to satisfy the requirements of the National Energy Board (NEB) Condition 49. Condition 49 requires Trans Mountain file with the NEB, at least four months prior to commencing construction and every six months thereafter until after commencing operations, a report on Trans Mountain’s consultations with local governments related to the activities undertaken by the TWGs during the reporting period. The report also captures the outcome of these activities. Where the issue is yet to be resolved, Trans Mountain will provide an update in future scheduled filings.

Trans Mountain filed the first Condition 49 report with the NEB on April 13, 2017 ([A82625](#)) and included activities between October 1, 2016 – March 31, 2017. The second report was filed on October 13, 2017 ([A86895](#)) and included activities between April 1, 2017 – September 30, 2017. This report covers activities conducted between October 1, 2017 and March 31, 2018.

Another filing related to this report is NEB Condition 14 – Technical Working Group (TWG) Terms of Reference ([A81760](#)) filed with the NEB on February 16, 2017. On December 28, 2017, the NEB determined Trans Mountain had met the pre-construction requirements of Condition 14 and Condition 49.

1.2 TWG Members

Trans Mountain has established TWG meetings with most local governments along the pipeline corridor and is actively engaged in regular TWG discussions. Some local governments have indicated a preference to schedule TWGs on an as needed basis rather than establish a quarterly or monthly schedule. This is acceptable to Trans Mountain and discussions with these local governments have continued as needed.

At this time, the City of Edmonton has turned down an opportunity to meet in person and instead requests Trans Mountain share information electronically on topics of mutual interest to both parties. Trans Mountain continues to follow up and share information with the City of Edmonton in this manner. Where meetings are requested in person Trans Mountain will comply.

Table 1.1 provides an update on the status of the TWG meetings as of March 31, 2018.

TABLE 1.1

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS INVITED TO FORM TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS

Alberta Local Governments	Status	BC Local Governments	Status
City of Edmonton	Invited and declined to meet in person; TWG meetings pending for Q2 2018	City of Abbotsford	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis
City of Spruce Grove	Invited and accepted. TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis	City of Burnaby	Invited and accepted in 2017; currently not meeting as Burnaby has rejected meeting requests since January 2018 despite repeated requests from Trans Mountain.
Parkland County	Invited and accepted. TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis	City of Chilliwack	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis
Strathcona County	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis	City of Coquitlam	Invited and accepted; regular TWG meetings underway
Town of Edson	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis	City of Kamloops	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis
Town of Hinton	Invited and accepted. TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis	City of Merritt	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis
Town of Stony Plain	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis	City of Surrey	Invited and accepted, regular TWG meetings underway
Village of Wabamun	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis	District of Clearwater	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis
Yellowhead County	Invited and accepted; regular TWG meetings underway	District of Hope	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis
		Fraser Valley Regional District (FVRD)	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis

Alberta Local Governments	Status	BC Local Governments	Status
		Metro Vancouver Regional District	Invited and accepted; regular TWG meetings underway
		Regional District of Fraser Fort George	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis
		Thompson Nicola Regional District, representing: Community of Avola Community of Blue River Community of Little Fort Community of Vavenby	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis
		Township of Langley	Invited and accepted; regular TWG meetings underway
		Village of Valemount	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as needed basis

Table 1.2, below, lists local governments that have yet to re-engage in a TWG and an explanation as to why not. As the Project approaches the start of pipeline construction, Trans Mountain will continue to offer invitations to schedule meetings with those local governments listed in Table 1.2.

Note: Westridge Marine Terminal is under construction.

TABLE 1.2
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS YET TO RE-ENGAGE IN TWG MEETINGS

Local Government (AB)	Status	Meeting Date
City of Edmonton	Invitation accepted with a request to share information electronically; TWG meetings pending for Q2 2018	Anticipated Q2 2018
City of Burnaby	Invitation accepted; TWGs occurred during 2017; As of January 2018 City of Burnaby has declined to continue with TWG meetings until further notice	N/A

TWG attendees can fluctuate and continue to be determined based on agreed upon agenda topics and issues to be addressed on an ongoing basis as the Project moves closer to construction. Trans Mountain endeavours to ensure it has a decision maker at each meeting who is authorized to make decisions and commitments regarding the matters to be discussed.

Conversations with subject matter experts in Engineering, Land, Construction, Traffic Management, Permitting, Environment, Security and Stakeholder Engagement also continue as needed. Some sub technical working groups (SWGs) have been formed within a TWG to address specific technical matters with subject matter experts as required.

An updated list of key TWG contacts is included in Table 2, below.

TABLE 2
TWG CONTACTS BY COMMUNITY

Local Government (BC)	Trans Mountain TWG Key Contacts	Local Government TWG Key Contacts
City of Abbotsford	Project Manager, Spread 5A (BC Interior) and Spread 6 (Fraser Valley) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Manager Development Engineering
City of Burnaby	Project Director, Lower Mainland, TMEP Senior Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Director, Engineering Director, Planning
City of Chilliwack	Project Manager, Spread 5A (BC Interior) and Spread 6 (Fraser Valley) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Deputy Director, Engineering
City of Coquitlam	Project Director, Lower Mainland, TMEP Project Manager, Spread 7 (Lower Mainland), TMEP Regional Specialist, Stakeholder	Manager, Design & Construction and Executive Sponsor Manager, Capital Projects and Inspections

Local Government (BC)	Trans Mountain TWG Key Contacts	Local Government TWG Key Contacts
	Engagement	Project Coordinator, Infrastructure Management
City of Kamloops	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 5A (BC Interior) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Director, Public Works and Utilities
City of Merritt	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 5A (BC Interior) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Chief Administrative Officer
City of Surrey	Project Director, Lower Mainland, TMEP Project Manager, Spread 7 (Lower Mainland), TMEP Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Manager, Drainage City of Surrey legal counsel (as determined by the City)
District of Clearwater	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 3 (Fraser-Fort George) and Spread 4 (North Thompson) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Chief Administrative Officer
District of Hope	Project Manager, Spread 5B (Coquihalla-Hope) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Chief Administrative Officer and Director, Operations
Fraser Valley Regional District	Project Manager, Spread 5B (Coquihalla-Hope) and Project Manager Spread 6 (Fraser Valley) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Manager, Strategic Planning
Metro Vancouver	Project Director, Lower Mainland, TMEP Senior Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Director, Air Quality and Environment Division Manager, Properties
Regional District of Fraser Fort George	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 3 (Fraser-Fort George) and Spread 4 (North Thompson)	Director of Planning Services or Manager of Planning Services

Local Government (BC)	Trans Mountain TWG Key Contacts	Local Government TWG Key Contacts
	Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	
Thompson Nicola Regional District, representing: Community of Avola Community of Blue River Community of Little Fort Community of Vavenby	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 3 (Fraser-Fort George) and Spread 4 (North Thompson) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Chief Administrative Officer
Township of Langley	Project Director, Lower Mainland, TMEP Project Manager, Spread 7 (Lower Mainland), TMEP Project Manager, Spread 6 (Fraser Valley) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Director, Public Works and Executive Sponsor Manager, Engineering & Construction Services
Village of Valemount	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 3 (Fraser-Fort George) and Spread 4 (North Thompson) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Chief Administrative Officer

Local Government (AB)	Trans Mountain TWG contacts	Local Government TWG contacts
City of Edmonton	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 1 (Edmonton) and Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Oil and Gas Liaison
City of Spruce Grove	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 1 (Edmonton) and Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder	Director, Planning and Development

	Engagement	
Parkland County	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 1 (Edmonton) and Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Project Officer, Engineering Services
Strathcona County	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 1 (Edmonton) and Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Coordinator, Development Permitting
Town of Edson	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 1 (Edmonton) and Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Chief Administrative Officer
Town of Hinton	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 1 (Edmonton) and Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Director of Planning and Development
Town of Stony Plain	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 1 (Edmonton) and Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	General Manager, Planning and Infrastructure
Village of Wabamun	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 1 (Edmonton) and Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	Chief Administrative Officer
Yellowhead County	Senior Director, Trans Mountain Expansion Project Project Manager, Spread 1 (Edmonton) and Spread 2 (Yellowhead)	Manager of Infrastructure Services

	Regional Specialist, Stakeholder Engagement	
--	---	--

2.0 FEEDBACK REGARDING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

Since filing submissions pursuant to Conditions 14 ([A81760](#)) and 49 ([A82625](#), [A86895](#)), Trans Mountain has incorporated general feedback from local government regarding the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) originally presented in Q4 2016, and has reached agreement on the ToR with most local governments along the Project corridor. Local government-specific ToR have also been finalized with eight local governments in BC as mentioned in the previous Condition 49 report filed on April 13, 2017 ([A86895](#)).

There were no ToR finalized during this reporting period. Trans Mountain continues to review and discuss additional feedback regarding draft ToR specific with two remaining local governments: City of Surrey and Metro Vancouver Regional District. Despite lack of finalization of draft ToR, both parties have agreed to a schedule of regular TWGs. Trans Mountain will continue to make every effort to reach agreed upon terms as soon as possible and update the NEB as part of future submissions pursuant to Condition 49.

The status of the outstanding local government-specific ToR are included below in Table 3.1. Additional feedback received by Trans Mountain related to the outstanding local government-specific ToR since the last report are included in Table 3.2.

**TABLE 3.1
 STATUS OF OUTSTANDING LOCAL GOVERNMENT-SPECIFIC TOR**

Local Government	Status
City of Surrey	No change in position since the previous Condition 49 report. Regular TWG meetings continue despite having final ToR. Trans Mountain will revisit the ToRs with the City of Surrey once the NEB has ruled on the plan, profile and book of reference for the section of the Project detailed route through Surrey (anticipated to be in Q2 2018).
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Trans Mountain’s discussions with Metro Vancouver Regional District continued during this reporting period. Trans Mountain was hopeful an agreement would be reached by Q1 2018, however additional review and discussion is required before the ToR can be finalized. Trans Mountain will provide an update in the next Condition 49 filing.

TABLE 3.2
ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK REGARDING THE OUTSTANDING LOCAL GOVERNMENT-SPECIFIC TOR
BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2017 AND MARCH 31, 2018

Local Government	Feedback	Trans Mountain Response
<p>Metro Vancouver Regional District</p>	<p>Metro Vancouver provided Trans Mountain with a substantial re-write of the ToR in February 2018.</p> <p>Metro Vancouver raised the following points at TWGs during this reporting period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is concern regarding long-term impacts of Trans Mountain operations. Metro Vancouver would like the ToR to speak to the Operational period as well, not just construction • Metro Vancouver noted that the City of Burnaby ToR discusses both operations and construction. • Metro Vancouver noted that some suggested modifications are based on a review of other TMEP TWG ToR with local governments. • Metro Vancouver is seeking reimbursement of costs and expenses to participate in the TWGs and SWGs or engage otherwise to address technical and construction issues related to the TMEP 	<p>Trans Mountain will continue to work with Metro Vancouver Regional District towards finalizing ToR in Q2 2018.</p> <p>Trans Mountain reviewed the re-written ToR as presented by Metro Vancouver and discussed with Metro Vancouver at a TWG meeting on March 28, 2018.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will provide an update in the next Condition 49 filing as discussions are ongoing</p>

3.0 TWG MEETINGS AND ACTIVITIES

Table 4 lists the methods, dates and locations of TWG activities that have taken place in this reporting period. A meeting with Yellowhead County on September 29, 2017 has been captured in this report, as it was not included in the previous report.

TABLE 4
METHODS, DATES AND LOCATIONS OF TWG ACTIVITIES

TWG	METHOD	DATE	LOCATION
Yellowhead County	Meeting	September 29, 2017	Yellowhead County office
Township of Langley	Meeting	October 3, 2017	Township of Langley operations centre
City of Coquitlam	Meeting – SWG Traffic Management	October 3, 2017	City of Coquitlam municipal office
City of Surrey	Meeting – SWG Traffic Management and Permitting	October 4, 2017	City of Surrey municipal office
City of Burnaby	Meeting	October 18, 2017	City of Burnaby municipal office
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Meeting	October 25, 2017	Metro Vancouver office
City of Surrey	Meeting	October 25, 2017	City of Surrey municipal office
City of Abbotsford	Meeting	October 27, 2017	City of Abbotsford municipal office
Town of Edson	Meeting	November 6, 2017	Town of Edson municipal office
Yellowhead County	Meeting	November 6, 2017	Yellowhead County office
Strathcona County	Meeting	November 9, 2017	Strathcona County office
Township of Langley	Meeting	November 22, 2017	Township of Langley operations centre
City of Coquitlam	Meeting	November 22, 2017	City of Coquitlam municipal office
City of Burnaby	Meeting	November 23, 2017	City of Burnaby municipal office
City of Surrey	Meeting	November 28, 2017	City of Surrey municipal office

TWG	METHOD	DATE	LOCATION
Village of Valemount	Meeting - SWG Site Specific Emergency Response Plan and Camp Medical and Health Services Management Plan	November 28, 2017	Village of Valemount offices
Metro Vancouver	Meeting	November 29, 2017	Metro Vancouver Regional District office
Parkland County	Meeting	November 29, 2017	Parkland County office
District of Clearwater	Meeting - SWG Site Specific Emergency Response Plan and Camp Medical and Health Services Management Plan	November 30, 2017	District of Clearwater office
Yellowhead County	Meeting	December 1, 2017	Yellowhead County office
Township of Langley	Meeting – SWG Traffic Management	December 4, 2017	Township of Langley municipal office
City of Burnaby	Meeting	December 6, 2017	City of Burnaby municipal office
District of Hope	Meeting – SWG Site Specific Emergency Response Plan	December 7, 2017	District of Hope municipal office
City of Chilliwack	Meeting – SWG Site Specific Emergency Response Plan	December 7, 2017	City of Chilliwack municipal office
Fraser Valley Regional District	Meeting – SWG Site Specific Emergency Response Plan	December 8, 2017	Fraser Valley Regional District office
Township of Langley	Meeting – SWG Site Specific Emergency Response Plan	December 8, 2017	Township of Langley municipal office
Town of Hinton	Meeting	December 15, 2017	Town of Hinton office
City of Abbotsford	Meeting	December 15, 2017	City of Abbotsford municipal office
City of Merritt	Meeting – SWG Site Specific Emergency Response Plan and Camp Medical and Health Services Management Plan	December 19, 2017	City of Merritt RCMP Detachment

TWG	METHOD	DATE	LOCATION
City of Kamloops	Meeting – SWG Site Specific Emergency Response Plan and Camp Medical and Health Services Management Plan	December 19, 2017	City of Kamloops RCMP Detachment
City of Spruce Grove	Meeting	January 9, 2018	City of Spruce Grove municipal office
Town of Stony Plain	Meeting	January 9, 2018	Town of Stony Plain office
City of Coquitlam	Meeting – SWG Tree Management	January 17, 2018	City of Coquitlam municipal office
City of Surrey	Meeting – SWG Crossing drawings	January 31, 2018	City of Surrey municipal office
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Meeting	January 31, 2018	Metro Vancouver Regional District office
Village of Wabamun	Meeting – SWG Permitting	February 1, 2018	Village of Wabamun office
Town of Hinton	Meeting – SWG Permitting	February 9, 2018	Conference call
Township of Langley	Meeting	February 13, 2018	Township of Langley civic facility
Township of Langley	Meeting – SWG Aquifer	February 13, 2018	Township of Langley operations centre
City of Coquitlam	Site visit to review street trees	February 15, 2017	Coquitlam
Town of Edson	Meeting – SWG Permitting	February 16, 2018	Conference call
Thompson Nicola Regional District	Meeting – SWG Permitting	February 19, 2018	Thompson Nicola Regional District office
City of Coquitlam	Meeting	February 20, 2018	City of Coquitlam municipal office
City of Abbotsford	Meeting – SWG Permitting	February 23, 2018	City of Abbotsford municipal office
City of Kamloops	Meeting – SWG Permitting	February 26, 2018	City of Kamloops municipal office
City of Merritt	Meeting – SWG Permitting	February 26, 2018	City of Merritt municipal office
City of Surrey	Meeting	February 27, 2018	City of Surrey municipal office

TWG	METHOD	DATE	LOCATION
City of Surrey	Meeting – SWG Drawings, Fraser Health separation guidelines	February 27, 2018	City of Surrey municipal office
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Meeting	February 28, 2018	Metro Vancouver Regional District office
City of Chilliwack	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 7, 2018	City of Chilliwack municipal office
District of Hope	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 7, 2018	District of Hope municipal office
City of Coquitlam	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 8, 2018	Glen Pine Pavilion, Coquitlam
Fraser Valley Regional District	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 8, 2018	Fraser Valley Regional District office
Township of Langley	Meeting – Site visit to review drainage in Ponder Park	March 13, 2018	Ponder Park, Langley
Regional District Fraser Fort George	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 14, 2018	Regional District office
District of Clearwater	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 15, 2018	District of Clearwater office
Village of Valemount	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 15, 2018	Village of Valemount office
Town of Stony Plain	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 23, 2018	Town of Stony Plain office
City of Spruce Grove	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 23, 2018	City of Spruce Grove municipal office
City of Surrey	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 27, 2018	City of Surrey municipal office
Town of Edson	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 29, 2018	Town of Edson municipal office
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Meeting	March 28, 2018	Metro Vancouver Regional District office
Parkland County	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 28, 2018	Parkland County office
Yellowhead County	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 28, 2018	Yellowhead County office
Town of Edson	Meeting – SWG Permitting	March 29, 2018	Town of Edson municipal office

4.0 ISSUES AND CONCERNS

As described in Trans Mountain’s filing of Condition 14 (A81760) and Condition 49 (A82625, A86895), local governments have raised a variety of Project topics and issues through the regulatory process and through ongoing engagement with Trans Mountain. Trans Mountain continues to address specific technical and construction concerns and issues with each individual local government where TWGs have been formed.

4.1 Local Government Permitting

In January 2018, following NEB Order MO-057-2017 (A89357) and to support broader construction planning toward an in-service date of December 2020, Trans Mountain turned its focus toward receiving greater clarity on outstanding permitting and other regulatory matters from a variety of authorities, including at the local level. Trans Mountain issued a letter to local governments requesting an opportunity to discuss the construction schedule in more detail, including critical dates, permits or other approvals that may be required, and how to work together to develop a permitting plan that will satisfy or demonstrate compliance with these requirements, while maintaining construction start dates in each of the local governments. A copy of this letter is included in Appendix A. A series of SWG meetings on this topic were scheduled in February and March 2018 and are identified in Table 4 above; the remaining meetings and outcomes from ongoing discussions will be included in the next Condition 49 report.

Following these discussions, a closure letter will be provided to the local government with schedules of the material presented and Trans Mountain’s understanding of the permits required by each local government for the construction of the Project. In its closure letter, Trans Mountain will request local governments advise if any of the information, including the list of required/not-required permits is incorrect or requires clarification, by notifying Trans Mountain. In the absence of a response, Trans Mountain will proceed on the basis that the list of permits is complete and accurate and that both parties have the same understanding of local government requirements going forward.

4.2 Status Update

Tables 5.1 and 5.2 provide a status update on issues and concerns raised by local governments up to September 30, 2017 and addressed in TWG meetings held between October 1, 2017 and March 31, 2018. Where a topic of concern has been addressed to the satisfaction of both parties, the status is identified as complete. Outcomes and measures to be implemented to address the issues and concerns in progress are also identified. Trans Mountain continues to review these topics with local governments and update the table as part of ongoing TWG engagement to be reported in future Condition 49 submissions.

Trans Mountain is including two meetings that took place outside of the reporting period, as final meeting records were not available prior to the submission of the last update in October 2017. These are:

- City of Chilliwack - May 15, 2017
- Yellowhead County - September 29, 2017

4.3 New Issues and Concerns

Tables 6.1 and 6.2 summarize new issues and concerns raised by local governments in BC and Alberta during this reporting period. Summaries for several meetings that took place in March 2018 are pending feedback. Trans Mountain will report on the issues and outcomes from March TWG and SWG meetings in the next Condition 49 Report.

