

## VIA ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION

April 14, 2020

Canada Energy Regulator  
Suite 210, 517 Tenth Avenue S.W.  
Calgary, Alberta T2R 0A8

To: Ms. Louise George, Secretary of the Commission

Dear Ms. George:

**Re: Trans Mountain Pipeline ULC (“Trans Mountain”)  
Trans Mountain Expansion Project (“Project”)  
Condition 49: Technical Working Group (“TWG”) Report Update (April 2020)  
File: OF-Fac-Oil-T260-2013-03 61**

Please find enclosed Trans Mountain’s compliance filing in relation to Condition 49. This condition compliance filing relates to the following legal instrument, as amended:

- OC-065, as amended (CPCN)

### Phased Filings

On January 16, 2017, Trans Mountain filed a Phased Condition Matrix ([A411J9](#)) with the Board wherein it established 39 Project phases. The appended filing relates to the following phases:

- 1: Westridge Marine Terminal
- 26: Spread 1
- 27: Spread 2
- 28: Spread 3
- 29: Spread 4
- 30: Spread 5
- 31: Spread 5, C39 Coldwater Hydrological
- 32: Spread 5, C7 Ohamil
- 33: Spread 6
- 34: Spread 6, C7 Tzeachten
- 35: Spread 6, C77 Lightning Rock
- 36: Spread 7

- 37: Spread 7, C7 Surrey Bend
- 38: Westridge Delivery Lines
- 39: Burnaby Tunnel

#### **Condition 49: Technical Working Group (TWG) reports**

The text of Condition 49, as established by the Board, is as follows:

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:

- (a) a list of all members of each TWG;
- (b) the methods, dates and location of all TWG activities or meetings;
- (c) a summary of all issues or concerns raised or addressed during the TWG activities;
- (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
- (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.

Attachment 1 includes a concordance table that shows where each aspect of the Condition is addressed in the attached material.

#### **Summary of Material Filed**

Attachment 1 to this letter includes the following document:

- Report Update No. 6 - Technical Working Group (TWG) Report for the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (April 2020), hereinafter the "Report"

TWGs have served, and will continue to serve, as the preferred vehicle for gathering technical information from affected local governments and to address concerns raised by local governments so the Project may be constructed in a manner acceptable to affected communities.

This Report provides an update on the development and progress of TWG activities for the period of October 1, 2019 to March 31, 2020.



Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this matter further, please contact the undersigned at [regulatory@transmountain.com](mailto:regulatory@transmountain.com) or 403.514.6400.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Scott Stoness".

Scott Stoness  
Vice President, Regulatory and Compliance  
Trans Mountain Canada Inc.

Enclosure



**REPORT UPDATE NO. 6  
TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP FOR THE  
TRANS MOUNTAIN PIPELINE ULC  
TRANS MOUNTAIN EXPANSION PROJECT**

**April 2020**

Prepared for:



**TRANS MOUNTAIN**

Trans Mountain Pipeline ULC

Suite 2700, 300 – 5th Avenue S.W.  
Calgary, Alberta T2P 5J2  
Ph: 403.514.6400

## TABLE OF CONCORDANCE

Condition 49 is applicable to the legal instrument: OC-065 (Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity [CPCN]). Table 1 describes how this report addresses the Canada Energy Regulator (CER) Condition requirements applicable to Condition 49. Please see subsection 1.2 for a regulatory update related to this Condition.

**TABLE 1**

### LEGAL INSTRUMENT CONCORDANCE WITH CER CONDITION 49 TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP REPORT UPDATE NO. 6

CER Condition 49	OC-065 (CPCN)
Trans Mountain must file with the CER, at least 4 months prior to commencing construction, and every 6 months thereafter until after commencing operations, a report describing the activities conducted by the Technical Working Groups (TWGs) during the reporting period and the outcomes of these activities. The reports must include, at a minimum:	See as follows.
a) A list of all members of each TWG;	Subsection 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

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
BC	British Columbia
BC MoTI	British Columbia Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure
CER	Canada Energy Regulator
CP	cathodic protection
CPCN	Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity
EMP	Emergency Management Plan
EPP	Environmental Protection Plan
ERP	Emergency Response Plan
FVRD	Fraser Valley Regional District
GCC	General Construction Contractor
HDD	Horizontal Directional Drill
HEP	Highway Excavation Permit
KAL	Kamloops Airport Limited
km	kilometre(s)
KP	Kilometre Post
m	metre(s)
PPBoR	Plan, Profile and Book of Reference
Project	Trans Mountain Expansion Project
RDFFG	Regional District of Fraser Fort George
Report Update	Technical Working Group Report Update No. 6
Reporting Period	Time period of October 1, 2019 to March 30, 2020
RROW	Road Right-of-Way
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SSERP	Site-specific Emergency Response Plan
SWG	Sub-technical Working Group
TMEP	Trans Mountain Expansion Project
TMPL	Trans Mountain Pipeline System (existing)
TNRD	Thompson Nicola Regional District
Trans Mountain	Trans Mountain Pipeline ULC
TUP	Temporary Use Permit
TWG	Technical Working Group
VFPA	Vancouver Fraser Port Authority

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF CONCORDANCE .....	II
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	III
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 About this Document.....	1
1.2 Participating Local Governments – Technical Working Group Meetings .....	1
2.0 TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETINGS AND ACTIVITIES.....	5
3.0 ISSUES AND CONCERNS.....	6
3.1 Local Government Permitting .....	6
3.2 Status Update – Issues and Concerns .....	7
3.3 New Issues and Concerns .....	18

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Legal Instrument Concordance with CER Condition 49 Technical Working Group Report Update No. 6 .....	ii
Table 2	Local Governments Invited to Form Technical Working Groups .....	2
Table 3	Technical Working Group Contacts by Community – British Columbia.....	3
Table 4	Technical Working Group Contacts by Community – Alberta .....	4
Table 5	Methods, Dates and Locations of Technical Working Group Activities Between October 1, 2019 and March 30, 2020 .....	5
Table 6	Technical Working Group Meetings Prior to Report Update No. 6 Reporting Period .....	5
Table 7	Status of Closure Letters – British Columbia .....	6
Table 8	Status of Closure Letters – Alberta .....	6
Table 9	Update on Issues and Concerns Raised by Local Governments in British Columbia and Addressed in Technical Working Group Meetings Held Between October 1, 2019 and March 30, 2020 .....	8
Table 10	Update on Issues and Concerns Raised by Local Governments in Alberta and Addressed in Technical Working Group Meetings Held Between October 1, 2019 and March 30, 2020 .....	17
Table 11	New Issues and Concerns Raised by Local Governments in British Columbia Between October 1, 2019 and March 30, 2020 .....	18
Table 12	New Issues and Concerns Raised by Local Governments in Alberta Between October 1, 2019 and March 30, 2020 .....	20

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

On June 18, 2019, the Governor-in-Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Natural Resources, directed the Canada Energy Regulator (CER) to issue Certificate of Public Necessity and Convenience (CPCN) OC-065, and various Amending Orders to Trans Mountain Pipeline ULC (Trans Mountain) to permit the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (TMEP or the Project) to proceed, subject to 156 Conditions. As a result of the decision of the Federal Cabinet and the issuance of a CPCN by the CER on June 21, 2019, Trans Mountain has resumed its construction and associated activities for the Project.

Trans Mountain submits this Technical Working Group (TWG) Report Update No. 6 (the Report Update) pursuant to Condition 49, Technical Working Group Reports, for the time period of October 1, 2019 to March 30, 2020 (the Reporting Period).

### 1.1 About this Document

Trans Mountain has long-standing relationships with local governments along the existing Trans Mountain Pipeline System (TMPL) corridor. Trans Mountain has been building on these relationships along the Project corridor in the development of the Project and will continue to do so through construction and eventual operation. TWGs continue to serve as the preferred vehicle for sharing Project information and planning with local governments, gathering technical information and addressing technical issues related to construction. Trans Mountain is committed to ongoing engagement and communications with the local governments identified in this Report Update.

