

QEW Credit River Bridge project – AGVC located at Dickson Road and Premium Way

Transcription of Webex meeting convened by Mayor Bonnie Crombie on Friday October 16, 2020 @ 2:30pm until 3:45pm

Attendees:

- BC Bonnie Crombie, Mayor of Mississauga
- SY Shafeah Yasseen, Community Liaison, City of Mississauga
- NM Nicole McInerney, A/Chief of staff to Mayor Crombie
- DD Dipika Damerla, Mississauga Councilor Ward 7
- JH Jordon Hambleton, Executive Assistant to Dipika Damerla
- DS Don Stewart, President of Gordon Woods Homeowners Association
- GC Grant Clark, Resident on Dickson Park Cres.
- LR Lin Rogers, Manager Transportation Projects, City of Mississauga
- HO Helen Noehammer, Director Infrastructure Planning and Engineering Services City of Mississauga
- SS Sven Spengemann, MP Mississauga-Lakeshore
- RC Rudy Cuzzetto, MPP Mississauga-Lakeshore
- GS Gail Sharko, TNPI, Manager Regulatory and External Affairs
- NZ Neil Zohorsky, MTO, Director, Capital Program Delivery Branch
- PVR Pauline Van Roon, Manager, Major Projects MTO

DD - Welcome and Introductions

BC (dials in on cell on way into office) – We have a big issue here that is really important to the community and I think we’ve gathered the right people in the room to see if we can come up with any sort of solutions. At this point I know it’s late in the day, the community is very concerned that they weren’t properly consulted and they didn’t receive proper notice - going to take the call in office (and will put herself on mute but states), I wanted to get the right people in the room to see if there’s anything that can be done at this stage because obviously this is an eyesore and safety concern for the residence. They don’t feel that they were consulted or well briefed and so I’m looking to the provincial government, our officials, Ministry of Transportation, MPP and even to our federal member at this point to see if there’s

anything at this point that can be done. (she then turns it back to Dipika to continue)

DD At this point, where we are at, TNPI has an above ground valve that is nearing completion. I as Ward Councillor have asked that it be relocated and to relocate it we need some land. I know that there is provincial land that is available along that strip that could potentially be an excellent location for that valve station so that to me seems the most obvious action at this point. That is why we are gathered here together to see if that is possible. What I'd like to do is turn it over to the residents, but before I do I'll turn it over to the MPP to see if you want to say something.

RC Thank you Dipika. I want to ask TNPI – Can the valve be moved to another location and can it be submerged instead of it being an above ground valve? I know that you have been installing above ground valves for the last 20 years, at the end of the day TNPI is the one that has to make the decision if they can be move that valve to a different location and the cost of moving that valve to a different location and what would it be for the residents because at the end of the day it's the taxpayers that are responsible for the movement of that valve.

DS With respect Rudy I don't agree with that in the sense that TNPI did not give adequate notice to either the city or the residents of this location so I don't think it should be up to them as to whether or not they are going to move it, I think that somebody should be telling them to move it and I'm quite happy to go through all the details of this right now because I think Neil has done a letter which deserves some attention Neil, you did a letter dated October 2nd 2020 to two of our residents Michael Pullen and Tom Tartaglia and they are part of our group and I want to correct a couple statements that you made in that letter of Oct. 2 because they are very critical to this whole exercise

No 1 is the statement in the 3rd paragraph of your letter stating that in December of 2018 there was a letter to the National Energy Board (NEB) about this and your absolutely right there was, but in that letter to the National Energy Board the location of this valve compound was going to be in the North/West corner of Dickson Road and Premium Way, a location that would have been much better than the North/East location which is where it is now. So that mistake was not only made in the application to the National Energy Board but it was also noted as a mistake as their letter to the residents in May of 2019 where they also described the valve compound as being on the north west side of Dickson Road. Furthermore, you mention in your letter there was a notice to the neighbourhood of this at a meeting in November of 2018 - a PIC (Public Information Centre) meeting and I agree with the reference to that and LIn Rogers filled me in and at that evening, which was a big meeting with many people, there were apparently 34 boards of information about the whole Credit River Bridge and the QEW realignment etc. and you are right this did appear. It appeared as a "footnote" on page 21 of 34 pages of information and the footnote referred to 7 different utility relocations of which this valve relocation was one. apparently, that were on boards around the exterior of the hall where this meeting was held. Totally insufficient information for the neighbourhood to even

find it and to find out later that it was described as being in a different location is very troublesome.

So, in my view the problem here was in the notification to residents which was totally inadequate. Furthermore, there was absolutely no notice when there was the sale of land to TNPI in June of 2019. So, my view is, that TNPI is the one that dropped the ball here and through their engineering and other people in terms of notice and our residents were taken totally at shock value at seeing what's happening today. (at this point Don requests that Sophia put up a picture of the valve compound as it stands currently so everyone can see it)

DS So there we have it, folks. That is going to be right at the entrance to Dickson Rd. and you'll see the stop sign there, so Dickson Rd. is immediately to the left of that stop sign. The valve compound as you will see, is about 8 feet from where a school buses load and unload school children and immediately behind that sidewalk that's going in front of the valve compound. Furthermore, the Multi-Use Trailway comes through here and the Multi-Use Trailway is going to be for the most part upwards of 10 or 12 feet in width but because of this valve compound it's shrunk down to a width of about 8½ feet. So, from Premium Way to the border of this valve compound will be about somewhere in the range of 8 or 9 feet. Furthermore, where this picture was taken from, is from the south side of Premium Way and you'll see the curb right at the bottom of the picture and guess what's going to be there? The safety wall for the QEW is going to be at that curb line on the south side of Premium Way. So not only do you have the valve compound constraining this whole site on the north but you have a safety wall immediately to the south of this curb. So, it's an incredible situation and how this could occur without proper planning is beyond me. So that's the residents' point of view and I want to turn it over to Dipika if you want to talk about the city's role in this.

