THE ALBERTA ENERGY REGULATOR

IN THE MATTER OF Application No. 432 to the Alberta Energy Regulator

AER PROCEEDING
VOLUME 2

Calgary, Alberta
March 6, 2024

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		
3	Description	Page
4	March 6, 2024 Morning Session	211
5	Opening Remarks	213
6	CHRIS NICHOLAS, KATRINA ROWE, MICHAELA DAVIS,	215
7	JOE MARCHESE, SCOTT FASH, Affirmed	
8	KALEN ANDERSON, Sworn	215
9	Direct Evidence of Developers Group Witness	215
10	Panel	
11	D. Brezina Cross-examines Developers Group	255
12	Witness Panel	
13	The Panel Questions Developers Group Witness	257
14	Panel	
15	D. Brezina Re-cross-examines Directors Group	269
16	Witness Panel	
17	A. Huxley Re-cross-examines Directors Group	270
18	Witness Panel	
19	PETER TSOUKALAS, Sworn	273
20	RICHARD WESTREN, Affirmed	273
21	Direct Evidence of Brookfield Residential	273
22	Alberta Limited Witness Panel	
23	The Panel Questions Brookfield Residential	287
24	Alberta Limited Witness Panel	
25	Discussion	288
26	Certificate of Transcript	292

1	Proceedings taken at Co	vier Hall, Calgary, Alberta
2	FIOCEEUINGS CAREN AC GO	vier nair, cargary, Arberta
3	March 6, 2024	Morning Session
4		5 - 5
5	P. Meysami	The Chair
6	H. Robinson	Hearing Commissioner
7	E. McNaughtan	Hearing Commissioner
8		
9	D. Brezina	AER Counsel
10	A. Huxley	AER Counsel
11	E. Arruda	AER Staff
12	T. Wheaton	AER Staff
13	D. Grzyb	AER Staff
14	D. Parsons	AER Staff
15		
16	G. Fitch	For Qualico Developments West Ltd.
17		
18	E. Appelt	For the Developers Group
19		
20	E. Dixon	For Brookfield Residential
21		Alberta Limited
22	M. Cherkawsky	For Brookfield Residential
23		Alberta Limited
24		
25		
26		

		212
1	D. Naffin	For Pembina Pipeline Corporation,
2		Plains Midstream Canada ULC,
3		and SECURE Energy Services
4	T. Myers	For Pembina Pipeline Corporation,
5		Plains Midstream Canada ULC,
6		and SECURE Energy Services
7	T. Machell	For Pembina Pipeline Corporation,
8		Plains Midstream Canada ULC,
9		and SECURE Energy Services
10		
11	S. Duncanson	For Keyera Corp.
12	J. Baker	For Keyera Corp.
13		
14	D. Lopez, CSR(A), RPR	Official Court Reporter
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

- 1 (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 9:01 AM)
- 2 Opening Remarks
- 3 THE CHAIR: All right. Good morning,
- 4 everyone, and welcome to Govier Hall. There are a
- 5 couple of things that have been brought to my
- 6 attention, and I'm going to talk about those first.
- 7 I've been told, yet again, I have been speaking
- 8 too softly, so if you have trouble hearing me, just
- 9 shake a hand.
- 10 The other thing is for the benefit of the court
- 11 reporters, if you may please speak slowly and not
- 12 together, and I know at times that is not avoidable,
- 13 but it makes transcribing a bit more difficult.
- And last but not least, video of the hearing is
- 15 being live-streamed through a link on the AER webcast.
- 16 We do not keep a record of the video cast, and the
- 17 video is not an official transcript. The court
- 18 reporters will prepare the only official transcript of
- 19 the hearing, so any viewers who are observing the video
- 20 cast, we advise that recording and rebroadcasting of
- 21 the hearing, audio or video, is strictly prohibited.
- 22 And the same applies to people who are in the room,
- 23 please. We appreciate your observance.
- So, with that, any preliminaries that you wish to
- 25 bring to our attention? Hearing none.
- 26 So we have the Developers Group next. You may

- 1 proceed.
- 2 E. APPELT: Good morning, Madam Chair and
- 3 Hearing Commissioners. As introduced yesterday, my
- 4 name is Eric Appelt with McLennan Ross. I'm here today
- 5 with Mr. Fitch. We are counsel for both the applicant
- 6 in this matter, Qualico Developments, and, more notably
- 7 for today's evidence, what we've been referring to as
- 8 the Developers Group.
- 9 I'm very pleased to now present the Developers
- 10 Group to you. Each witness will introduce themselves
- 11 in turn once we get into the direct evidence, but I
- 12 thought it would be helpful at the outset to just
- 13 briefly note their name for the record.
- 14 First, we have Ms. Kalen Anderson with
- 15 UDI Edmonton; we have Chris Nicholas with MLC Group; we
- 16 have Katrina Rowe with Cantiro Communities; we have
- 17 Michaela Davis with Melcor Developments; closest to me,
- 18 we have Joe Marchese with Avillia Developments; and
- 19 then closest to you, we have Scott Fash with BILD
- 20 Alberta.
- 21 THE CHAIR: Sorry, Counsel. Are your
- 22 witnesses going to take oath or affirmation?
- 23 E. APPELT: Has that been administered by
- 24 the court reporter yet? If -- if not --
- 25 THE CHAIR: No, they haven't.
- 26 E. APPELT: -- we should.

1		THE CHAIR:	We do it on record.
2		E. APPELT:	Okay. We should go ahead with
3		that, then	
4		THE CHAIR:	Yes, please.
5		E. APPELT:	before the direct evidence
6		is entered.	
7		THE CHAIR:	Thank you.
8		CHRIS NICHOLAS, KATRINA	ROWE, MICHAELA DAVIS,
9		JOE MARCHESE, SCOTT FASH	, Affirmed
10		KALEN ANDERSON, Sworn	
11		Direct Evidence of Devel	opers Group Witness Panel
12		THE CHAIR:	Okay. Thank you.
13		E. APPELT:	Thank you.
14	Q	E. APPELT: M	s. Anderson, good morning.
15	A	K. ANDERSON: G	ood morning.
16	Q	Can I get you to please	introduce yourself for the
17		record as well as the or	ganization that you're here
18		representing today on th	e witness panel.
19	A	Sure. My name is Kalen	Anderson. I'm the CEO of the
20		Urban Development Instit	ute or the Edmonton Metro
21		Region. I have been wor	king with the organization as
22		its leader for about two	-and-a-half years. Previous to
23		that, I've been a profes	sional planner for about 20 in
24		Alberta and in Ontario.	
25	Q	Thank you.	
26		And so you are sitt	ing today on this witness panel

- as part of the Developers Group, as we've established.
- 2 Can you confirm that it's your organization,
- 3 UDI Edmonton, that's referenced at -- starting at
- 4 page 11 of the Developers Group written submission
- 5 that's found at Exhibit 66.01?
- 6 A Yes, I can.
- 7 Q And that submission, Ms. Anderson, was prepared under
- 8 your direction and is adopted as the evidence of
- 9 UDI Edmonton in these proceedings; is that correct?
- 10 A That is correct.
- 11 Q And is the evidence in that submission accurate, to the
- 12 best of your knowledge and belief?
- 13 A It is.
- 14 Q Thank you.
- 15 I'll get you to now please describe for the
- 16 Hearing Commissioners from a general sense the
- operations that UDI Edmonton undertakes.
- 18 A Thank you.
- 19 UDI is a nonprofit organization with over
- 20 180 different member companies in the real estate
- 21 development industry. Our members include developers,
- 22 planners, architects, engineers, as well as school
- 23 boards and various municipalities, including the
- 24 City of Edmonton. On behalf of and in collaboration
- 25 with our members, UDI participates in public policy
- discussions and provides expertise on municipal issues

- that may impact the real estate development industry as
- well as economic development, more broadly speaking.
- 3 Q And sitting next to you is Scott Fash with
- 4 BILD Alberta. Can you confirm whether UDI Edmonton
- is a -- a member of BILD Alberta?
- 6 A Yes. UDI is, in fact, a constituent member of
- 7 BILD Alberta. We're a three-tiered organization,
- 8 so UDI advances municipal interests, BILD Alberta
- 9 covers provincial ones, and CHB National deals with
- 10 federal concerns. So we work together across these
- orders of government, and where there are areas of
- overlap, such as today, we will collaborate on those
- 13 proceedings.
- 14 Q Is the applicant in these proceedings, Qualico
- Developments, a member of UDI Edmonton?
- 16 A Yes, they are.
- 17 Q And does that make them also a member of BILD Alberta,
- 18 to your knowledge?
- 19 A Yes, they are both a member of BILD Alberta and
- 20 UDI Edmonton.
- 21 O Thank you.
- 22 I'll ask you next, Ms. Anderson, to provide a
- 23 summary of what exactly it is that UDI Edmonton's
- 24 members have been saying about their experiences with
- 25 pipeline operators over the past several years.
- 26 A Thanks for that.