The purpose of this Report Update is to address the requirements of the CER Condition 49, as outlined in Table 1.

On February 16, 2017, Trans Mountain filed a related report to address the requirements of CER Condition 14 – Technical Working Group Terms of Reference (Filing ID [A81760](#)). On December 28, 2017, the CER determined Trans Mountain had met the pre-construction requirements of Condition 14 and Condition 49.

Trans Mountain's previous Condition 49 filings include:

- Initial Report: October 1, 2016 – March 31, 2017 reporting period, filed on April 13, 2017 (Filing ID [A82625](#))
- Report Update No. 1: April 1, 2017 – September 30, 2017 reporting period, filed on October 13, 2017 (Filing ID [A86895](#))
- Report Update No. 2: October 1, 2017 – March 31, 2018 reporting period, filed on April 13, 2018 (Filing ID [A91269](#))
- Report Update No. 3: April 1, 2018 – September 30, 2018 reporting period, filed on October 12, 2018 (Filing ID [A94775](#))
- Report Update No. 4: October 1, 2018 – March 31, 2019, filed on April 12, 2019 (Filing ID [A98818](#))
- Report Update No. 5: April 1, 2019 – September 30, 2019, filed on October 15, 2019 (Filing ID [A6Y7Q7](#))

### 1.2 Participating Local Governments – Technical Working Group Meetings

Trans Mountain has established TWG meetings with most local governments along the pipeline corridor. Within this reporting timeframe, some local governments have continued with regular TWG discussions, whereas others have opted to meet on an as-needed basis. One local government declines to convene TWG meetings, however will meet to advance permit discussions and/or to address complaints from constituents who may be impacted by construction of the Project. This is acceptable to Trans Mountain and discussions with this local government has continued as needed. Table 2 provides an update on the status of active TWGs as of March 31, 2020.



**TABLE 2**

**LOCAL GOVERNMENTS INVITED TO FORM TECHNICAL WORKING GROUPS**

Local Government	Status
<b>Alberta</b>	
City of Edmonton	Invited. Meetings occur on an as-needed basis
City of Spruce Grove	Invited and accepted. TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
Parkland County	Invited and accepted. TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
Strathcona County	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
Town of Edson	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
Town of Stony Plain	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
Village of Wabamun	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
Yellowhead County	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
Municipality of Jasper	Invited and accepted; meetings on an as-needed basis
<b>BC</b>	
City of Abbotsford	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
City of Burnaby	Invited and accepted in 2017. City has declined to meet in TWG format since December 2017. Periodic discussions with the City of Burnaby on specific topics such as permits and construction-based complaints continue.
City of Chilliwack	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
City of Coquitlam	Invited and accepted; regular TWG meetings underway
City of Kamloops	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
City of Surrey	Invited and accepted, regular TWG meetings underway
District of Clearwater	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
District of Hope	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
FVRD	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
Metro Vancouver	Invited and accepted; regular TWG meetings underway
RDFFG	Invited and accepted; TWG meetings underway on an as-needed basis
TNRD, representing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community of Avola</li> <li>• Community of Blue River</li> <li>• Community of Little Fort</li> <li>• Community of Vavenby</li> </ul>	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

Notes:

- BC = British Columbia
- FVRD = Fraser Valley Regional District
- RDFFG = Regional District of Fraser Fort George
- TNRD = Thompson Nicola Regional District

Local government and Trans Mountain TWG attendees are determined based on agreed-upon agenda topics and issues to be addressed. Trans Mountain endeavours to ensure a team member authorized to make decisions regarding agenda items and issues attends each TWG meeting.

Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in Engineering, Land, Construction, Traffic Management, Permitting, Environment, Security, and Stakeholder Engagement attend as needed. Some Sub-technical Working Groups (SWGs) have been formed within a TWG to address specific technical matters with additional SMEs attending meetings, as required.

Updated lists of key TWG contacts are included in Table 3 and Table 4.

**TABLE 3**

**TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP CONTACTS BY COMMUNITY – BRITISH COLUMBIA**

<b>Local Government</b>	<b>Trans Mountain TWG Key Contacts</b>	<b>Local Government TWG Key Contacts</b>
City of Abbotsford	Project Manager, Spread 6 (Fraser Valley) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	General Manager Innovation, Strategy and Intergovernmental Relations
City of Burnaby	Project Director, Lower Mainland Manager, Lower Mainland and Community Investment	Director, Corporate Services
City of Chilliwack	Project Manager, Spread 6 (Fraser Valley) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Deputy Director, Engineering
City of Coquitlam	Project Director, Lower Mainland Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Manager, Design and Construction and Executive Sponsor Manager, Capital Projects and Inspections Project Coordinator, Design and Construction
City of Kamloops	Project Manager, Spread 5A (BC Interior) Senior Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Civic Operations Director
City of Merritt	Project Manager, Spread 5A (BC Interior) Senior Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Chief Administrative Officer
City of Surrey	Project Director, Lower Mainland Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Manager, Drainage
District of Clearwater	Project Manager, Spread 4B (North Thompson) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Chief Administrative Officer
District of Hope	Project Manager, Spread 5B (Coquihalla-Hope) Senior Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Chief Administrative Officer and Director, Operations
FVRD	Project Manager, Spread 5B (Coquihalla-Hope) Project Manager, Spread 6 (Fraser Valley) Senior Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Manager, Strategic Planning
Metro Vancouver	Project Director, Lower Mainland Senior Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Division Manager, Properties
RDFFG	Project Manager, Spread 3 (North Thompson) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Director of Planning Services or Manager of Planning Services
TNRD, representing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community of Avola</li> <li>• Community of Blue River</li> <li>• Community of Little Fort</li> <li>• Community of Vavenby</li> </ul>	Project Manager, Spread 3 (North Thompson) Project Manager, Spread 4A (North Thompson) Project Manager, Spread 4B (North Thompson) Project Manager, Spread 5A (BC Interior) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Senior Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Chief Administrative Officer
Township of Langley	Project Director, Lower Mainland Project Manager, Spread 6 (Fraser Valley) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Director, Public Works and Executive Sponsor Manager, Engineering and Construction Services
Village of Valemount	Project Manager, Spread 3 (North Thompson) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Chief Administrative Officer

**TABLE 4**

**TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP CONTACTS BY COMMUNITY – ALBERTA**

Local Government	Trans Mountain TWG contacts	Local Government TWG contacts
City of Edmonton	Project Manager, Spread 1 (Greater Edmonton) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications Crossings Coordinator	Oil and Gas Liaison
City of Spruce Grove	Project Manager, Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Director, Engineering
Parkland County	Project Manager, Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Project Officer, Engineering Services
Strathcona County	Project Manager, Spread 1 (Greater Edmonton) Project Director, Edmonton Terminal Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Coordinator, Development Permitting
Town of Edson	Project Manager, Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Director Planning and Development
Town of Hinton	Project Manager, Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Director of Planning and Development
Town of Stony Plain	Project Manager, Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	General Manager, Planning and Infrastructure
Village of Wabamun	Project Manager, Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Chief Administrative Officer
Yellowhead County	Project Manager, Spread 2 (Yellowhead) Community Liaison, Stakeholder Engagement and Communications	Manager of Infrastructure Services

## 2.0 TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETINGS AND ACTIVITIES

Table 5 lists the methods, dates and locations of TWG and SWG activities which took place during the Reporting Period.