TABLE 5.1
UPDATE ON ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN BC UP TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2017
AND ADDRESSED IN TWG MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2016 AND MARCH 31, 2018

In the status column where issues and or concerns are Out of Scope for the TWGs this has been indicated. These issues and or concerns are however addressed through other channels.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Abbotsford	An appropriate Communication Plan to be in place during construction to ensure that the City does not shoulder the burden of fielding questions and complaints from the public.	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting; prior to construction commencement.</p> <p>At a TWG meeting on May 31, 2017 Trans Mountain confirmed the intention to share the TMEP Communications and Notification Plan with the City when available. Trans Mountain expects to have this plan ready to share in Q4 2017.</p>	<p>In progress. Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on October 27, 2017 and February 23, 2018. The City stated the importance of Trans Mountain representatives on-site to answer questions in person. They also expect notifications to residents will be provided well in advance of impacts with more notice provided if work is in a City park.</p> <p>Trans Mountain confirmed that a process to triage and respond to public queries exists and is being used today. Trans Mountain will provide an overview of this process at an upcoming meeting to review the Communications and Notification Plan that is now ready to share.</p> <p>As part of the Communication and Notification Plan, Trans Mountain will provide the City with the process for issues resolution as a result of resident concerns. As part of the Highway Excavation Permit (HEP) requirements, Trans Mountain will provide an internal contact list for City staff use only. Previously, the City had requested a single point of contact for all internal TMEP queries. It was agreed that Trans Mountain would provide a limited list of key individuals and their roles to City's key TMEP contact.</p> <p>The topic will continue to be discussed at future TWG meetings.</p>
City of Abbotsford	Crossing agreements.	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting.</p> <p>Municipal permits were discussed at the May 31, 2017 TWG meeting</p>	<p>In progress. Crossing Agreements were discussed at s TWG meetings on October 27, 2017 and December 15, 2017. The City received a package of 48 additional drawings and undertook a technical review. There were only minor comments, such as</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>and have been identified as a future agenda topic.</p> <p>Trans Mountain confirmed the expectation of 107 crossings within Abbotsford to include all road crossings and City owned infrastructure. Trans Mountain confirmed all utility owner crossing applications would be made directly to the respective utility owner.</p> <p>Trans Mountain submitted utility crossing drawings to the City of Abbotsford for 87 crossings on June 15, 2017. The remaining drawings are in development and Trans Mountain expects these will be submitted to the City in Q4 2017.</p>	<p>expanding clearance in certain areas to accommodate future infrastructure planning.</p> <p>The Contractor (SAEG) offered to provide a summary of crossing methods and alternate methods if preferred crossing method is not feasible for the City to review. SAEG will also organize an on site visit for City staff during construction.</p> <p>The City asked if Trans Mountain will undertake analysis and submit to the City or if analysis will be submitted as each road crossing is completed. Trans Mountain provided crossing table at the December 15, 2017 TWG meeting. City to review and both parties agreed any potential deviations or changes based on geotechnical investigations would be resubmitted to City for approval.</p>
City of Abbotsford	<p>Permitting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • highway use and/or excavation • oversize vehicles • hydrant use • tree cutting • soil removal 	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting.</p> <p>Municipal permits were discussed at a TWG meeting on May 31, 2017.</p> <p>Trans Mountain confirmed intent to comply with municipal permits. A number of permits have been identified that Trans Mountain believes would be required from the City. Trans Mountain confirmed that it does not believe any development permits are required. Trans Mountain will continue to discuss permitting with the City at future TWG and SWG meetings in Q1 2018.</p>	<p>In progress. Municipal permitting was discussed at TWG meetings on October 27, 2017, December 15, 2017 and February 23, 2018. The City will issue a Highway Excavation Permit (HEP) for pipeline construction. HEP requirements were provided to Trans Mountain on January 19, 2018. Requirements for the permit were discussed at the February 23, 2018 TWG meeting. While the City would like to review all requirements as one package, certain elements will be provided in advance.</p> <p>A separate meeting to discuss permitting requirements related to Sumas Terminal is expected to occur Q2 2018.</p> <p>New issues raised during this reporting period on this topic are captured in Table 6.1 below.</p>
City of Abbotsford	Culverting agricultural ditch crossings by the pipeline.	This concern is aligned with culverting of Line 1. As this concern also impacts other municipalities, Trans Mountain will review internally for issue resolution with respect to constructing TMEP.	Topic deemed out of scope as it relates to existing operations.
City of	Finalization of pipeline design crossing of the JAMES	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	Topic deemed out of scope as it relates to existing operations.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
Abbotsford	Trunk Sewer (existing and future twinning).		
City of Abbotsford	Trans Mountain to arrange with the Spread 7 Contractor to provide a Project update related to Sumas Terminal and environmental impacts.	Topic for a future TWG meeting Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	In progress.
City of Abbotsford	The City would like a plain language document explaining risk based design.	Topic for a future TWG meeting Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	In progress. Trans Mountain will revisit this concern with the City at a TWG meeting in Q2 2018.
City of Abbotsford	The City requests information on communication plans related to tree clearing.	The topic of permitting related to tree clearing was discussed at the TWG meeting on May 31, 2017 and Trans Mountain confirmed its intention to share the Communications and Notification Plan with the City. Trans Mountain expects this plan will be ready to share in Q4 2017.	In progress. Trans Mountain expects to have the Communication and Notification Plan ready to share in Q2 2018. The topic will be discussed at a future TWG meeting.
City of Abbotsford	Interest in the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) and various environment management plans.	Topic was discussed at TWG meeting on May 31, 2017 and Trans Mountain confirmed the EPP has been out for consultation since November 2016. Future topic for a TWG meeting Q4 2017 – Q1 2018. Trans Mountain to organize a meeting with a member of the environment team to review the Riparian Management Plan with the City.	In progress. Topic for a TWG meeting Q2 – Q3 2018.
City of Abbotsford	Public and adjacent landowner complaints process during construction	Topic discussed at a TWG meeting on May 31, 2017. Trans Mountain confirms there will be a Construction Liaison and a Community Liaison for each construction spread. Trans Mountain to share the Communication and Notification Plan with City for input. Trans Mountain expects this plan will be ready to share in Q4 2017.	In progress. The Community Liaison for Spread 6 will be the main contact at TMEP. Trans Mountain expects to have the Communication and Notification Plan ready to share in Q2 2018. The topic will be discussed at a future TWG meeting.
City of Abbotsford	The City would like a regular presence from Trans Mountain to attend public council meetings during construction to respond to queries from Mayor and Council as well as the public. Trans Mountain to bring this request back to the broader team for consideration.	Future topic at a TWG meeting Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	In progress. Topic for future TWG meeting Q2 – Q3 2018.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Abbotsford	The City would like to be added as an additional insured party. Trans Mountain to consider request and provide a response to the City at a future TWG meeting.	Future topic at a TWG meeting Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	In progress. Trans Mountain confirmed this is a requirement of the Highway Execution Permit (HEP) and will be addressed by submission of the HEP anticipated to be in Q2 2018.
City of Abbotsford	Notification to landowners of impending work. The City would like to understand the radius for landowner notifications.	<p>Topic discussed at a TWG meeting on May 31, 2017.</p> <p>Trans Mountain confirmed that landowners are assigned a land agent who keeps them informed of impending work. Trans Mountain will communicate with landowners in advance of construction beginning; this could be a pre-construction availability for landowners to inform them of upcoming work and potential impacts. Trans Mountain will confirm details via the construction communication plan. Trans Mountain confirmed land agents will be available on site to deal with directly impacted property owners to relocate them if necessary.</p>	Trans Mountain expects to have the Communication and Notification Plan ready to share in Q2 2018. The topic will be discussed at a future TWG meeting.
City of Abbotsford	The City is concerned about potential hardship as mitigation measures, such as those outlined in the EPP, are implemented.	<p>Topic discussed at a TWG meeting on May 31, 2017.</p> <p>Trans Mountain reiterated that EPPs have been available for review and input for some time; however, Trans Mountain recognizes that there have been significant staffing changes within the City. Trans Mountain is always willing to have conversations about any aspects of its Project to provide clarity. The City agreed to provide any concerns related to filed management plans to Trans Mountain for discussion.</p>	Complete.
City of Abbotsford	The City expressed concern over temporary workspace areas, as the extent of workspace has not been clearly explained and provided. The City is concerned about impacts of proposed workspace, for example, tree removal. The Section 34 notices received by the City do not provide the information that the City requires to provide adequate feedback.	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor to work with the City to address concerns in relation to construction and temporary workspace on City owned lands.</p>	In progress. Trans Mountain and its Contractor will continue to work with the City to address concerns in relation to construction and temporary workspace on City owned lands.
City of Burnaby	Increased risk and consequences of spills and accidents as a result of the Project, including Westridge Marine Terminal.	<p>Trans Mountain is committed to meeting NEB Condition 129 and NEB Condition 133.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has and will continue to invite City of Burnaby First</p>	<p>In progress. Ongoing topic for future TWG and SWG meetings Q2 – Q3 2018.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	Increased risk and consequence of a marine spill with the Project; the financial, environmental and health impacts of a spill to the community.	Responders to participate in its Emergency Response engagement, training and exercises.	notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.
City of Burnaby	The ability for TMEP to respond in a timely manner and have the appropriate resources to respond to a pipeline incident.	<p>Trans Mountain continues to engage with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the proposed Project, including ongoing engagement on ERPs to share information and seek input.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has and will continue to invite City of Burnaby First Responders to participate in its Emergency Response engagement activities, training and exercises.</p>	<p>In progress. Topic discussed at October 18, 2017 TWG meeting. Ongoing topic for future TWG and SWG meetings Q2 – Q3 2018.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	Impacts and risks of additional tanks at Burnaby Terminal.	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting.</p> <p>Trans Mountain continues to engage with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the proposed Project, to share information and seek input.</p>	<p>In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q1 2018.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	Trans Mountain will not follow local by-laws.	<p>Topic of conversation for a future TWG meeting.</p> <p>On May 31, 2017 Trans Mountain applied for four Preliminary Plan Approvals (PPAs) from the City of Burnaby:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction at Westridge Marine Terminal • Construction at Burnaby Terminal • Temporary infrastructure site at Kask Brothers • Relocates of existing infrastructure at Burnaby Terminal <p>Trans Mountain notes that the City of Burnaby officially recorded receipt of these four PPAs between June 16 – June 27, 2017.</p>	<p>In progress.</p> <p>On December 7, 2017, the NEB granted Trans Mountain relief from the requirements of Condition 2, pursuant to Condition 1 of Certificate OC-064 (Filing A88474) to proceed with Terminal Work in the absence of the City of Burnaby having issued PPA under section 7.3 of the Zoning Bylaw or Tree Cutting Permits under section 3 of the Tree Bylaw for the Terminal Work.</p> <p>Trans Mountain is currently focused on confirming the municipal permitting requirements and advancing the permitting process with all municipalities along the Project corridor. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain is communicating with the City in writing. On March 26, 2018, Trans Mountain issued a letter to the City of Burnaby outlining its disappointment the City chose to postpone the January 10, February 2 and March 7, 2018 TWG meetings and to defer any further TWG meetings until some</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			unknown date in the future. In its letter, Trans Mountain once again requested an opportunity to meet to discuss permitting, construction and other technical matters in a collaborative effort so the City's concerns can be addressed as the Project moves closer to construction. As of April 6, 2018 Trans Mountain has not received a response.
City of Burnaby	Construction impacts to recreational use areas including land base areas and Burrard Inlet.	<p>Topic for future a TWG meeting.</p> <p>Trans Mountain continues to engage with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the proposed Project, to share information and seek input, including to recreational user groups and parks managers as detailed construction plans are developed; to minimize impacts and determine best methods to communicate to recreation users during construction.</p> <p>Regarding land base areas, City of Burnaby has indicated that they will engage on this topic once the NEB has ruled on the plan, profile and book of reference for this section of the Project detailed route. Trans Mountain expects to have these conversations Q1 2018.</p>	<p>In progress. Topic for a future TWG meeting once the NEB has made a decision on the Routing Hearing.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	Operational impacts to protected species in Burnaby parks and conservation areas.	<p>Topic for future a TWG meeting.</p> <p>Trans Mountain continues to engage with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the Project, to share information and seek input.</p> <p>Trans Mountain's draft environmental management plans are being posted in phases on its website for comment. Stakeholders are invited to provide their feedback through the website and TWG discussion during the consultation window for each plan.</p> <p>Burnaby was notified about the opportunity to provide input to Trans Mountain's draft environmental management plans by email on September 23, 2016 and reminded again about this opportunity on December 12, 2016. Trans Mountain offered to meet to review plans.</p>	<p>In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q2 2018.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	These areas include fish-bearing waterways or conservation areas that are important for the habitat of migrating salmon, as well as Nooksack Dace and	<p>Trans Mountain has a long history of investing in conservation efforts. Trans Mountain has sponsored a study by Bird Studies Canada to map bird populations in the Burrard Inlet to quantify and map seasonal</p>	<p>In progress.</p> <p>Trans Mountain successfully relocated an eagle's nest at Westridge</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	<p>Cutthroat Trout; noise impacts to marine wildlife due to dredging and construction; and impacts to wildlife such as the Killer Whale, Great Blue Heron, and migratory birds.</p>	<p>bird populations. The maps will be made publicly available so that local stakeholders, such as industry, government and environmental organizations can use the information in planning for the appropriate conservation and protection of marine birds.</p> <p>In January 2015, Trans Mountain contributed \$50,000 to the Pacific Salmon Foundation in response to stakeholder feedback and input from Aboriginal groups identifying salmon habitat as a priority for Burrard Inlet. The funding will be used for salmon habitat enhancement in Burrard Inlet, which is expected to improve foraging opportunities for piscivorous marine birds inhabiting Burrard Inlet.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and the Kinder Morgan Foundation continue to field requests from conservation organizations to help with habitat restoration and education initiatives.</p> <p>Trans Mountain reviewed stream crossing methods in Burnaby at the September 6, 2017 pre-TWG meeting and discussed concerns raised by the City of Burnaby. Trans Mountain will continue to work with the City of Burnaby to address issues related to this concern.</p> <p>On July 27, 2017, the Pacific Salmon Foundation (PSF) and Trans Mountain announced measures that will be introduced by the company in the protection of wild Pacific salmon. Trans Mountain has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PSF for multi-year salmon programs, including a third-party assessment by PSF of Trans Mountain’s construction across sensitive salmon-bearing watercourses in British Columbia. The agreement provides \$2.5 million in funding to support grants to community groups for salmon conservation, coastal research, and post-secondary education bursary program and up to \$500,000 for the third-party construction assessment.</p>	<p>Marine Terminal in September 2017 in consultation with the City of Burnaby. Trans Mountain is preparing an ecological report. A copy will be shared with the City when available.</p>
<p>City of Burnaby</p>	<p>Trans Mountain has failed to meaningfully consult with Burnaby between December 15, 2016 and February 20, 2017. Specifically related to filings relating to Conditions 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34, 127B.</p>	<p>A response was filed with the NEB from Osler (on behalf of Trans Mountain) on March 24, 2017 which stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trans Mountain rejects the assertion that it failed to meaningfully consult with Burnaby in this timeframe • Burnaby withdrew from discussions regarding the Project in 	<p>Complete.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will continue to share information related to regulatory submissions with the City of Burnaby.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>2013 on the basis that is preferred to deal with matters of concern through a ‘formal’ process (NEB process/the courts). Since that time, Trans Mountain has continued to provide Burnaby with timely information regarding the Project and has sought Burnaby’s feedback on various Project-related reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the past six months, Trans Mountain has sought input from Burnaby on topics including environmental plans, TWGs; invited the City to participate in a construction planning workshop and an information session; as well as Emergency Management Project-related matters. • Trans Mountain remains open and willing to receive input from Burnaby and to meet to discuss Project-related matters • Trans Mountain and the City met on December 15, 2016 and are planning a TWG meeting on April 4, 2017. <p>Filings related to Project Conditions 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 33, 34 and 127B do not require consultation with appropriate government authorities in advance of filing.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will continue to engage through regular TWG meetings on topics according to ToR.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will continue to share information related to regulatory submissions with the City of Burnaby.</p> <p>In relation to Trans Mountain’s Variance Application and compliance filings pursuant to Conditions 22 and 24 of the NEB Order, Osler (on behalf of Trans Mountain) filed a response to the Letter of Comment from the City of Burnaby dated June 30, 2017 (A84741) with the NEB on July 14, 2017 (A84954). A copy of this letter is located in Appendix B.</p>	<p>notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City’s earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	Review list of applicable City of Burnaby permits. Permit applications must be directed to the TWG meetings per City of Burnaby’s request.	Trans Mountain provided to the City a list of city permits along with highlights of the permits that Trans Mountain considers applicable for compliance submissions at a pre-TWG meeting on May 5, 2017. Permitting was discussed at a TWG meeting on October 18, 2017.	In progress. As stated above, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City’s earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>Topic for SWG meeting once feedback from the City of Burnaby is received on PPA applications.</p>	<p>On March 26, 2018, Trans Mountain issued a letter to the City of Burnaby outlining its disappointment that the City chose to postpone the January 10, February 2 and March 7, 2018 TWG meetings and to defer any further TWG meetings until some unknown date in the future. In its letter, Trans Mountain once again requested an opportunity to meet to discuss permitting, construction and other technical matters in a collaborative effort so the City's concerns can be addressed as the Project moves closer to construction. As of April 6, 2018 Trans Mountain had not received a response.</p>
City of Burnaby	<p>Concerns related to traffic management around Westridge Marine Terminal and Burnaby Terminal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative options for traffic management with respect to proposed Gaglardi access • Concern about impacts on Forest Grove and Sperling neighbourhoods and security 	<p>Traffic management was a topic at a pre-TWG meeting on May 3, 2017. Trans Mountain provided an overview of the Traffic Management Plan and answered questions from city staff. The group agreed to table topic for future TWG and SWG meetings.</p> <p>City of Burnaby identified priorities for SWG meetings are to discuss access to and from the terminals. A traffic management update is on the draft agenda for October 11, 2017 TWG meeting.</p> <p>Trans Mountain presented an update on traffic management at an October 18, 2017 TWG and answered questions from city staff. Both parties agreed to review and discuss the draft traffic management plan in development with the General Construction Contractor at a SWG meeting.</p>	<p>In progress. The City of Burnaby has not responded to or provided any comments to Trans Mountain on the previously submitted Traffic Management Plan. The City has not made Trans Mountain aware of any concerns related to the previously submitted Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>The City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing. On March 26, 2018, Trans Mountain issued a letter to the City of Burnaby outlining its disappointment that the City chose to postpone the January 10, February 2 and March 7, 2018 TWG meetings and to defer any further TWG meetings until some unknown date in the future. In its letter, Trans Mountain once again requested an opportunity to meet to discuss permitting, construction and other technical matters in a collaborative effort so the City's concerns can be addressed as the Project moves closer to construction. As of April 6, 2018 Trans Mountain had not received a response.</p>
City of Burnaby	Review crossings.	<p>Initial conversation took place at June 5, 2017 pre-TWG meeting. Agreement to defer to post NEB Route Hearing decision. Future TWG meeting topic.</p>	<p>In progress. In January 2018 the NEB held Route Hearings for pipeline segments within Burnaby and the NEB decision on same is expected in Q2 2018.</p> <p>The City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			<p>communicate with City in writing. On March 26, 2018, Trans Mountain issued a letter to the City of Burnaby outlining its disappointment that the City chose to postpone the January 10, February 2 and March 7, 2018 TWG meetings and to defer any further TWG meetings until some unknown date in the future. In its letter, Trans Mountain once again requested an opportunity to meet to discuss permitting, construction and other technical matters in a collaborative effort so the City's concerns can be addressed as the Project moves closer to construction. As of April 6, 2018 Trans Mountain had not received a response.</p>
City of Burnaby	<p>Establish subgroup meetings to continue discussions on additional topics.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain confirmed sub-group meeting topics in a pre-TWG meeting on July 5, 2017. Both parties agreed to the following SWGs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Utility crossings • Emergency management • Restoration • PPAs) • Eagles nest relocation • Terminal access (added during July 5, 2017 pre-TWG) 	<p>Complete. In Q4 2017 Trans Mountain established SWGs on the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eagles nest relocation • Traffic • Emergency management • Terminal access <p>Trans Mountain will continue to schedule SWGs on the remaining topics as required in Q2 – Q4 2018.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	<p>Additional information about Westridge Eagles Nest proposed alternate location.</p>	<p>A SWG meeting was held on August 22, 2017 to discuss the relocation of an eagles nest at Westridge Marine Terminal. The City provided permission to Trans Mountain to install an alternate nest platform and nesting materials in a tree on City property. Monitoring and discussions are ongoing related to this topic.</p>	<p>In progress. Fieldwork was completed and updates were provided at TWG meetings and electronically by email in Q4 2017. Trans Mountain is preparing an ecological report; it will include setback information and be shared with the City. Both parties agreed any ongoing discussions related to this topic would be discussed outside the TWG.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages,</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.
City of Burnaby	Investigate using KMC-owned Shell 16 inch pipeline corridor for TMEP to cross Shellmont Street; and abandonment of KMC-owned Shell 16 inch pipeline.	<p>Initial conversation took place at June 27, 2017 pre-TWG meeting followed by subsequent discussion at a pre-TWG meeting on July 27, 2017.</p> <p>Trans Mountain advised abandonment would require separate application to NEB and slight re-route to run through trench. Group agreed to defer until NEB route hearing process is complete and revisit once a final route is determined.</p> <p>Future TWG meeting topic Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.</p>	<p>In progress. The NEB held a Route Hearing for pipeline segments in Burnaby in January 2018. The NEB decision is expected in Q2 2018 and both parties agree to discuss topic post NEB decision.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	Add, "confirm list of outstanding issues" to future agendas.	For discussion at future TWG meeting Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	<p>In progress. Future TWG meeting agenda topic.</p> <p>Trans Mountain presented a draft list of outstanding issues at the November 23 TWG meeting. The City expressed interest in reviewing and providing feedback at a future TWG meeting. No further feedback received.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	Trans Mountain to provide City of Burnaby with a copy of final forestry pipeline corridor site visit report once complete	In progress. Reports scheduled to be completed in Q4 2017.	<p>In progress. Topic discussed at October 18, 2017 TWG meeting. Report is outstanding and will be circulated when completed. City of Burnaby clarified that the forestry report is for the pipeline.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	The City wants to understand the rationale for alignment of crossings and is interested in details of where the flexes could be the City wants to review the	The group agreed at a pre-TWG meeting on May 3, 2017 to table this topic for a future TWG or SWG meeting. Trans Mountain reviewed crossings with the City at a pre-TWG meeting on June 27, 2017 and addressed questions and concerns around trenchless construction	In progress. The NEB held a Route Hearing for pipeline segments in Burnaby in January 2018. The NEB decision is expected in Q2 2018 and further discussion is required once detailed alignment has been