- So over the past few years, the issue of pipeline 1 2 crossings has been a growing topic of conversation 3 among our membership who are working in the Edmonton This includes municipalities, as I 4 Metro Region. mentioned before, who are also members of UDI. 5 So this 6 is important to note because this impact is not just a 7 private-to-private issue but affects public and private sector land development taken together. 8 9 What we've been hearing is that the lack of 10 predictability when it comes to timelines, pipeline 11 alteration costs, the sharing of costs, the transparency of role and responsibilities, these are 12 13 all the themes that have been emerging from our 14 membership. And it's important to note that the Edmonton Metro 15 Region contains the highest density of pipelines of any 16 17 major metro area in North America. So this is a pretty important topic to us. In Alberta, most pipeline 18 systems deliver to two central locations: Edmonton and 19 20 Hardisty. Within the Edmonton Metro Region, many of 21 our local jurisdictions are impacted, then, by this
- And then added on to that, it's important to
 note that our city region is growing extremely quickly,
 and we're planning for ongoing expansion of all

city of Edmonton's newly developing neighbourhoods.

connectivity with a significant influence in the

22

1		13 municipalities. By just the third quarter, for
2		example, of 2023, there were an additional 56,000
3		residents who joined our region, and our regional board
4		currently is planning for a growth of 1.5 million,
5		which is our current state, to 2 million within about
6		20 years. So that's another half million people who
7		will need to be accommodated and need places to live.
8		So, therefore, given this context, the efficient
9		and effective interface between urban and energy land
10		uses is a really germane feature of the growth and
11		development in our region in Alberta in particular,
12		which is why this issue is so important to address.
13	Q	Given the members' concerns that you've just laid out,
14		are you able to provide for the Hearing Commissioners a
15		general sense of where exactly it is that these
16		pipeline crossings rank in terms of the goals or
17		objectives of UDI Edmonton?
18	A	Yeah. So every year, we make a bit of a top ten list
19		of our top ten advocacy issues, and in early 2023, we
20		actually identified the issue of pipeline crossings as
21		one of our top ten advocacy priorities, and we put it
22		out on our website well in advance of this hearing
23		being called.
24		So I'll just maybe read what what we've
25		said online, and it's still there today, which
26		summarizes our position, and this is also summarized
1		

1		in the Developers submission on in paragraph 65:
2		(as read)
3		UDI Edmonton believes that pipeline
4		operators' approaches to crossing agreements
5		and rights-of-way are presenting impediments
6		to efficient and responsible development and
7		redevelopment. Pipeline crossings and
8		conflicts are becoming more frequent as our
9		population increases and demand for housing
10		and civic facilities grow across the region.
11		Costs associated with these crossing
12		agreements have reached a threshold where the
13		public is losing from a variety of different
14		angles that might not yet be entirely
15		realized. We, therefore, believe that
16		collaborative this collaborative approach
17		in pursuit of effective pipeline crossings is
18		in the public interest.
19	Q	Thank you.
20		And just to confirm, that position that you've
21		just described from the UDI Edmonton, would that be
22		based on the complaints or reports received by
23		UDI Edmonton from its public members?
24	A	Yes, that's correct. We, in fact, have created
25		recently a specific UDI subcommittee dedicated, in
26		particular, to working through these oil and gas

interface issues within our region. So it is a -- an 1 2 ongoing concern that we're taking seriously. 3 One of the, I guess, secondary issues spoken to 0 yesterday during Qualico's evidence was the ability of 4 developers to complete due diligence before acquiring 5 6 lands that would ultimately be developed. Are you able 7 to speak to that concept of due diligence from the perspective of UDI Edmonton? 8 9 Α Yes. Certainly. I'm happy to. 10 And I'm just going to take a few moments maybe to raise it up a level to more of the policy gaze, 11 12 which -- which is what we -- we apply at UDI. 13 it comes to the issue of due diligence and any 14 assumptions that developers would be in a position to know all of the factors that would -- and financial 15 requirements that would impact the lands they either 16 17 intend to acquire or have already acquired relative to 18 existing pipeline infrastructure, there's a few important points that we need to note about how the 19 20 planning and development system happens within our 21 region. 22 We do have an Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board 23 which governs and manages all regional development within the Edmonton area, and it has a long-term plan 24 25 for growth which outlines where urban expansion will 26 occur, to what level of intensity, and what general

- 1 land use. This is approved by a board of 13 mayors --
- 2 they are the board -- and guided by a CEO.
- Once that direction's been provided, all municipal
- 4 development plans, so city plans, then set out the
- 5 citywide growth strategy and more detailed area and
- 6 neighbourhood structure plans, which bring that down
- 7 closer to the ground, so to speak.
- 8 These area and neighbourhood structure plans are
- 9 approved in a political forum by municipal councils,
- 10 and all of these levels of plans are being prepared and
- 11 amended regularly.
- 12 These policy directions that come out of the plans
- are then supported by local regulations in the land use
- 14 bylaw as well as more detailed engineering and design
- 15 and construction standards. So taken together, these
- 16 plans and policies are both determined by our elected
- 17 bodies and implemented through administrative
- 18 structures.
- 19 It's important to note that in addition to what
- 20 I've just described, there are also provincial rules
- 21 and regulations that we must follow. So technical
- 22 requirements and political policy direction of all type
- 23 is updated often, and our industry, as UDI, is actively
- 24 engaged in all of the relevant changes as -- as we can
- 25 be, and we participate fully to ensure that our end --
- 26 end users' needs are met. And in the case of thinking

- 1 about new neighbourhoods, the end user is ultimately
- 2 the homebuyer.
- 3 So within this context, it's not possible to
- 4 simply avoid traversing or crossing a pipeline as a
- 5 proactive business decision of some type, either
- 6 practically speaking or economically, nor is it
- 7 possible to set out a very clear and unchangeable
- 8 development vision at the point of due diligence and
- 9 expect that no external impacts based on changing
- 10 policies, regulations, or technical requirements
- 11 will -- will affect those over time.
- 12 So this is why as an -- a collection of different
- 13 groups under the Urban Development Institute's
- 14 guidance -- what we're asking for is clarity in terms
- of process; we're asking for open and clear
- 16 communication, and we really want to share -- establish
- 17 shared expectations that are so important when
- 18 assessing these potential impacts.
- So, really, as table stakes in the Edmonton Metro
- 20 Region, developers must grow contiguously, they have to
- 21 meet the density targets that are set out by the
- 22 different plans, and they also are not able to develop
- 23 wherever they might see to be most advantageous for
- 24 them at the time. Their decisions are highly
- 25 constrained, so we need to grow the region in a logical
- 26 and connected way.

So, as I mentioned earlier, the -- unlike the 1 2 situation of pipeline crossings where interactions and 3 outcomes are inconsistent or have been in the past, we 4 make it a real point to try to get involved both at the political level and the administrative level wherever 5 6 we can to help ensure that we have the clarity so that 7 our businesses can operate with the most confidence. At this point in time, for example, in Edmonton, 8 there are a couple of policy activities that are 9 10 ongoing which will impact how neighbourhoods are built 11 and designed over time. We have a new terms of 12 reference being established for area structure plans 13 and neighbourhood structure plans, so that -- that 14 show -- that will give direction to different 15 development companies in terms of how they can plan their neighbourhoods, and we're also working through a 16 technical exercise to develop new cross sections for 17 18 roadways called complete streets. In addition to that, we just adopted a new -- a 19 20 zoning bylaw in Edmonton which will affect what kind of 21 land development -- or development rights you can have 22 on any parcel of land. So all of these are very kind of watershed policy amendments that our industry has 23 been involved with and our -- our developers are 24 25 subject to. 26 So when we think about all of these city-building

- 1 influences that are brought to bear when we're planning
- 2 and developing new communities, we really can't expect
- 3 an individual land developer who may be working within
- 4 any of these areas to note every possible future
- 5 outcome that would impact where specific crossings may
- 6 or may not be required and indeed the -- the exact type
- 7 of engineering that will be required at the time.
- 8 That's just from a planning policy perspective,
- 9 notwithstanding the regulations of the -- the pipeline
- 10 infrastructure itself.
- 11 So the -- kind of to wrap up here and to bring it
- 12 home, this is currently the situation in -- in our
- 13 region to a fairly significant level. As was described
- 14 yesterday by Mr. Fjeldheim, in the one area alone of
- 15 Edmonton, Horse Hill, there are over 45 different
- 16 crossing points, and Edmonton in 2019 recently annexed
- 17 land from the county of Leduc, which is a major future
- 18 growth area, and it also has quite a few pipeline
- 19 crossings or future crossings.
- 20 So because this presents a risk that cannot be
- 21 currently accounted for or mitigated, we -- it's
- 22 characterized by uncertainty, and this is an area that
- 23 we would really be hoping to get a little bit more
- 24 clarity out of the hearing today.
- 25 What is really required at the end of the day to
- 26 enable a high-functioning real estate development

industry that supports residential and nonresidential 1 2 growth in Alberta's cities and towns is to maintain the 3 most predictable and supportive regulatory environment 4 possible that is informed by stakeholder input and keeps the needs of end users in mind. 5 6 Our members and UDI as an association work 7 diligently to improve clarity, enable growth, support 8 investment, and adapt to changing consumer needs, as 9 well as economic impacts that ultimately adds up to 10 building excellent and affordable communities for 11 Albertans to call home. 12 The issue of pipeline crossings and the associated 13 costs has been one area where the membership of UDI has 14 not been able to achieve the needed clarity, 15 transparency, and equity to a satisfactory degree. 16 We are indeed hopeful that more certainty can be 17 brought to -- to our member companies through this process today. 18 19 Thanks very much. Q 20 My last question for you, Ms. Anderson: 21 know, Qualico has brought this application seeking cost 22 sharing in the circumstances that you've described, 23 which Qualico says is in the public interest. 24 Can you confirm, from the perspective of 25 UDI Edmonton, what -- what is your position in connection with Qualico's application on that issue in 26