**TABLE 5**

### METHODS, DATES AND LOCATIONS OF TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP ACTIVITIES BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2019 AND MARCH 30, 2020

TWG	Method	Date	Location
Township of Langley	In-person	October 15, 2019	Township of Langley office
City of Edmonton	In-person	October 19, 2019	City of Edmonton Firehall #1
Metro Vancouver Regional District	In-person	October 30, 2019	Metro Vancouver office
Parkland County	In-person	November 18, 2019	Parkland County office
Town of Stony Plain	In-person	November 19, 2019	Town of Stony Plain office
City of Spruce Grove	In-person	November 19, 2019	City of Spruce Grove office
City of Edmonton	In-person	November 20, 2019	City of Edmonton office
City of Chilliwack	Letter	November 22, 2019	Not Applicable
Strathcona County	In-person	November 26, 2019	Strathcona County office
Metro Vancouver Regional District	In-person	November 27, 2019	Metro Vancouver office
Metro Vancouver Regional District	In-person – Eaglequest / Landfill alignment SWG	November 27, 2019	Metro Vancouver office
Township of Langley	In-person	November 29, 2019	Township of Langley office
City of Surrey	In-person – Pre-construction surveying and potholing SWG	December 3, 2019	City of Surrey office
City of Coquitlam	Email	December 3, 2019	Not Applicable
Yellowhead County	In-person	December 3, 2019	Yellowhead County office
Town of Hinton	In-person	December 3, 2019	Town of Hinton office
Town of Edson	In-person	December 3, 2019	Town of Edson office
TNRD	In-person – permitting SWG	December 4, 2019	TNRD office
City of Kamloops	In-person	December 5, 2019	City of Kamloops office
City of Kamloops	In-person	December 6, 2019	City of Kamloops office
City of Coquitlam	In-person – potholing SWG	January 3, 2020	City of Coquitlam engineering services yard
Metro Vancouver Regional District	In-person	January 29, 2020	Metro Vancouver office
City of Coquitlam	In-person	February 24, 2020	City of Coquitlam office
Township of Langley	In-person	February 25, 2020	Township of Langley office
Metro Vancouver Regional District	In-person	February 26, 2020	Metro Vancouver office
City of Edmonton	In-person	February 28, 2020	City of Edmonton office
City of Surrey	In-person	March 2, 2020	City of Surrey office

Two meetings occurred outside of the Reporting Period (Table 6) for this Report Update that have not yet been included in a previous Condition 49 Report Update. Final records from these meetings were not available prior to the October 15, 2019 submission of Report Update No. 5 which covered the reporting period from April 1, 2019 to September 30, 2019. Any issues or concerns raised from this meeting will be reported on in Table 9.

**TABLE 6**

### TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETINGS PRIOR TO REPORT UPDATE NO. 6 REPORTING PERIOD

TWG	Method	Scheduled Date
Metro Vancouver Regional District	In-person	September 25, 2019
City of Chilliwack	In-person	September 25, 2019

### 3.0 ISSUES AND CONCERNS

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 local government through TWG meetings.

#### 3.1 Local Government Permitting

Trans Mountain has met with most local governments to review and confirm permitting expectations. Following these discussions, a permitting Closure Letter was provided with a schedule of Trans Mountain's understanding of the permits necessary for Project construction within that local government's geographical boundaries (Schedule B). In each Closure Letter, Trans Mountain requested the local government's confirmation of the Schedule B permit list and provided an opportunity for further discussion or clarification. Trans Mountain also indicated a lack of response by a specified date would be understood as agreement that the Schedule B permit list was complete and accurate. The status of the Closure Letter with each local government is provided in Tables 7 and 8.

**TABLE 7**

**STATUS OF CLOSURE LETTERS – BRITISH COLUMBIA**

Local Government	Status
City of Abbotsford	Complete
City of Burnaby	Not issued
City of Chilliwack	Complete
City of Coquitlam	Complete
City of Kamloops	Complete
City of Merritt	Complete
City of Surrey	Complete
District of Clearwater	Complete
District of Hope	Complete
FVRD	Complete
Metro Vancouver	Not Applicable
RDFFG	Complete
TNRD	Complete
Township of Langley	Complete
Village of Valemount	Complete

**TABLE 8**

**STATUS OF CLOSURE LETTERS – ALBERTA**

Local Government	Status
City of Edmonton	Not Applicable*
City of Spruce Grove	Complete
Parkland County	Complete
Strathcona County	Complete
Town of Edson	Complete
Town of Hinton	Complete
Town of Stony Plain	Complete
Village of Wabamun	Complete
Yellowhead County	Complete

\*TWG discussions with the City of Edmonton focused on other priority items during this period. With construction now underway within the City of Edmonton boundaries, permits are being applied for and obtained as needed. No closure package will be issued.

### **3.2 Status Update – Issues and Concerns**

Tables 9 and 10 provide a status update on issues and concerns raised by local governments in BC and Alberta and addressed in TWG or SWG meetings, or other specific meetings, held during the Reporting Period.

The issue status is identified as complete where a topic of concern has been addressed. Items previously reported as complete or out-of-scope have been excluded from this Report Update.

**TABLE 9**

**UPDATE ON ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND ADDRESSED IN TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2019 AND MARCH 30, 2020**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Abbotsford	City of Abbotsford would like all requirements for the HEP submitted at one time, with the exception of the proposed traffic routes and Traffic Control Plan. City of Abbotsford requests the proposed traffic routes and Traffic Control Plan as soon as possible as they will need to be presented to Council for approval.	Trans Mountain confirmed that the requirements for the HEP will not be available until 3 months prior to construction. City of Abbotsford previously confirmed at a TWG meeting on February 23, 2018 to discuss permitting requirements that it would take approximately 2 months to review and approve the HEP: 4 to 6 weeks for engineering and 4 to 6 weeks for development engineering.  Topic for future TWG meeting.	In progress
City of Abbotsford	Trans Mountain indicated a number of crossing agreements have been prepared with BC Hydro. The City of Abbotsford requested copies of crossing agreements with BC Hydro within Municipal boundaries to be included with the HEP application.	Trans Mountain noted that they will be moving a number of BC Hydro poles within the City of Abbotsford. Where Trans Mountain is able to obtain those agreements in advance of the HEP submission, it will do so. However, Trans Mountain is in discussions with BC Hydro regarding this matter, which may not be resolved prior to the submission of the HEP application.	In progress
City of Abbotsford	City of Abbotsford 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 of Abbotsford strongly recommends Trans Mountain take pre- and post-construction photos. If City of Abbotsford determines any damage to the roads, Trans Mountain would be responsible for cost to repair.	Trans Mountain no longer requires a laydown yard in Spread 6 (Abbotsford).	Complete
City of Abbotsford	City of Abbotsford requested estimated weight of tank pieces being transported to Sumas Terminal. City of Abbotsford 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.	At the December 17, 2018 meeting City of Abbotsford confirmed Highway Use Permit and Road Use Permit will apply for getting materials to Sumas Terminal. Vehicle weight restrictions may apply. Trans Mountain to provide estimated weights when available.  Topic for future TWG meeting.	In progress
City of Abbotsford	Crossing agreements.	Trans Mountain anticipates 107 crossings within the City of Abbotsford and includes all road crossings and City of Abbotsford-owned infrastructure. Trans Mountain submitted 87 utility crossing drawings to the City of Abbotsford on June 15, 2017. Trans Mountain and the City of Abbotsford are working to complete the outstanding crossing agreements. Target for completion is Q2 2020.  Topic for future TWG meeting.	In progress
City of Burnaby	City of Burnaby concern that Trans Mountain will not follow local bylaws.	Trans Mountain has committed that it will follow the intent of local bylaw requirements where the bylaw does not conflict with a higher permitting authority. For the purposes of constructing the TMEP, Trans Mountain has been sharing information with, and submitting required permit applications to, the City of Burnaby. As work has progressed, Trans Mountain has kept City of Burnaby informed by mail, email and phone to provide additional information as requested and where required.  Trans Mountain has expressed and demonstrated an interest in working with the City of Burnaby to resolve all concerns related to permits. Trans Mountain also repeated the importance of receiving time sensitive permits in good faith. In its communication in early 2020, Trans Mountain expressed concerns about the amount of time it was taking for certain permits to be processed and approved.	In progress