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	Gaglardi crossing and he North Road crossing.	<p>methodology, tree removals, and the Shell Burmount Terminal.</p> <p>Initial conversation is underway; however, further discussion required once detailed alignment approved by NEB.</p>	<p>approved.</p> <p>TMEP reviewed detailed alignment and construction methodology at the July 5, 2017 TWG meeting. TMEP received limited specific feedback. The City of Burnaby confirmed that it would not receive further information about crossings until after the route hearing as the City objects to the route alignment.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	Emergency management, specifically NEB Condition 123 Evacuation Plans and NEB Condition 118 Firefighting capacity.	<p>The group agreed at a pre-TWG meeting on May 3, 2017 and June 27, 2017 to table topics for future TWG meetings and establish a SWG meeting to continue discussion about mass evacuation planning and firefighting capacity.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has been having conversations with Simon Fraser University regarding evacuation planning and has worked on an Evaluation Plan with them. Trans Mountain would like to have the City participate in an upcoming SWG meeting with SFU in order for all three parties to work together on a mass evacuation exercise in 2018.</p> <p>The City advised that under the Evacuation Plan #123, the City is the only one who can announce an evacuation. Trans Mountain would like the City to be part of discussions related to Evacuation Plans for the site.</p>	<p>Complete. Both parties agreed at a TWG meeting on October 18, 2017 that an Emergency Management SWG would be set as required to discuss these topics of interest to the City of Burnaby.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	The City is concerned that there is a lack of understanding of special requirements related to pipeline construction methodology.	Future TWG agenda topic Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	<p>Future TWG agenda topic Q2 – Q3 2018 once the NEB has approved a detailed route in Burnaby. Initial conversation took place at a pre-TWG meeting in May 2017.</p> <p>Trans Mountain reviewed detailed alignment and construction methodology at the July 5, 2017 TWG meeting. Trans Mountain received limited specific feedback. The City of Burnaby confirmed that it would not receive further information about crossings until after</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			<p>the route hearing as the City objects to the route alignment.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	<p>The City of Burnaby is interested in further information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Route alignment rationale and detail to determine where flexibility may exist • Detailed route alignment Construction methodology 	<p>Topics discussed at a pre-TWG meeting on July 5, 2017. Further discussion at future TWG meetings Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.</p>	<p>Future TWG agenda topic Q2 – Q3 2018 once the NEB has approved a detailed route in Burnaby. Initial conversation took place at a pre-TWG meeting in May 2017.</p> <p>Trans Mountain reviewed detailed alignment and construction methodology at the July 5, 2017 TWG. Trans Mountain received limited specific feedback. The City of Burnaby confirmed that it would not receive further information about crossings until after the route hearing as the City objects to the route alignment.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Burnaby	<p>Provide distance (measurement) between Westridge Marine Terminal and Dynamite Creek.</p>	<p>Future TWG agenda topic Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.</p>	<p>Complete. Topic discussed at November 23, 2017 TWG meeting. Trans Mountain is preparing an ecological report; it will include setback information and be shared with the City.</p> <p>As of January 2018, the City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in the TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience. Until the City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in writing.</p>
City of Chilliwack	<p>Sardis-Vedder Aquifer protection.</p>	<p>Ongoing TWG meeting topic.</p> <p>Please see Appendix C of Section 21 Chilliwack route re-alignment application (A82269) for documentation related to City's concerns and Trans Mountain's responses.</p>	<p>Ongoing. Information will be discussed/and or shared with the City as it becomes available.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Chilliwack	The City requests that the NEB add a condition that requires Trans Mountain to, at a minimum: develop and implement a Communication Plan in consultation with local governments that demonstrates how Trans Mountain will ensure that all public inquiries, complaints and concerns regarding construction and operations of the TMEP are directed to and handled by Trans Mountain, which includes the provision of a full-time Trans Mountain employee at the municipal City hall(s) where construction is underway to act as a resource for the public and point person for municipal employees.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	In progress. Information will be shared with the City as it becomes available.
City of Chilliwack	Monitor groundwater data at monitoring well locations agreed upon by the City.	Groundwater Monitoring Program will be assessed as per requirements outlined in NEB Condition 130. Groundwater monitoring, if deemed appropriate, will be carried out during Project operations.	Complete. Trans Mountain will carry out engagement related to Condition.
City of Chilliwack	Ensure that environmental monitor and water quality resource specialists are independent of Trans Mountain.	<p>The NEB is responsible for verifying and ensuring that Trans Mountain is in compliance with NEB Conditions. For any questions or concerns about Trans Mountain’s Conditions compliance, please contact the National Energy Board at 1-800-899-1265.</p> <p>Environmental inspectors will be contracted to work on the project and will be experienced in linear or large scale construction projects. Water quality monitors will be experienced and will have professional qualifications or be under the direct supervision of a qualified professional. Third party and internal environmental audits will be conducted during construction to verify environmental resources are effective in protecting the environment and in compliance with conditions and commitments.</p>	Complete. Topic to be addressed at an appropriate date in the future once monitors have been selected.
City of Chilliwack	Obtain baseline water quality data for hydrocarbons, heavy metals, nutrient loads and bacteria, and sediment quality prior to construction.	A Groundwater Management Plan has been prepared as part of the Environmental Management Plans required for the Project. This plan outlines procedures for identifying groundwater related effects of the Project, provides criteria for implementing those procedures, reviews planned mitigation measures, and describes monitoring of groundwater quality and/or quantity. It also emphasizes protection of	In progress.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>identified vulnerable aquifers along the proposed pipeline route.</p> <p>When construction is complete, field testing results will be available for comparison to results from pre-construction monitoring. Post-construction results will also be compared to Health Canada's Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has shared the draft Groundwater Management Plan along with a Technical Memo regarding the protection of municipal water sources. Trans Mountain anticipates receiving feedback on these documents related to this topic at an upcoming TWG meeting.</p>	
City of Chilliwack	<p>Establish monitoring protocols in conjunction with the City for monitoring groundwater quality and quantity before, during and after construction and during operations.</p>	<p>A Groundwater Management Plan has been prepared as part of the Environmental Management Plans required for the Project. This plan outlines procedures for identifying groundwater related effects of the Project, provides criteria for implementing those procedures, reviews planned mitigation measures, and describes monitoring of groundwater quality and/or quantity. It also emphasizes protection of identified vulnerable aquifers along the proposed pipeline route.</p> <p>When construction is complete, field testing results will be available for comparison to results from pre-construction monitoring. Post-construction results will also be compared to Health Canada's Guidelines for Canadian Drinking Water Quality.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has shared the draft Groundwater Management Plan along with a Technical Memo regarding the protection of municipal water sources. Trans Mountain anticipates receiving feedback on these documents related to this topic at an upcoming TWG meeting.</p>	In progress.
City of Chilliwack	<p>Request Draft Condition 63 (NEB Condition 72) be amended to:</p> <p>Include the requirement that Trans Mountain demonstrate how it has developed the plan in meaningful consultation with and input from local governments; require Trans Mountain to retain an independent third party monitor to ensure compliance</p>	<p>NEB Condition 72 – Pipeline Environmental Protection Plan requires Trans Mountain to consult with Appropriate Government Authorities, potentially affected Aboriginal groups, and affected landowners/tenants. In its summary, Trans Mountain must provide a description and justification for how Trans Mountain has incorporated the results of its consultation, including any recommendations from those consulted into the plan.</p>	Complete. Trans Mountain filed Condition 72 on June 1, 2017.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	<p>with the plan and share the monitoring results with local governments; develop monitoring protocols and baseline measurements in conjunction with local governments.</p>	<p>The Condition includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) environmental procedures (including site-specific plans), criteria for implementing these procedures, mitigation measures, and monitoring applicable to all Project phases and activities b) policies and procedures for environmental training and the reporting structure for environmental management during construction, including the qualifications, roles, responsibilities, and decision-making authority for each job title identified in the updated EPP <p>Trans Mountain informed the City of draft Environmental Plans available on its website for review and comment, as well as offered the option to meet to discuss specific feedback from the City with respect to these plans in emails sent on September 23, 2016 and November 30, 2016.</p> <p>Trans Mountain did not receive a response from the City or a request to meet to discuss specific concerns related to the draft Pipeline Environmental Protection Plan during the review and comment period.</p> <p>If the City would like to discuss the Pipeline EPP once it is filed with the NEB, including stakeholder feedback incorporated, Trans Mountain would be pleased to arrange a meeting with one of its technical experts.</p>	
<p>City of Chilliwack</p>	<p>Request to amend Draft Condition 88 (NEB Condition 90) to: replace the word “communities” with “local governments”; require Trans Mountain to develop a Terms of Reference with each local government that establishes a mutually agreed protocol for “consultation” and mutual obligations; develop the Emergency Management Plan (EMP) and obtain approval of the EMP by the NEB before Project construction begins.</p>	<p>NEB Conditions refer to ‘Appropriate Government Authorities.’</p> <p>NEB Condition 14 requires Trans Mountain to develop ToR for Technical Working Groups.</p> <p>Trans Mountain’s Emergency Response Program is a comprehensive set of policies, procedures and processes designed to support our commitment of safety and security of the public, workers, company property, and the environment. Our current EMP includes Emergency Response Plans that are location specific and cover all current pipeline</p>	<p>In progress. The City of Chilliwack will continue to be invited to participate in all emergency management engagement and training relevant to the region.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>and associated facilities for the Trans Mountain pipeline system.</p> <p>Trans Mountain is committed to meeting NEB Condition 90 – Consultation on improvements to Trans Mountain’s Emergency Management Program, NEB Condition 124 – Implementing improvements to Trans Mountain’s Emergency Management Program.</p>	
City of Chilliwack	City requests NEB amend Draft Condition 58 (NEB Condition 62) to: require that Trans Mountain seek local government feedback and coordinate with local governments when developing and implementing the construction schedule; require that Trans Mountain submit the construction schedule 60 days in advance to the local government in which it will be in that local government’s jurisdiction.	Trans Mountain will seek input into construction plans, including the schedule, through ongoing TWG discussions with the City.	<p>In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q1 2018.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will abide by all requirements outlined by regulators. Trans Mountain will share ongoing Project updates including Construction schedules as information becomes available.</p>
City of Chilliwack	City requests NEB to amend Draft Condition 61 (NEB Condition 73) to: include the requirement that Trans Mountain abide by local government bylaws pertaining to street and traffic and apply for highway use permits where applicable; submit a compensation plan which outlines how Trans Mountain will calculate its use of local government resources, staff time and first responders to administer its traffic closures and how it will compensate local governments for this time.	<p>Wherever practical, Trans Mountain will work with provincial and municipal governments to ensure its project plans meet or exceed expectations outlined in applicable provincial regulations and municipal bylaws.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has stated that it is not Trans Mountain’s intent to be a financial burden on municipalities. If a local government believes it is in a situation of net loss, Trans Mountain will meet and discuss outstanding concerns or costs.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will consult on draft Traffic Control Plan as part of NEB Condition 73 at an upcoming TWG meeting.</p>	In progress. Traffic Management Plan was a topic discussed at a TWG Meeting on May 19, 2017. When the detailed Traffic Management Plan is available, Trans Mountain will share it with the City for comment.
City of Chilliwack	City requests NEB include a Condition that requires Trans Mountain to develop a Noise Management Plan for general construction noise (not solely from horizontal drilling) in residential areas, near schools, and in parks, and that Trans Mountain abide by local government noise bylaws or else seek exemption permits from local governments for exceeding noise requirements.	<p>Trans Mountain will ensure the operation and testing for noise generating equipment meets local noise bylaws by designing and installing equipment with appropriate consideration of noise suppression. Additionally, testing for this type of equipment is normally done during regular working hours. Detailed mitigation measures for this equipment have not yet been determined, as this will be done during the final phase of detailed design and engineering work.</p> <p>In addition, Condition 74 requires site specific Horizontal Directional</p>	Noise bylaw requirements were discussed with the City at a March 7, 2018 TWG Meeting. Trans Mountain will share the Noise Management Plans for the Vedder River DPD crossing when filed with the NEB.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		Drilling (HDD) Noise Management Plans to be filed 3 months prior to the commencement of construction of each HDD crossing.	
City of Chilliwack	City expressed concern over ensuring topics of importance were discussed. City would like to have road crossings, river crossings, and groundwater as standing agenda items.	To be included on future TWG agendas as required.	In progress. Crossing agreements were a topic discussed at a TWG Meeting on May 19, 2017, and the March 7, 2018 TWG Meeting.
City of Chilliwack	City requested Sardis-Vedder Aquifer be added to the Rolling Action Plan (formerly List of Outstanding Concerns).	Trans Mountain added this to the RAP to be shared with the City with each subsequent TWG meeting.	In progress. Information to be shared related to the aquifer as it becomes available.
City of Chilliwack	City expressed concern over ensuring proper documentation of meetings. Request for any documents shared at meetings to be included with meeting minutes along with agenda.	Trans Mountain agrees with this request and will incorporate this feedback into the ToR specific to the City of Chilliwack.	In progress.
City of Chilliwack	City expressed concern that not all of the recommendations in its Letter of Comment, related to the aquifer were addressed in the Waterline Technical Memo shared with the City of Chilliwack.	Trans Mountain is currently preparing a formal response.	Completed. Trans Mountain has addressed through the Section 21 Route Hearing.
City of Chilliwack	Trans Mountain to provide updated construction information as it becomes available.	In progress. Ongoing topic for future TWG meetings Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	Trans Mountain technical experts to share construction information as it becomes available and seek the City's input where appropriate.
City of Coquitlam	Environmental impacts of construction.	<p>Environmental management plans are a topic for TWG or SWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain established TWG and SWGs with the City of Coquitlam to address specific topics of interest including environmental impacts.</p> <p>The City provided their feedback to the TMEP environment management plans available online and the feedback is being discussed through TWGs and environment SWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and the Contractor discussed environment-related</p>	<p>In progress. Conversations continue at regular TWG and SWG meetings.</p> <p>Tree protection during construction is addressed in the TMEP EPP, which has been shared with the City.</p> <p>Trans Mountain reviewed the tree management plan and addressed questions and concerns at a SWG meeting with the City of Coquitlam on January 17, 2018, and subsequent site visit with the City arborist on February 15, 2018. The results of the site visit were reviewed at the TWG meeting on February 20, 2018, including boulevard trees to be removed (one boulevard tree on United</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>topics at TWG meetings on May 16, 2017, July 18, 2017, September 12, 2017 and at a SWG meeting/site tour on August 29, 2017.</p> <p>The City of Coquitlam is being provided any Condition filings related to environment plans as they are filed with the NEB. Discussions are underway about environment topics including Bear Smart plant species, tree management and design for culverts near the Port Mann compensation area to meet City of Coquitlam specifications (size and height/weight ratio).</p>	<p>Boulevard and a cluster of cotton wood trees near Hartley). Trans Mountain is currently revising the Tree Management Plan and will share with the City once revisions are complete. Generally, boulevard trees that are 4m or greater away from the pipeline will not be removed during the clearing stage.</p> <p>Ongoing topic for future TWG and SWG meetings.</p>
City of Coquitlam	Economic impacts to businesses affected by construction.	<p>Topic for future TWG or SWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain continues to engage with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the proposed Project, including ongoing engagement with neighbours (including businesses) to share information and seek input to our detailed construction plans to minimize impact to neighbours during construction.</p> <p>Trans Mountain hosted an engagement event (coffee chat) for local businesses on August 30, 2017.</p>	In progress. Further outreach with the business community is planned for Q2-Q3 2018 prior to construction.
City of Coquitlam	Construction impacts on municipal services such as fire/rescue.	<p>Topic for future TWG or SWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain established TWG and SWGs with the City of Coquitlam to address specific topics of interest including coordination with the City's Emergency Services.</p> <p>Discussions are underway through established Emergency Management SWGs. Trans Mountain and the Contractor commit to arranging an Emergency Services site tour prior to the start of construction along with regular updates on Project-related traffic information.</p>	<p>In progress.</p> <p>Site-specific emergency response plans will be discussed with City of Coquitlam Fire, RCMP and emergency services in Q2 2018.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Coquitlam	Assurance that TMEP will adhere to City by-laws and permits requirements.	<p>Topic for TWG or SWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain established TWG and SWGs with the City of Coquitlam to address specific topics of interest including permitting.</p> <p>Trans Mountain confirmed intent to comply with all local and regional permitting requirements, as applicable; however, permits would be applied for by the General Contactor responsible for each spread (Q4 2017).</p>	<p>In progress.</p> <p>On January 18, 2018, the NEB announced a process to resolve potential future permitting disputes between Trans Mountain and provincial and municipal authorities for TMEP (Filing A89357). Since that time, Trans Mountain has been focused on advancing the permitting process and engaging municipalities in discussion on the Project schedule in greater detail, including the critical dates, permits or other approvals that may be required, and how to work together to satisfy or demonstrate compliance with these requirements while maintaining a September 2018 construction start date.</p> <p>A meeting took place on March 8, 2018. Additional outcomes will be included in the next Condition 49 report.</p>
City of Coquitlam	Construction impacts to landowners with property built on an old landfill	<p>Topic for future TWG or TWG subgroup meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and the Contractor have discussed conducting pre-condition surveys prior to construction.</p>	<p>In progress. Pre-condition surveys are planned to be completed by Q1 2018.</p>
City of Coquitlam	Impacts of construction on recreational use in Colony Farm Regional Park.	<p>Trans Mountain intends to avoid the use of Colony Farm land to the extent feasible. Refer to response to BC Nature Canada IR No. 2.41b (A4H7Y8).</p> <p>On several occasions, Trans Mountain has confirmed verbally and in writing with the City of Coquitlam (including by letter to Mayor Stewart on May 28, 2015) and other stakeholders, our commitment to use the Mayfair CP Rail siding as temporary workspace for the Fraser River trenchless crossing. As our design proceeds we will confirm access, however we commit to restricting access to existing disturbed areas such as the rail siding or existing roadways.</p> <p>This is a topic for TWG or SWG meetings.</p>	<p>Complete. Topic was discussed at TWG meeting on November 22, 2017 and Trans Mountain confirmed there are no planned trail closures in Colony Farm Regional Park. This topic will continue to be a future TWG agenda topic as required.</p>
City of	City of Coquitlam is concerned that material from trenchless construction may be contaminated and	<p>Topic for future TWG or TWG subgroup meetings.</p>	<p>Complete.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
Coquitlam	asked Trans Mountain to notify the City if contamination is discovered during construction.	<p>Under Condition 46 - Contamination identification and assessment plan, Trans Mountain will mitigate potential risk from exposure to pre-existing contamination. The Plan outlines appropriate measures for handling contaminated material to protect workers, public and the environment. Environmental site assessments will be completed at selected high-risk properties prior to construction.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor will implement the TMEP Contamination Identification and Assessment Plan to address contaminated sites and disposal of such material and will notify the City if contamination is encountered during construction. Trans Mountain have captured this topic in the Rolling Action Plan regularly discussed with the City of Coquitlam at ongoing TWG meetings. The topic will continue to be included in the Rolling Action Plan for discussion by both parties.</p>	
City of Coquitlam	Pavement on United Boulevard (City of Coquitlam requested that Trans Mountain restore and repave the two west bound lanes on United Boulevard after construction).	<p>Topic for future TWG and SWG meetings.</p> <p>Through the NEB IR process, Trans Mountain committed to restoring and repaving as necessary the two northern (westbound) lanes of United Boulevard post construction, in the areas affected by Trans Mountain's construction work.</p> <p>Discussions with the City about plans for United Boulevard re-pavement are ongoing. The topic was discussed and progress made at the Traffic Management SWG meeting on June 5, 2017, TWG meetings on July 18, 2017 and September 12, 2017. City of Coquitlam is reviewing and will provide feedback at the next scheduled TWG meeting. Topic will be discussed in a separate "United Boulevard rebuild" SWG.</p>	<p>In progress. The topic was discussed again at TWG meeting on November 22, 2017. Trans Mountain and Kiewit-Ledcor Trans Mountain Partnership (KLTP) presented a plan to maintain three lanes of traffic during construction and restore lanes with 50 mm touch up on southern lanes. A credit for future work will be provided to the City of Coquitlam. Proposed credit scope includes paving of 50mm of lanes, reconstruction of the median islands, all line painting and cutting traffic loops at intersection.</p> <p>The City will review the plan, scope and credit and provide their response to Trans Mountain at a future TWG meeting.</p>
City of Coquitlam	City of Coquitlam is a designated Bear Smart certified community and must consider reducing human-wildlife conflict. The City asked Trans Mountain to consider a change from three smaller culverts to one larger culvert in the area between Fraser River HDD crossing exit and United Boulevard to allow crossing	Topic for future TWG or SWG meetings.	<p>In progress.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and KLTP continue to work on the culvert design in collaboration with the City of Coquitlam. Future agenda topic in Q2 2018.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	for larger animals.		
City of Coquitlam	City of Coquitlam would like to review erosion control measures and Pipeline EPP	Erosion control measures are outlined in the Pipeline EPP plan. Future SWG meeting topic to review site specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plans with the City of Coquitlam in Q4 2017.	In progress. Future agenda topic in Q2 2018.
City of Coquitlam	Pipeline is buried at 2 m depth through the United Boulevard area. City requested to review the burial depth of pipeline so it does not interfere with City of Coquitlam infrastructure.	Ongoing topic at TWG and SWG meetings. Trans Mountain and the Contractor discussed pipeline depths at TWG meeting on May 16, 2017. Trans Mountain is planning on the pipeline being 2 m deep at most locations. Trans Mountain has every intention to minimize impact to City's infrastructure by crossing underneath utilities. Final design and crossing drawings were discussed at the May 16, 2017 TWG meeting and will continue through Utility SWG meetings. KLTP will complete a utility locate program by Q1 2018 and address the burial depth of the pipeline within final design.	Complete.
City of Coquitlam	Staging areas on Rogers Avenue, Hartley Avenue, and United Boulevard.	Trans Mountain and the Contractor discussed aspects of the Traffic Management Plan for each scheduled full closure and detour with the City of Coquitlam at the Traffic Management SWG meeting on June 5, 2017. Staging areas will continue to be discussed at future TWG and SWG meetings.	Complete.
City of Coquitlam	Traffic management, business and emergency access: City of Coquitlam requires a list of proposed traffic management plans and construction methodologies throughout City. Traffic Management needs to include provisions for emergency response times. Traffic Management plans should consider MOTI impacts at Mary Hill Bypass and Brunette Highway.	Trans Mountain and the Contractor discussed the Traffic Management Plan with the City of Coquitlam at a TWG meeting on May 16, 2017. The Plan was available for feedback online until May 21. This plan provides the overall approach and has a list of key locations. KLTP is developing site-specific traffic management plans. KLTP reviewed aspects of the Traffic Management Plans for each scheduled full closure and detour during the SWG meeting on June 5, 2017 including United Boulevard, Hartley Avenue and Rogers Avenue. KLTP will submit Traffic Management plans to the City and also review	In progress. Topic discussed at TWG meeting on November 22, 2017 and Traffic SWG meeting on October 3, 2017. KLTP reviewed drawings and received comments from the City for United Boulevard, Hartley and Rogers Avenues that will be incorporated in the IFC (Issued for Construction) drawings. Trans Mountain has been actively engaged with the United Boulevard business community since 2013. Two coffee chats have occurred to date (the most recent on November 15, 2017) to share information about construction plans and answer questions and