DD Thanks Don. I want to focus on moving forward and what the solutions can be so to me there are two questions here and I also want to give MP Sven Spengemann a chance to say a few words. So, Sven did you have anything that you wanted to share?

SS Look Councillor first of all thank you for inviting me to be part of this conversation, I've had bilateral conversations with a number of you. Thank you to Don Stewart for pulling us together and for the advocacy. I want to be focused on the parameters that connect to the federal government and I don't have anything to offer other than to say from an engineering perspective and a code perspective we have learned that under Federal Regulation this valve station can be either above ground or below ground. There is no regulatory requirement that requires it to sit on the surface provided the adequate safety parameters have been put in place. I think the less obstructive the better. I am a longtime resident of Mississauga and I used to take this route when I drove down to air cadets weekly. This was a much more beautiful corner before the construction began and I think that there's a collective view that this valve does not belong there. It kind of looks like it's something to the entrance to Fort McMurray. I don't think that it's helpful to start a

blame game, I think it's much more helpful that we creatively get our heads together to see if there are any options to achieve a better outcome to all parties concerned and from a Federal perspective I will happily listen and see if there is anything that I can do to precipitate that, with the understanding that the current status quo is not acceptable.

DD Thank you Sven this is very, very helpful. So this is new information for all of us which is that it does not have to be above ground, that it can be below grade as per Federal Regulations, so if that is true I'm going to ask MTO as well as TNPI if they will entertain either burying it on the spot where it is now or moving it further out. I believe the residents were suggesting either 75metres further west or east, I can't remember (DS clarifies West) I know that 75metres west there is Crown land owned by Hydro One which would be provincial jurisdiction so 1 of those 2 options to me seems to be the way forward. I would like to hear from TNPI if they would entertain the below grade option given what the member of parliament has just shared with us or alternatively consider, I'm going to ask MTO and Rudy if they would entertain selling the land 75metres west of where it is so that we can move it and whether TNPI would be open to moving that and who's call is it finally is it MTO's call or TNPI's call or the federal government's call? Who can issue the order that this needs to be moved which – would it be the federal government that can come in and say that as the regulator or it be MTO as the proponent.

NZ I'm the Director of Capital Programs Delivery at MTO and look after all of the construction in Ontario including our major projects office... I just want to clarify a couple of things. Although the Ministry is the proponent of the Credit River Bridge project, I'd like to defer the detailed questions to Gail at TNPI. TNPI are the proponent of the pipeline relocation to facilitate our project. They could comment better related to whether the valve and the valve complex can be below ground I don't know those details – that would be between TNPI and the Federal Regulators. I think Gail may also be in a position to discuss the alternatives that were considered that landed this site as the preferred alternative. There may be some alternatives to consider in terms of improving the aesthetics if the TNPI pipeline valve chamber was to remain above ground - we could maybe discuss that later as required. I just wanted to recognize that the Ministry is the proponent of the Credit River Bridge Project and TNPI is the proponent of the utility move as MTO requested them to do to ensure no conflict for our project. I don't know Mr. Stewart if maybe we go offline I could respond to your concerns from my letter of Oct. 2nd and I maybe could talk to you about some of the "chatknowledges" related to the your perception of the November 2018 Public Information Centre and the level of detail that we have had at that time versus how this has progressed over time and there is quite a chronology. Probably not worthwhile for me to go through that now, I agree with MP Spengemann and MPP Cuzzetto that let's look for alternatives here so with that I turn things to Gail if Gail could comment on the below ground vs above ground and the other alternatives.

DS Neil, excuse me before we start that, can I just ask the question – from an environmental assessment point of view, are you saying that the environmental assessment approvals are required to be achieved by TNPI as opposed to MTO as far as this project is concerned? My understanding is that under the environmental assessment rules the overall owner of the site is MTO and despite the fact that some parts of it may be subcontracted, ultimately the environmental assessment aspects of this whole thing are MTO responsibility. Maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong.

NZ Sure I can try to clarify that, I might need Pauline to help me. The preliminary design that is done that includes the environmental assessment is just that a preliminary design does not reflect the detailed design aspects of the project. I believe, I'd have to go back and look but it's possible that the preliminary design identified some alternatives for the location of the pipeline but it was up to TNPI to ultimately determine the detailed location and the detailed assessment of the pipeline. Our preliminary design identified the need to relocate the pipeline however we rely on TNPI to determine the detailed engineering parameters and options around that. Pauline did I explain that properly?

PVR You are correct. So essentially, we identified the need for the relocation but the class EA does not give the approval for the relocation that is a separate process that TNPI has to follow.

DS Right, because my understanding is that the engineering drawings didn't really get completed until 2018 or later and so my understanding is that from an environmental assessment point of view there is an addendum to the 2013 McCormick Rankin study and that addendum I believe has not been completed and that's yet to be done. It is interesting, you know, from our point of view who gets that environmental assessment done, is it TNPI or MTO?