1 these proceedings? 2 Α Thank you. 3 We are fully --4 THE CHAIR: Sorry. Before you proceed, 5 may I interject? 6 Could you speak a bit slowly? Because I can see 7 it's going quite fast here with the transcribing, if 8 you may. 9 E. APPELT: Sure. Thank you. 10 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 11 K. ANDERSON: My answer is yes. Α 12 E. APPELT: Thank you, Ms. Anderson. Those are all of my questions for you today. 13 14 Mr. Nicholas, good morning. Can I get you to 15 please introduce yourself and the organization that you are here on behalf of? 16 17 Α C. NICHOLAS: My name is Chris Nicholas. I'm with MLC Group. 18 19 And what -- what is your group with the organization --0 20 that organization, sir, and how long have you filled 21 it? 22 I've been with the company since 2010 and president of Α the company since 2014. 23 24 What exactly is it that MLC does? Q 25 Α We're a land development management organization 26 specializing in residential and commercial development

- in Edmonton and area, and we're currently managing the
- development of over 15 communities in the capital
- 3 region.
- 4 Q And I'll take you, sir, through the same housekeeping
- 5 items that -- that I reviewed with Ms. Anderson first.
- I see that MLC Group is referenced at page 7 of
- 7 the written Developers Group submission. Again, that's
- 8 Exhibit 66.01. Can you confirm that that submission
- 9 was prepared under your direction?
- 10 A Yes.
- 11 Q And that the evidence in the submission is accurate, to
- the best of your understanding and belief?
- 13 A It is.
- 14 Q And what is MLC's overall position taken in connection
- with the application brought by Qualico in these
- 16 proceedings?
- 17 A We're in full support.
- 18 O Has MLC dealt with pipeline operators on crossings in
- any of its Edmonton neighbourhoods?
- 20 A We have, yeah.
- 21 Q And which neighbourhoods and pipeline operators would
- those be?
- 23 A Neighbourhoods: Marquis West, which is immediately
- 24 adjacent to the Horse Hills land; Desrochers and
- 25 Heritage Valley Town Centre, which are in Southwest
- 26 Edmonton. And operators would include ATCO and the

1 respondents to Qualico's application, Pembina and 2 Plains. 3 And can you describe for the Hearing Commissioners, 4 Mr. Nicholas, MLC's experience in dealing with those 5 particular operators on pipeline crossings in your 6 Edmonton development? 7 It -- it seems to our organization that there's Α been a market change in the past three to four years on 8 9 the operators' approach to these crossing agreements. 10 Previously, for example, the neighbourhood of Quarry 11 Ridge, which is immediately south of the Horse Hills 12 neighbourhood -- which that was constructed about 13 2008 -- or the neighbourhood was built -- and this is 14 the exact pipeline in question that you heard about 15 yesterday -- there -- there are no fees nor agreements 16 nor anything needed to construct that neighbourhood. 17 Thank you. 0 And so we've heard these terms floated around this 18 19 morning and yesterday: crossing agreements, 20 backstopping agreements. Are you able to just provide 21 a brief explanation for the Hearing Commissioners as --22 as to what exactly is meant by -- by those terms in MLC's experience? 23 24 I'll do my best. Α Sure. 25 And I think the terms are interchangeable, 26 depending on which operator you're dealing with, but

1 I'll pick on -- backstopping agreement is an agreement 2 provided by operator to us to -- that has a cost 3 estimate wherein we accept the cost, sign off on it, 4 are obliged to pay, and that's the first step in order 5 to gain the crossing agreement. 6 Thank you. Q 7 Now, two questions ago, you mentioned that over the past three or four years or so, MLC had noticed 8 9 there had been a change in the process implemented by 10 operators on these backstopping agreements. Are you 11 able to, first, briefly describe what was the old 12 system before the change, again, in MLC's experience? 13 Prior to our dealings in our Marquis neighbourhood, Α 14 there were -- I -- I was never aware of a backstopping 15 agreement nor cost in order to obtain a -- a -- a 16 crossing. 17 And what -- what exactly has changed under this new system that you described as having arisen over the 18 19 past couple of years? 20 Previously we were obliged, you know, for reinforcement Α 21 work or the -- the work to -- for -- for the infrastructure that we provide to roads specifically, 22 you know, in -- in the tune of -- just to quantify it, 23 24 fifteen -- fifteen -- \$60,000, and now these agreements 25 come with a price tag of \$900,000-plus.

So there's been a change in the asking price made by

26

Q

1 operators in your experience. Has there been any other 2 changes that you've noticed over the past couple of 3 years? 4 I think it all comes down to transparency. Α that the fees being requested are -- are somewhat 5 6 arbitrary and indiscriminant [sic], but, moreover --7 I'll go back to the transparency. It's very hard to get the cost breakdowns for the engineering assessment 8 9 specifically in -- in the Horse Hills neighbourhood. 10 0 And in MLC's dealings with pipeline operators on these 11 crossings, is there any offering of cost sharing or any 12 opportunity to negotiate the -- the total cost that's 13 been requested by the operators? 14 Α The costs have been provided on a -- a -basically a take-it-or-leave-it basis. 15 16 Thank you. 0 17 Now, turning the page somewhat. Earlier in your 18 evidence, sir, you mentioned that Marquis West was one of the neighbourhoods that MLC has been responsible for 19 20 developing and overseeing, and I'll -- I'll ask you 21 first to confirm where exactly is that Marquis West 22 neighbourhood? 23 It's immediately adjacent -- it's west of Qualico's 24 Horse Hill neighbourhood. 25 And was there a crossing of a Plains pipeline that was

required in that area?

- 1 A There was, yes.
- 2 Q And I take it that was the crossing at Meridian Street
- 3 and 172nd Avenue?
- 4 A Correct, yeah.
- 5 Q Can you describe for the Hearing Commissioners the
- 6 circumstances surrounding the alteration work that was
- 7 completed at that intersection?
- 8 A Our joint venture called Marquis JV Ltd., we entered
- 9 into an agreement with Plains and -- who completed the
- 10 work to -- in order to proceed with development.
- 11 Marquis paid for the crossing under protest,
- understanding it would be encompassed by Qualico's
- application. Again, it was -- it was out of necessity
- because the crossing is right across the entrance to
- 15 our neighbourhood.
- 16 Q And final set of questions for you this morning,
- 17 Mr. Nicholas.
- 18 You also mentioned the Desrochers Village
- 19 neighbourhood in Edmonton. Can you confirm exactly
- where that -- that is located in Edmonton?
- 21 A Southwest Edmonton. It's west of the highway on
- James Mowatt Trail and 41st Avenue.
- 23 O Some of the -- the issues and the challenges that
- 24 you've just described in dealing with pipeline
- operators on crossings, in this particular case on the
- 26 Desrochers Villages development, did you also encounter

- 1 to -- some of those same problems in that case?
- 2 A It's an identical situation, yes.
- 3 Q And any other specific concerns to note for Desrochers
- 4 Villages from your experience?
- 5 A Well, I think as previously mentioned, but we're --
- 6 we're specifically 18 months delayed from request to
- 7 getting correspondence back in -- in the form of that
- 8 backstopping agreement that I previously referenced
- 9 from the operator in this case.
- 10 Q In terms of that delay you just mentioned, can you
- 11 briefly summarize for the Hearing Commissioners the
- 12 challenges --
- 13 A M-hm.
- 14 Q -- that delay poses to MLC in its operations as a land
- 15 management organization?
- 16 A Sure. So in this case, there's a collector road which
- is a major collector between east and west. There's a
- 18 20-metre gap which represents the area that would be
- 19 the crossing over the pipeline in this case. The
- 20 gap -- obviously it's paved up until this place.
- 21 It's -- it's impassable by vehicle and very unsafe for
- 22 pedestrians to go across. This collector happens to be
- 23 the main feeder for a K to 9 school as well as a
- 24 brand-new high school, Anne -- Dr. Anne
- 25 Stevenson [sic], which, obviously, has a huge impact on
- all our residents and the students.

1 The delays in response and the costs that have 2 been requested, obviously, affect MLC's ability to deliver housing affordability in a timely manner. 3 4 Thank you very much, sir. Those are all my questions 5 for you this morning. Moving one spot to the right, Ms. Rowe, good 6 7 Can I please get you to state your full name and your organization for the record. 8 9 Α K. ROWE: Good morning. I'm Katrina 10 Rowe with Cantiro Communities. 11 Thank you, Ms. Rowe. 12 And what -- what is your position with Cantiro 13 Communities? 14 Α I'm president of Cantiro Communities. I have been 15 since 2022, and I've been with the company since 2012. In terms of broad strokes, what -- what type of work 16 0 17 does Cantiro Communities engage in? Cantiro is an integrated real estate company. 18 Α 19 communities, we build houses, commercial properties, 20 and investment properties across Alberta, Ontario, and British Columbia. 21 22 For the Developers Group written submission, can you

26 A That's correct.

that written submission?