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	<p>City of Coquitlam has concerns regarding methane readings and would like to discuss fire response plan in a SWG.</p> <p>City noted that many businesses only have one driveway access. It is City's understanding that during construction, KLTP will want to close accesses for a period of time, and utilize driveways to other businesses, and the parking lot areas and internal connections to provide access to all businesses (albeit indirect). This needs to be communicated to affected businesses and they will need to agree to this scenario.</p>	<p>the emergency response times; if these are not achievable, a temporary fire or emergency station may be required.</p> <p>KLTP will share Traffic Management plans for MOTI locations within the City of Coquitlam. KLTP will set up a meeting with City of Coquitlam Fire to discuss methane readings and Fire response plan in January 2018.</p> <p>Trans Mountain/KLTP will engage with local businesses to understand impacts, access and peak hours in Q4 2017.</p>	<p>concerns related to schedule, traffic management and access to businesses along United Boulevard, Hartley and Rogers Avenues. Trans Mountain is planning future outreach in Q2 – Q3 2018 prior to construction start.</p>
City of Coquitlam	City of Coquitlam requested pre and post construction video inspections of all storm and sanitary service connections that may be affected by crossings (crossing or running parallel).	Trans Mountain and its Contractor discussed this topic with the City of Coquitlam at a TWG meeting on September 12, 2017. KLTP will coordinate video inspections prior to the start of construction in Q1 2018.	Complete. KLTP will complete pre construction video inspections during potholing program.
City of Coquitlam	City of Coquitlam requested an update regarding the TMEP Communication and Notification Plan.	Communication and Notification Plan will be provided to the City in Q4 2017. Trans Mountain will set up a SWG meeting to discuss the plan.	In progress. Trans Mountain expects to have the Communication and Notification Plan ready to share in Q2 2018. The topic will be discussed at a future TWG meeting.
City of Coquitlam	Beedie Development Group requested that KLTP explore options for re-aligning TMEP alignment into city street to mitigate conflict to their proposed development.	<p>Trans Mountain will complete a traffic study at King Edward and United Boulevard and share it with the City in Q4 2017.</p> <p>Future TWG agenda topic Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.</p>	In progress. The traffic study was completed in Q4 2017 and discussed at a TWG meeting with the City of Coquitlam on November 22, 2017. Trans Mountain and KLTP are working to address the concerns of Beedie Development Group and will continue to keep the City informed as discussion progresses in Q2-Q3 2018.
City of Coquitlam	Through the regulatory process, Trans Mountain committed to working with City of Coquitlam in developing and executing a protocol agreement for construction of the TMEP within Coquitlam.	City of Coquitlam will discuss internally and provide an update to Trans Mountain by the next TWG in Q4 2017.	Complete. On November 22, 2017 the City of Coquitlam noted that this commitment was made early in the process and the Project and engagement has evolved. The City participates in the NEB-led meetings that aim to address some of the issues related to operations and there was acknowledgment that the TWG ToR fulfill

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			<p>this commitment for construction.</p> <p>The City will provide a sample agreement used with other utility companies to Trans Mountain for further discussion and consideration.</p>
City of Kamloops	Utility crossings and methods.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	<p>Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on February 26, 2018.</p> <p>The City is concerned about construction impacts on utilities at the HDD exit site in the proximity of the Kamloops Airpor. There is City infrastructure in the ground. The City will prepare a strong contingency plan for potential interruptions to service. Trans Mountain explained they are in discussion with the Kamloops Airport Society to relocate the HDD exit point about 40m north. Trans Mountain will daylight all utilities prior to construction.</p> <p>The City requests advance notice for bulk use of sewer or water to adjust utility operations to accommodate bulk loading. Trans Mountain will provide notification prior to use.</p>
City of Kamloops	Traffic delays due to construction - Ord Road, Tranquille Road (trucking) and Missions Flats Road (access to solid waste management site)	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting.</p> <p>Public access to the solid waste management site along Mission Flats Road will be maintained throughout construction. Short delays may be experienced by the public due to construction vehicle movement on and off Mission Flats Road. These activities will be managed by professional traffic controllers.</p> <p>Trans Mountain is committed to meeting NEB Condition 73 – Traffic control plans for public roadways, and to providing detailed traffic plans for discussion through TWG meetings. NEB Condition 73 requires Trans Mountain to consult with Appropriate Government Authorities, such as the City of Kamloops, in the development of this plan, and to provide a description and justification for how feedback from those consulted has been incorporated.</p>	<p>Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on February 26, 2018.</p> <p>Mission Flats Road is experiencing traffic delays due to the new rail crossing to the Cando temporary site. The City understands this is not under Trans Mountain's control however would like Trans Mountain to support requests to CP Rail to minimize traffic delays when bringing in pipe by rail to this location (when possible).</p> <p>Trans Mountain anticipates full closure of Ord Road for blasting and construction up to one week. Residents and trucking companies will be notified and there will be signage as identified in the Traffic Management Plan. The City expressed interest in aligning City blasting work with TMEP construction activities. Trans Mountain's contractors will provide advance notice of planned Ord road closures and blasting work in order to align with City works.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan is under development and will be a topic for a future TWG meeting in Q2 – Q3 2018. Trans Mountain</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			agreed to provide the plan to the City four weeks prior to the TWG to review
City of Kamloops	Maintain access and maintain storm water storage infrastructure function at Ord Road Dog Park.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	In progress. Topic for a future TWG meeting in Q2 – Q4 2018.
City of Kamloops	Impacts to green spaces, parks and natural areas such as Kenna Cartwright and Ord Road Dog Park.	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting. Detailed planning will be tied to the anticipated construction schedule.</p> <p>Alternate site located for Ord Road Dog Park. Detailed planning required for Kenna Cartwright notifications and dog park relocation.</p>	<p>Discussions about construction planning related to Ord Road and Kenna Cartwright are underway. The topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on February 26, 2018 and a construction update was provided.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will provide resident notifications as outlined in the Communication and Notification plan to address the City's concern about noise, traffic flow changes and/or closures and changes to park access or use.</p>
City of Kamloops	<p>Prior to construction, Trans Mountain will arrange procurement open houses or workshops at various local and regional locations to present potential supply opportunities to the project.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will provide information about procurement opportunities to potential Aboriginal, regional, provincial and Canadian suppliers using various communication means.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain agrees to arrange procurement workshops with its Contractors at various locations. Trans Mountain expects to begin these workshops in Q2 2017.</p> <p>Trans Mountain is committed to meeting NEB Condition 11 – Aboriginal, local, and regional skills and business capacity inventory; NEB Condition 12 – Training and Education Monitoring Plan; and NEB Condition 107 – Aboriginal, local and regional employment and business opportunity monitoring reports.</p>	In progress. Trans Mountain now expects to begin these workshops in Q2 2018.
City of Kamloops	The City should review proposed signs and locations within the Municipal boundary (Mitigation Measures #17-20 of the Pipeline EPP).	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	Complete. Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on February 26, 2018 and the City's concern has been addressed through conversation.
City of Kamloops	Construction clean up. Specific requirements will be captured through Municipal permitting for specific construction sites (road crossings etc.).	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on February 26, 2018. Ongoing discussion and topic for future TWG meetings.
City of Kamloops	There are many gully crossings that typically do not have surface water flowing, or may only flow intermittently. While the gullies do not have fish value, they do play important roles in storm water management and protection of properties	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on February 26, 2018. Topic for a future TWG meeting in Q2 2018.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	downstream. Given the history of the gullies and their role in storm water management, Trans Mountain should be made aware of their importance.		
City of Kamloops	Working windows should also consider times when Kamloops is at higher risk of significant rain events. These are typically early summer (June/July) and September. Snow melt should also be considered and measures in place to deal with these events.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.
City of Kamloops	Vehicle/Equipment Crossings: Activity/Concern 22 (Closed and Open Bottom Culverts) of the Pipeline EPP refers to use of culverts. Crossings should be adequately sized to convey the 1 in 100 year rain events and the City is generally not supportive of the use of Corrugated Steel Pipe material.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.
City of Kamloops	Parks department requests that in-person meetings with Kinder Morgan and/or their chosen contractor be held (when timing is appropriate) to go over the reclamation/work plans in the field, specifically for Kenna Cartwright Park. This approach is working very well with BC Hydro.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.
City of Kamloops	Page 29 Table 5.2-1 of the Riparian Habitat Management Plan (Vehicle/Equipment Crossings at watercourses): There is mention of erosion and sediment control measures being implemented immediately following installation of crossing. Consideration should be given to control measures being in place before and during construction as well.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.
City of Kamloops	Page 30 of the Riparian Habitat Management Plan: Geotechnical Engineer should be involved for many (if not all) crossings throughout the project, not only during clean up.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Kamloops	City requests list of sub-contractors.	<p>Trans Mountain will provide this list when it is available.</p> <p>Topic for a future TWG meeting.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has identified core sub-contracting services anticipated for construction to allow the City of Kamloops to plan infrastructure projects that do not draw on the same resources. Trans Mountain will provide a list of sub-contractors when contracts have been secured (estimated Q2 2018).</p>	In progress. Topic for a future TWG meeting.
City of Kamloops	Trans Mountain requests list of City projects.	<p>City will provide this list in advance of a future TWG meeting.</p> <p>Topic for a future TWG meeting.</p> <p>City will provide this list in advance of a future TWG meeting when the information is available</p>	Topic for a future TWG meeting.
City of Merritt	Capacity of TMEP to accommodate the proposed runway expansion (1000 ft. new runway). Capacity of TMEP to accommodate runway.	Discussions underway with the City of Merritt. Topic for future TWG in Q1 2018.	Topic for future TWG in Q2 – Q3 2018.
City of Merritt	Proximity of pipeline construction to Coldwater River due to salt leaching and stability problems.	Trans Mountain will follow EPP commitments related to protection of riparian areas and will ensure construction site stability.	Complete. Topic discussed in TWG meeting on February 26, 2018. The City of Merritt agrees the Riparian Management Plan filed with the ENB addresses concerns in this regard.
City of Merritt	Need to know what type of activity and equipment is on site at proposed laydown area in order to amend fire protection agreement with Lower Nicola Band.	<p>Trans Mountain will provide additional information once its contractor and the site are confirmed.</p> <p>Topic for a future TWG meeting.</p>	No longer applicable. Camp location is outside the City of Merritt fire response area.
City of Merritt	Trans Mountain will consult with owners and operators of Merritt, Kamloops and Blue River airports as part of Community Readiness Engagement and will continue throughout the Project planning and potential construction phases as more information becomes available.	In progress. Topic for a future TWG meeting.	<p>Discussions underway with the City of Merritt. Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on February 26, 2018. Trans Mountain confirmed the City of Merritt airport closure is anticipated to be up to one week.</p> <p>The City advised that notifications (NOTAMS) are needed for airport runway closures. Trans Mountain is aware and will complete these notifications as part of the Communications and Notifications plan.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			Follow-up meeting to confirm requirements is planned for Q2 2018.
City of Surrey	Minimizing construction impact to residential neighbourhoods and the public (Fraser Heights).	<p>Construction related impacts are topics for future TWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain continues to engage with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the Project, including ongoing engagement with neighbours (including businesses) to share information and seek input to our detailed construction plans to minimize impact to neighbours during construction.</p> <p>Trans Mountain held a bilingual (Mandarin) information session in Fraser Heights on June 27, 2017 and an update to Fraser Heights Community Association on June 29, 2017. Future outreach is planned for the fall 2017 and early 2018.</p>	<p>In progress and ongoing.</p> <p>Trans Mountain discussed a draft reclamation and replanting plan with the City of Surrey at TWG meetings on October 25, 2017 and February 27, 2018. The plan addresses the City's and residents' concerns about loss of trees in the areas where tree removal is required for TMEP construction..</p> <p>The temporary work space and the permanent ROW where vegetation has been removed for construction use will be replanted according to the plan. The reduced 10m permanent easement will be revegetated appropriately to protect the pipe where the pipeline is constructed using a trenched construction method. Trans Mountain will have a monitoring program for all reclaimed areas for a minimum of five years.</p> <p>Trans Mountain revised the Plan based on the City's feedback and the City is satisfied with the revised plan.</p>
City of Surrey	Construction timing (avoid delays to Surrey Infrastructure improvement projects).	<p>Construction timing is a topic for future TWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will work with the City in the scheduling of respective works to avoid or minimize construction impacts through advance coordination and planning.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and the City have established regular TWG and SWG meetings to discuss and coordinate technical aspects of TMEP including the scheduling of respective works to avoid or minimize construction impacts through advance coordination and planning.</p>	Complete.
City of Surrey	City of Surrey requested that prior to Trans Mountain submitting a Condition filing to the NEB, Trans Mountain provide the City with a draft summary of the consultation undertaken with the City and allow the	<p>Trans Mountain is committed to transparently working together through the TWGs.</p> <p>Although it is not practical to provide a draft consultation summary to stakeholders for review in advance of filings, as part of the TWG</p>	Complete.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	City reasonable period to provide feedback.	process, Trans Mountain will share draft TWG meeting summaries and a RAP for review and input within a specified timeframe. These documents will form the basis of the Condition filings related to consultation.	
City of Surrey	City of Surrey requested that Trans Mountain provide a copy of the NEB filing receipt, for, or notice of, the condition filing to which the consultation pertained.	<p>Trans Mountain will commit to notifying the City when Condition reports are filed with the NEB.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has been notifying the City as Condition reports pertaining to the City of Surrey are being filed.</p>	Complete. Trans Mountain will continue notifying the City for the foreseeable future as Condition reports pertaining to the City of Surrey are being filed.
City of Surrey	City of Surrey provided feedback to the draft TWG ToR and Appendix B: Joint Municipal Conditions.	<p>Draft Terms of Reference are a topic for future TWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has developed the draft ToR based on the requirements and as directed by NEB conditions 14 and 49. The goal of the TWGs is to address specific technical and construction issues with each affected municipality. The ToR provide the framework for how Trans Mountain and municipalities will work together to achieve this goal, including identifying the appropriate contacts to participate in TWGs; proposing a method for tracking issues and resolution of concerns; protocols for reporting and communicating with TWG members; and identifying the issues or topics within the TWGs scope and mandate.</p> <p>Technical and construction issues related to TMEP will be addressed through the TWG framework. Decisions related to the existing TMPL or future operations once TMEP is completed, including municipal costs, crossing agreement and permitting, will be addressed through discussions with the appropriate KMC representative, as well as meetings convened by the NEB.</p> <p>As mentioned in section 2.0 of this report, Trans Mountain has not received any specific feedback from the City of Surrey on the draft ToR since they were shared on May 26, 2017. TWG meetings continue with agreement from both parties that ongoing discussions will follow the current TWG format. Trans Mountain remains committed to working with the City of Surrey to resolve any outstanding concerns to the extent practical. Discussions with the City of Surrey will continue</p>	In progress.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>and appropriate Trans Mountain experts will attend future TWGs as necessary.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will revisit the ToR with the City of Surrey once the NEB has ruled on the plan, profile and book of reference for the section of the detailed route through Surrey.</p>	
City of Surrey	Relocate TMEP to 'alternative' corridor approximately between AK 1160 and AK 1166 [immediately adjacent to SFPR, Golden Ears Connector Corridor and CN Rail Corridor].	<p>On March 17, 2017 Trans Mountain filed its Plan, Profile and Book of Reference for Surrey, as well as Condition 7 for Surrey confirming its detailed alignment. Although the alignment removes routing from Surrey Bend Park, it does not follow the City's described 'alternative' corridor.</p> <p>As mentioned above, per the City's request, Trans Mountain provided a written rationale (by email) on September 8, 2017 supporting the current TMEP pipeline alignment between Golden Ears Connector (GEC) and Port Mann Bridge to the City of Surrey subject to Condition 7.</p>	Complete.
City of Surrey	The City is concerned about wind throw issues on City park land due to vegetation removal and requested Trans Mountain provide a wind throw report conducted by a Registered Professional Forester where tree removals are planned adjacent to City lands.	<p>Trans Mountain will prepare a wind throw and danger tree assessment report in or around Q4 2017. As requested by the City of Surrey, the report will be prepared by a Registered Professional Forester.</p> <p>In the meantime, discussions continue at TWG Meetings and Trans Mountain provided the LiDAR high-level maps showing the areas that will be field-assessed in the near future for danger trees and wind throw potential.</p>	<p>In progress. Trans Mountain discussed the request for a danger tree assessment and windthrow survey at a TWG meeting on October 25, 2017. Both parties agreed a danger tree assessment is not required at this time and it would be appropriate to complete closer to the commencement of construction and clearing activities.</p> <p>Trans Mountain is considering the City's request to complete a wind throw survey on the current proposed alignment. At a TWG meeting on November 28, 2017 TMEP informed the City that it requires geotechnical studies to be completed in the area before it can determine further action on the windthrow assessment.</p>
City of Surrey	The City expressed concern about tree removal and reduction of green space. The City of Surrey would like to see less tree removal in an effort to keep as much green space as possible.	Trans Mountain and its Contractor clarified that tree removal for the open cut sections in the Fraser Heights area has been reduced to 24 m from the 40 m initially proposed. Reclamation following construction will include replanting in 14 m of temporary work space, with 10 m of the permanent right-of-way (ROW) revegetated with grass and lower growing plants. Tree removal in the areas with Horizontal Directional Drills (HDD) will be minimal to ensure access for maintenance and	<p>Complete. Tree removals are subject to NEB approval of the detailed route. Topic was discussed at October 4, 2017 SWG. TMEP will not be pursuing extra work space at the intersection of Golden Ears Way and Golden Ears Connector other than what is required for construction and pipeline installation, thus reducing the extent of tree removal.</p> <p>As mentioned above, Trans Mountain discussed the request for a</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>emergency response when the pipeline is operational.</p> <p>Trans Mountain reviewed a draft tree management plan with the City in the August 3, 2017 SWG meeting. As per the City's request, Trans Mountain will complete a wind throw and danger tree assessment in Q4 2017.</p>	<p>danger tree assessment and windthrow survey at TWG meetings on October 25, 2017 and November 28, 2017; both parties agree it is appropriate to complete these assessments closer to commencement of construction and clearing activities.</p> <p>In March 2018, Trans Mountain reached an agreement with the City of Surrey, as a landowner, for route modifications to the alignment for the Trans Mountain Expansion Project on the North Slope Buffer in Fraser Heights. The modifications are based on feedback from the City of Surrey and will help minimize construction impacts by moving the alignment segment further away from residences, increasing separation between homes and the pipeline, and increasing the width of the remaining tree buffer.</p>
City of Surrey	<p>The City of Surrey is interested in truck access, traffic detours and access to bike/pedestrian paths during construction.</p> <p>The City asked TMEP to share Traffic Management details with residents in Fraser Heights in advance, because the proposed main route in and out of the area goes through several school zones.</p>	<p>Discussions of traffic management and access control plans occurred at SWG meetings (June 28, July 19 2017)</p> <p>Traffic management and Traffic Control Plans will continue to be discussed at future Traffic SWG meetings in Q4 2017.</p> <p>Trans Mountain continues to engage with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the Project, including ongoing engagement with neighbours (including businesses) to share information and seek input to our detailed construction plans to minimize impact to neighbours during construction. Trans Mountain held a bilingual (Mandarin) information session in Fraser Heights on June 27, 2017 and an update to Fraser Heights Community Association on June 29, 2017. Future outreach is planned for the fall of 2017 and early 2018.</p>	Complete. Discussed preliminary traffic management plans in a SWG on October 4, 2017. KLTP proposed a new traffic route along 168 Street to avoid school zones on 160 Street. KLTP will submit the final traffic management/ detour plans to the City for review.
City of Surrey	Main access during construction through the Fraser Heights neighbourhood. The City is concerned the utility ROWs are not designed for heavy vehicles and equipment and wants to ensure protection of underground utilities. The City is interested in truck traffic volume expected.	<p>Trans Mountain presented preliminary planning for access in and out of Fraser Heights for feedback at the SWG meeting on June 28, 2017. Trans Mountain continues to address concerns related to access points off the SFPR Highway and Highway 17 and construction truck traffic volume.</p> <p>Topic for further discussion at future TWG meetings and SWG meetings.</p>	Complete. As mentioned above, Trans Mountain and KLTP have altered traffic management and control access plans based on stakeholder feedback. A final traffic management plan will be shared with the City for review.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Surrey	The City of Surrey requested Trans Mountain align the pipe with a proposed multiuse path (MUP) where possible.	<p>Trans Mountain and the City of Surrey discussed the MUP at the SWG meeting on June 28, 2017 and reviewed an overlay drawing at the TWG meeting on July 19, 2017.</p> <p>MUP will continue to be addressed as an agenda topic at future TWG meetings in Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.</p>	Complete. In March 2018, Trans Mountain and the City of Surrey reached an agreement on the MUP. The paved multi-use pathway will be up to 4 m wide and will overlie portions of the proposed TMEP route constructed using a trenched construction method on the North Slope Buffer and Golden Ears Connector sections for a total of approximately 2.2 km. Additional MUP details will be discussed through ongoing TWGs as required.
City of Surrey	The City would like Trans Mountain to consider reducing construction footprint at the intersection of Golden Ears Connector and Golden Ears Way.	<p>In progress. Topic for further discussion at future TWG meetings and SWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor will review construction footprint at intersection of Golden Ears Connector and Golden Ears Way at future TWG meetings or subgroups in Q4 2017.</p>	Complete. Topic discussed at October 4, 2017 SWG meeting. Subject to confirmation of detailed routing TMEP will not be pursuing extra work space at the intersection of Golden Ears Way and Golden Ears Connector, other than what is required for construction and pipeline installation.
City of Surrey	TMEP alignment through the Vesta development site.	Trans Mountain is discussing potential opportunities to adjust the pipeline alignment through the Vesta development site with Vesta properties and the City of Surrey. Further discussion will take place at future TWG and SWG meetings in Q4 2017.	<p>Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on October 25, 2017. TMEP and KLTP are working on a trenchless solution through the Vesta property however require geotechnical drilling to confirm if a trenchless solution is viable. Access for the geotechnical drill locations through City property was discussed at a TWG on November 28, 2017 and Trans Mountain hopes to proceed with the work in Q2 2018.</p> <p>Future TWG agenda topic in Q2-Q3 2018.</p>
City of Surrey	City is concerned about impacts to existing infrastructure including sanitary and storm drains on 112 Ave. The City requests Trans Mountain and the Contractor review underground utilities when working near roads.	Trans Mountain and the Contractor will take necessary precautions and protect with mats if needed. The Contractor will also complete a utility locate program prior to construction as well as pre- and post-construction video inspections.	Complete.
City of Surrey	City prefers the pipeline is not located above existing utilities. The City notes that if it is not feasible for Trans Mountain to construct the pipeline below existing utilities it may consider a variance if there is sufficient backup.	<p>Trans Mountain and KLTP will review the City's utilities and explore design options to avoid impact to City infrastructure by staying below utilities where practical.</p> <p>Future TWG agenda topic Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.</p>	<p>Complete. Topic was discussed at a SWG on October 4, 2018 and a TWG on October 25, 2017. Trans Mountain alignment runs below City of Surrey utilities except in three locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where City sanitary and storm are 5m deep • where storm is installed on piled foundations