NZ Pauline can you correct me if I'm wrong but I believe in 2018 we updated the environmental assessment, is that the difference between the 2013 original and the 2018?

PVR Yes, So even an addendum will be at a preliminary design level, it will never go into the detail the design level so it does happen on occasion that there are modifications from the time an EA's approved but it does not go into the detail design. The issue here is a detail design, so no the addendum would not have gone into that detail of the detail that is being discussed here.

DD I think that maybe it's in the interest of time that we go over to TNPI and see if we can get some responses because there are some key questions here. So Gail, I'm just going to repeat the questions because there have been a lot of questions. 1 is, If you can just shed some light on the underground vs over-ground because there's been some back and forth and at first we under the impression that it could be buried and then we were told that no it cannot be buried as per new regulations and now I've just heard the member of parliament say it's ok to bury it as long as all safety precautions have been taken. So, the first one would be to clarify for us if

burying was an option not taken and is it an option going forward? The second one would be relocation is an option? And my last is, who can persuade TNPI to move? Is there an agency that you have to listen to if they said that you have to move, then you'd have to move? I'd like to know that as well so those would be the 3 questions that might help to this move forward.

BC I'd just want to contribute to that point of discussion Dipika, and I really want to really thank everyone for coming together. (Bonnie back in her office) but this is a really unacceptable option for the residents. You have to understand how inappropriate it is at the gateway of their community to have this huge structure there that they feel is unsafe and unsightly, that if it had been moved 75 metres to the west of it would have made all the difference. I really don't think the concerns of the residents were taken into consideration whatsoever when these decisions were made. I know that we were consulted and the residents weren't made aware that this was coming and what it would look like because of the change that was originally to be across the street. So we want to do whatever we can to assist them and we want to get this either buried or moved and it's just the wrong location for it and it is causing them a lot of indigestion and angst and for the Councillor and myself it is as well. I feel like the group combined here has really, we've dropped the ball for these residents because this is their community and they don't want to look at this. And this might be the best place that you've deemed from an engineering standpoint that it be located but from a physically cosmetic and other reasons, safety reasons, for the residents, they don't want it there and it's their neighbourhood and that should have been considered. So, I feel very strongly, as does the Councillor, so let's do what we can I don't know what your expense it is but it's going to be worth it for everybody.

GC May I jump in here as one of the residents and Bonnie, I want to thank you for making that very strong statement on behalf of residents here. I've lived in this community for about 7 years, I've lived in Mississauga for 60 years, I've owned 3 different properties so I know the community very well and I've been quite active in it. As one of the residents here, I guess my feeling has been that we have been at the beck and call of TNPI and whatever TNPI wants to do and the residents be damned. At the last meeting we had that you graciously hosted for this, one of the things we introduced was a report that had been done on pipeline safety in Canada, primarily in Ontario and Quebec. TNPI's safety record is atrocious. It's atrocious in terms of incidents that have occurred and doing anything to rectify them. Earlier in this process here, one of the things that was set up was a meeting of all parties and there was to be two of us that could come as residents and meet with the pipeline representatives - we understood that to be TNPI and the contractor building the site. We showed up, myself and another gentleman who is an engineer, showed up at the site and guess what? The contractor was there, nobody from TNPI. We asked for some drawings, one of the people there, went to the trailer, got a drawing, brought it back, and we said that's great can we have a copy. No, sorry you can't, not allowed to give it to us.

So, if TNPI is calling shots in this you are going to have even more outrage in this neighbourhood. And I say outrage. Don and I and a group of others have been working on this project diligently for several weeks. There are a lot of other neighbours that are very interested in what's going on. They don't know why it's taking so long, they don't know why this happened the way it did in the first place, and frankly they are just fed up. One of the other things, and I don't know if it was considered here but I found in some of the research, the importance of the history of the area. I'm sure you'll all remember the work that was done here in 2017/2018, I guess I'll call it here the "archeological dig". This is a very important area for the First Nations people of this country. It's very important, and I don't know what consideration has been given to them here. I've spoken to in the last couple of days, some people, I'm not going to mention them by name, they're very credible, they are involved in history, they are very familiar with the Indigenous people, one of their comments was, "The pipelines always get what they want." If you want to hear an angry citizen and resident of that neighbourhood, I'm one of them and by far, not the most outspoken. But I think there is an opportunity here to get a resolution of this that will be satisfactory. I really appreciate the comments of Mayor Crombie in terms of support for this but I'm not prepared to go down this rabbit hole of what TNPI wants to do any more. I'm fed up with it.

DD Well thank you Grant, I am just going to turn it over to Gail now.

GS Yah thanks and thanks Dipika and thank you. I appreciate your concerns Mr. Clark and Mr. Stewart and those of your community and we are listening to you and we are working and we have worked with the residents and the MTO and the City of Mississauga when this site was selected. I do want to bring to your attention the photograph that you showed doesn't not depict what the final location or look of that valve site is. That is still in construction, the elevations are not correct, so what you see today is not what you will see when the pipeline has been tied in. So, I just want to make sure that that's clear, and we did show a model in the past of what that site would look like. As far as the question regarding the location of the valve below ground it has been TNPI's engineering standards for the last three years to construct any new valve site above ground. Those are based on the safety of our employees as well as the safe operation of the valve site. The site itself what you see in cases where a valve compound is put below ground, there would still be an above ground structure because you have an electrical, these are remotely operated valves and there is an electrical component there that would still remain.