**TABLE 9 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
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.	<p>Trans Mountain originally provided the City of Burnaby a list of City of Burnaby permits along with highlights of the permits that Trans Mountain considers applicable for compliance submissions at a pre-TWG meeting on May 5, 2017 and permitting was discussed at a TWG meeting on October 18, 2017.</p> <p>When the City disengaged in TWG meetings prior to the January 2018 TWG meeting, Trans Mountain began submitting permit applications through the usual permit application channels.</p> <p>Trans Mountain has submitted permit applications related to the following City of Burnaby permits: alternate access from Greystone and Gaglardi; installation of sound walls outside Burnaby Terminal and Westridge Marine Terminal; electrical permits for temporary infrastructure sites; Burnaby Terminal and Westridge Marine Terminal; and security and safety fencing at Westridge Marine Terminal.</p> <p>Follow-up discussions occurred by email and phone throughout Q4 2019 and Q1 2020 with Trans Mountain seeking clarification on specific permit application requirements required by the City of Burnaby and providing additional information to support timely approval from the City of Burnaby, including meeting the City of Burnaby requirement to complete additional public engagement with more than 1,300 residents living near Burnaby Terminal and Westridge Marine Terminal. This subsequent engagement sought input into a permit for the installation of two sound walls and is supplementary to the extensive engagement conducted with these residents during the previous 8 years.</p> <p>In an email on February 4, 2020 Trans Mountain expressed concerns about the amount of time it was taking for certain permits to be processed and approved. Trans Mountain will continue to work in good faith with the City of Burnaby toward Municipal bylaw compliance and looks forward to receiving approvals where possible, and as soon as possible. As of March 31, 2020, some permits have been with the municipality for more than 150 days. As of March 31, 2020, Trans Mountain has received confirmation that it will receive a permit for the Greystone temporary alternate access and Burnaby Terminal sound wall, subject to meeting a number of conditions, as well as for the on-site overhead transmission line at Westridge Terminal. At this time, the City of Burnaby has not granted permits for the Gaglardi alternate access, temporary security fence at Westridge Marine Terminal, Westridge Marine Terminal sound wall and certain electrical permits.</p>	In progress
City of Burnaby	Construction impacts to recreational use areas including land-based areas and Burrard Inlet.	<p>Trans Mountain engaged with stakeholders around multiple aspects of the Project, to share information and seek input, including to recreational user groups and parks managers as detailed construction plans were developed; to minimize impacts and determine best methods to communicate to recreation users during construction.</p> <p>Safe access to local public waterways has been maintained since construction began in 2017 when appropriate navigation safety measures were put in place around the perimeter of the marine construction safety zone.</p> <p>Regarding land-based areas, previously, the City of Burnaby has indicated that they will engage on this topic once the CER has ruled on the PPBoR for this section of the Project's detailed route. As part of the route settlement with City of Burnaby in Q3 2019 (Filing ID <a href="#">A6Y8W7</a>), Trans Mountain and the City of Burnaby addressed Brunette River Conservation Area, Cottonwood Park and the East Lake corridor. The City of Burnaby has future plans for parks space in these locations.</p>	Complete



**TABLE 9 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Burnaby	<p>Concerns related to traffic management around Westridge Marine Terminal and Burnaby Terminal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative options for traffic management with respect to proposed Gagliardi access</li> <li>• Concern about impacts on Forest Grove and Sperling neighbourhoods and security</li> </ul>	<p>Prior to filing with the CER, Trans Mountain shared Traffic Access and Control Management Plans (TACMP - Condition 73) with local governments for input, including City of Burnaby, between Q3 2016 and Q2 2017.</p> <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 of Burnaby 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 was 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 of Burnaby staff. Both parties agreed to review and discuss the draft Traffic Management Plan in development with the GCC at a SWG meeting. The City of Burnaby disengaged in TWG discussions prior to the January 2018 meeting.</p> <p>In October 2019, Trans Mountain submitted permit applications for Gagliardi and Greystone alternate accesses during construction. Alternate accesses will help to manage traffic flow near Burnaby Terminal. In early March 2020, the City of Burnaby confirmed that subject to a number of conditions, it will provide a permit for a temporary alternate access via Greystone Drive but declines a permit for Gagliardi Way due to steep gradient and related safety concerns.</p> <p>Trans Mountain continues to work with the City to address traffic and truck staging concerns near Burnaby Terminal with City of Burnaby staff. As of March 31, 2020, conversations are ongoing and include measures for improved pedestrian safety and road preservation (in light of heavy truck traffic).</p>	In progress
City of Burnaby	Review crossings.	<p>Initial conversation took place at June 5, 2017 pre-TWG meeting. Agreement to defer review of crossings until after CER route hearing decision.</p> <p>Trans Mountain is developing a standard Crossing Agreement for lower mainland Municipalities. Crossing application packages were submitted to City of Burnaby throughout 2017; no response has been received to date.</p>	In progress
City of Burnaby	Investigate using Trans Mountain-owned Shell 16-inch pipeline corridor for TMEP to cross Shellmont Street; and abandonment of Trans Mountain-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 CER and slight re-route to run through trench. Group agreed to defer until the CER route hearing process is complete and re-visit once a final route is determined. The route has been approved and this was not part of approved route decision. Trans Mountain investigated and determined this corridor is not practicable. Trans Mountain will use the corridor approved as part of the routing decision (Filing ID <a href="#">A6Y8WZ</a>).</p>	Complete

**TABLE 9 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Chilliwack	City of Chilliwack remains concerned about the amount of time it would take to mount a response to an incident and the potential for product to reach the aquifer while a response was being coordinated. City of Chilliwack requested Trans Mountain review liner options to contain product if a release occurred allowing for emergency response without contamination of the aquifer. City of Chilliwack is not as concerned with product outside the aquifer region.	<p>Trans Mountain agreed to investigate potential liner options taking into account constructability and any potential increased risk to pipeline operations. Primary concern for Trans Mountain would be management of water near the pipe and potential for corrosion.</p> <p>Trans Mountain completed an engineering, constructability and operations assessment of the proposed trench liner through 1.4 km of the TMEP right-of-way between KP 1095 and KP 1097 (Sardis Aquifer) in Chilliwack. Trans Mountain's engineering assessment concluded the construction of the proposed trench liner, while technically feasible, would add significant complexity for construction. A subsequent review by the Trans Mountain Operations Team concluded the installation of a liner will impact the long-term integrity of the pipeline by interfering with CP and would likely lead to an increased risk of corrosion. The proposed trench liner does not meet the Canadian Standards Association Z662 Standard for pipeline construction. Trans Mountain and its Consultants are not aware of any similar use of a pipeline trench liner within the pipeline industry. Based on these increased risks, Trans Mountain is unable to accommodate the City of Chilliwack's request to install a trench liner in the pipeline segment crossing the Sardis Aquifer. Trans Mountain remains confident in the protection measures that it committed to in regulatory processes and in communications with the City of Chilliwack to date. These are described in more detail in a letter sent to City of Chilliwack on November 22, 2019.</p> <p>Trans Mountain continues to engage stakeholders, including local governments, on its EMP. As part of the Expansion, Trans Mountain is reviewing and enhancing the EMP and associated ERPs to address requirements of the expanded system. Trans Mountain has and will continue to invite City of Chilliwack First Responders to participate in its emergency response engagement activities, training and exercises. Most recently, City of Chilliwack was invited and participated in an Emergency Management info session held on March 3, 2020.</p>	Complete
City of Chilliwack	City of Chilliwack requests CER include a Condition that requires Trans Mountain to develop a Noise Management Plan for general construction noise (not solely from HDD) 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.</p> <p>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>Trans Mountain submitted a permitting closure package to the City of Chilliwack on May 24, 2018. The City of Chilliwack provided comments and a revised Schedule B was provided on September 24, 2018.</p> <p>In addition, Condition 74 requires site-specific HDD Noise Management Plans to be filed 3 months prior to the commencement of construction of each HDD crossing. Trans Mountain will share a copy of the Vedder River HDD Noise Management Plan once completed.</p>	In progress
City of Coquitlam	City of Coquitlam noted concerns with Maquabeak Park access during construction	Trans Mountain confirmed construction will not impact the park. Trans Mountain has requested access through the park via Metro Vancouver. Permission has not yet been granted. Trans Mountain does not expect to impact traffic in the park.	In progress
City of Coquitlam	City of Coquitlam will require Trans Mountain to obtain a permit to discharge water into sanitary system; and an additional permit from Metro Vancouver will be required for any discharge to their system. City of Coquitlam will require Trans Mountain to demonstrate that the discharged water is quality water suitable for aquatic life before any discharge to City of Coquitlam storm water system.	Topic was discussed with City of Coquitlam at TWG meeting on February 24, 2020. Trans Mountain's Contractor confirmed that the quality of water will meet City of Coquitlam water guidelines and in the event a major stormwater discharge to the City of Coquitlam's storm system is required, the Contractor will engage the City of Coquitlam on its plans. The City of Coquitlam requested a temporary storm service connection and will look into providing this connection to the site.	In progress