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • where storm is 4m deep and water table is very high
City of Surrey	The City of Surrey identified a potential conflict with Trans Mountain pipeline alignment at a new sanitation pump station proposed at 182a Street.	Future TWG agenda topic Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	In progress.
City of Surrey	Noise impacts from Fraser River HDD on residents located on the Fraser Heights slopes.	Trans Mountain discussed the high level Noise Mitigation Plan with the City of Surrey. The plan outlines various mitigation efforts including sound walls and position of equipment. HDD areas will require 24/7 work. A site-specific HDD noise management plan will be developed for the HDDs in Fraser Heights as required by NEB Condition 74 at least three months prior to commencing HDD activities at the Fraser River crossing.	Complete.
City of Surrey	The compensation area near the Golden Ears Connector must be maintained for five years by the BC Ministry of Transportation (MOTI).	Topic is on the agenda at a SWG meeting on September 26, 2017. The outcome will be reported in the next Condition 49 update.	<p>Compensation sites were discussed at a SWG meeting on September 26, 2017 and again at TWGs on October 25, 2017 and November 28, 2017. A discussion with both parties and MOTI took place on November 1, 2017 to review the specific sites together.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These sites are complex and difficult to delineate or determine what was done by each project (i.e. Different contractors, some projects have been moved to other locations and some were never implemented) • Majority of these were undertaken by MOTI • TMEP continues to investigate with initial consultations and so far has identified two sites with potential overlap with TMEP. • Need to determine which sites are no longer being monitored / still being monitored. For sites no longer being monitored, will coordinate with MOTI. For sites still being monitored, will check alignment vs the site and work with DFO to determine path forward. • Some sites are no longer under DFO. South Fraser Perimetre Road (SFPR)/ Port Mann have been signed off because they have timed out. There is a five year monitoring

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			<p>plan and some sites have been completed for over five years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some sites are still under five years of DFO monitoring, for example Golden Ears. Further discussion with DFO required. • TMEP and KLTP will send the City of Surrey a summary of locations. TMEP will work with the City to determine the land values.
City of Surrey	Staging areas should be discussed through TWGs.	<p>Trans Mountain agrees. Topic was discussed at TWG Meeting on September 12, 2017.</p> <p>Topic will continue to be discussed at future TWG and SWG meetings.</p>	In progress. This will be discussed in more detail at a future TWG and SWG meetings.
City of Surrey	City is interested in sediment control. Surrey doesn't allow direct discharge into municipal drainage system. City would need to be notified should there be a sediment release during construction.	Topic was discussed at the SWG meeting on September 26, 2017. Sediment control is covered by environmental management plans; however, location-specific sediment control plans are in development and will be discussed in more detail at future TWG SWG meetings.	In progress. Trans Mountain expect to have location-specific sediment control plans prepared by KLTP in Q3 2018. This will be discussed in more detail at a future TWG and SWG meetings.
City of Surrey	Tree replanting in temporary work space. The City noted that there is land of interest to the City as it has been designated a future urban forest. This area needs to be revegetated.	Trans Mountain is developing a planting plan, which it will share with the City when complete. Trans Mountain has an operational requirement to keep the pipeline easement free of tall vegetation, but the permanent ROW can be revegetated with lower growing plants. The temporary working space will be replanted with trees.	<p>Complete. As mentioned above, Trans Mountain discussed a draft reclamation and replanting plan with the City of Surrey at TWG meetings on October 25, 2017 and February 27, 2018. The plan addresses the City's and residents' concerns about loss of trees in the areas where tree removal is required for TMEP construction.</p> <p>The temporary work space and the permanent ROW where vegetation has been removed for construction use will be replanted according to the plan. The reduced 10m permanent easement will be revegetated appropriately to protect the pipe where the pipeline is constructed using a trenched construction method. Trans Mountain will have a monitoring program for all reclaimed areas for a minimum of five years.</p> <p>Trans Mountain revised the Plan based on the City's feedback and the City is satisfied with the revised plan.</p>
City of Surrey	The City would like to see efficient & effective information flow between contractors, TMEP and the	Trans Mountain agrees it is important to have an effective flow of information during construction. This will be added as a future	In progress. Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on October 25, 2017 and the group agreed to continue discussion about

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	City during construction.	TWG/SWG topic in Q1 2017 – Q1 2018.	communications between the City of Surrey, TMEP and KLTP in future TWGs/SWGs.
City of Surrey	The City asked when TMEP is doing work adjacent to Surrey lands, the City would like to be informed if knotweed is discovered.	Trans Mountain keeps track of which invasive species are adjacent to the ROW and will keep the City informed. Trans Mountain uploads information on weeds/invasive plants to the BC FLNRO Invasive Alien Plant Program (IAPP) database annually.	Complete.
District of Clearwater	Concern about lost recreational use of the ROW through North Thompson Park during construction.	Trans Mountain will coordinate construction notifications with BC Parks and the District of Clearwater. Trans Mountain will update the District of this topic through a future TWG meeting.	Notifications will be provided as per regulatory updates. A verbal update will be provided to the District of Clearwater prior to construction.
District of Clearwater	Potential water capacity issue due to construction and influx of workers.	Topic for a future TWG meeting. This topic is addressed through the NEB Condition 59 Worker Accommodation Strategy and related camp development applications.	Complete. Approval of potable water supply is a condition of camp permitting and will be completed by the camp contractor.
District of Clearwater	May require sewer lagoon upgrades if camp waste is trucked to Clearwater (no capacity at Vavenby).	Topic for a future TWG meeting once camp capacity and locations are confirmed. This topic is addressed through the NEB Condition 59 Worker Accommodation Strategy and related camp development applications.	Complete. Approval of potable water supply is a condition of camp permitting and will be completed by the camp contractor.
District of Clearwater	Confirm camp location, format and utility requirements.	Topic for a future TWG meeting. Trans Mountain is currently consulting on NEB Condition 61 – List of Temporary Infrastructure Sites. Camp location has been identified. Format and utility requirements are under development. Discussions will continue through the permitting process in Q4 2017 and Q1 2018.	Complete. Approval of potable water supply is a condition of camp permitting and will be completed by the camp contractor.
District of Clearwater	Existing ROW from Norfolk Rd to the hospital is in high use. District is applying for grant for new multi-use pathway that could be developed in time to	District has agreed to provide project timing to Trans Mountain at a future TWG meeting.	No longer applicable. District project is complete

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	relocate pedestrian activity. Would like to liaise re: timing.	The District of Clearwater will provide an update in Q4 2018	
District of Hope	Stakeholder interests and concerns and ensuring Mayor and Council are kept updated on construction plans.	Communication and Notification Plan will be the topic of a future TWG meeting.	In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings Q2 – Q3 2018.
District of Hope	Interested in coordinating District's operation plans (sanitary main project) with Trans Mountain construction plans.	Trans Mountain appreciates being provided with information regarding District projects to coordinate timing and minimize conflicts.	In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q2- Q3 2018.
District of Hope	Construction vehicles using Othello Road and impact to local traffic if Nestle's trucks need to reroute to accommodate.	Trans Mountain acknowledges there will be an overall increase to local traffic due to construction. Trans Mountain is developing a traffic plan, which will also include mitigation measures. This will be a topic at a future TWG meeting. Topic was discussed at a TWG Meeting on May 16, 2017	Complete. Traffic management will be a topic for future TWG meetings as required.
District of Hope	District request for consideration of cemetery visitors when construction around Tract 1979, which adjoins a local cemetery.	Future TWG agenda topic. Trans Mountain confirmed that construction should not impact access to the cemetery. Trans Mountain adds this concern to the RAP for consideration as the Communications and Notification Plan is developed.	In progress.
District of Hope	In lieu of formalized approach for crossing approvals, District of Hope to discuss approach to crossings (utility, road and watercourse) and confirm with Trans Mountain.	Future TWG agenda topic Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	In progress. Trans Mountain is waiting for the District to provide input regarding their approach.
District of Hope	Trans Mountain to confirm if it will apply for a business license from the FVRD or the District of Hope.	Future TWG agenda topic Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	In Progress. Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on March 7, 2018. Outcomes from this meeting will be included in the next Condition 49 report.
Fraser Valley Regional District	Protest activity and the potential impact to FVRD's ability to complete its work, and keeping elected officials informed through regular updates.	Trans Mountain understands community concerns with regards to security. Trans Mountain has developed detailed security plans and is working with local enforcement agencies. The Communications and Notification Plan will be a topic at a future	In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q2 – Q3 2018.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		TWG meeting.	
Fraser Valley Regional District	Proposed camp in Hope St. Elmo Road location is an interest as the site is within the Laidlaw community which falls under Electoral Area jurisdiction and is an area of interest to the FVRD.	<p>Topic discussed at a TWG Meeting on May 15, 2017. Trans Mountain provided an overview of the proposed sleeper camp to be located within the District of Hope. FVRD acknowledged the Flood Hope Road location is within the District of Hope jurisdiction and will rely upon the District to provide feedback with respect to that location. Trans Mountain is no longer pursuing the St. Elmo Road location for a laydown area or camp location.</p> <p>Trans Mountain to provide advance notice to FVRD when final camp location chosen.</p>	Complete. This camp location is no longer being pursued.
Fraser Valley Regional District	Authority and jurisdiction with respect to permitting. FVRD noted time is required to assess the various permits that would be required for a worker accommodation camp such as earth works, potable water, waste generation, as well as any temporary use permits that may be required.	<p>Trans Mountain confirmed intent to comply with all local and regional permitting requirements to the extent practicable; however, permits would be applied for by the General Contractor responsible for each spread.</p> <p>Trans Mountain confirmed that once the General Contractors for each spread is announced, a meeting would be arranged with the FVRD to discuss required permitting.</p>	In progress. Trans Mountain introduced the General Contractor at a SWG meeting with the District on December 8, 2017. Permits were discussed at the March 8, 2018 TWG meeting and outcomes will be included in the next Condition 49 report.
Metro Vancouver	Metro Vancouver is planning a transportation hub in United Boulevard area and the construction timing may overlap.	Topic for a future TWG or SWG meetings.	In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q2 – Q3 2018.
Metro Vancouver	Metro Vancouver is concerned about the Lake City interceptor, which is proximal to TMEP.	Topic for a future TWG or sub-TWG meetings.	In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q2- Q3 2018.
Metro Vancouver	Impacts of a spill in Burrard Inlet.	<p>Topic for future TWG or subgroup meetings.</p> <p>For accidents and malfunctions, Trans Mountain conducted a series of Human Health Risk Assessments (HHRA) with the aim of identifying and understanding the potential health effects that might be</p>	Complete.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>experienced by people in the unlikely event of an oil spill. Some of the major conclusions that emerged from the HHRAs were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the unlikely event of an oil spill, there was no obvious indication that people’s health would be seriously adversely affected by acute inhalation exposure to the chemical vapours released during the early stages of a spill under any of the simulated oil spill scenarios examined; and • In the unlikely event of an oil spill, the health effects that could be experienced by people in the area would likely be confined to mild, transient sensory and/or non-sensory effects, attributable largely to the irritant and central nervous system depressant properties of the chemicals. Odours also might be noticed, which could contribute to added discomfort and irritability • The exposure and hazard/effects assessment methodology is described in Section 5.0 of Volume 8 B of the Facilities Application (Filing ID A3S4K7) • A complete Emergency Response Assessment of marine oil spill, including spill trajectory modelling can be found in Volume 8B (Filing IDs A3S4K7 through A3S4R2) of the Application. <p>Trans Mountain is committed to meeting NEB Condition 133 - Marine shipping-related commitments.</p> <p>Trans Mountain welcomes the opportunity to meet with Metro Vancouver to discuss emergency management, to identify areas of specific environmental concern, or other topics of concern.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has and will continue to invite Metro Vancouver to participate in its Emergency Response engagement, training and exercises where critical information about impact to a community in the event of an oil spill is exchanged.</p> <p>Trans Mountain offered an Emergency Management presentation to Metro Vancouver staff.</p> <p>Trans Mountain would also be pleased to arrange for a briefing for</p>	