23

24

25

confirm, Ms. Rowe, that it is your organization,

Cantiro Communities, that's referenced at page 10 of

1	Q	And, again, I'll ask you to confirm that that
2		submission was prepared under your direction and that
3		the evidence is accurate, to the best of your knowledge
4		and belief.
5	A	That's correct.
6	Q	Ms. Anderson earlier this morning spoke briefly to the
7		concept of due diligence, which, again, was raised
8		yesterday. My question for you is: When Cantiro
9		Communities is considering the prospect of acquiring
10		lands which will be which will ultimately be
11		developed, what what does the due diligence process
12		entail, again, from the perspective of Cantiro
13		Communities? And, more specifically, if you could
14		speak to the factors that can be investigated during
15		that process, that would be much appreciated.
16	A	Most typically upon signing a purchase and sale
17		agreement, we would have a 90-day due diligence period.
18		Sometimes this can be as short as 30 days, and the
19		longest I've ever seen is 180 days. During this time,
20		we determine if the lands have already been provided
21		with any development rights through municipal
22		development plans, area structure plans, or
23		neighbourhood structure plan approvals.
24		We also check for zoning and subdivision
25		approvals, some of which Ms. Anderson with UDI Edmonton
26		has already touched upon. We review any environmental

studies, geotechnical reports, or engineering reports
that might already exist. If nothing exists, we would
generally conduct geotechnical assessments and do an
environmental site assessment.

We also take a preliminary look at the engineering requirements to service the land; we look at the topography of the land, any relevant features or amenities and rights-of-ways that exist, especially pipeline right-of-ways.

We walk the land. We also look at the market conditions in the area, population growth, demographics, and try to determine what types of housing would make sense for the area. Once we've completed all of the research we can, we would begin making educated assumptions to come up with a pro forma and cash flow based on all of the information we have to determine if the project is financially viable.

Due diligence can be a very intense period of time with a lot of work happening in a short time frame.

20 Q Thank you.

So you've provided a helpful summary of the factors that Cantiro can look into during a due diligence process and understand. What conversely -- in your experience, what are some of the factors that cannot be fully understood or fully delineated even by way of the comprehensive due diligence process that you

1 just described? 2 We cannot understand everything there is to know about 3 the lands in a few months. As an example, we can see 4 if any planning approvals have been obtained, but we don't know, ultimately, if the Municipality will 5 6 approve development. We can look into the 7 rights-of-ways that exist, but we can't always learn everything about them. Pipeline rights-of-way are 8 9 especially challenging, as we can't usually find much 10 information within a 90-day period. We look at what 11 rights-of-ways exist, where they're located, how close 12 to them we are, and what regulations we understand to 13 exist at that time. 14 Further to Ms. Anderson's commentary, it's not possible for an individual land developer to know all 15 possible future outcomes that would impact where 16 17 specific crossings may or may not be required. particularly the case in areas where land is acquired 18 for development prior to any high-level or detailed 19 20 planning taking place. 21 We do not know the expense of a potential pipeline 22 crossing even if we know that a pipeline crossing will We're not provided timely or consistent 23 be required. 24 information regarding the age of pipeline's depth, 25 classification, condition, et cetera by operators

within a due diligence period or sometimes ever at all.

1	Q	And those last factors that you just described
2		regarding the the technical aspects of the pipeline,
3		isn't Cantiro able to inquire with the operators for
4		that information and to receive it that way?
5	А	Yes, inquiries can be made and almost always are;
6		however, based on past experiences, Cantiro is unlikely
7		to receive a response by the operator within the due
8		diligence time period, which, again, is usually
9		90 days. No urgency is shown by the operators in these
10		situations, what makes it impossible for Cantiro to
11		fully understand the scope and cost of any crossing
12		agreements at an early stage.
13		Most recently, Cantiro required a proximity
14		agreement for a pipeline in Southeast Edmonton. It
15		took us 16 months, from December 2021 to April 2023, to
16		obtain a proximity agreement which allows us to develop
17		alongside the pipeline. This wasn't even for a
18		crossing agreement. This was a relatively simple
19		situation. And the proximity agreement took a long
20		time, during which we were unclear what the issues were
21		or what work was happening in the background.
22	Q	Thank you.
23		And I'll ask you to confirm as well the position
24		taken by Cantiro in connection with Qualico's
25		application for cost sharing in the public interest in
26		these proceedings.
I		

- 1 A We are fully in support of Qualico's application.
- 2 Q Thank you very much.
- Moving one further to the right, Ms. Davis. Good
- 4 morning. Can you please introduce yourself and your
- 5 company.
- 6 A M. DAVIS: Yeah. My name is Michaela
- 7 Davis, and I work for Melcor Developments.
- 8 Q And what is your role with Melcor Developments?
- 9 A I'm a regional manager in our community development
- 10 division. I've been in this role for over ten years
- and at Melcor Developments for over 12 years.
- 12 Q What is it exactly that Melcor does?
- 13 A Melcor Developments is a real estate development and
- management company operating in Western Canada and
- parts of the United States. My role as regional
- 16 manager is -- in Melcor's community development
- 17 division includes acquiring land, planning land through
- 18 municipal and statutory approvals, coordinating the
- 19 engineering of land with consultants, coordinating the
- 20 grading and servicing of land with contractors, and
- 21 ultimately selling subdivided residential, commercial,
- or industrial lots to builders and/or end users.
- 23 O And I take it, Ms. Davis, that you've reviewed the
- 24 portion of the Developers Group written submission that
- 25 speaks to your organization, Melcor Developments?
- 26 A Yes.

- 1 Q And can you confirm that that submission is adopted as
- 2 the evidence of Melcor in these proceedings and that
- 3 the evidence is accurate, to the best of your
- 4 understanding?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q I note that in the Developers Group written submission,
- 7 it is indicated that Melcor is not currently in the
- 8 midst of a crossing dispute with a pipeline operator
- 9 but that it has dealt with operators on crossings in
- 10 the past. Is that accurate?
- 11 A Yes, that is correct.
- 12 O And which -- which neighbourhoods is it in Edmonton
- specifically that Melcor is involved in developing and
- managing?
- 15 A Currently Melcor is involved in approximately
- 16 20 neighbourhoods in Edmonton, including Rosenthal,
- 17 Rosewood at Secord, Cavanagh Ridge, Jagare Ridge, Lewis
- 18 Estates, and new communities in Glenridding, The
- 19 Uplands, and Mattson in Southeast Edmonton.
- 20 O That last neighbourhood that you mentioned, Mattson in
- 21 Southeast Edmonton, where exactly is that located?
- 22 A Mattson is located south of 25th Avenue Southwest and
- 23 east of 66th Street Southwest immediately adjacent to
- the Orchards of Ellerslie development, which is managed
- 25 by Brookfield Residential.
- 26 O Are you aware of which operator it is that holds the

1		right-of-way encumbrance for the necessary pipeline
2		crossing in that Mattson neighbourhood?
3	A	Yes. Keyera Corp.
4	Q	Can you please describe for the Hearing Commissioners
5		what exactly was required for that crossing in terms of
6		alteration work.
7	А	Yes. So in 2022, Keyera presented different options
8		for replacement and lowering and reinforcement, which
9		were dependent under the construction timing and if the
10		work could be done or can and completed in
11		conjunction with the crossing and the lowering being
12		completed in the adjacent Brookfield lands. Overall
13		costs were vague and changed a bit over the course of
14		the crossing agreement discussions. Final costs were
15		\$830,000 in the agreement, but we did not receive a
16		a detailed cost breakdown which identified any sort of
17		overall cost sharing or any detail on costs associated
18		with pipeline reinforcement work.
19		Initially it was indicated that the cost was to
20		be was to be paid after the work was completed.
21		Then it was requested that the funds be paid completely
22		up front. Ultimately the agreement was written to
23		require a partial payment upon execution of the
24		agreement and a second payment on an agreed-upon date
25		later on through the construction process.
26		We did receive a small refund later in the fall of

2 2022 after the final construction costs were 2 reconciled, but a detailed final breakdown was not 3 provided.

I'd like to note that we were not able to anticipate any of these costs during our due diligence period when we purchased the land, as we would not have known that the pipe would need to be lowered to accommodate the grades of the crossing, and we would not have been able to anticipate that the portion of the pipe would need to be reinforced due to changes in allowable pipeline wall fixes. Additionally, had the adjacent developer not been developing at the same time, our crossing would have been delayed until a future pipeline shut down later in fall of 2023, which would have been about 18 months later.

Melcor had crossed this right-of-way in other locations in previous development stages. We were told that increases to the cost this time around had come as a result of new CSA rules that required the pipe to be reinforced to meet a certain wall thickness. Again, not something we could have anticipated during our due diligence period.

Q Is there a neighbourhood adjacent to Mattson that is also impacted on by this Keyera Corp. pipeline that you've just described?