These approvals, our approval and who we would get for the other question that you have asked Councillor Damerla was for who we get our approval for, so we submit our engineering design and approval to the National Energy Board now The Canadian Energy Regulator and they basically approve the design that we have made for the site that was selected. With regard to below ground, it is not as safe as far as TNPI's engineering standards, our specification is they are all to be above ground.

As far as relocation, I think it was mentioned a few times, there were several locations and we communicated that through letters to The City of Mississauga and multiple people so in conjunction with the MTO and The City of Mississauga and area, Hydro One is one of the main land owners along the site, there were several different sites that were assessed. Of all the sites that were assessed, there were constraints to all of the sites. Those were all investigated back in 2017 & 2018.

DS With respect Miss Sharko, we have asked for those site locations from all of The City of Mississauga, from TNPI and from MTO. We have never had the courtesy of knowing what those other sites are. We would be most appreciative of seeing those because despite asking 3 times for them we've never had that information released. So, if you could release that, that might be helpful.

GS So that's an MTO document - there's an MTO drawing that depicts those locations so I'll defer to Neil, if he would want to release that or my understanding that it might have been provided as part of the Nov. 2018 session that was mentioned.

DS No, it wasn't

NZ If I could just comment, defer to Pauline with regards to the work. I do know that Morrison Hershfield our consultant in the 2017/2018 time frame identified some sites and the various constraints at which point I think TNPI took over the assessments. I'm not sure of the details of that work that Morrison Hershfield did and ultimately it was TNPI that identified the final location. Mr. Stewart just so that you are aware, I'm not sure just what information is available, Pauline can you comment on that?

PVR I'll take this back. I understand that information was provided back in May to a member of the Association, I don't have the name so leave it with me but there was a plan with I believe 6 or 7 locations and it was circulated through multiple stakeholders for limited constraints that Gail was referring to.

SS If you could share that with my office as well, I'd be very grateful.

DD What I'm hearing Pauline, that list is with the MTO because you already circulated it once and we look forward to seeing it one more time, so that would be great. So, if I can just go back to Gail. So, Gail, are you able to share what those constraints were, generally, broadly? I mean, so, is there any piece of land that it can be relocated to?

GS So there's environmental constraints, there's different utility constraints. None of the sites that were investigated had anything, there were construction ability to construct. This is a very large project and you can appreciate the pipeline that was relocated has already been installed but at the time when they looked at all of the different sites, it's also looking at how the extraction point of the pipeline installation what that location would be. So, taking into account, environmental considerations, utilities, corridors, safe operation of the actual construction as well

as the final location for that site, those were all taken into account, in determining that. One of the – it also mentioned about the design or having a TNPI representative. So TNPI contracts the actual design of the pipeline to a consulting engineering company which is Stantec Consulting who did complete the detailed design and they provide the engineering detail and background on what site is acceptable or not.

The comment made about not having a TNPI representative on site. The representative on site that represented TNPI, was a pipeline engineer working on behalf of TNPI, I just wanted to make sure that I clarified that as well.

GC What was the name of that person? (no response)

DS Can you give us access to your engineering people so that they could share that information with us, Gail? (no response) We'd like to have a peer review of the engineering of the site selection process so we would like to have the ability to look at the sites that Stantec proposed and have that peer reviewed by another engineering company because if this is the best location which is unbelievable to most of us on this screen, it's all about a kilometer from the Credit River to Hurontario and we understand that anywhere along that line could be where this valve compound is - here you put it right beside a residential community's only way of access and egress to their 77 homes. It is absolutely ridiculous and for you to say this is the best location in areas where we've got open land, available land through Hydro and this is the only site? I mean, this is ridiculous.

I harken back to the report that Grant Clark mentioned which is the 10 year summary of "Pipeline Safety failures in Canada" and I want to read the final words of summary which is contrary to Trans Northern and which basically stating that Trans Northern is the worst performer among the pipeline companies in Canada ! It indicates the following, the final sentence. " National Energy Board data indicates that the largest proportion – nearly 70% of incidents arose in part from engineering and planning problems" for Trans Northern and here we have another one facing us as you look at that picture from a few minutes ago. Thank you.

DD Thank you Don. Gail, so can I just ask you based on what you're saying, you are essentially saying that you're not willing to relocate or bury? Is that what you are saying?

GS Burying the pipeline at that location is not feasible and it is not part of our engineering standards so the pipeline cannot be buried.

DD So I guess, where does this leave us now then? So, what if CER was to say to you that you can bury it, would you bury it? If the CER, Canadian Energy Regulator said that TNPI has to bury it, would you bury it?

GS I can't speak on behalf of the Canadian Energy Regulator however, they veer on the side of safety and safe operation – the engineering design that was provided met their requirements, met our requirements, so I do not believe burying the

pipeline, there's other concerns as far as not necessarily visual because this was the only reason for this, what we're considering would be visual, it is not a safety thing. The pipeline is safest the way it is currently designed. The valve site.

DD I just want to say that is very disappointing to hear, I'm going to turn it over to MP Spengemann, he has some ideas. Go ahead Sven.