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		Metro Vancouver from Western Canada Marine Response Corporation (WCMRC).	
Metro Vancouver	Design of the pipeline has not taken adequately into consideration seismic hazards.	<p>Topic for future TWG or SWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will recognize all seismic hazard areas along the entire TMEP alignment including within the Metro Vancouver Regional District and will design and construct the pipeline in accordance with the BC Building Code and National Building Code of Canada requirements for an earthquake with a 1:2475 annual probability of exceedance. Furthermore, Trans Mountain will adopt proven materials and undertake design in accordance with CSA Z662, Oil and Gas Pipeline Systems.</p> <p>Trans Mountain is committed to meeting NEB Condition 68 - Seismic reports – liquefaction potential, NEB Condition 69 - Fault studies.</p>	In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q2 – Q3 2018.
Metro Vancouver	Contingency planning in the event of a spill or accident during construction and / or operation of the Project.	<p>Topic for future TWG or SWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has access to \$750 million in insurance for a land-based spill. Compensation frameworks and insurance covering a land-based spill are described in responses to NEB IR Nos. 1.08b to 1.08h (Page 24 of 481 in Filing ID A3W9H8). In the event that a liability occurs that is in excess of its insurance, Trans Mountain expects that any losses and claims would be paid out of cash reserves and cash flow from operations, which are illustrated in the response to NEB IR Nos. 1.09a and 1.09b (Page 29 of 481 in Filing IDs A3W9H8 and A3W9I1). Those responses illustrate that Trans Mountain expects that it would have cash available over the first 5 years of approximately \$2.1 billion and a cash reserve balance at the end of Year 5 of approximately \$150 million. To the extent there is insufficient cash available Trans Mountain would either draw on credit facilities, issue debt, or borrow from its parent company, depending on the extent of the loss and its immediacy.</p> <p>Trans Mountain efforts will further be dedicated to reducing the chances of such unlikely events occurring, and to developing comprehensive contingency plans that mitigate impacts in the unlikely</p>	Complete.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>event that they do occur.</p> <p>Trans Mountain is committed to meeting NEB Condition 89 - Emergency Response Plans for construction, NEB Condition 90 - Consultation on improvements to Trans Mountain's Emergency Management Program, NEB Condition 117 - Reporting on improvements to Trans Mountain's Emergency Management Program, NEB Condition 124 - Implementing improvements to Trans Mountain's Emergency Management Program, NEB Condition 125 - Emergency Response Plans for the Pipeline and for the Edmonton, Sumas and Burnaby Terminals, NEB Condition 126 – Emergency Response Plan for Westridge Marine Terminal.</p> <p>Trans Mountain continues to engage with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the proposed Project, including ongoing engagement on ERPs to share information and seek input.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has and will continue to invite Metro Vancouver to participate in its Emergency Response engagement, training and exercises.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has offered an Emergency Management presentation to Metro Vancouver staff. Metro Vancouver has not yet requested a presentation.</p>	
Metro Vancouver	Impacts to sensitive ecosystems, designated conservation areas, parks, fish-bearing waterways and habitat that supports Species at Risk, public recreation, tourism and fisheries.	<p>The mitigation and restoration measures proposed for the Project are designed to meet or exceed those required by Federal and Provincial agencies.</p> <p>Mitigation measures are incorporated within the Project design to reduce the spatial scale, duration, and intensity of effects to manage the potential for serious harm to fishes and their habitat. These measures include, for example, adherence to the Least Risk Biological Window (LRBW) for all proposed isolated trenched crossings of fish bearing watercourses within the Lower Mainland, conducting fish salvages where there is known or potential fish presence within the Project footprint, and water quality monitoring where high sensitivity fish habitat may be present. Conservative LRBWs have also been</p>	Complete.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>applied to protect salmonid species and/or other species of risk where they may have potential to occur, regardless of whether or not they were captured within the Local Study Area during Trans Mountain field investigations. In addition, impacts to functional riparian habitat will be avoided or minimized by limiting disturbances to riparian areas and implementing minimum riparian setback distances for temporary and permanent facilities. Mitigation and restoration measures considered in the assessment for fish, fish habitat, and surface water quality are provided in Table 7.2.7-2 of Section 7.2.7 of Volume 5A ESA – Biophysical (TERA December 2013; Filing ID A3S1Q9) and the Pipeline EPP (Volume 6B; Filing ID A3S2S3).</p> <p>Additional site-specific mitigation measures will also be applied to watercourses identified as proposed critical habitat or potential habitat for species at risk. For details on site-specific mitigation for species at risk, please refer to Sections 10.1 and 10.3 of Supplemental Fisheries (BC) Technical Report (Triton Environmental Consultants 2014) This supplemental technical report was recently provided to the National Energy Board (NEB) and is available as an attachment to NEB IR No. 3.039a (NEB IR No. 3.039a – Attachment 1; Filing ID A4H1Z2).</p> <p>Trans Mountain is committed to meeting NEB Condition 3 - Environmental protection, NEB Condition 13 - Socio-Economic Effects Monitoring Plan, NEB Condition 44 - Wildlife Species at Risk Mitigation and Habitat Restoration Plans, NEB Condition 75 - Nooksack Dace and Salish Sucker Management Plan.</p> <p>On several occasions, including at the February 8, 2017 TWG meeting, Trans Mountain has confirmed verbally and in writing its commitment to use the Mayfair CP Rail siding as temporary workspace for the Fraser River trenchless crossing. As our design proceeds we will confirm access, however we commit to restricting access to existing disturbed areas such as the rail siding or existing roadways.</p> <p>At the February 8, 2017 meeting, Trans Mountain also provided an update that it planned to file the detailed route for Surrey, indicating its preferred route south of South Fraser Perimeter Road in Surrey,</p>	

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<p>outside of Surrey Bend Park. Metro Vancouver indicated their satisfaction with this outcome. Trans Mountain filed the detailed route for Surrey, as well as NEB Condition 7 – Environmental and socio-economic assessment – route re-alignments for Surrey Bend Regional Park on March 17, 2017.</p> <p>At the February 8, 2017 meeting Trans Mountain reviewed routing and construction methodology through the Brunette Greenway in Burnaby. Further discussions through the TWGs and sub-groups are planned to review Metro Vancouver’s infrastructure and environmental plans related to this area.</p> <p>Metro Vancouver was notified about the consultation window for the Environment Plans on September 23, 2016 and December 12, 2016.</p> <p>SWGs have been established with Metro Vancouver to review Metro Vancouver’s infrastructure and environmental plans related to the Brunette Greenway in Burnaby. Trans Mountain will discuss temporary access during construction at future TWG and SWG meetings.</p>	
<p>Metro Vancouver</p>	<p>Construction impacts to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coquitlam Landfill. • infrastructure and services including pipeline 	<p>Trans Mountain has engaged specialized engineering consultants recommended by Metro Vancouver to provide advice on TMEP crossing the methane collection system in place throughout the Coquitlam landfill site and along the United Boulevard corridor.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has engaged BGC Engineering to investigate geotechnical recommendations to avoid differential settlement.</p> <p>Construction related topics for future TWG or SWG meetings in Q1 2018. Trans Mountain can arrange for an Emergency Management presentation on request.</p>	<p>Complete.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and KLTP provided pipeline alignment options for the Coquitlam Landfill to Metro Vancouver at a TWG on October 25, 2017:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern alignment has challenges with methane infrastructure and proximity to the Coquitlam Interceptor. • Southern alignment Option #2 (parallel to United Boulevard) location is outside NEB corridor. In order to complete this option, a NEB Act Section 21 Variance would be required. A Section 21 variance would make this in effect a separate pipeline application on its own. This option is not going to be pursued by TMEP. • The NEB study corridor did not include the southwest corner of Metro Vancouver’s property near the Brunette Interceptor. • KLTP identifies southern alignment option #1 is the best option.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			Geotechnical bore hole locations were selected with input from Metro Vancouver and drilling took place in Q1 2018. Trans Mountain and KLTP shared as built information of methane infrastructure and Land Fill with Metro Vancouver to finalize the TMEP alignment through the Landfill. Drawings and revisions have been reviewed and are considered to be final. If there are any further revisions to the alignment or additional issues or comments that come up a SWG meeting will be arranged.
Metro Vancouver	Current construction schedule may impact concurrent solid waste construction projects in Metro Vancouver.	Trans Mountain continues to engage with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the proposed Project to share information and seek input to our detailed construction plans to minimize impact to neighbours during construction.	In progress. Topic for future TWG or SWG meetings.
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Share construction / crossing detailed schedule and priorities, as well as details about the 23 crossings.	In progress. Trans Mountain is awaiting a further response from Metro Vancouver.	Complete. Trans Mountain and KLTP issued a crossing schedule to Metro Vancouver in Q4 2017 and the topic was discussed at TWG meetings on November 28, 2017, January 31, 2018 and February 28, 2018. KLTP fine-tuned the designs in collaboration with Metro Vancouver. Both parties agree this will be a topic for future SWG meetings as required.
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Metro Vancouver expressed concern through VFPA Permit application about impacts to outflow near Westridge Marine Terminal (WMT) as a result of new marine traffic patterns.	Discussed at September 13, 2017 TWG meeting. Trans Mountain will ensure Metro Vancouver remains able to access outflow during TMEP construction. Trans Mountain reviewed mitigation measures to be established and surveys. Further discussion to take place at SWG meetings. Trans Mountain also responded to concerns by letter on September 21, 2017. A copy of this letter is located in Appendix B.	Complete.
Village of Valemount	Permits: Trans Mountain will require a Development Permit for Development Permit Areas to ensure protection of the natural environment, enable safe development in areas which may be subject to wildfire hazards, and	Conversation will continue at future TWG meetings in Q4 2017 or Q1 2018. A temporary use Permit was issued on September 12, 2017 by the Village of Valemount for the camp location.	In progress. Trans Mountain discussed permitting at a SWG meeting on March 15, 2018. Outcome of this discussion will be included in the next Condition 49 report.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	<p>establish form and character of commercial and multi-family development.</p> <p>The proposed Utility Complex may require a Zoning Bylaw Amendment or Temporary Use Permit.</p> <p>Construction camps/worker accommodation, offices, warehouses and stock yards will require a Zoning Bylaw Amendment or Temporary Use Permit.</p> <p>Building permit requirements.</p>	<p>Topic was discussed at a TWG Meeting on July 19, 2017 followed by a site visit to the proposed work camp with the Village of Valemount on July 25, 2017 to discuss further details of utility services and opportunities available.</p> <p>Trans Mountain confirmed the permit application for temporary use of the airport is no longer required. Site 1 (stockpile site) will require a permit and Trans Mountain will work with the Regional District on this process. Trans Mountain will work directly with the Village of Valemount on the permit process for the workforce camp.</p> <p>The Regional District has no concerns about permit process at this time. Permitting will be a topic for future TWG and SWG meetings, as required.</p>	
Village of Valemount	Request to obtain accommodation trailers after construction.	The request will be considered following construction when Trans Mountain and its Contractors have identified the scope of Project assets for disposal.	Complete. Trans Mountain acknowledges the Village of Valemount request. A decision regarding dispersal of Project assets will be deferred until the post-construction period.
Village of Valemount	Request to consult with fire department when camp site and details have been determined.	Topic for a future TWG meeting once camp locations have been confirmed.	Complete. Fire department was involved in the SWG meeting on November 28, 2017 which involved discussion on the site specific emergency management plan.
Village of Valemount	Share construction schedules such that access to essential Village and Regional District-owned property is available during normal business hours if open-cut crossing methods are employed.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	<p>Complete. Construction will not disrupt normal access to Village or District owned property.</p> <p>Trans Mountain to provide updated schedule when it is available.</p>
Regional District of Fraser-Fort George	Possible challenges to supplying tourists and workers with services.	Topic for a future TWG or SWG meeting Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	Complete. Trans Mountain addressed through the social economic monitoring plan and Worker Accommodation Strategy plan.
Regional District of Fraser-Fort	Regional District role in delivering emergency services	In progress. Discussed at a TWG meeting on July 19, 2017. Trans Mountain confirmed camps will be self sufficient. There will be ongoing	Complete. The SWG meeting (site specific emergency response plan) on November 28, 2017 addressed this issue.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
George	to camp.	opportunities in follow up discussions to further discuss ways to enhance local infrastructure and improve efficiencies.	
Thompson-Nicola Regional District	Blackpool: construction timing is related to community park development (community benefit project). Requires coordination for grant purposes.	In progress. Initial construction schedule provided in February 2017. Updates will be required.	Updated schedule will be provided as available in Q2 or Q3 2018.
Thompson-Nicola Regional District	Concern about camp water requirements and waste management plans.	<p>Topic for future TWG meeting once camp locations has been confirmed.</p> <p>Topic was discussed at a TWG Meeting on June 28, 2017. Trans Mountain confirmed detailed waste management plans will be completed by contractors. Ongoing topic for future TWG Meetings during permitting process in Q4 2017 or Q1 2018.</p>	In progress. Plans will be developed by camp contractors in accordance with permitting requirements.
Township of Langley	Pipeline integrity and emergency response measures to protect Langley’s aquifers in the event of a spill.	<p>Trans Mountain continues to engage stakeholders on its EMP. Trans Mountain will invite Township of Langley to future emergency management engagement opportunities and exercises/deployments.</p> <p>Topic was addressed at a SWG meeting on June 6, 2017. During operations, Trans Mountain will continue to allocate extensive resources to its pipeline integrity program, which is used to identify and repair anomalies in the pipe before leaks occur. A computational pipeline monitoring (CPM) system is used in combination with other monitoring methods, such as surveillance patrols, regular in-line inspections using smart tools, Control Centre Operator (CCO) monitoring using the supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) system, and scheduled line balance calculations. In the unlikely event that released petroleum impacts groundwater, Trans Mountain will implement a remediation program to recover petroleum and treat contaminated water to meet stringent government criteria.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will continue to offer the Township opportunities to participate in emergency response exercises and Community Awareness and Emergency Response (CAER) presentations. Trans Mountain Emergency Management Team will share, and meet with the Township, to gather input for consideration for further refinement of the GRP in 2018 when complete.</p>	Complete.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
Township of Langley	<p>The Township did not support any of the western alignments through Redwoods Golf Course and asked Trans Mountain to develop an eastern route.</p> <p>The Township requested that 88th Avenue be widened/ upgraded by TMEP during construction. Township indicated it will agree to the eastern alignment through the Redwoods Golf course only if this condition is met.</p>	<p>Topic for future TWG meetings.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has been working with stakeholders including the Township of Langley and Redwoods Golf Course management to adjust the pipeline alignment through the golf course to minimize impacts to both the golf course and its neighbours. Trans Mountain developed and refined an eastern alignment through the golf course to minimize disturbance to existing fairways and greens. The routing refinement was shared with the Township in 2016.</p> <p>Topic was discussed at TWG Meetings on May 1, 2017, and May 24, 2017 in conjunction with the Township’s request for Trans Mountain to widen/upgrade 88th Ave. The Township explained that the road is a major trucking route that the Township has plans to expand in the future to a four-lane configuration. Township is concerned that the current proposed TMEP alignment through the Redwoods golf course along 88th Ave would result in delays and additional costs due to the statutory right-of-way and 30 m prescription (or Safety) zone. Township would require 4 m from the existing property line into the golf course for the road allowance. Township suggested that TMEP could consider moving the alignment further into the golf course or changing the route to avoid any future conflicts with the road expansion to a four-lane configuration, or, if the current alignment is pursued, Township requests that TMEP complete the widening and upgrade of this segment of the road. The Township is not prepared to sign any agreements for land use unless this concern is addressed.</p> <p>At the TWG meeting on August 28, 2017, TMEP advised that it would not be able to complete a review of the Township’s request to widen/upgrade a portion of 88th Ave until after the NEB route hearings in the area are complete.</p>	<p>In progress. Discussions on the topic are underway. As previously mentioned, TMEP will review the request to widen 88th Avenue after the NEB Route Hearings. Future TWG agenda topic.</p> <p>At a TWG meeting on October 3, 2017, KLTP reviewed the Hope Redwoods crossing via HDD, resulting in no impact to this environmentally sensitive area. The Township had no questions or concerns.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>Site specific mitigation measures regarding three municipal parks affected by the expansion.</p>	<p>This topic was discussed at TWG Meeting on May 1, 2017. The Township advised their preference that construction method for two creek crossings be trenchless due to erosion issues.</p> <p>The TMEP Project footprint crosses three Township of Langley Parks</p>	<p>In progress.</p> <p>The Township requested information on tree removal in Ponder Park and how wide the final corridor will be post-construction. The Township also requested a tree management plan for Spread 6.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unnamed (KP 1136 to KP 1136.8) Spread 6 • Ponder Park (KP 1141.1 to KP 1141.9; and • Hope Redwoods Park (KP 1150.85 to KP 1151). <p>Hope Redwoods Park will be constructed with a horizontal directional drill (HDD) and no disturbance will occur in the Park. The existing TMPL right-of-way crosses through Unnamed and Ponder Parks. The pipeline in these areas will be constructed using an open cut method that is adjacent to the existing right-of-way; resulting in a wider permanent easement in the parks. The permanent easement will be seeded with low growing grasses and trees will be planted in the working space. TMEP welcomes input from the Township of Langley regarding the plant species they would like to see in the parks.</p> <p>Discussions on this topic and construction methodology will continue at future TWG and SWG meetings in Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain provided a tree management plan for Spread 6 on September 22, 2017 and the topic was discussed at October 3, 2017 TWG meeting. The Township expressed concerns with respect to the number of trees that are coming down in the municipal parks (about 10 per cent) and would like to have a separate meeting to discuss tree management with Parks in attendance.</p> <p>At a November 22, 2017 TWG meeting, SAEG reviewed the anticipated tree removal area in Ponder Park which has been reduced by about 50 per cent due to ability to shift the work area. The Township requested an updated tree count info prior to the Parks SWG meeting in Q1 2018.</p> <p>Trans Mountain provided an updated tree count to the Township on March 7, 2018. In total the footprint reduction will result in retaining 883 trees that were initially planned for removal.</p>
Township of Langley	The need for and costs of additional inspection to ensure potential issues related to erosion control and sedimentation is managed during construction.	Trans Mountain is developing erosion and sedimentation control plans. This topic will be included on future TWG and SWG agendas in Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	In progress.
Township of Langley	<p>Crossing packages:</p> <p>The Township of Langley requested detailed design drawings of the proposed pipeline at each road and utility right-of-way crossing, with construction not to take place until the Township approves the design drawings. The Township requested that TMEP work with the Township to develop appropriate pipeline depth through the Township and to seek approval adjacent to and under the Township’s infrastructure.</p> <p>The Township would like to see elevations plus depth of utilities TMEP will be crossing on design drawings including drainage infrastructure. The Township is concerned with the depth of the pipeline at locations of existing and future water, sanitary sewer, and storm</p>	<p>Crossing packages and construction methods are being discussed through TWGs.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has committed to work with the Township to develop appropriate pipeline depths through the Township and to seek approval adjacent to and under the Township’s infrastructure. Design drawings were provided to the Township of Langley and discussed at a TWG meeting on May 24, 2017.</p> <p>The Township shared some of their comments with Trans Mountain and KLTP. There may be further comments when the detailed route is approved.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will continue discussions related to pipeline depth through TWGs and Utility Crossing SWG meetings. Pipeline depth to be finalized following potholing (utility locate) program scheduled for</p>	In progress. Topic for continued discussion at future TWG and SWG meetings. KLTP anticipates pipeline depth will be finalized following the potholing (utility locate) program scheduled for Q2 2018.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	<p>sewer pipes.</p> <p>The Contractor should be required to pre-expose utilities to confirm depth and location and submit of videos of the inside of storm and sanitary sewers after construction to confirm they are not damaged, and be required to take appropriate remedial action if there is damage. The Township noted that review of crossing documents does not constitute crossing approval or consent.</p>	<p>Q4 2017.</p> <p>Video inspection is anticipated pre and post construction for the Township of Langley’s municipal infrastructure. Trans Mountain and contractors will use a utility locate program in Q4 2017 to get more detailed information and will continue to share information with the Township at future TWG and SWG meetings.</p>	
Township of Langley	The Township requested that detailed design considerations for crossings be formalized in a crossing agreement.	<p>While municipal costs of working around the existing and new pipeline are outside the TWG scope, at the Township’s request, the Crossing agreement for the expanded pipeline will be part of discussion through TWGs.</p> <p>The Township is working on a draft crossing agreement and will share it with Trans Mountain in Q4 2017.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain requested the Township share a draft crossing agreement. The Township advised in an email on November 27, 2017 that the Township has not begun work on the crossing agreement as they are instead focused on preparations for the detailed route hearings.</p> <p>Future TWG agenda topic.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>The Township notes that Trans Mountain committed that where minor roads are crossed that may affect established community use/access routes, Trans Mountain will complete open cut crossings within one day, where practical.</p> <p>The Township requested that roads within the Township are crossed trenchlessly.</p>	<p>This topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on May 1, July 24 and August 28, 2017. Trans Mountain is reviewing its position in regards to commitments to completing trenchless crossings on Langley streets.</p> <p>Trans Mountain’s approach to road crossings is captured in the NEB Recommendation Report, page 71, under 6.1.8 Infrastructure crossings: "Crossings would be individually assessed to determine the most appropriate crossing method and design. Crossing of highways, high-use gravel roads and railways would be constructed using a bored crossing method, which would have a minimum effect on traffic or interruption to communication or utility services. Crossings of low-use gravel roads, minor roads and trails would be completed by conventional open-cut crossings." Where the pipeline alignment runs parallel to a road, the only viable construction option is open cut.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor to complete traffic counts to determine road crossing methods. Topic will continue to be discussed in future TWG and SWG meetings in Q4 2017.</p>	<p>Topic discussed at a TWG meetings on October 3, 2017 and November 22, 2017 where traffic counts and methodology were reviewed with the Township. The Township agreed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • construction methods for all perpendicular road crossings as presented in the table for Spread 7, with the exception of the parallels: 217A, 99A. • Construction methods for crossing roadways in Spread 6 <p>The Township does not accept an open cut method for 217A and 99A due to potential disruption. Further discussion required about these two parallel crossings in Spread 7 at TWG meetings in Q2-Q3 2018.</p> <p>The Township requested TMEP/KLTP consider an alternative pedestrian path for Ziegler Trail. Further discussion will take place at the Parks subgroup meeting in Q2 2018.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
Township of Langley	<p>The Township has concerns about erosion control for Nathan Creek; the Township requested that Nathan Creek and West Creek be crossed via trenchless method.</p>	<p>Topic was discussed at a SWG meeting on June 6, 2017. Nathan Creek and West Creek will be crossed via isolated trenched method. Mitigation measures were discussed with the Township’s environment experts. Trans Mountain provided a letter to the Township dated August 9, 2017 with a summary of some of the key mitigation measures. (Appendix B). A detailed list of mitigation measures for watercourses is provided in <u>Section 14.0 of the Pipeline EPP (Volume 2 of the Environmental Plans)</u>.</p> <p>The Township is reviewing the letter and will provide a response.</p> <p>Trans Mountain understands the Township has concerns regarding erosion and sedimentation issues. We are confident with the isolated trenched crossing method and appropriate mitigation measures employed during construction. Potential issues can and will be addressed and mitigated to the extent practical.</p>	<p>Complete.</p> <p>The Township advised by email on December 8, 2017, that it has reviewed the letter and if both crossings are constructed in low-flow periods, then open-cut construction with the protection measures listed in the letter will be adequate for the construction period. The Township still has concerns about erosion along Nathan Creek post-construction until the banks are stabilized and the potential for filling of the sediment collection pond. Additional discussion will be scheduled for a SWG meeting as required.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>Hydrostatic testing:</p> <p>The Township’s water system is not to be used as a source of water for pipeline testing, unless otherwise approved by Langley. The Township requested it be notified of discharge locations and schedules. The Township requested a copy of the Hydrostatic Testing Plan prior to submission.</p> <p>The Township requested that Trans Mountain instruct its contractor to forward copies of Water Withdrawal and Discharge Forms to the Township, as the discharge could impact Langley’s drainage systems.</p>	<p>The Hydrostatic Testing Plan (NEB Condition 113) will be filed three months prior to commencing pressure testing of any Project component and will include the site-specific mitigation measures to be implemented at the water withdrawal and discharge locations.</p> <p>Discussed at May 24, 2017 TWG meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trans Mountain clarified that water withdrawal for the hydro test will be from the Fraser River. Contractor (KLTP) may need to tap into municipal water sources but those will be relatively small volumes. • Trans Mountain will share Hydrostatic Testing plan when available (anticipated in Q4 2017). <p>Discussion on this topic will continue through SWG meetings.</p>	<p>In progress. Discussion continues through SWG meetings to share the Hydrostatic Testing plan with the Township. Future SWG meeting agenda topic.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>Municipal bylaw compliance and permitting (including highway and noise). The Township would like to confirm that contractors</p>	<p>Approach discussed at TWG meetings on May 1 and May 24, 2017 and a list of applicable permits/bylaws was reviewed. Trans Mountain confirmed intent to comply with all applicable local and regional</p>	<p>In progress. The discussion continues on topics of hours of work, horizontal directional drills (HDDs), noise variances and complaints management process. Areas where variance is required are two</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	<p>will apply for highway use and noise control permits. Section 254 of the NEB Decision states: “Trans Mountain has committed to comply with, or seek variance from, all municipal bylaws, including those involving noise.”</p>	<p>permitting requirements where practicable. Permits will be applied for by the Contactor responsible for each spread and variance will be sought where it is unable to comply.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor met with the Township on July 19, 2017 to review preliminary Traffic Management Plans through a SWG. Trans Mountain confirms there will be a complaints management process in place and an emergency contact will be made available 24/7 during construction.</p> <p>Ongoing topic for discussion at future TWG and SWG meetings.</p>	<p>HDDs in Spread 7: Belmont Golf Course and Redwoods Golf Course.</p> <p>KLTP to provide areas requested for noise variances to accommodate business operations in the Port Kells area (non-residential areas – type 1). KLTP to make application to Township under noise exemption policy where noise variances (type 2) are required for HDD and major trenchless operations (24/7 work). Noise Mitigation plans will be implemented and supplied to the Township. KLTP will request variances to accommodate businesses.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>Trans Mountain will work with the Township to establish days and hours of work.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor discussed hours of work at the TWG meeting on July 24. There are three locations in Spread 7 where variance will be required. Trans Mountain and its Contractor plan to work day and night shifts in those locations and will require variance from the Township’s noise bylaw.</p> <p>Discuss noise mitigation plan through TWGs and SWGs. Work with the Township to determine where variances are requested and/or required (e.g. HDD). Continue discussion in Permitting SWG. Trans Mountain and its Contractor to address this in the permitting process</p>	<p>In progress. As mentioned above, Trans Mountain continues to discuss the topic of hours of work with the Township through ongoing TWG and SWG meetings.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>The Township requested to provide input in the use of heavy wall pipe or concrete casings at road allowances and water bodies; discuss risk assessment methodology and mitigation options through the Technical Working Group as the detailed design progresses.</p>	<p>Topic was discussed at TWG meetings on July 24, 2017 and August 28, 2017. Trans Mountain indicated that pipeline thickness is varied. The pipeline design takes into account potential geohazards and other factors. Typical wall thickness on the existing pipeline is 9.5 mm. For TMEP it is generally 11.8 mm, 14.7 mm for major roads and 19 mm for major HDD crossings. Wall thickness is identified within pipeline alignment sheets that were sent to the Township. The Township will review the drawings and discussion will continue through TWGs in Q4 2017.</p>	<p>In progress. Discussion on this topic carries forward to TWG meetings in Q2 – Q3 2018.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>The Township is concerned how hydrovac excavations in the pavement sections of roadways will be filled, as future subsidence of asphalt can become a hazard and will be a maintenance issue.</p>	<p>Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on July 24, 2017. Trans Mountain and its Contractor will maintain roads up to one year after construction. The Highway Use Permit will cover most of these requirements, and will be applied for by KLTP.</p> <p>Discussed the general process at Permitting SWG meeting on July 25,</p>	<p>Complete.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
		2017.	
Township of Langley	<p>The Township requested to be consulted on preparation of traffic management plans; The Township requests that TMEP consult with Langley in advance of finalizing traffic and access management plans (and traffic mitigation measures) in Langley.</p>	<p>Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on July 19, 2017; the Contractor reviewed Spread 7. Trans Mountain and the Contractor will continue working with the Township on Traffic Management Plans through future SWG group meetings.</p>	<p>In progress. KLTP discussed traffic management plans for Spread 7 (217a St, 99a Ave and Ziegler Trail) at a subgroup meeting on December 4, 2017. The Township provided specific feedback, including concerns regarding equipment staging, road width and duration of construction.</p> <p>KLTP will consider feedback and address where possible in site specific traffic management plans. Discussion will continue through TWGs. SAEG continues to work with AllNorth to complete the Spread 6 Traffic Management Plan. Specific Traffic Control Plan at each crossing are being developed.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>The Township notes that the following wildlife species at risk have been encountered in Langley, although not necessarily in the pipeline corridor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barn Owl (Langley locations noted in Plan 6.4.2 Barn Owl Mitigation Plan) • Oregon Forest snail • Oregon Spotted Frog • Pacific Water Shrew <p>The Township's comment: the Oregon Forest Snail critical habitat polygon is close to the Salmon River crossing - it is just outside the end of their mapped habitat.</p>	<p>Topic was discussed in the Environment SWG meeting on June 6, 2017. Trans Mountain has management plans specific to each of the species.</p> <p>Regarding the Oregon Forest Snail critical habitat, if construction does not overlap but is very close to habitat, Trans Mountain would confirm their presence/absence prior to construction and implement the site-specific mitigation for this species as needed.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will continue to discuss reclamation in the Township through future TWG and SWG meetings.</p>	<p>Complete.</p> <p>In a TWG meeting on October 3, 2017, Trans Mountain provided the Township with a hard copy of the Environment Alignment Sheet Package. The barn owl present in the area requires a more restricted window than other bird species and will be taken into account when planning tree removal.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>Truck access requiring culvert extension may require driveway application.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor provided a list of access locations for Township assessment within Traffic Management Plans discussed at a Permitting SWG meeting on July 25, 2017.</p> <p>Topic for further discussion at future TWG and SWG meetings.</p>	<p>Complete.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>The Township requests Trans Mountain inspectors monitor construction activities to ensure that grading does not create issues, construction materials are</p>	<p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor will apply for a Soil Removal and Deposition Permit, which addresses this concern.</p>	<p>Complete.</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	<p>contained within the approved construction right-of-way, and no settlement issues arise with adjacent properties or services.</p>		
Township of Langley	<p>The Township has concerns about cathodic protection on Township infrastructure and potential conflicts with TMEP's cathodic protection. The Township requested more information about cathodic protection.</p>	<p>Topic was discussed at TWG meetings on May 1, 2017 and July 24, 2017. Trans Mountain will engage with KMC operations and identify all areas of potential conflict and include recommendations.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and its Contractors will schedule a meeting with the Township to identify the crossings that Trans Mountain is looking to bond, provide clarification on bonding and determine what the issues are and the recommendations to resolve them. Trans Mountain update the crossing drawings to reflect this.</p> <p>Discuss avoidance of potential conflicts with cathodic protection on existing Township infrastructure through Utility Crossing SWG and TWG meetings. Cathodic protection strategy will be reviewed once utility locate program is complete by Q1 2018.</p>	<p>In progress. Further discussion required through TWGs and SWGs on avoidance of potential conflicts with cathodic protection on existing Township infrastructure.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>The Township requests an opportunity to provide input towards communication plans related to activities that impact normal traffic flow (pedestrian, cyclist, and vehicles).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Township would like to see notice signs posted 48 hours before construction where traffic is concerned. The Township would like TMEP to review the municipality's highways expectations guideline for traffic control available on the Township's website. • Highway Use Permits will contain Township traffic management requirements. 	<p>Trans Mountain has developed a communication and notification plan and provided an overview of the plan at July 24, 2017 TWG meeting.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will set up a SWG meeting discuss communication and notification plan in Q4 2017.</p>	<p>In progress. Topic for future TWG meeting in Q2 2018.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>The Township requested Trans Mountain to develop a discharge plan to mitigate drainage impacts, including erosion control and sediment management for the construction work.</p>	<p>Further discussion regarding drainage through TWGs and SWGs. Trans Mountain and its Contractor will complete a utility locate program by Q1 2018 to confirm missing elevations on crossing drawings. TMEP is developing erosion and sedimentation control plans.</p>	<p>In progress. KLTP will be developing Erosion Control Plans in Q2 2018. The General Contractor, SAEG, will be executing the work on the steep slopes in east Langley. The proposed plan detailed in the November 22, 2017 TWG meeting minimizes disturbance of the slopes in question. If the route change is approved and Langley is in</p>