26 A Yes.

- 1 Q And who -- who's the developer for that neighbourhood?
- 2 A Brookfield Residential.
- 3 Q Have you had any discussions with Brookfield
- 4 Residential as to their dealings with Keyera Corp.
- 5 on that same pipeline?
- 6 A Yeah. Melcor worked closely with Brookfield during the
- 7 period of time that we were working through the
- 8 agreements, discussing the requirements of the crossing
- 9 agreement. Melcor did perceive that Keyera utilized
- some inconsistencies in terms of payment timing,
- 11 contingencies, insurance, the agreements. We worked on
- it through a period of time, and -- and some
- inconsistencies were noticed.
- 14 Q Thank you, Ms. Davis.
- 15 And, again, I'll ask you to confirm the position
- taken by Melcor Developments in connection with these
- 17 proceedings.
- 18 A Yeah, we fully support it. Thank you.
- 19 Q Mr. Marchese, you're up next. Good morning.
- 20 Can you please state your full name for the record
- as well as the organization that you're here on behalf
- 22 of.
- 23 A J. MARCHESE: Good morning. Joe Marchese
- 24 with Avillia Developments.
- 25 Q And what -- what is your role with that organization,
- 26 sir?

- 1 A My role is vice president. I've been with Avillia for
- 2 approximately 16 months.
- 3 Q What business is Avillia Developments in?
- 4 A Avillia is a land developer and a land development
- 5 manager of residential and industrial projects within
- 6 the province of Alberta and British Columbia.
- 7 Q In terms of the same housekeeping questions, sir, I
- 8 take it you've reviewed the written submission that was
- 9 tendered on behalf of the Developers Group in these
- 10 proceedings?
- 11 A Yes.
- 12 Q And that submission is accurate, to the best of your
- 13 knowledge and belief; is that correct?
- 14 A Correct.
- 15 Q And can you confirm the position taken by Avillia
- 16 Developments in respect of Qualico's application that
- 17 brings us here today?
- 18 A Avillia is in full support of Qualico's application.
- 19 Q Thank you.
- 20 Can you describe for the Hearing Commissioners
- 21 Avillia's experience in dealing with pipeline operators
- on crossings in any of the Edmonton neighbourhoods that
- it oversees and manages?
- 24 A Sure. Our -- our most recent experience is -- is in
- 25 our Quarry Landing project, which is in Horse Hills
- Neighbourhood 1A immediately south of Qualico's Horse

1 Hills neighbourhood.

On our lands, we do have two pipelines: one being Imperial Oil, the other being Pembina Pipelines. Our experiences were extremely different from one to the other. Our experience with Imperial Oil required us to provide them with an engineering assessment or an integrity assessment, depending what you want to call it, at a cost of approximately \$20,000, a report completed of which we were unable to get any information from. It was withheld from us.

That was the only cost. We executed our service agreements, and everything was in place to proceed with the crossing of the Imperial pipeline crossing.

Our -- our experience with Pembina was -- was vastly different. In our communications, we were told that in order to enter into an agreement, we needed a backstopping agreement, which has been outlined previously by some of the colleagues on the panel. The cost of this backstopping agreement was going to be \$1.3 million, and we needed to sign it in order to get the agreements in place -- were completed for us to proceed with any surface structures -- crossing -- sorry -- surface crossings.

24 O Thank you.

Sir, you've described Avillia's experience in the Quarry Landing development. Can you explain how that

- 1 experience compares with Avillia's prior dealings with 2 Pembina or other pipeline operators? Avillia in the past has dealt with different 3 Α Sure. 4 pipelines in areas such as Salisbury Village in our Sherwood Park -- in Sherwood Park, rather; Laurin in 5 6 Sturgeon County [sic]; and, again, most recently, our 7 Quarry Landing project. In the past, there was not any requirements at all for any backstopping agreements or 8 9 any costs other than the required surface structure to cross the pipelines to protect the integrity of the 10 pipeline. 11 12 Thank you. 0 13 And can you describe just briefly your overall 14 impression, again, in Avillia's experience in dealing 15 with the operators on these crossings? Just -- again, Mr. Nicholas touched on it. 16 Yeah. Α 17 just seems very arbitrary now that there isn't any 18 inconsistency either between one pipeline to the other, and ideally, obviously, we'd like to see some 19 20 consistency so we know what we're dealing with when 21 we're approaching anywhere near pipeline crossings. Thank you very much, Mr. Marchese. 22 Those are all of my 0
- 24 A Thank you.

23

- 25 Q Last but not least, Mr. Fash. Good morning. Can you
- 26 please state your name for the record and your

questions during direct for you today.

	organization, sir.
А	S. FASH: Yeah. My name is Scott Fash,
	and I am the CEO of the Building Industry and Land
	Development Association of Alberta. So we were formed
	by an amalgamation of legacy organizations, being
	UDI Alberta and CHBA Alberta, in around 2017. So we
	have a number of constituent associations across the
	province, including Fort McMurray, Grande Prairie,
	Edmonton, Red Deer, Calgary, Lethbridge, and
	Medicine Hat.
Q	And you've touched on it briefly, but can you explain
	exactly what what it is that BILD Alberta does in
	terms of its operational mandate?
A	Yeah. So we we represent 1,300 member companies who
	are involved in home building, land development,
	renovations, as well as kind of the supporting
	industries, the trades, so the suppliers, the
	consultant the consulting firms that kind of help
	make everything happen.
	So we're we're an advocacy organization, and we
	focus on provincial legislation, regulation, or
	processes that have an impact on residential
	construction, land development, and specifically how
	that might interface with housing affordability.
Q	I believe Ms. Anderson may have touched on this
	earlier, but are you able to confirm whether Qualico is
	Q

- 1 a member of BILD Alberta?
- 2 A Yes, that's correct.
- 3 Q Thank you.
- 4 And as with your fellow panel members, sir, I take
- 5 it you've had a chance to review the Developers Group
- 6 written submission that was tendered in these
- 7 proceedings?
- 8 A Yes.
- 9 Q And that -- the portion of that submission speaking to
- 10 BILD Alberta was -- is adopted by yourself as evidence
- in these proceedings?
- 12 A Yes.
- 13 O And I'll, again, ask you to confirm the overall
- 14 position taken by BILD Alberta in connection with
- 15 Qualico's application that brings us here today.
- 16 A Yeah. We're fully in support.
- 17 Q Thank you.
- I'll get you, Mr. Fash, to please provide a
- 19 summary of what exactly it is that BILD Alberta's
- 20 members have been saying over the past several --
- 21 several years regarding their experiences with pipeline
- 22 operators on crossings.
- 23 A Yeah. So I -- I think we really started hearing about
- 24 this in 2021 and -- and more so leading into 2022.
- 25 Whenever a member brings an issue to us, we -- we have
- to first kind of do a bit of an analysis of, Is this a

- 1 broader issue, or is this a one-off? Meaning we don't
- 2 advocate on a member's specific project on a specific
- 3 issue. We have to ascertain, Is -- is this a broader
- 4 issue that's being experienced by either a group of
- 5 developers in a region or all of the developers
- 6 province-wide?
- 7 So after that, we then try to understand the
- 8 impact on affordability and -- and then also what are
- 9 the pathways -- potential pathways for a resolution,
- 10 either regulator, legislative change, or -- or other
- 11 means. So we -- we brought this to our provincial land
- 12 development committee and then did some direct outreach
- 13 to active developers in -- in Grande Prairie, Edmonton,
- 14 Red Deer, and Calgary. And what we found is that while
- 15 a number of developers across the province have to
- 16 regularly deal with pipeline crossings, it was really
- 17 the only -- only the Edmonton area developers who
- 18 seemed to be dealing with issues of transparency,
- 19 delays, and escalating costs.
- 20 So the developers that are active in -- in the
- 21 other jurisdictions, they -- they still had to deal
- 22 with pipelines in their projects; they still had to pay
- 23 for crossings but largely found that the companies were
- 24 being responsive in terms of when they would get back
- 25 to folks but then also reasonable in our infrastructure
- 26 asks.

On the other hand, what we -- what we heard from 1 2 the Edmonton developers consistently indicated a lack 3 of responsiveness from the operators and lost 4 construction seasons as a result, being required to pay significant sums of monies for studies that they then 5 6 aren't permitted to see. That leads to them paying 7 significantly larger sums of money on infrastructure when they're not actually sure if it's required, if the 8 9 cost is reasonable, or if they should even be 10 responsible for it. 11 And then, lastly, limited recourse should they 12 disagree. 13 Thank you. 0 14 So in addition to what you've just described in terms of what you've heard from BILD's members in terms 15 of complaints regarding lack of responsiveness, large 16 17 sums of money being requested by operators, and no negotiation of cost sharing, are there any other 18 specific concerns that have been raised by BILD's 19 20 members that you've been made aware of over the past 21 several years? 22 Well, yeah. I mean, yes, in terms of affordability and Α 23 its -- its impact on affordability. So there's, 24 obviously, the hard infrastructure cost that I think 25 I've -- have -- everybody's kind of gone into in terms 26 of what's required, not only on the crossing side but

potentially any improvements that might be required from a pipe -- pipeline operator. So those can be, as we've heard, in the hundreds of thousands upwards to potentially the millions on a given project.