SS Just to go back to the question of the Regulator. The Regulator took a view that there is conceptually nothing that would stop the burial of the pipeline valve. It would have to meet certain safety criteria. If TNPI says our safety standard is not to bury, it is a question of siting and of money, it's not that the pipeline can't be buried. If the access shaft is safe and the territory allows it, then it can be buried and in the minds of people here, should be buried. It becomes a financial question and a convenience question. If this siting was granite bedrock on the Canadian shield and you had to blast to the tune of millions of dollars to get an access shaft in to bury it, of course the situation would be different. So TNPI's own engineering standards are not the same as the Regulator and the Regulator is saying it could be buried or it could be above ground provided that the safety and engineering parameters are met. So, the option is on the table. What I want to come back to is the helpful suggestion or comment by Mr. Clark. This whole ball got rolling through the engineering and construction work on the Credit River Bridge, the QEW Bridge in the course of which we unearthed an Indigenous burial site of some 2500 years in age. The entire watershed, including Port Credit, which is the emblem of our community, has a significant deep history among the Indigenous peoples and from the Federal Government's perspective the project of reconciliation includes stewardship of the land. It's a very easy and obvious answer to say if we put an access valve above ground on the banks of the Credit River and it doesn't need to be there, that is not stewardship of the land in the Indigenous sense of the word. We have seen pipeline protests elsewhere across the country, I don't think we need to invite Indigenous protest in these circumstances. From that angle alone, I think the location isn't ideal and we need to be respectful, especially in a city that bears the name of a First Nation, in terms of how we take care of the land. So other options should be pursued, I think, by this group, should be diligently pursued and let us get creative in terms as to how it can be done and ultimately as to how it can be financed.

GS I'll add something to MP Spengemann, the engineering assessment did take into account which it does at all times any archeological or any heritage historical features. Some of the sites that were indicated as possible sites for the location of the valve compound were constrained by potential and heritage sites. So that is definitely one of the considerations in the location and the positioning of the valve compound. I just want to make sure that is clear, that was considered as part of the assessment.

DD Thank you Gail. I just want to turn it over to MPP Rudy Cuzzetto if he wanted to add anything because it looks like we are in a bit of a stalemate.

RC Gail, I just want to ask you a question for TNPI, "Have you submerged valves in the last 20 years?"

GS I can't say that for sure in the last 20 years. In the last 5 years, definitely not.

RC Not even in a residential area?

GS No.

RC But don't you find it unsafe for a valve to be at a corner of two roads?

GS Part of the assessment that was completed looks at the safety and obviously the permits required to place a valve in certain location has to take into account anything that is concerned with public health and public safety. So, all of that was investigated prior to the valve positioning and the design of the compound itself. So once it's finished, once it's completed and put back, the engineers have gone through and validated that there is no additional safety concern or safety concerns to the residents as a result of the placement of the valve above ground. And the sightlines of that location have been confirmed by the City of Mississauga, that it meets their requirements.

RC But Gail, I look at it, it is at the corner of a busy intersection. You don't feel that if a speeder were to lose control of a car, it wouldn't hit that valve? That valve is above ground, a minimum of a meter above ground, you don't find that concerning to you?

GS No sir, the valve is protected, the valve will be protected.

RC By what? The building, is it a concrete building?

GS There's concrete balusters that would go beside the pipe and that is within any above ground structure. And as far as the intersection at Premium and Dickson, that was reviewed with city planners and it does meet their requirements.

RC So if a car ends up speeding, gets into an accident and goes airborne it would that not valve?

GS I think it's a residential street, I hope that nobody

RC So is Lakeshore, and a car 5 months ago went 150km down Lakeshore and hit the corner of Stavebank and Lakeshore and (Sven was aware of that as well) and destroyed the car and destroyed the concrete barrier there.

GS Like I said the safety of that location was vetted and was reviewed.

GC Maybe I can speak up here a moment because you are on a topic that's important to me as one of the residents here and I specifically wrote an email on this back in July. I have a grandson that I walk down to that corner every day to take the bus. It is a 3way stop. I have spoken to numerous Peel Regional Police for the efforts that they put when they have the resources available to monitor the stops at that

site. I would say 40% or more of the people who are on that road, don't even slow down for that stop sign. Doesn't happen. That's going east to west. Let's talk about north to south. If you take a look at this community and Ms. Sharko, I don't know if you've ever been here or not, but the street that goes down, Dickson Road, is on a fairly severe decline that goes down to Premium Way. In the wintertime when it is icy, you have two things, you have foliage up on the sides and the ground that makes it difficult to see that site. If there is any ice on the street at all, cars don't stop. All kinds of them go right through that intersection. So, if anybody thinks that is a safe 3way intersection, you've never been there. That's a serious concern of many neighbours here including myself. Now in addition to the existing condition, we're going to put in the multi- trail system, so you're going to encourage more cyclists to use that. How many cyclists do you think are going to stop when they approach the stop sign coming along Premium Way either east or west? They're not. And the view of them with motorists coming down there with a valve compound with any kind of enclosure around it is going to be more restricted than it is right now. Trust me, I and many others in this neighborhood have gone there and looked at that with exactly that in mind. You are not going to convince anyone that lives in this neighbourhood, never mind the aesthetics, that it is a safe location.

GS Mr. Clark, I was just going to say that perhaps the City of Mississauga or MTO can comment because TNPI are not familiar with the traffic concerns or anything in that area so that may be a question.