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
			<p>agreement with the proposed plan, this will not be an issue. In the event the proposed plan is not accepted, SAEG would develop a steep slopes plan.</p> <p>Future topic for TWG/SWG meetings.</p>
Township of Langley	<p>The Township requests that Trans Mountain identifies instances such as noise disruption, and seeks stakeholder input and subsequently obtains relevant exemptions, and providing forward notification to affected residents and/or businesses.</p> <p>The Township requests TMEP work with Langley to develop a mitigation plan providing an immediate response to noise complaints. The Township also request that TMEP instruct its contractors to comply with Langley’s Noise Control Bylaw.</p>	<p>Approach discussed at TWG meeting on May 24 and list of applicable permits/bylaws have been reviewed. Trans Mountain will submit applications to demonstrate compliance with applicable bylaws, and will seek variance where unable to comply.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor will have a noise mitigation plan and communication and notification plan in place. Trans Mountain is required to submit a noise mitigation plan to the NEB for HDD installations. The plan will need to be filed 90 days prior to work beginning. Appropriate steps will be taken to mitigate noise. One example is a temporary sound wall using stacked containers. All of this will be based on the noise studies.</p> <p>Continue discussion regarding hours of work, notifications and complaints management process through TWGs.</p> <p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor to provide areas requested for noise variances to accommodate business operations in the Port Kells area (non-residential areas).</p> <p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor to make application to the Township under noise exemption policy where noise variances are required for HDD and major trenchless operations (24/7 work). Noise mitigation plans will be implemented and supplied to the Township prior to construction.</p>	Complete.
Township of Langley	The Township is concerned construction activities may adversely impact events such as walkathons and running or cycling races or tours. Langley would like confirmation that contractors will be required to obtain Highway Use Permits (HUP) or similar approvals for	Approach discussed at TWG meeting on May 24, 2017 and list of applicable permits/bylaws have been reviewed. Trans Mountain will submit applications to demonstrate compliance with applicable bylaws, and will seek variance where unable to comply. Trans Mountain will apply for a HUP.	Complete.

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
	work on public roadways in Langley so potential conflicts can be identified in advance	Trans Mountain and its Contractor met with the Township on July 19, 2017 to review preliminary traffic management plans. Discussions will continue through TWG and SWG meetings. Trans Mountain and its Contractors will coordinate specific traffic management plans and construction schedule with the Township at future TWGs and SWGs in Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.	

TABLE 5.2
UPDATE ON ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ALBERTA UP TO SEPTEMBER 30, 2017
AND ADDRESSED IN TWG MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2016 AND MARCH 31, 2018

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Edmonton	Road crossings.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.
City of Spruce Grove	Road crossing designs and crossing applications	The City indicated to Trans Mountain that it is open to establishing a TWG, if required, closer to construction.	In progress. Topic was discussed at the first TWG meeting with the City of Spruce Grove on January 9, 2018. Additional discussions related to permitting will take place on March 23, 2018 and be included in the next report.
City of Spruce Grove	Upcoming twinning of a water line in 2017 located north of the rail crossing.	Topic for a future TWG meeting, if a TWG is formed.	Complete. Project timing no longer overlaps with TMEP.
Parkland County	Road crossings.	The TWG discussed road crossings at a TWG meeting on June 19, 2017. Specifically, the County is interested in crossings near Gainsford and wants to make sure the new pipeline is below grade.	In progress. Trans Mountain will discuss this topic at its TWG meeting on March 28, 2018 and include an update in the next report.
Parkland County	Parkland County's new process for wetland identification.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q2 – Q3 2018.
Parkland County	Potential conflicts with Alberta Transportation's future plans to extend Highway 628 west of Edmonton and realign further to the north, with an interchange at the Highway 60 crossing.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	In progress. Trans Mountain continues to share design drawings with the County. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q2 – Q3 2018.
Parkland County	Undeveloped road allowances where future development is likely to occur and road allowances where development will not occur.	Topic for a future TWG meeting.	In progress. Topic for future TWG meetings in Q4 2017 – Q1 2018.
Parkland County	Parkland County requested that Mayor and Council receive a formal Project Update presentation so that TMEP plans and schedule	In progress.	Topic was discussed at a November 29, 2017 TWG meeting and Parkland County mentioned that they would inquire whether Mayor

	<p>are clear.</p> <p>Trans Mountain agrees and committed to delivering a presentation to Mayor and Council. Trans Mountain plans to organize a presentation to Council in Q4 2017, after the municipal election.</p>		<p>and Council would still like TMEP to make a presentation.</p>
Parkland County	<p>Parkland County is interested in the planned procedure for communication with residents leading up to and during construction.</p> <p>If future Information Sessions are planned, and depending on timing, Parkland County requested that Trans Mountain look into the possibility of participating in joint Information Sessions for the public, in combination with other projects in the area. The County recommended this approach to avoid stakeholder fatigue and make information from several projects in the area available to residents with one visit.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain explained the role of community liaisons and once in place, their contact information will be made available. Construction information and contact information will also be available online at www.transmountain.com.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has developed a communication and notification plan with the intention to share the plan with the County when available.</p>	<p>Complete. In Q4 2017 the Community Liaison met with the Parkland County Director of Communications to discuss the Project communications approach and tools to share information with area residents.</p>
Strathcona County	<p>Road crossings.</p>	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting.</p>	<p>In progress. Topics discussed at a TWG meeting on June 19, 2017 included utility and road crossings, road use agreements, and permit applications process.</p> <p>Topic for future TWG meetings.</p>
Strathcona County	<p>Strathcona County is interested in the planned procedure for notifying impacted residents. The County suggested that a letter be sent to residents adjacent to the Transportation and Utilities Corridor (TUC) once construction is ready to commence. Such a letter should include contact information.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain explained the role of community liaisons and once in place, their contact information will be made available. Construction information and contact information will also be available online at www.transmountain.com.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has developed a communication and notification plan with the intention to share the plan with the County when available. Trans Mountain expects the plan will be ready to share in Q4 2017.</p>	<p>In progress. Trans Mountain will share the Communication and Notification Plan with the County in Q2 2018. The topic will be discussed at a future TWG meeting.</p>
Town of Edson	<p>Project scope and construction timing.</p>	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting, if a TWG is formed. The City has indicated to Trans Mountain that it is open to establishing a TWG,</p>	<p>In progress.</p> <p>Trans Mountain met with the Town of Edson on November 6, 2017</p>

		if required, closer to construction.	<p>to discuss the Site Specific Emergency Response Plans for construction. At this meeting, Trans Mountain provided a Project update which included an update on the construction schedule. The Town requested Trans Mountain confirm whether there will be any spring construction as it will impact the local softball season.</p> <p>The Town of Edson indicated they do not have a need for regular TWG meetings with Trans Mountain at this time. Both parties agreed they are comfortable scheduling future TWG meetings on an as needed basis.</p>
Town of Edson	Pre-construction activities such as stock pile site preparation, pipe hauling, and vegetation management.	Topic for a future TWG meeting, if a TWG is formed. The City has indicated to Trans Mountain that it is open to establishing a TWG, if required, closer to construction.	Complete. Trans Mountain notified the Town of preparation activity at a temporary infrastructure site in Edson to stock pile pipe which began arriving during this reporting period. Trans Mountain will continue to keep the Town informed about activity underway at temporary infrastructure sites in the Town’s jurisdiction and near by.
Town of Edson	Preservation of a walking path and trees along the existing TMPL for about 600m, located west of Edson Drive.	Topic for a future TWG meeting, if a TWG is formed. The City has indicated to Trans Mountain that it is open to establishing a TWG, if required, closer to construction.	In progress.
Town of Edson	Crossing agreements and road use permits.	Topic for a future TWG meeting, if a TWG is formed. The City has indicated to Trans Mountain that it is open to establishing a TWG, if required, closer to construction.	<p>In progress.</p> <p>On January 18, 2018 the NEB announced a process to resolve potential future permitting disputes between Trans Mountain and provincial and municipal authorities for the TMEP (Filing A89357). Since that time, Trans Mountain has been focused on advancing the permitting process and engaging municipalities in discussions on the Project schedule in greater detail, including the critical dates, permits or other approvals that may be required, and how to work together to satisfy or demonstrate compliance with these requirements while maintaining a September 2018 construction start date.</p> <p>Trans Mountain discussed permitting with the Town at a SWG meeting on March 29, 2018. The outcome of those discussions will be included in the next Condition 49 report.</p>
Town of Edson	Worker accommodation plans, including whether a camp will be located in Edson, and other	Consultation regarding worker accommodation began in 2013 and is ongoing. Trans Mountain’s draft Worker Accommodation	Complete.