So then there's also the impact of the delays that can come from a lack of responsiveness. Again, I think it was mentioned yesterday, but our construction season in Alberta is very short. We might have six to eight months where you have the time to get -- get the road, the pipe, all of that work done on -- on the subdivision side of things. So what might -- a six-month delay might seem minor for some. That ultimately results in a -- in a lost construction season, and -- and in doing that, you've basically delayed the construction of new housing units, limiting the supply that could have otherwise be -- brought online, which ultimately has an impact on housing affordability.

Beyond that, there's also, then, yeah, the interest costs that are associated with delays, you know, that -- that still has to be funded by a developer and then ultimately the home builder and -- and the end homebuyer.

24 Q Thank you.

And you -- you provided a nice segue just at the end of your answer, but can you confirm base -- based

on your discussions with the members of BILD Alberta, 1 2 are the pipeline crossing costs typically borne by the 3 developers at the end of the day, or are they passed on 4 to homebuyers as the ultimate consumers of housing products? 5 6 Α Yes, it's -- it's like any other hard or soft cost 7 associated with -- with residential construction and home building. The developer's going to recover these 8 9 costs through the price of the lot that they sell to a 10 builder. The builder is then going to recover those 11 costs of that lot in the sale of the home to the end 12 user, which is the homebuyer. If the market doesn't 13 allow for either of those parties to recover those 14 costs, they're typically going to hold off until conditions allow them to do so. 15 16 Thank you. 0 Skipping ahead, Mr. Fash. 17 You had mentioned earlier on that BILD Alberta fills somewhat of an 18 advocacy role by making recommendations on legislation, 19 20 policies, regulations, and so forth. Can you confirm -- I quess to start with, has BILD Alberta had 21 22 any specific discussions in the past with government 23 departments regarding these concerns raised by its members? 24 25 Α Yes. 26 And which -- which governmental department would that

1 be? 2 The Ministry of Energy. Α 3 Can you please describe from a high-level perspective 0 exactly what those discussions with the Minister of 4 5 Energy entailed? 6 Α Yeah. So we -- we sent a letter to minister --7 then-Minister Pete Guthrie in November of 2022 to -- to raise high-level concerns with what we were seeing kind 8 9 of happen within the Edmonton region. That led to a 10 meeting in February of 2023 with Assistant Deputy 11 Minister Mike Simpson. Typically with an issue that --12 that has -- involves a regulator or an appeal body, 13 so -- like the Alberta Energy Regulator or -- we often deal with matters in front of the Alberta Utilities 14 15 Commission or the Land and Property Rights Tribunal. Government from both the nonpolitical and political 16 17 side typically doesn't want to start looking at or considering legislative change while there is a matter 18 19 that is being considered that might provide clarity --20 otherwise clarity that would negate the need to -- to 21 go through kind of that legislative process. 22 So it's, again, been in my experience when there's an active matter in -- in front of a commission that --23 24 again, you're not going to be able to kind of go into 25 the detail of potential legislative change, even to have those discussions, until it's been resolved. 26

1		we had the meeting, understanding this matter was going
2		to be reconsidered basically with the an
3		understanding that we'll circle back pending the
4		outcome of the decision here. And if the direction's
5		provided, if we get the precedent set, I think that
б		everybody's comfortable with, then we may not need to
7		pursue legislative change. But if if additional
8		clarify is needed, that's typically when BILD Alberta
9		would then step in, have those additional meetings, do
10		that additional advocacy to discuss potential
11		legislative or regulatory changes if if they're
12		required.
13	Q	Thank you very much, Mr. Fash. Those are all of my
14		questions for you today, and that concludes the direct
15		evidence of the Developers Group.
16		E. APPELT: Madam Chair, the witness panel
17		is now available for cross-examination.
18		THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
19		And thank you, everyone, for your direct. I am
20		checking my cheat sheet to see if we have a break
21		planned. No, we don't.
22		So are you prepared to proceed with your cross?
23		D. NAFFIN: Good morning, Madam Chair.
24		Plains, Pembina, and SECURE have no questions for this
25		panel. Thank you.
26		THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.

1		So next is AER staff.
2		Counsel, do you wish to have a break, or you would
3		like to proceed?
4		D. Brezina Cross-examines Developers Group Witness
5		Panel
6	Q	D. BREZINA: I'm actually curious about
7		what you just spoke about, Mr. Fash, potential
8		legislative change.
9		Can you go into what sorts of changes you were
10		thinking about?
11	A	S. FASH: I wouldn't speak to the
12		specific legislative wording or anything along those
13		lines because, again, we would defer to to expert
14		panels like this to kind of have a do an evaluation,
15		make a decision, make an evaluation of what the current
16		legislation says, how it applies, those sorts of
17		things.
18		What we'd be looking for is clarity or some
19		direction in the legislation regulation, again, if
20		required, specifying transparency associated with the
21		costs, responsiveness, and requirements for industry to
22		fund those crossings, but not any improvements to the
23		actual pipeline themselves. That's a high-level, I
24		guess, overview of what we'd be looking at if those
25		legislative requirements or changes sorry
26		are are required. Does that make sense?

And specifically for legislation under the AER's 1 0 2 jurisdiction, like the pipeline legislation --3 That -- and it -- I wouldn't know exactly -- the full Α 4 extent of what -- what is going to be required. think that would be a really exhaustive process, 5 6 pending the decision of this, of figuring out what that 7 would have to look like or even if the Government of Alberta would entertain it. I -- I don't have enough 8 9 knowledge now to say whether they would or not. 10 mentioned, those are discussions that are typically 11 deferred until a decision's been made. 12 Okay. And I -- I don't want to get off --0 13 Α M-hm. 14 -- topic here, but anything regarding the Municipal 0 Government Act or that area of legislation? 15 Yeah, we'd like to -- likely have to look if that 16 Α 17 interfaces with the MGA as well with -- the Municipal Government Act, yes. 18 19 Thank you. 0 20 Yes. Α 21 THE CHAIR: Does that summarize your 22 questions? 23 No more questions. D. BREZINA: Thanks. 24 THE CHAIR: Thanks, Counsel. So the Panel may, I think, have questions, but we 25 will take a brief break to caucus, and then we'll come 26

back and ask our questions. 1 Thanks for your patience. So I'm targeting 20 past. 2 That's a test of my 3 punctuality. (ADJOURNMENT) 4 THE CHAIR: 5 So we have some questions for 6 the panel, for individual members of the panel. Commissioner McNaughtan, please go ahead. Thank you, Madam Chair. 8 E. MCNAUGHTAN: 9 The Panel Questions Developers Group Witness Panel 10 0 E. MCNAUGHTAN: Thank you for your -- your 11 evidence this morning. 12 I have a question for Mr. Marchese, please, of Avillia. First of all, you mentioned an experience --13 14 I think it was in Quarry Landing; is that correct? south of -- with two pipelines south of the Horse 15 Hills --16 I'm sorry. I missed the first 17 Α J. MARCHESE: part of that. I didn't hear that. 18 19 Tn --0 20 E. DIXON: I -- I hesitate to rise, but I 21 am having difficulty hearing. 22 E. MCNAUGHTAN: Okay. Sorry about that. 23 Having a lifetime of being told I mumble, I apologize. 24 apologize. 25 E. MCNAUGHTAN: You mentioned, I believe, this 26 morning your experience with two pipelines -- crossing

- two pipelines in -- was it Quarry Landing, just south
- of -- so an Imperial pipeline and a Pembina pipeline?
- 3 A J. MARCHESE: That's correct.
- 4 Q And in your submission, you point to the Pembina
- 5 pipeline, you give some numbers about the cost you
- 6 expect at that crossing, you put it in your estimate of
- development, and that was -- you budgeted \$300,000 for
- 8 that crossing?
- 9 A That's correct. Our office had budgeted \$300,000.
- 10 Q As a preliminary --
- 11 A Correct.
- 12 0 -- sort of?
- And when you spoke about Imperial's crossing
- experience, they charged you approximately \$20,000 for
- an engineering study but no further cost. Was further
- 16 work done on the crossing? Did Imperial do work? Did
- 17 you do work?
- 18 A To my knowledge, there was no additional work that was
- 19 being done. It was just paying for the impact
- 20 assessment, and that was it.
- 21 Q So then you expected that there would be work at the
- 22 Pembina crossing that needed to be done, and you had
- 23 budgeted \$300,000 for that; correct?
- 24 A Our -- our original budget would have been 300,000. It
- 25 would assume just the proper surface structure in order
- 26 to cross the pipelines to protect the integrity of the

- 1 pipeline. So that --
- 3 A That would have been the budgeted cost estimate for a
- 4 preliminary budget.
- 5 Q Okay. Thank you.
- 6 And then I understand that what changed was a
- 5 backstopping agreement that -- am I still mumbling?
- 8 Sorry.
- 9 A No. No.
- 10 That's correct. We -- we -- we later had a
- 11 backstopping agreement that came to us in order to
- cross the pipe -- Pembina pipeline of the \$1.3 million
- originally. Yes, that's correct.
- 14 Q Okay. Thank you.
- 15 And just to point out, my interest is that we have
- heard quite a number of different cost estimates given
- to us of what potential crossing work would cost,
- anywhere from zero to one over a million dollars. And
- 19 I wanted some clarity on what a zero-cost estimate
- 20 might entail. So thank you very much.
- 21 A Okay. Thank you.
- 22 THE CHAIR: Commissioner Robinson.
- 23 H. ROBINSON: Thank you very much,
- 24 Madam Chair.
- 25 Q H. ROBINSON: Ms. Rowe, I -- I think I heard
- 26 you, when you were speaking to due diligence, would