**TABLE 9 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Coquitlam	Economic impacts to businesses affected by construction.	<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 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. In September 2019, Trans Mountain mailed letters to businesses with single driveway access on United Boulevard, Hartley and Rogers Avenue with an offer to meet to review traffic and access management plans and discuss access requirements specific to each business. Close to 20 meetings with local businesses took place in Q4 2019 to Q1 2020 and further engagement will take place prior to construction. Meetings have been constructive focusing on key topics of concern including overall impact to area, business access, transportation and security plans during construction.</p>	In progress
City of Coquitlam	Construction impacts on Municipal services (e.g., fire/rescue).	<p>Topic for future TWG or SWG meetings.</p> <p>SSERPs were shared with the City of Coquitlam and discussed during a site visit on September 13, 2018. The City of Coquitlam requested that Trans Mountain revise the SSERP to include additional scenarios for potential issues. Trans Mountain will revise the SSERP and set up a future meeting to discuss with the City of Coquitlam.</p>	In progress
City of Coquitlam	City of Coquitlam is a designated Bear Smart certified community and must consider reducing human-wildlife conflict. The City of Coquitlam 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 for larger animals.	<p>Trans Mountain shared the culvert design with the City on July 30, 2019. The culvert is in MOTI jurisdiction. The design has been shared with MOTI for review/comment.</p>	In progress
City of Coquitlam	City of Coquitlam would like to review erosion control measures and Pipeline EPP.	<p>Erosion control measures are outlined in the Pipeline EPP. Additionally, Environmental Work Plans for each work area will be developed and shared with the City of Coquitlam prior to construction.</p>	In progress
City of Coquitlam	<p>Traffic management, business and emergency access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Coquitlam requires a list of proposed Traffic Management Plans and construction methodologies throughout City of Coquitlam. Traffic Management needs to include provisions for emergency response times. Traffic Management Plans should consider BC MoTI impacts at Mary Hill Bypass and Brunette Highway.</li> <li>• City of Coquitlam has concerns regarding methane readings and would like to discuss fire response plan in a SWG.</li> <li>• City of Coquitlam noted that many businesses only have one driveway access. It is City of Coquitlam's understanding that during construction, Trans Mountain will want to close accesses for a period of time and use 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.</li> </ul>	<p>Discussions between the City of Coquitlam and Trans Mountain about site-specific Traffic Management Plans and business and emergency access are ongoing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trans Mountain will submit Traffic Management Plans to the City of Coquitlam and also review the emergency response times. A temporary fire or emergency station will be set up if required.</li> <li>• Trans Mountain will share Traffic Management Plans for BC MoTI locations within the City of Coquitlam.</li> <li>• Trans Mountain will set up a meeting with City of Coquitlam Fire to discuss methane readings and fire response plan prior to construction.</li> </ul> <p>Trans Mountain has been and will continue engaging with local businesses to understand impacts, access and peak hours.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will continue to report on progress in future Condition 49 Report Updates.</p>	In progress
City of Coquitlam	The City of Coquitlam is concerned with tree removal prior to and during construction on private and Municipal lands.	<p>Trans Mountain and the City of Coquitlam had discussions about the Tree Management Plan. Trans Mountain shared the updated plan which included the City of Coquitlam's feedback on October 17, 2019 and discussed a requirement for a tree cutting permit at a TWG meeting on February 24, 2020. The City of Coquitlam has indicated to Trans Mountain that a tree cutting permit is required for trees over a certain size.</p> <p>Trans Mountain intends to comply with necessary Municipal permit requirements and remains committed to addressing questions as they come up in future TWG and SWG meetings with the City of Coquitlam.</p>	Complete

**TABLE 9 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Kamloops	Impacts to green spaces, parks and natural areas (e.g., Kenna Cartwright and Ord Road Dog Park).	<p>Since the progress updated in the Condition 49 Update Report No. 5 (Filing ID <a href="#">A6Y7Q7</a>) Trans Mountain has continued to engage the City of Kamloops and keep them informed about construction plans and impacts to parks and green spaces. Engagement is ongoing as TMEP approaches the start of construction in this area in Q2 2020.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At a TWG meeting on December 6, 2019, team members reviewed construction plans at Ord Road including detailed traffic plans.</li> <li>Discussions about construction impacts in Kenna Cartwright Park took place at a site meeting on January 9, 2020. Trans Mountain and the City of Kamloops toured the park discussing general construction activities and plan, trail access, construction access and signage.</li> </ul> <p>A notification postcard was mailed in February 24, 2020 to affected parties in the neighbourhood of Kenna Cartwright Park to communicate temporary closure and re-location of the dog park activities to a new facility at Aviation Way. The development of the new dog park was funded by Trans Mountain. Both sites will remain open following construction. Mitigations for impacts to public use at both sites have been confirmed with the City of Kamloops.</p>	Complete
City of Kamloops	Parks department requests that in-person meetings with Trans Mountain (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.	Trans Mountain met with the City of Kamloops on August 23, 2019 to review potential use of City of Kamloops biosolids for reclamation on City of Kamloops property. Additional discussions took place in Q4 2019 and Q1 2020.	In progress
City of Kamloops	City of Kamloops requests list of Sub-contractors.	<p>Trans Mountain is providing a list of Sub-contractors as it is available. Trans Mountain is planning to engage in regular construction update meetings with the City of Kamloops in 2020 and will provide information a few months prior to the start of construction.</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. Information will be provided when Sub-contractors have been confirmed.</p>	In progress
City of Surrey	City of Surrey has concerns about tree removals and re-planting.	Trans Mountain and the City of Surrey reviewed the Tree Management Plan and re-planting plan for natural areas in City Surrey and identified areas of concern at a meeting on August 27, 2019. Trans Mountain will revise the plans based on the City of Surrey's feedback and provide updated plans to the City of Surrey in Q1 2020.	In progress
City of Surrey	The City of Surrey is concerned about windthrow issues on City of Surrey park land due to vegetation removal and requested Trans Mountain provide a windthrow report conducted by a Registered Professional Forester where tree removals are planned adjacent to City of Surrey lands.	Trans Mountain confirmed with the City of Surrey at the July 29, 2019 TWG meeting that the windthrow report and danger tree assessment will be provided to the City of Surrey prior to construction. Trans Mountain performed a preliminary windthrow assessment in Q4 2019 and is in the process of incorporating this information into planning.	In progress
City of Surrey	The compensation area near the Golden Ears Connector must be maintained for 5 years by the BC MoTI.	Trans Mountain will have further discussions with BC MoTI and Fisheries and Oceans Canada regarding compensation areas and provide an update to the City of Surrey.	In progress
City of Surrey	The City of Surrey would like to see efficient and effective information flow between Contractors, Trans Mountain and the City of Surrey during construction.	<p>Trans Mountain agrees it is important to have an effective flow of information during construction. Topic was discussed at a TWG meeting on October 25, 2017 and the group agreed to continue discussion about communications between the City of Surrey, Trans Mountain and its Contractors in future TWGs/SWGs.</p> <p>Trans Mountain will share an information package with high level information regarding the Project. During construction, the need for TWG and SWG meetings may increase.</p>	Complete
District of Clearwater	District of Clearwater requested extension of water main from Grizzly Heights subdivision. An 800 m extension would provide potable water and fire suppression. The extension would be a legacy project for the District of Clearwater.	Topic for future TWG meeting. Trans Mountain and its Contractor met with the District of Clearwater in March 2020 to discuss water requirements for the temporary worker accommodation site and identify potential locations for the water main. Trans Mountain will continue to engage the District of Clearwater as detailed planning progresses.	In progress