	<p>accommodation.</p> <p>The City indicated to Trans Mountain that it is open to establishing a TWG, if required, closer to construction.</p>	<p>Strategy is available for review and comment, and will be reviewed with Edson at a future TWG meeting, if a TWG is formed.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain confirmed that there will be no camps in Alberta for the Project; hotels, apartments and campgrounds will be used to house the workforce.</p>
Town of Stony Plain	<p>Crossing agreements and road use permits.</p>	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting, if a TWG is formed.</p>	<p>In progress. Topic was discussed at the first TWG meeting with the City of Stoney Plain on January 9, 2018.</p> <p>On January 18, 2018 the NEB announced a process to resolve potential future permitting disputes between Trans Mountain and provincial and municipal authorities for the TMEP (Filing A89357). Since that time, Trans Mountain has been focused on advancing the permitting process and engaging municipalities in discussions on the Project schedule in greater detail, including the critical dates, permits or other approvals that may be required, and how to work together to satisfy or demonstrate compliance with these requirements while maintaining a September 2018 construction start date.</p> <p>Additional discussions related to permitting will take place on March 23, 2018. The outcome of those discussions will be included in the next Condition 49 report.</p>
Village of Wabamun	<p>Crossing agreements and road use permits.</p>	<p>Topic for a future TWG meeting, if a TWG is formed.</p>	<p>In progress. First TWG meeting is anticipated in Q1 2018.</p>
Yellowhead County	<p>Yellowhead County reminded TMEP that the potential spread of Clubroot disease is an issue that many landowners and the County are concerned about.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain is aware of the effects of Clubroot disease on landowner and understands the County's concern. Trans Mountain referred to its Clubroot Management Plan at a TWG meeting on September 6, 2017 and noted that Trans Mountain is currently finalizing the cleaning station locations and composition.</p>	<p>Complete.</p>
Yellowhead County	<p>Yellowhead County inquired as to whether storing pipe at the proposed Temporary Work Site in the County could be an issue with access onto Highway 16 due to the intersection, required distances for different turns.</p> <p>Yellowhead County suggested that a roadside</p>	<p>Trans Mountain will pursue the development permit through Alberta Transportation, which will establish any requirements for highway access and site egress.</p>	<p>Complete. Trans Mountain resolved the concern with Alberta Transportation and started using the temporary work site in Q4 2017 after receiving necessary permits and regulatory approvals. Trans Mountain notified the County prior to activity commencing at the site.</p>

	development permit would be required from Alberta Transportation.		
Yellowhead County	Yellowhead County asked that as construction gets closer to commencement that Trans Mountain provide a detailed schedule so that any potential issues or conflicts can be addressed early and proactively.	Trans Mountain will pursue the development permit through Alberta Transportation, which will establish any requirements for highway access and site egress.	In progress.

TABLE 6.1
NEW ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN BC
BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2017 AND MARCH 31, 2018

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome
City of Abbotsford	<p>Construction schedule and reclamation at Ledgeview Golf Course.</p> <p>The City will be constructing Ledgeview Clubhouse in 2018 and would like Trans Mountain’s construction schedule to align construction activities and minimize conflicts between two construction schedules.</p>	<p>Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on December 15, 2017 and the City had an opportunity to discuss and ask questions with Trans Mountain and the Contractor (SAEG). Trans Mountain will share an updated construction schedule with the City as soon as it is available. The City is confirming whether the City will be responsible for reclamation and development of Reclamation Plan for Ledgeview Golf Course.</p>
City of Abbotsford	<p>City expressed concern over any night work and disturbing resident’s ability to sleep.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain previously informed the City of potential night work due to the Direct Pipe installation in the Sandy Hill neighbourhood. Condition 74 requires Trans Mountain to file a noise mitigation plan for Sandy Hill and other Horizontal Direct Drill or Direct Pipe/ installations. Trans Mountain will provide the City with advance notice of night work schedule and noise mitigation measures that will be employed.</p> <p>As mentioned above in Table 5.1, Trans Mountain will have a robust Communication and Notification Plan in place. It is expected to be ready to share in Q2 2018. The topic will be discussed at a future TWG meeting.</p>
City of Abbotsford	<p>City expressed concern about plans for temporary use of lands in Abbotsford that is part of the Agricultural Land Reserve.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain to determine an alternate location and will work with the City to keep them informed.</p>
City of Abbotsford	<p>Trans Mountain indicated a number of crossing agreements have been prepared with BC Hydro. The City requested copies of crossing agreements with BC Hydro within municipal boundaries. It will be attached to Highway Excavation Permit.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain noted that they will be moving a number of BC Hydro poles (unsure of the total number in Abbotsford). The City will require these permits/authorizations.</p>
City of Abbotsford	<p>Sumas Terminal construction and permitting.</p> <p>City confirmed at a high level the following permits may be applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building permit for structural work: tank, retaining walls greater than 1.2 metres, and site servicing • Tree removal permit to include a compensation plan, tree assessment, and environmental protection plan <p>City prefers one package to review for Sumas Terminal. City confirmed it requires copies of regulatory agency monitoring reports to be included as part</p>	<p>Topic discussed at TWG meetings on December 15, 2017 and February 13, 2018. Trans Mountain to provide copy of regulatory agency monitoring reports as part of the Environmental Development Permit documentation requirements.</p> <p>Both parties agreed to arrange a SWG meeting (Development Information Meeting (DIM)) to discuss application permits and specific information required for Sumas Terminal.</p> <p>Topic for future TWG and SWG meetings.</p>

	<p>of the Environmental Development Permit documentation requirements.</p> <p>The City suggested a follow-up Development Information Meeting (DIM) to further discuss construction plans for Sumas Terminal and to further confirm which City permits will be required for the scope of work. City supports an expedient meeting timeframe. City requested Trans Mountain prepare detailed information for this meeting including tree assessment, details on underground work, specifics for retaining walls, etc. More information on DIM requirements list is located on the City's website.</p>	
City of Abbotsford	<p>Trans Mountain would like to establish a City water connection to Sumas Terminal to support a new reservoir associated with the new tank being added.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain (KLTP) to review suggested options for obtaining required water and incorporate into planning design.</p>
City of Abbotsford	<p>City requested detailed traffic management plans to review vehicle weight restriction for Parallel Road where Trans Mountain is investigating a Temporary Infrastructure Site location. The City strongly recommends Trans Mountain take pre and post construction photos. If City determines any damage to the roads, Trans Mountain would be responsible for cost to repair</p>	<p>Trans Mountain agrees and (SAEG) will take pre and post construction photos of all roads to be traversed.</p>
City of Abbotsford	<p>The City suggested that Trans Mountain provide a letter or report prepared by a qualified environmental professional determining whether the construction of Sumas Terminal would comply with the City's environmental bylaws and development permit requirements. The City did confirm that parts of the Sumas Terminal site were subject to the City's steep slope development permit area and may require a development permit for construction on lands with a slope greater than 30 percent.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain has engaged the necessary qualified environmental professionals to determine if construction of the Sumas Terminal complies with the applicable City bylaws.</p>
City of Abbotsford	<p>City requested estimated weight of tank pieces being transported to Sumas Terminal. City also requested that Trans Mountain reach an agreement with the gravel companies for use of their roads for construction vehicles to minimize traffic impacts to Sumas Mountain residents.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain and its Contractor (KLTP) to provide estimated weight for tank pieces. Trans Mountain will also seek to reach agreement with gravel companies for use of their roads to minimize traffic disturbance to Sumas Mountain residents.</p>
City of Burnaby	<p>Provide Forestry Field Work reports to City of Burnaby</p>	<p>In progress. Trans Mountain committed to provide reports based on field work completed</p>
City of Burnaby	<p>Request by City of Burnaby to submit all geotechnical investigation and potholing program requests (permits) through the TWG.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain has agreed and all applications for geotechnical and potholing program requests (permits) have been raised at TWG meetings since this request was brought forward.</p> <p>As of January 2018, City of Burnaby has disengaged until further notice in TWG process. Trans Mountain remains ready to re-engage at the City's earliest convenience and sent a letter to the City on March 26, 2018 to this effect. Until City re-engages, Trans Mountain will communicate with City in</p>

		writing.
City of Merritt	Business licenses will be required	Complete. Trans Mountain's Contractor and its sub-contractors will apply for business license as required by the City.
City of Surrey	Concerns with impacts to residents and windthrow. The City asked if the alignment on Fraser Heights slope could be moved further north closer to SFPR.	Complete. The City removed their route objection as a result of ongoing dialogue and discussions through TWGs. In March 2018, Trans Mountain reached an agreement with the City of Surrey, as a landowner, for route modifications to the alignment for the Trans Mountain Expansion Project on the North Slope Buffer in Fraser Heights. The segment will be moved further north closer to the SFPR. The modifications are based on feedback from the City of Surrey and will help minimize construction impacts by moving the alignment segment further away from residences, increasing separation between homes and the pipeline, and increasing the width of the remaining tree buffer.
District of Clearwater	Business licenses will be required for all companies and subcontractors	Complete. Trans Mountain's Contractor and its sub-contractors will apply for business license as required by the City.
District of Clearwater	District requested extension of water main from Grizzly Heights subdivision. 800m extension would provide potable water and fire suppression for the camp. The extension would be a legacy project for the District	In progress. Request has been forwarded to TMEP. Topic for future TWG once detailed camp planning is underway.
District of Hope	The District appreciates TMEP making the effort to have a worker camp inside the district boundaries. The District is interested in working with the Contractor (MSJV) on a fire plan for the temporary site on Laidlaw.	Trans Mountain looked for a camp location in Hope but was unsuccessful. A location has not been determined yet. Trans Mountain is in the process of finalizing a temporary site (stockpile) on Laidlaw Road in Hope and agrees in working in collaboration with the District on a fire plan.
District of Hope	Safety and emergency response The District is interested in a coordinator exercise with all agencies. District of Hope requested to have a discussion about mutual aid agreement due to the impact that construction could potentially have on emergency services in the District.	In addition to sharing the final Site Specific Emergency Response Plan with the District, Trans Mountain will invite the District of Hope to participate in future site specific emergency exercises for TMEP. Trans Mountain offered a "construction 101" presentation to the District's emergency planners and fire department. Trans Mountain and the Contractor (MSJV) to continue discussions on emergency management outside of TWG.
District of Hope	Hazard assessment for Hope Creek	Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on March 7, 2018. Trans Mountain to follow up. Future TWG agenda topic for Q2- Q3 2018.
District of Hope	Permitting	Permitting was discussed at a TWG meeting on March 7, 2018. TMEP to determine if any buildings are being moved at Hope Pump Station as part of construction and if there will be any municipal connections associated with a potential move that might require a demolition permit. District of Hope to review their tree cutting bylaw and notify TMEP of any potential permit requirements

District of Hope	The District would like to see a community specific traffic plan, including any signage requirements that may require a permit.	Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on March 7, 2018. Future TWG agenda topic for Q2- Q3 2018.
Fraser Valley Regional District	Permitting. FVRD requested Trans Mountain apply for a temporary site permit for the Laidlaw Temporary Work site. FVRD to provide TMEP with the proposed revised draft of the Good Neighbor Policy related to noise disturbance	In progress. Topic was discussed at a meeting on December 8, 2017. TMEP will work with the contractor and the FVRD to apply for this permit. This topic was further discussed at a TWG meeting on March 8, 2018; outcomes of this discussion will be included in the next Condition 49 report.
Fraser Valley Regional District	Permitting.	Permitting was discussed at a TWG meeting on March 8, 2018. The FVRD will provide TMEP information regarding the permits required for the Laidlaw temporary site, the revised Good Neighbor Policy related to noise disturbance, and if pipeline and valve construction activities will require permits.
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Metro Vancouver would like to come to an agreement on Crossing Agreements prior to construction of the first crossing (expected to be in 2018).	In progress. Topic was discussed at several TWGs including most recently on October 25, 2017 and November 29, 2017. Trans Mountain and KLTP have revised the crossing agreement based on feedback from Metro Vancouver. Metro Vancouver will complete additional review and provide comment.
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Review and discuss crossing drawings.	In progress. The TWG decided an in-person session to review documents and address concerns would be appropriate and efficient. Metro Vancouver agrees but notes unofficial technical agreement only at the SWG. Executive approval still required on crossing agreements.
Metro Vancouver Regional District	Concern about temporary workspace proposal by Trans Mountain adjacent to the Coquitlam landfill as this space is not available to use. Metro Vancouver noted that there will be two active construction zones in the same area.	Complete. Trans Mountain confirms the letter to Metro Vancouver requesting to use this space was sent in error.
Regional District of Fraser Fort George	The District noted that building permits would be required for any building greater than 10 m ² .	Trans Mountain will adhere to local building permits and apply as necessary.
Township of Langley	The Township has concerns regarding the depth and structure of the pipe at the Golden Ears Works Yard (currently leased by the Township from TransLink) as they use heavy trucks to access the yard.	Discussed at a TWG on October 3, 2017. Trans Mountain and KLTP reviewed alignment through Golden Ears Works Yard and temporary access points. KLTP is in discussions with Translink and a site visit with all parties was conducted in Q4 2017.
Township of Langley	Storm Sewer east of 199B Street.	Trans Mountain and its Contractor (KLTP) to provide a crossing drawing for storm sewer right-of-way east of 199B Street.
Township of Langley	The Township has concerns with construction access at 224 Street including hauling as this is not a standard road and will not accommodate heavy equipment vehicles. Reconstruction will likely be required post construction.	Topic was discussed at TWG on October 3, 2017. At 224 Street, the string will be underneath the road on rollers, and a temporary bridge will be constructed overtop. This method will maintain access during construction. KLTP noted that they are also looking at this property as possible laydown area and plan on accessing this off 224 Street. KLTP will complete an initial road access pre- and post construction. The Township would like this written into the highway use permit.

Township of Langley	The Township is concerned about construction impacts to Ziegler Trail and would like TMEP/KLTP to look into alternative path and notification to users.	Trans Mountain and KLTP to consider an alternative pedestrian path. Further discussion will take place at the Parks SWG meeting in Q1 - Q2 2018. Outcomes of these discussions to be included in future Condition 49 filings.
Township of Langley	The Township raised concern about noise disruption to residents during construction.	Trans Mountain and the Township discussed the site specific noise mitigation plan for Salmon River HDD at the Nov 22, 2017 TWG meeting. The Township is concerned about noise and impacts to residents. Discussion will continue related to hours of work, notifications and complaints management process through TWGs. Trans Mountain will arrange a SWG meeting to discuss TMEP communication and notification plan (expected Q2 2018). KLTP will consider specific mitigation measures to reduce noise and impacts to residents. A plan for a noise variance during HDD activities will be provided to the Township.

TABLE 6.2
NEW ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ALBERTA
BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2017 AND MARCH 31, 2018

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome
Town of Hinton	Requested that Trans Mountain make a presentation to their regional emergency responders at a regular quarterly meeting closer to the commencement of pipeline construction.	Trans Mountain agrees and will follow up closer to construction to coordinate with the Town of Hinton.
Town of Hinton	The Town would like to know when to anticipate workforce presence in the community. Local accommodations often have minimal availability especially during the summer.	Trans Mountain will share more information regarding anticipated project workforce in the community once the Project schedule is available.
Town of Hinton	The Town is interested in the marine component of the project and would like more information.	Trans Mountain directed Hinton staff to where information on marine topics is available on www.transmountain.com . If any specific questions arise Trans Mountain is available to discuss these through regular communication with the Town or at a future TWG meeting. Trans Mountain will continue to provide updates as the Project progresses and discuss topics as required closer to construction.
Yellowhead County	Yellowhead County permitting application process and coordinating with upcoming County work. The County also requests a coordinated permitting approach with Trans Mountain and its various Contractors.	Trans Mountain appreciates the County's efforts to streamline and move permit applications forward for processing in an efficient manner. Trans Mountain and the County discussed permits for crossings, approaches and the preferred format and procedure for submission to the County at a TWG meeting on September 29, 2017. A detailed follow up discussion took place at a Permitting SWG on March 28, 2018 to discuss any other required permits for construction of the pipeline in Yellowhead County. Further discussions will take place at future TWG and SWG meetings; outcomes of those discussions will be included in the next Condition 49 report.
Yellowhead County	County wants to ensure that there will be resident Notifications regarding noise impacts	Trans Mountain expects to have the Communication and Notification Plan ready to share in Q2 2018. The topic will be discussed at a future TWG meeting. Trans Mountain also described the communications platform and tools in place to communicate with residents, including a Project website with a community page that will contain updates to share with residents in the future, twitter and Facebook. The Project also has an information line and email to field any resident questions.

5.0 APPENDICES OVERVIEW

5.1 Appendix A: Project Update Letter – February 2018

5.1 Appendix A: Project Update Letter – February 2018

February 14, 2018

Rod Sanderson
Deputy Director, Engineering
City of Chilliwack
8550 Young Road
Chilliwack, BC V2P 8A4

Dear Mr. Sanderson,

RE: Trans Mountain Expansion Project Update and Next Steps

Trans Mountain values its ongoing and long term relationship with the City of Chilliwack and your ongoing involvement in the Technical Working Group (TWG) for the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (TMEP).

As you may know, Trans Mountain began construction on Westridge Marine Terminal, located in Burnaby, BC, on September 29, 2017, and continues to work on acquiring applicable permits and approvals from a variety of authorities at federal, provincial and local levels.

Over the coming months, Trans Mountain is focusing on the National Energy Board (NEB) route hearings and advancing the permitting process, as outlined in our recent [fourth quarter results](#). During this time, Trans Mountain will work towards receiving greater clarity on outstanding permitting and other regulatory matters before commencing broader construction activities. Trans Mountain in-service date is now December 2020, and on February 1, 2018 we filed an updated construction schedule with the NEB ([A89749](#)). In order to achieve this schedule, Trans Mountain will need to commence certain works within the City of Chilliwack no later than December 1, 2018.

We would like to meet with you in the coming weeks to discuss the schedule in more detail, including the critical dates, permits or other approvals that may be required, and how we can work together to satisfy or demonstrate compliance with these requirements, while maintaining the above noted construction start date. The primary objective of the meeting will be to develop a permitting plan that will allow Trans Mountain to achieve the critical dates. I understand that Lexa Hobenshield (while Kristjana Hawthorne is on vacation, returning February 14, 2018) has been in touch with you to arrange a TWG meeting at your earliest availability.

We are committed to working with local authorities to address concerns, and ensure the Project is built and operated safely. We look forward to the discussion and your continued engagement in the Project. Should you have any questions in the interim, please contact Kristjana Hawthorne.

Sincerely,



John MacLeod, P. Eng.
Project Manager Spread 6
Trans Mountain Expansion Project