DD Can I just say something Gail? The sentiment is quite clear that it either has to be moved or it has to go underground. There is no point in litigating every issue over and over again. So, my ask of you Gail would be to go back to whoever makes the decisions. One of the things that I found very disappointing was, I tried to arrange a mediation between the residents of Gordon Woods and TNPI through the Canadian Energy Regulator and TNPI did not want to even engage in those talks. So that was somewhat disappointing. That is my understanding. So, my ask going forward is, let's look at what we can do to bury it. The Member of Parliament is clearly saying that perhaps TNPI safety standards are not in alignment with what the federal government's regulations are. You are obviously free to have your own standards, but you can't use the Federal Government as an excuse when the Federal Government's regulations clearly allow you to bury it. So, my ask, can you go back to TNPI, to your CEO and say: Can you look at burying this. And I'm going to ask the MP to see if he can, one more time, reach out to the Canadian Energy Regulator. I did do that to try and bring the parties together perhaps the Member of Parliament might.

SS Dipika I want to be very clear, I'm not saying that the current siting is unsafe, it went through an approval and it's all approved. I'm saying, the code, the Canadian Energy Regulations allow the flexibility to bury the site. The one thing that I want to add on the safety considerations, the paradox here is that for the current siting to be safe . If you imagine a Canada Post truck or you have a delivery truck in the winter sliding and going into this facility you're going to have to construct ram barriers that

will amplify the signature of this installation even more. Yes, it will be safe but it'll be bombastic because you'll have to put a perimeter around it to be sure that a truck that derails doesn't hit it and doesn't go up in flames. So, from a safety and visual perspective to combine these facts, this location really isn't ideal.

BC Can I just say also that this nomenclature around meeting standards strikes me as that we are really only meeting minimum safety and engineering standards and that more could have been done and should have been done.

DS I certainly agree Madam Mayor. The whole issue is the environmental assessment has not been completed on this site and we have two or three P.Eng people that live in our community that are very knowledgeable in environmental assessment aspects. The questionnaires that were filled in by TNPI at the time of the National Energy Board applications are inaccurate in the sense that they have not taken into consideration basic environmental assessment issues. Human health and safety for instance, has not even been considered and you can hear from Mr. Clark an immediate resident, issues like not only the school buses but the homes that are close by. When we have Jet Fuel going through this pipeline on a regular basis, this poses a huge risk for this community. We don't think that the environmental assessment has yet been done and if and when it gets to the hearing process, we don't think that it will be ultimately approved. And I don't like to hear MTO bailing out and saying: Oh the safety aspects are all up to TNPI and the CER, because that's just not good enough. They appear to be not caring about human health and safety issues of immediate residents in this area. I disagree with this whole issue that TNPI has followed regulations. Because as the Mayor said they are minimum regulations and I don't think they've been looked at in a reasonable way at all. Rudy, do you have some other ideas?

GS Can I just say, sorry Mr. Clark as far as following the regulatory requirements which include stringent safety guidelines and looking over and above TNPI has followed that and I would suggest that the place, the fact that the valve is being placed above ground is an enhancement to our safe operation and the safe operation of our pipeline company and well as the community. Those considerations were a match and they were made and they were presented to the Regulator which the Regulator approved. I'm sorry I can't add any more and assist you there, but that was approved by the Regulator.

BC How is it safer on that corner than it would be on the Hydro corridor, that Hydro One owns? Why wasn't that a possibility?

GS Each site had slightly different constraints. One of the main constraints as with anything Hydro One does not allow on any Bill 58 land any above ground structures. So that's one area.

DD So Gail, to me that seems something that can be easily surmounted. So this is just a policy of Hydro One it's not a real constraint, they just don't want to sell you the land so I'm going to ask the MPP to see if he can intervene because this is what

I've heard anecdotally that there is Hydro One land that could be suitable but they're not willing to sell it. If the constraint is an unwilling seller, that is very different from an engineering constraint. So, I'd like some clarity if Hydro One was ready to sell some of that land, would you be from an engineering and safety point of view be able to relocate it?

NZ A few things I wanted to mention, as these considerations are ongoing I'm concerned about the potential delay of a critical project. An infrastructure project of the Credit River Bridge, we have already invested in the relocation of this pipeline. From a road safety perspective it may be possible for us to partner with the city and the engineers we have on hand as owners/engineers to consider a safety review if the pipeline were to remain above ground as an option. And then with that we could also consider various aesthetics features to improve the aesthetics. I don't know Gail, I've seen a rendering but I really don't know other than seeing the picture that was shared what it looks like in the end. And we can certainly share road safety as a number one goal as we look for any of our project and safety of the travelling public. I can commit to supporting the city and insuring the city is happy with any safety review from a road safety perspective, whether that involves an enhanced barrier system and other aesthetics whether that is a fence or any other enclosure that would improve the aesthetic. I am concerned that any consideration of further relocation of the pipeline of the pipeline could impact the award of a critical infrastructure project. The Credit River Bridge Project is planned to be a 4 year project and we're nearing making the decision on the award of that contract and it's critical to the community as well and it includes the widening of the QEW in the area as well as the rehabilitation of the existing bridge. I want to make sure that everyone knows that concerns with further delay of the project while we're nearing award. We do have some solutions that can be considered to assure public safety as well as to improve aesthetic features and we would be more than happy to include the community in consultation on various aesthetic features. I'm not sure what TNPI allows in terms of enclosures, and I do know that they need access to the facility but I'm sure you could find ways to improve the aesthetics and maybe it could even be part of a gateway feature to the community at that location.

DD Thank you Neil but I still did not get the answer to the question. My question was: Some of the land was rejected, not because the valve could not be technically sited there but because there was an unwilling seller? Can someone clarify that because that is important to know? (No response) Gail, would you be able to respond to that?