**TABLE 9 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
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. Trans Mountain engagement is ongoing. Trans Mountain has assigned a Community Liaison to Spread 5B which includes the District of Hope. Trans Mountain has developed a Local Government information package to support information sharing with local governments in all communities.	Ongoing
Metro Vancouver	Metro Vancouver would like to come to an agreement on crossing agreements prior to construction of the first crossing.	<p>Topic has been discussed at several TWGs since 2017 and is a regular agenda topic at monthly TWG meetings with Metro Vancouver.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trans Mountain issued the first set of drawings in December 2018, which included all deliverables with packages including access plans and geotechnical drawings and additional crossing packages are being submitted on an ongoing basis.</li> <li>• A revised crossing agreement template was shared with Metro Vancouver in September 2019 for review and comment.</li> <li>• Metro Vancouver has requested that they are included in ongoing working group discussions with the CER to refine and clarify regulatory safety requirements; advised they will not provide comments until they are appraised to their members decisions made in the CER working group.</li> <li>• A follow-up workshop will be organized to discuss packages and any required submission changes.</li> </ul>	In progress
Metro Vancouver	Review and discuss crossing drawings.	Trans Mountain issued first set of drawings in December 2018, which included all deliverables with packages including access plans and geotechnical drawings. The TWG decided an in-person session to review documents and address concerns would be appropriate and efficient; these technical reviews, currently underway, have been productive. Metro Vancouver agrees but notes unofficial technical agreement only at the SWG. Executive approval still required on crossing agreements. Once Metro Vancouver has reviewed the packages, a follow-up workshop will be organized to discuss packages and any required submission changes. TMEP to provide Metro Vancouver with Level 2 Schedule.	In progress
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 meeting.	In progress
Metro Vancouver	Metro Vancouver is concerned about the Lake City interceptor, which is proximal to TMEP.	Topic for a future TWG or SWG meeting.	In progress
Village of Valemount	<p>Permits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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 establish form and character of commercial and multi-family development.</li> <li>• The proposed Utility Complex may require a Zoning Bylaw Amendment or TUP.</li> <li>• Construction camps/worker accommodation, offices, warehouses and stock yards will require a Zoning Bylaw Amendment or TUP.</li> <li>• Building permit requirements.</li> </ul>	<p>The location for the Valemount temporary worker accommodation site was changed in 2019 and is now located in the RDFFG near Valemount, BC. Trans Mountain submitted a TUP application to the RDFFG and participated in a public hearing on November 26, 2019. The RDFFG approved the TUP on December 19, 2019 and preparations are underway to build the temporary accommodation site to house the TMEP workforce as early as mid-2020.</p> <p>Since the progress updated in the previous Condition 49 Report Update No. 5 (Filing ID <a href="#">A6Y7Q7</a>), Trans Mountain and its Contractors submitted an application to the Village of Valemount for the necessary building permits related to the Construction Office and Yard in Valemount participating in a second public hearing on February 11, 2020. Prior to the hearing Trans Mountain provided written responses to a series of questions from the Village of Valemount with additional information about site operations (e.g., hours of operation, noise, sewer and water, electricity, greenhouse gas offsetting, invasive weed control and site plan). Council approved the TUP on February 12, 2020 and commended Trans Mountain on its community-minded approach.</p>	Complete
TNRD	Concern about camp water requirements and waste management plans.	Plans will be developed by temporary worker accommodation site Contractors in accordance with permitting requirements once construction schedule and Contractors for camp development are finalized.	In progress

**TABLE 9 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
Township of Langley	Township of Langley has concerns re: tree removal in Township of Langley parklands.	Trans Mountain developed an enhanced re-planting plan in consultation with the Township of Langley for three affected parks in Township of Langley.	Complete
Township of Langley	The Township of Langley is concerned about construction impacts to Ziegler Trail and would like Trans Mountain to look into alternative path and notification to users.	Trans Mountain to consider an alternative pedestrian path at Ziegler Trail. There may be trail use restrictions during construction. Trans Mountain will look at various options to reduce impact.	In progress
Township of Langley	The Township of Langley did not support any of the western alignments through Redwoods Golf Course and asked Trans Mountain to develop an eastern route. The Township requested that 88 <sup>th</sup> Avenue be widened/upgraded by TMEP during construction. Township of Langley indicated it will agree to the eastern alignment through the Redwoods Golf Course only if this condition is met.	<p>Routing engagement has been ongoing since the Project was announced in 2012. Continuing discussions have occurred with the Township of Langley, owner of the lands where the Redwoods Golf Course operates, Redwoods Golf Course owner/operator and stakeholders to adjust the pipeline alignment to minimize impacts to the golf course and neighbours.</p> <p>Previous updates on these discussions can be found in Condition 49 filings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial Report: filed on April 13, 2017 (Filing ID <a href="#">A82625</a>)</li> <li>• Report Update No. 1: filed on October 13, 2017 (Filing ID <a href="#">A86895</a>)</li> <li>• Report Update No. 2: filed on April 13, 2018 (Filing ID <a href="#">A91269</a>)</li> <li>• Report Update No. 3: filed on October 12, 2018 (Filing ID <a href="#">A94775</a>)</li> <li>• Report Update No. 4: filed on April 12, 2019 (Filing ID <a href="#">A98818</a>)</li> <li>• Report Update No. 5: April 1, 2019 – September 30, 2019, filed on October 15, 2019 (Filing ID <a href="#">A6Y7Q7</a>)</li> </ul> <p>Trans Mountain and the Township of Langley reached a signed agreement on March 24, 2020. The Township of Langley's Statement of Opposition for the route filed with the CER for PPBoR was retracted with the signing of this agreement.</p>	Complete
Township of Langley	<p>Crossing drawings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Township of Langley requested detailed design drawings of the pipeline at each road and utility right-of-way crossing, with construction not to take place until the Township of Langley approves the design drawings. The Township of Langley requested that Trans Mountain work with them to develop appropriate pipeline depth through the Township of Langley and to seek approval adjacent to and under their infrastructure.</li> <li>• The Township of Langley would like to see elevations plus depth of utilities the TMEP will be crossing on design drawings including drainage infrastructure. The Township of Langley is concerned with the depth of the pipeline at locations of existing and future water, sanitary sewer and storm sewer pipes.</li> <li>• The Contractor should be required to pre-expose utilities to confirm depth and location, submit 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 of Langley noted that review of crossing documents does not constitute crossing approval or consent.</li> </ul>	<p>Trans Mountain has committed to working with the Township of Langley to develop appropriate pipeline depths through the Township of Langley and to seek approval adjacent to and under the Township of Langley's infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design drawings were first provided to the Township of Langley in 2017 and have been a regular topic on the agenda at TWG and SWG meetings since then.</li> <li>• Trans Mountain will continue discussions related to pipeline depth through TWGs and Utility Crossing SWG meetings.</li> <li>• Trans Mountain's Contractor will begin a potholing (utility locate) program in Q2 2020 to obtain more detailed information about existing utilities in the approved pipeline corridor prior to start of construction. Pipeline depth will be finalized following completion of this program.</li> <li>• Trans Mountain will complete a utility locate program in the Township of Langley and provide updated crossing drawings prior to construction and the Township of Langley will have an opportunity to review and discuss at future TWG meetings.</li> </ul>	In progress
Township of Langley	The Township of Langley requested that detailed design considerations for crossings be formalized in a crossing agreement.	The Township of Langley and Trans Mountain are currently in discussions regarding the crossing agreement.	In progress