1 make inquiries of pipeline operators about age of 2 pipeline, condition, depth, those sorts of things, to 3 help make an informed decision during that 90-day sort of window that you had to do that. 4 5 I thought I heard you say that the companies sort 6 of seldom got back to you. That suggests to me that 7 sometimes they did. Can you speak to -- or help me understand, you know, if they did, when they did, what 8 did -- what did that look like, and, you know --9 recently, as -- or are you talking about the distant 10 11 past? 12 K. ROWE: Thank you for the question. Α I don't have any experiences where I've received 13 14 meaningful information within a due diligence period. The example I gave where it took us 16 months to get a 15 16 crossing -- sorry -- a proximity agreement -- we 17 submitted a request on December 7th, for example, for a proximity agreement. On December 10th, Pembina 18 19 responded that they received our request. From that 20 time, we followed up, we followed up, we followed up. We didn't really receive any relevant or material 21 22 information for a very long time. Thank you. 23 24 Is there alternative ways to get information, you 25 know, about the -- more than just where the pipelines 26 are that perhaps anyone from the Developers Group sort

1		of is interested in or or has successfully tapped
2		into to help with your due diligence?
3	А	C. NICHOLAS: I I know of no helpful
4		database of the the obviously, the alignment you
5		have, the depth. We can sometimes look back and see
6		how old the pipeline is, but as far as depths and
7		condition and/or the construction thereof, I I
8		we've had no luck in finding any of that information
9		and rely on the operators to provide.
10	Q	Okay. And if if I'm hearing you right, I think a
11		theme in your submissions is that the lack of
12		transparency and timeliness in your dealings with
13		pipeline companies when alterations are required due to
14		new road crossings diminishes your sort of capacity to
15		do your due diligence and make informed decisions with
16		respect to future development. I think I've got that
17		right, and I see some nodding.
18		I've also, I think, heard you clearly say
19		because I think part of our our job is to determine
20		what is or isn't in the public interest that cost
21		sharing you jumped to sort of the end and suggest
22		cost sharing ought to be part of the public interest.
23		I'm wondering, in relation to transparency,
24		timing, you know, you might call this "business
25		efficacy" that relates back to your ability to then
26		exercise due diligence. Is business efficacy something
l		

```
that, you know, would or could form part of the public
 1
 2
         interest, if we can isolate that, or does that make no
 3
         sense?
         I -- I think that's well said. I don't think --
 4
     Α
 5
         that -- that phrase hadn't occurred to me, but, as the
 6
         Panel can respect, like, we -- we deal in the
 7
         regulatory process, and our timelines are long, but we
         deal with a very stringent set of rules, whether it be
 8
 9
         provincially or municipally, which, obviously, would --
10
         which governs ethics. There's no such guideline, so
11
         terms of -- or -- terms of engagement and -- and
12
         business ethics, expectations on both sides, which
13
         amounts -- which I think -- if I'm interpreting wrong,
14
         please correct me -- is a collaboration, which that's
15
         very much what we deal with within our government
16
         agencies.
                    We -- I -- I think that's right, yeah.
17
         it well.
         K. ANDERSON:
18
                                We --
     Α
         There's also an element of --
19
     0
20
              Oh, I -- I apologize. Please -- please go ahead.
21
         No, maybe just -- sorry. Maybe just as a quick
     Α
22
         follow-up.
23
              In terms of that question of business efficacy and
24
         ensuring that we have a predictable regulatory
25
         environment, I think -- I think that is truly at the --
         at the core. It's less about which dollar or which
26
```

1 month some part of a long-term planning process occurs 2 and more about can we try to streamline it, and can we 3 predict it, and can -- if you're a developer, can you actually go to your bank and, you know, transact on 4 that kind of assumption. And that's -- that's one of 5 6 the pieces that's missing from that business efficacy 7

point of view with respect to this situation.

Thanks. 8 0

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Α

A question I have too is: I mean, there's the public interest elements under Section 33, and then there's the question of discretion in that little May -- in -- in the section and what might persuade us to trigger the discretion to issue an order, and this tracks back to this -- what I'm hearing around transparency, the timeliness, and the effects of that on due diligence.

So in addition to the question of whether it could or should form part of the public interest -- which I don't know -- could or should it inform the activation of our discretion to issue an order at all, this question of dealings and perhaps dealings over the last three or four years inform our -- the activation of our discretion?

- 25 Yeah. Thanks. 0
- 26 Apologize for the --Α C. NICHOLAS: Okay.

Can we just take a moment to caucus?

```
1
         I'm just trying to get this.
                                        I quess the question --
 2
         the answer to the question is, and use at the Panel's
 3
         discretion, is yes. Love some discretion in terms
 4
         of --
 5
         THE CHAIR:
                                   Could you speak up --
 6
     Α
         C. NICHOLAS:
                                 Sorry.
 7
         THE CHAIR:
                                   -- or bring the mic closer?
                                 Love -- yes, we would -- we
 8
     Α
         C. NICHOLAS:
 9
         would encourage discretion in -- in -- in public
10
         interest, not only -- but I want to just clarify.
11
         not only in the -- the due diligence period.
12
         construct these facilities that we -- like roads which
13
         we build for the neighbourhood. We can't build roads
14
         because the same unreactiveness, lack of transparency.
         So utilizing your discretion, it's -- it's -- it'd be
15
16
         wholistic of the request of this panel.
17
         H. ROBINSON:
                                 Any other thoughts on -- in
     0
         relation to my question?
18
19
         S. FASH:
                                 Yeah.
                                        Maybe I'll try to
     Α
20
                  So I think getting this -- this clarity
         expand.
21
         through this process is -- is critical. As mentioned,
22
         it's not just through the due diligence phase, it's
         then when you're actually able to begin construction.
23
24
              So last year in Alberta, we probably needed to
         double our housing starts to meet up with the
25
26
         actual in-migration of -- of -- of new residents to the
```

1		province. That's despite Calgary building more homes
2		than they've ever built, Edmonton building above its
3		ten-year average. We're expecting those same pressures
4		that are facing that have faced Calgary the past
5		couple of years to start in Edmonton. I'm sure we've
6		already seen it in in demand.
7		So it's the due diligence phase to kind of get
8		that project ready, going, buy the land, get the
9		approvals. Beyond that, it's missing consecutive
10		construction seasons. You're putting housing out
11		five-plus years as a result of that.
12		So getting the clarity here, I think, then gives
13		the industry the ability to kind of activate much
14		more confidently knowing that there has been
15		potentially a precedent set or discretion used by this
16		panel on matters related to this. I hope that answers
17		the question.
18	Q	Yeah, that that, as you said, expands on the initial
19		answer, so thank you for entertaining my my
20		questions.
21		H. ROBINSON: That that's it from me,
22		Madam Chair.
23		THE CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you very
24		much.
25	Q	THE CHAIR: So I have some questions for
26		you as well. Where do I begin?

1		So this should be just a clarification question
2		for you, Mr. Fash. You mentioned that you're
3		advocating that the industry pay for the crossing but
4		the pipeline company pays for the for the upgrades
5		that may be required as a result of it. Did I
6		understand you correctly?
7	A	S. FASH: Yeah. That's in discussion
8		with the developers who are being impacted by this
9		within the Edmonton region, as well as those who
10		operate in other jurisdictions where this has not been
11		an issue, the standard practice has been industry funds
12		a crossing to protect the integrity of the pipe.
13		Anything required beyond that is is required or
14		should be funded by the the pipeline company.
15	Q	And by "industry", you mean development industry?
16	A	Development industry, yes. Sorry.
17	Q	Thank you.
18	А	Sorry. Yeah.
19		And I correct me if I'm wrong, but that's based
20		on our initial conversations that would you know, if
21		we were to have to go down that route of trying to look
22		at legislative or regulatory change, that would be kind
23		of the the starting point for those discussions.
24	Q	And that's irrespective of new or existing crossing; is
25		that correct?
26		Let's say there is a rural road that you need to

1 upgrade, such as the Meridian Street here, or there is 2 a brand-new crossing that happens as a result of 3 development, irrespective of that, that's what you're advocating for? 4 5 Yes, that's likely what we'd be advocating for, again, Α 6 pending the -- the -- the outcome of this, yes. 7 And I see heads nodding from the executives of the 0 8 development companies as well. Okay. Thank you. 9 G. FITCH: Madam Chair, again, we're 10 having trouble at the back here. 11 THE CHAIR: I apologize. I'm a lifelong 12 whisperer. Now I am chairing. It's an adjustment. 13 THE CHAIR: So that answers my question. 0 14 Now, I have a question for Ms. Anderson and 15 Mr. Fash. You both represent advocacy groups for a specific industry, but this challenge of Edmonton 16 17 growing, specific to Edmonton, is now a real challenge for development industry to know how to deal with the 18 pipeline crossings. 19 20 In your work with the stakeholders and advocacy 21 work, have you engaged any of the pipeline companies, 22 pipeline representatives? 23 K. ANDERSON: Neither of us have engaged 24 with the pipeline companies directly. 25 Okay. Thank you. 0