GS I don't think it's considered an unwilling seller, Councillor Damerla, it's a policy of Hydro One to not allow above ground structures on their property. There are also other considerations with the above ground power lines and having the above ground valve compound sited underneath power lines. So, there's different criteria within that that would have to be, and that would be the detailed engineering assessment that Mr. Stewart was referring to.

DD So Rudy, can I just ask you if you could check with Hydro One whether this rule 85 whatever it is, Regulation 85, if an exception could be made as long as safety is not compromised so that the valve compound could be relocated?

RC Thank you, I'd just like to ask Gail one more question. If the land was released by Hydro One, would you move the valve?

GS TNPI is working for the MTO and the valve move would be if the MTO were to require TNPI to move the valve and pay for the valve to be moved would delay their project.

DS What would be the costs of moving the valve Gail?

GS The dollars that are spent on this project, I believe Neil indicated that the overall project is very high. The costs to date are in the millions of dollars, I can't give you an exact number.

NZ I don't have a detailed number on the relocation. We've already invested heavily in the relocation already.

DD So I want to say something Gail, you continued to wrench ahead with the construction even after I have repeatedly reached out and it was quite clear, you were part of those discussions. You knew that I was asking the Canadian Energy Regulator to talk about relocating. TNPI was aware that myself and the ward residents were looking at perhaps burying or relocating. Despite that you guys continued to move ahead so to that extent, any cost overruns, you guys went into this to some extent knowing full well that we were looking for some changes. I just wanted to table that. We are running out of time, it is 3:31. So what I heard though and finally what I heard, that if TNPI were to say that if MTO were to direct them then they would relocate. Mayor Crombie, I am going to ask you to wrap it all up, if you don't mind, and then talk about next steps.

BC Yah absolutely (interruption by RC)

RC Excuse me Mayor, I just want to ask one quick question. I thought that MTO authorizes the work but it is up to TNPI to move a valve.

NZ Yes MPP Cuzzetto, as I mentioned earlier, we identified the need to relocate the pipeline and that impacted the pipeline. We are the requestor that asked TNPI to move the pipeline and the valve assembly, I understand. So, we are the requestor and then TNPI becomes the proponent to support the overall project. We are the original proponent of the project and TNPI looks after as the proponent of the pipeline move.

DD With all due respect, (interruption by GS)

GS Councillor Damerla, let me add to that verification is that, to your point, is the approval to position the valve in that location was received in 2019, in June of 2019 and the construction started for this project in November of 2019, so I would just like to bring that forward and the MTO are correct. We are doing the work and relocating the valve at their request for their project, but we are the ones that decide where the valve, in conjunction with the MTO, where the valve would be positioned.

DD But Gail just to clarify, what I heard you say was, if MTO said that you were to move it, that you would move it? Could you just confirm that?

GS If we were required by law to move the valve, we would have to. But someone would, right now, there is no regulatory requirement for us to move that valve.

NZ And the Ministry wouldn't have the authority to order the valve to be relocated. And as I mentioned and as the process dictates TNPI manages that.

SS Councillor, being mindful of people's time, can I just ask? I understand that currently the valve is not currently even in the approved location, is that true? That the approval was for the north/west corner, is that where you installed it?

GS No, it's in the approved location where it sits right now, the actual footprint; however, it's not in its final place, it's not been tied in so it's going to look a lot different from what you see today.

SS I may have misunderstood, I understood that the permit was approved for the north/west corner and it's actually in the north/east corner.

DD So over to the Mayor now, let us have this wrapped up.

BC So I think we have the onus of responsibility on all of us here to see what more can be done so I'm going to ask Rudy to work with MTO and Neil to see about moving this because it's unacceptable to the residents and the City absolutely. I don't really care about the costs. Sven if you could explore the land stewardship and whether there would be indigenous issues. Certainly, we wouldn't want the indigenous community to push back on this and create scenes as they have done elsewhere, on this site. Also, we need to explore the safety concerns for the residents. I think there are a whole bunch of issues that we haven't looked very closely at. So, I think we all have a piece of this to go back to, and work with the residents. Neil, if you could set something up to have another round table with myself, the MPP and the residents, so whoever you report to and Gail reports to at a more senior lever, I don't know if it's the Minister, fine, let it be the Minister that we can have this discussion with, because it's just not acceptable to the City and to the residents where it's located. It wasn't the intent that it be located there and we need it changed. So, I don't even care what the costs are at this point. Maybe it means rebuilding it elsewhere and we also need to speak to somebody at Hydro One to see why we could not locate it there. (Neil talking over BC to interrupt to speak, so BC say's to Neil we're done, you can have last words after me) So there are a whole

bunch of avenues that we have open to us, this needs to be reconsidered. I don't know who the best person is to speak to Hydro One, is it me or who would it be? Happy to do so. Neil, is that better coming from MTO to speak to Hydro One?

NZ I don't know if it would be the Ministry, um.

BC Can you work this with the chain please because this isn't acceptable to us at all, it wasn't the intended location and it has to be changed. That's just the bottom line here. It's not acceptable to the residents.

NZ Are you willing to consider some of the options that I was suggesting regarding assuming the road safety and the aesthetic at the current location?

DD No I don't think so Neil.

BC Unless it be buried, I think 75metres to the west is the perfect location, unless you want to bury it at the current location.