**TABLE 9 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
Township of Langley	Storm sewer east of 199B Street.	This is an ongoing topic that has been discussed at TWG meetings since 2017. Trans Mountain sent revised drawings to the Township of Langley with an updated crossing list in January 2018 and continues to keep the Township informed as work continues. Drawings will be submitted with crossing applications and include information on depth once the utility program (potholing) is complete.	In progress
Township of Langley	The Township of Langley 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 1 day, where practical.  The Township of Langley requested that roads within the Township of Langley are crossed trenchless.	As noted in Condition 49 Report Update No. 3, traffic counts and methodology were reviewed with Township of Langley during previous TWG meetings and agreements were reached for majority of road crossings. Township of Langley is concerned with construction impacts to 217A Street and 99A Avenue and subsequent restoration. Discussions on this topic are ongoing on a without prejudice basis.	In progress
Township of Langley	The Township of Langley requested to be consulted on preparation of Traffic Management Plans.  The Township of Langley requests that Trans Mountain consult with the Township of Langley in advance of finalizing Traffic and Access Management Plans (and traffic mitigation measures) in Township of Langley.	As noted in Condition 49 Report Update No. 3, Traffic Management Plans have been discussed during previous TWG meetings. Township of Langley has provided specific feedback. Finalized Traffic Management Plans to be shared with the Township of Langley prior to construction.	In progress

Notes:

BC MoTI = BC Ministry of Transportation and Infrastructure

CP = cathodic protection

EMP = Emergency Management Plan

EPP = Environmental Protection Plan

ERP = Emergency Response Plan

GCC = General Construction Contractor

HDD = Horizontal Directional Drilling

HEP = Highway Excavation Permit

PPBoR = Plan, Profile and Book of Reference

SSERP = Site-specific Emergency Response Plan

TUP = Temporary Use Permit

**TABLE 10**

**UPDATE ON ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ALBERTA  
AND ADDRESSED IN TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2019 AND MARCH 30, 2020**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Edmonton	<p>Crossing Agreements and sharing of Risk Management Plan.</p> <p>City of Edmonton requested detailed crossing drawings. Parts of the TMEP route through developer-owned lands and the City of Edmonton will not provide authorization for those crossings.</p> <p>In an email dated November 28, 2018, the City of Edmonton confirmed the pipeline within a RROW requires authorization via a Utility Line Assignment Permit. City of Edmonton requested drawings that show all utilities, plus offsets and coordinates when entering and exiting a RROW. Preference is to remove unnecessary information such as individual road plans.</p> <p>City of Edmonton also provided specific feedback for re-submitting crossing agreements. City of Edmonton requested a follow-up meeting to discuss and review crossing agreements.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain Land and the City of Edmonton Land Administration reached agreement on crossings and formal crossing agreements are in place. With construction now underway in the City of Edmonton, permits are being applied for and obtained as needed. Trans Mountain also reached a long-term agreement with the City of Edmonton for construction and operational land rights related to the Project.</p> <p>A meeting with City of Edmonton Fire Chief, TMEP and SA Energy to discuss Project specific Emergency Response Plans took place on October 17, 2019.</p> <p>No further concerns noted. Meetings will be on an as-needed basis during construction.</p>	Complete
City of Spruce Grove	<p>Coordination regarding City of Spruce Grove environmental planning.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain met with the City of Spruce Grove to provide a Project update on November 19, 2019. At this meeting Trans Mountain shared the Project schedule and introduced Midwest Pipelines Construction Liaison.</p> <p>No further concerns noted. Meetings will be on an as-needed basis during construction.</p>	Complete
Strathcona County	<p>Road crossings.</p>	<p>As noted in previous Condition 49 Report Updates, road crossings, road use agreements and permit applications were discussed in previous TWG meetings. A permitting closure package was submitted to the County on August 17, 2018 and crossing agreements, along with road use agreements, were reached between TMEP and Strathcona County Land Administration and Strathcona Transportation and Agricultural Services in Q1 2020.</p> <p>No further concerns noted. Meetings will be on an as-needed basis during construction.</p>	Complete
Town of Edson	<p>Project scope and construction timing.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain provided a Project update, including construction schedule, on December 3, 2019.</p> <p>No further concerns noted. Meetings will be on an as-needed basis during construction.</p>	Complete
Town of Hinton	<p>Requested that Trans Mountain make a presentation to its Regional emergency responders at a regular quarterly meeting closer to the commencement of pipeline construction.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain provided a Project update and delivered an Emergency Response presentation to the Town of Hinton on December 3, 2019.</p>	Complete
Town of Hinton	<p>The Town of Hinton would like to know when to anticipate workforce presence in the community. Local accommodations often have minimal availability especially during the summer.</p>	<p>Trans Mountain provided a Project update to the Town of Hinton on December 3, 2019. Trans Mountain also participated in the Hinton Chamber mini job fair on January 9, 2020.</p>	Complete
Yellowhead County	<p>Yellowhead County wants to ensure there will be resident notifications regarding noise impacts.</p>	<p>As noted in previous Condition 49 Report Updates, Trans Mountain 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. Trans Mountain also has a communication and notification process to notify residents and the public about potential construction impacts in the community.</p> <p>In Q3 2019 Trans Mountain notified members of the community, key stakeholders and the public about construction activities taking place in Spread 2. Information was also made available on the Project website and shared with those who signed up to receive construction update e-newsletters.</p> <p>Trans Mountain also provided a Project update to Yellowhead County in a TWG meeting on December 3, 2019.</p>	Complete

Note:  
RROW = Road Right-of-Way



### 3.3 New Issues and Concerns

Tables 11 and 12 summarize new issues and concerns raised by local governments during this Reporting Period. This may include previously identified issues and concerns that were considered complete but have been raised again.

**TABLE 11**

#### **NEW ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2019 AND MARCH 30, 2020**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Coquitlam	City of Coquitlam emailed Trans Mountain with questions related to leak detection and emergency response should a leak occur below the clay cap within the Municipal landfill located on United Boulevard. If a leak occurred, would the landfill material need to be excavated and how would the material be treated and disposed of.	Trans Mountain provided the City of Coquitlam with a summary of measures used to identify, prevent and monitor all hazards that could affect pipeline safety, including: corrosion protection, inline inspection tools, integrity digs, pipeline protection program and information about the current leak detection system in place. In addition to the systems already in place, Trans Mountain is planning to enhance leak detection by installing a secondary leak detection fibre-optic system on the Project. Trans Mountain also provided response regarding emergency management and remediation activities in the unlikely event of a leak.	Complete
KAL	Conflicts with wildfire season (mid-May to September) when runway length at Kamloops Airport is required for fire fighting. KAL requests TMEP avoid completing pull back when full runway length is required.	Trans Mountain continues to engage KAL as construction planning details become available as communicated to the City of Kamloops during TWG discussions in 2017-2018. At a meeting on September 17, 2019, Trans Mountain shared an updated construction schedule and reviewed options for pull back crane height within the airport property. Trans Mountain is prepared to work with KAL to accommodate pull back and runway restrictions when required. Concerns have been addressed through the KAL's approval of the Pan of Construction which provides authorization for activities within the airport properties.  Note: Kamloops Airport is operated by KAL under contract to the City of Kamloops.	Complete
City of Kamloops	Ord Road construction execution and community impacts: steep slope construction, road and traffic impacts and coordinating with City of Kamloops projects in area.	Trans Mountain reviewed construction and traffic plans for Ord Road at a TWG meeting on December 6, 2019. Due to the complex nature of construction in this area, Trans Mountain is developing a plan in conjunction with the City of Kamloops to coordinate activities, schedule and minimize impacts to the public. Trans Mountain will submit a Traffic Management Plan that addresses the City of Kamloops' feedback and additional details will be provided in Traffic Control Plans.  Construction-related impacts are topics for future TWG meetings. Trans Mountain is planning to engage in regular construction update meetings with the City of Kamloops in 2020. The first construction update meeting took place on March 10, 2020.	In progress
Metro Vancouver	Metro Vancouver requests clarification of different types of Safety Plans that have been or will be submitted.	Trans Mountain addressed these differences in an email with a table of definitions, contents of plans, owners and when the final plans will be submitted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work Plans will have a safety section applicable to specific areas of work.</li> <li>• The Safety Plan is global and all-encompassing document for Spread 7 and Terminal work.</li> <li>• The SSERP is owned by TMEP and is broken down by segment (e.g., Spread 7, Burnaby Terminal, Westridge Marine Terminal, Burnaby Tunnel) confirming with the Contractor what to include in their Safety Plans.</li> </ul>	Complete
Metro Vancouver	Metro Vancouver has concerns about the pipeline route alignment within the Eaglequest golf course/former Coquitlam Landfill property. Metro Vancouver is concerned about impacts to future use of land, specifically plans to twin a 3 m sewer line in the area. Metro Vancouver would like to see the pipeline located as far north as possible and requests that TMEP accommodate header and affiliated systems during construction, whether it is moving or replacing.	Trans Mountain has been discussing pipeline alignment options through the Eaglequest golf course/former Coquitlam Landfill property with Metro Vancouver since TWGs were established in 2016 and engagement is ongoing. Trans Mountain is currently working with Metro Vancouver to resolve concerns and finalize pipeline alignment through this property.	In progress

**TABLE 11 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
Metro Vancouver (cont'd)	See above.	<p>At a meeting on October 30, 2019, the TWG agreed an in-person SWG to discuss this topic would be appropriate and efficient; this meeting took place on November 27, 2019. SWG participants reviewed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A history of how TMEP arrived on alignment through the Coquitlam Landfill property</li> <li>• Alternate options for a northern alignment through the property that is within the PPBoR corridor</li> <li>• Metro Vancouver's concerns and request to locate the pipe as far north as possible</li> </ul> <p>Trans Mountain's Contractor agrees that adding a Metro Vancouver sewer line in proximity to TMEP is viable. Trans Mountain also provided rationale for why alignment within the BC Hydro right-of-way is not a feasible option. In a letter to Trans Mountain dated February 28, 2020, Metro Vancouver provided clarification on their requirements for locating the TMEP pipeline as far north as possible while still allowing Metro Vancouver to install and maintain a future twin sewer line to the south of their existing sewer line.</p> <p>In Metro Vancouver's view, it is not possible for Trans Mountain to locate the pipeline south of Eaglequest without significantly constraining future developments of the site. Metro Vancouver asked Trans Mountain to determine a safe distance that the TMEP pipeline can be located south of the landfill to facilitate construction of a future twinned pipe ensuring construction excavation does not encroach within 7.5 m of TMEP. TWG discussions are ongoing. Topic for future TWG and SWG meetings.</p>	See above
Metro Vancouver	Metro Vancouver requests the TMEP schedule is shared with each TWG meeting agenda.	Trans Mountain is sharing the CER Condition 62 Construction Schedule filed on a monthly basis with Metro Vancouver. There is also a Project Update standing agenda item which provides an opportunity for Trans Mountain to regularly update Metro Vancouver on construction activities that are underway or scheduled to start in the near future.	Complete
Metro Vancouver	Construction impacts to Metro Vancouver's outflow pipe located at Westridge Marine Terminal. Metro Vancouver's main concern is prop wash from ships; however, there are also concerns regarding TMEP's storm system and water pumping from the site.	<p>Metro Vancouver raised concerns about impacts to their outflow pipe near the Westridge Marine Terminal through the VFPA Permit application process in 2017 and it was a topic of discussion at several TWG meetings as reported in prior Condition 49 TWG Report and Report Updates filed with the CER (Report Update No. 1 [Filing ID <a href="#">A86895</a>] and Report Update No. 2 [Filing ID <a href="#">A91269</a>]). Trans Mountain also provided written response to Metro Vancouver's concerns by letter on September 21, 2017 – see Appendix B of Report Update No. 1 filed on October 13, 2017 (Filing ID <a href="#">A86895</a>).</p> <p>In its letter Trans Mountain outlined the actions it is required to take to protect the sewage system from any construction activities to satisfy Condition 39 of VFPA Project Permit No. 15-322 Trans Mountain Westridge Marine Terminal Upgrade and TMEP. At TWG meetings in November 2019 and January 2020, TMEP and the Contractor confirmed they are monitoring the outfall and agreed to share monitoring information with Metro Vancouver as it is available. Trans Mountain is reviewing the storm discharge system and will provide an update at a future TWG meeting.</p>	In progress
Metro Vancouver	HDD Fraser River Crossing and construction impacts on Colony Farm Regional Park.	The crossing has been identified as a high priority and high risk by Trans Mountain; construction is scheduled to start in Q2 2020. The Contractor has proposed applying for proximal and access permits in the absence of a crossing agreement. Metro Vancouver agrees with Trans Mountain's approach to submitting one package with descriptions of the different components (north, south sides of river and stringing) and will prioritize its review.	In progress
Metro Vancouver	Metro Vancouver would like to add restrictions for proximal work near their water mains during high demand periods (May 1 to October 15 annually) to the crossing agreement.	Trans Mountain's Contractor has concerns with TMEP meeting this guideline as defined. The Contractor wishes to discuss possibly assessing higher risk areas, work, or timing to provide a less strict work window. Waterline capacity and pipeline work schedules are often conflicting matters, but the risks will be mitigated. Trans Mountain's Contractor will prepare a risk assessment and duration of work schedule for Metro Vancouver to review. If a follow-up meeting is required to discuss further, a SWG will be arranged.	In progress

**TABLE 11 Cont'd**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
Metro Vancouver	Metro Vancouver requests that TMEP ensures the Land Agreement reflects the process for accessing the expansion line in the future. (i.e., TMEP needs to apply for Metro Vancouver permits before making changes to the expansion line once operational.)	Trans Mountain reviewed the Statutory Right-of-Way Agreement and is clarifying process for future access to the pipeline. Topic for a future TWG meeting.	In progress

Notes:

KAL = Kamloops Airport Limited

VFPA = Vancouver Fraser Port Authority

**TABLE 12**

**NEW ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN ALBERTA BETWEEN OCTOBER 1, 2019 AND MARCH 30, 2020**

Local Government	Issue/Concern	Response/Outcome	Status
City of Edmonton	Overall Project and communications with neighbours and the public.	Trans Mountain met with the City of Edmonton on November 20, 2019 and February 28, 2020 to provide Project updates and review the Project's ongoing communication and notification process of sharing information with neighbours and the public that may be impacted by TMEP construction.	Complete
Town of Edson	The Town expressed concern about traffic safety in certain areas of Town where pedestrian crossings intersect busy roads. Town of Edson would like to continue conversation and discussion around plans for Vision Park and temporary mitigations when construction is active near the Park.	Topic of traffic safety was discussed with the Town of Edson at a TWG meeting on December 3, 2019 where Trans Mountain provided a Project update and introduced the Contractor and local contacts were provided to the Town of Edson for construction in their community. The Town of Edson provided feedback on Trans Mountain's Traffic Control Plans. Engagement is ongoing. Topic for future TWG meeting.	In progress
Town of Hinton	Traffic Management	Trans Mountain met with the Town of Hinton on December 3, 2019 to provide Project update. The Town of Hinton had an opportunity to review Traffic Control Plans for the area and ask staff questions.	Complete