RC Excuse me, Could Gail leave the conversation right now, so we can talk without Gail here at the present time?

BC Gail, you were put in a really difficult position, we understand that, we're very sorry, but it's still none the less not acceptable. We'll release you and we'll see what we can get done without TNPI. Thank you, Gail.

DD Gail, I want to add my thanks. I know this wasn't easy for you but you work great under pressure and have a great weekend.

BC You sure earned your pay cheque today.

GS leaves meeting.

RC Can Dickson Road be moved so it will be 75feet away from the valve if we move Dickson Road over to the left or to the right?

BC I don't know the configuration of that right now, so I don't know.

RC So Lin is on the line right now, Lin would be able to give us information

LR This is a new request, I haven't really looked at it in great detail. If it were to be moved, it would have to encroach upon Hydro One lands as well. I would have to review the safety and operation of the curvilinear section of road that would be required in order to tie into the existing Dickson Road as well as Premium way so I can't say for sure right now, but we can get back to you.

RC It would be much safer than putting a valve underneath a hydro line, moving a road underneath hydro line, correct?

? Again, without the luxury of a design it may result in some very sharp curves in order to meet the existing alignment of Dickson Rd. so I can't say for sure that it would be safer.

DD MPP Cuzzetto I think it's an excellent idea but before we go down that path I want to make sure that our residents are on side with that idea.

RC I've been speaking with Don about that earlier on this on week about moving the road but I didn't want TNPI to be involved in that conversation, right.

DD Yep, fair enough. I think we went as far as we could, I think we delivered a really strong message to Gail so I like the idea of maybe in 2 or 3 weeks, having another meeting like this to see where we are at. In the meantime, I will, through back channels, call TNPI again to see again, if they're willing to move. But I think Rudy, you might have a big stick here in term if we could get that Section 85 looked at and if an exception can be made, then that makes it much harder for TNPI to say that it can't be relocated. So, can I leave that with you?

RC Yah, we'll look into that for you.

DD And Sven if I can ask, if the Canadian Energy Regulator was to say that you have to move this, then my guess is that TNPI has to move this. So the question is how do we get the CER to acknowledge the local issue, because they may have given the approval just based upon engineering drawings and they're like 5000 feet above the ground, not knowing the grass roots reality. But can I ask you Sven to see if CER has the ability to direct TNPI to relocate?

DS I don't think Sven is still on the call Dipika.

DD Ok.

BC Sven's not on. Lynn and Helen, are you going to look at moving the road if that's even a possibility.

H Madam Mayor, we can take a closer look at it, my first quick look at it. It would essentially introduce a couple 90degree turns, especially if the target is to move it essentially 75 metres to the west. I think it would be extremely challenging to do that.

DD So why don't we leave it at this. The city will look at relocating Dickson Road. Rudy will look at Hydro One making an exemption from Section 85. I will speak to Sven Spengemann and see if he can talk to the CER and see if they are able to direct TNPI. Let's plan on circling back and having another meeting maybe 3 weeks from now. Does that work for everyone?

BC Yes, that works.

DS One other point Dipika, before we go. The idea of a peer engineering review on the Stantec site selection I think, would be very worthwhile. To get a second

profession opinion in terms of where this location might be more appropriate, because right now you've got a company Stantec, who's done the work and come with this conclusion. Also, CER has already approved it. One of the reasons, and I've spoken directly to Sven about this, we are going to be doing a letter directly to the Minister of Energy at the Federal level, because it's rather ridiculous when CER who is the regulator and is the auditor of this transaction today. That they've already approved it and yet we're asking them to consider looking at that really hard again and possibly moving it. Sven has agreed with this he said you know it's ridiculous that CER has already thrown holy water on this and blessed this and now we're asking them to audit it. So, Sven was very clear that a peer review by another engineering company would be very positive. The question would be, somebody's got to pay for that.

DD I would say the MTO would be. It's MTO's project, your peer reviewing MTO's engineers so maybe we can ask MTO to pay for it, they're the ones with the deep pockets, so maybe we can leave that with MPP Cuzzetto as well in terms of exploring that.

NZ I think that you're referring to the peer review of TNPI's consultant Stantec.

DS Yes, that's right.

NZ All of these things I'm just concerned as I mentioned earlier, and I don't know if I was heard about the if about the delay related to the project and other options that everyone's unwilling to consider. Stantec was the consultant for TNPI, I believe that Mr. Stewart is referring that notion of peer review.

DS Yes

DD Neil, who's paying for Stantec? MTO right?

NZ Indirectly, we pay TNPI to make adjustments to the pipeline.

DD That's my point, you're paying Stantec, so if there's a peer review it should be paid by MTO, because you're peer reviewing your engineers.

NZ No I'm sorry Councillor, it's TNPI's engineer.

DD But you're paying for it.

NZ We may be, we're the requestor for the pipeline to be moved but we're not the proponent for the pipeline move.

DD I know Neil, all of this is happening because the MTO wants to move the bridge so, what I'm saying is the naturalAnyway we can talk about it more. Homework for all of us, I'll ask Jordan in my office to summarize the homework for everyone and send it off, and that way it's all nicely documented. Thank you everyone for joining us.

BC Thank you. I'm really glad we had this opportunity to bring everyone together and as I had told the residents, this wasn't solely on the City. You know, there were a lot of players in this decision and how it happened the way it did. I'm glad we had everyone in the room together to hash out solutions so thank you everyone.

Everyone signs off.