So at a policy level or at a broader perspective,

26

```
1
         there hasn't been any?
 2
         S. FASH:
                                      And I think from our end,
                                No.
 3
         we haven't kind of gotten into that policy discussion
 4
         with -- with government. Again, we're -- we're always
 5
         trying to be very careful and respectful of any
 6
         regulatory process that may be in place, so it's --
 7
         it's been kind of a -- high-level introductory
         discussions with government. Our anticipation would
 8
 9
         be -- you know, again, pending the outcome of this
10
         decision is that is where we would kind of engage more
11
         fulsomely, both the Government of Alberta, but then
12
         also, obviously, the other stakeholders, those being
13
         the -- the pipeline operators.
14
         Okay.
                Thank you very much.
     0
15
              Now, this question is specific to Marquis JV.
         Yesterday we had a panel member, a witness from ARA,
16
17
         and they gave me a little bit of a lesson on how the
18
         levy system works. But in the evidence that has been
19
         filed and submissions of different parties, as I read
20
         it, the Marquis JV at the intersection of 172 chose not
21
         to take the levy route and absorb the cost of the
22
         crossing.
                    So can you elaborate why that was, how
23
         that -- and how is it being reimbursed, the details of
24
         it?
                                 I'll -- I'll try to give you
25
     Α
         C. NICHOLAS:
26
         the details without getting into the weeds.
                                                       It's not a
```

choice. Arterial roads are identified based on -- you 1 2 know, like, they're identified through the statutory 3 planning process, and those are roads that -- that -one step away from, you know, a -- a highway; right? 4 So if it's an arterial road, it goes into a levy cost 5 6 shareable. A collector road, which -- and this is all based on volume of traffic, based -- easiest way: 7 can't be shareable. It's -- it has to be absorbed. 8 collector and/or a local has to be absorbed by the 9 10 neighbourhood or -- or the ownership of the land. 11 So it's just not -- it wasn't a choice for us not 12 to take this to a steering committee. It's just not a 13 leviable item, unfortunately. We just have to -- we have to absorb it -- or the -- my residents have to 14 absorb it in the end, unfortunately. 15 That clarifies it very well. Thank you. 16 0 Okay. 17 And that is all my questions. Thank you very I appreciate your time. 18 much. 19 D. BREZINA: Excuse me. 20 THE CHAIR: Sure. 21 D. BREZINA: Sorry. I have a few follow-up 22 questions if that's okay. 23 THE CHAIR: Sure. Go ahead. 24 D. Brezina Re-cross-examines Directors Group Witness 25 Panel 26 So given that this is an 0 D. BREZINA:

application by Qualico under Section 33 to direct 1 2 Plains and Pembina to alter pipelines, I'm curious how 3 this panel, the Developers Group -- how they think that the -- the AER, the decision-makers, can do what is 4 being asked for on page 16 of the Developer Group 5 6 written submissions of December 13, 2023. I'm just curious how you think that this panel can 8 direct certain policy things. Or is this more a legal 9 question that --10 G. FITCH: Yeah. 11 D. BREZINA: -- Gavin's going to answer? 12 Okay. 13 G. FITCH: Well, I -- what I'm going to 14 say is I do think it's a legal question, and it's one that we're prepared to address and will address in 15 16 final argument. 17 D. BREZINA: Okay. G. FITCH: I don't think it's really 18 19 appropriate for the witness panel --20 D. BREZINA: That's fine. Thank you. 21 G. FITCH: -- in my respectful view. 22 A. HUXLEY: And just one more question for 23 this panel. 24 A. Huxley Re-cross-examines Directors Group Witness 25 Panel 26 0 A. HUXLEY: I'm just wondering, as you've

```
talked about the differences in the Edmonton region
 1
         versus elsewhere in the province, if there's any
 2
 3
         reasoning for that that you're aware of or finding that
 4
         things are more difficult in Edmonton Metro than
         elsewhere?
 5
 6
     Α
         S. FASH:
                                 No.
                                      Honestly, I -- we --
 7
         we -- we haven't really been able to figure out what
         the difference is other than, necessarily, the parties
 8
 9
         involved.
                    That's been really the only differentiating
10
         factor, and -- and, you know, these are anecdotal
11
         discussions I'm having with the developers in, again,
12
         Grande Prairie, Red Deer, Calgary, and Edmonton.
13
         seemingly related to the Edmonton region and with the
14
         specific operators that we're talking about here
15
         through these hearings.
         Okay.
16
     0
17
     Α
         Yeah.
         THE CHAIR:
                                   Is that all?
18
                                                 Okay.
19
              Thank you very much, everyone, and thank you, the
20
         witness panel, for your time. I'm assuming you all
21
         came from Edmonton, so ...
22
         (WITNESS PANEL STANDS DOWN)
23
         THE CHAIR:
                                   And next on our agenda -- so
24
         the Panel is released. Thank you for that.
25
              Next on our agenda, we have Brookfield.
26
         have scheduled you for after lunch, but we are still
```

- 1 ways away from lunch, so I'm wondering if you're
- 2 prepared to proceed, or ...
- 3 E. DIXON: Good morning, Madam Chair.
- 4 Brookfield is certainly prepared to proceed at this
- 5 moment if that -- if that's the preference of the
- 6 Panel?
- 7 THE CHAIR: Just before we proceed.
- 8 Mr. Fitch, you stood up, and I -- I missed an item
- 9 on my agenda. Did you have any re-direct for this
- 10 panel?
- 11 E. APPELT: No -- no re-direct. Thank
- 12 you.
- 13 THE CHAIR: No re-direct.
- 14 Thank you. I apologize.
- 15 So if you're -- do you want a bit of a break, or
- 16 you're happy to proceed right away?
- 17 E. DIXON: I think if we just have three
- 18 or four minutes to clear the panel and get my panel
- 19 seated, we're certainly prepared to proceed at that
- 20 point.
- 21 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
- 22 (DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD)
- 23 THE CHAIR: Whenever you're ready,
- 24 Mr. Dixon.
- 25 E. DIXON: Good morning, Madam Chair,
- 26 Members of the Panel. Once again, my name is Evan

Dixon, and I am counsel to Brookfield Residential 1 2 Alberta LP, who, for the purposes of my presentation, I 3 will simply refer to either as "Brookfield" or "Brookfield Residential". 4 If it would be convenient now, Madam Chair, I 5 6 would ask that the witnesses be sworn or affirmed. THE CHAIR: Yes, please. 8 If you may swear the witnesses, that would be 9 great. PETER TSOUKALAS, Sworn 10 11 RICHARD WESTREN, Affirmed 12 Direct Evidence of Brookfield Residential Alberta 13 Limited Witness Panel 14 THE CHAIR: Please proceed, Mr. Dixon. 15 E. DIXON: Thank you, Madam Chair. It is my great privilege to introduce the panel 16 17 for Brookfield. Sitting closest to you, we have Mr. Rich Westren; and next to Mr. Westren, closest to 18 19 me, is Mr. Peter Tsoukalas. 20 E. DIXON: I have a few short questions Q 21 for you, gentlemen, following which -- I understand, 22 Mr. Westren, that you have prepared an opening 23 statement. After that, I -- obviously, my 24 E. DIXON: 25 panel will be available for cross.

Mr. Tsoukalas, can you please

26

0

E. DIXON:

- 1 confirm your name and current position with Brookfield.
- 2 A P. TSOUKALAS: Peter Tsoukalas, director of
- 3 planning and development.
- 4 Q And, Mr. Tsoukalas, can you confirm that your
- 5 curriculum vitae has been filed with the Regulator as
- 6 Exhibit 77.2 in this proceeding?
- 7 A Yes.
- 8 Q And, Mr. Tsoukalas, does your CV accurately describe
- 9 your education, work background, and professional
- 10 qualifications?
- 11 A Yes, it does.
- 12 Q And can you please describe for the Panel, sir, what
- your role and responsibility was with respect to the
- evidence that has been filed on behalf of Brookfield in
- this proceeding as Exhibits 25.01, which is
- Brookfield's request to participate, and 65.01, which
- is Brookfield's written submission.
- 18 A I have assisted with the preparation and review of the
- 19 written submission filed on behalf of Brookfield
- 20 Residential.
- 21 Q And can you confirm, sir, that the evidence that you
- 22 prepared is accurate and true, to the best of your
- 23 knowledge and belief?
- 24 A Yes.
- 25 Q Mr. Tsoukalas, can you confirm that in preparing for
- this hearing, you reviewed the evidence submitted by

1 Keyera Corp. in this proceeding, which is referred to as "Exhibit 72.01"? 2 3 Yes, I have. Α 4 And, Mr. Tsoukalas, do you have any specific comments or response to any of the evidence that was filed on 5 6 behalf of Keyera that you wish to provide the Panel 7 today? Based on my review of the -- of Keyera's 8 Α Yes. submission, some of the dates referenced in 9 10 paragraph 10 do not align with my understanding of what 11 happened or with the internal records I have reviewed 12 in preparation for the -- this hearing. However, none 13 of the -- none of this is material in terms of 14 impacting the general narrative regarding the timelines provided by both Keyera and Brookfield. 15 There is, however, one specific point made by 16 17 Keyera at paragraph 11 of its written submission that 18 Brookfield would like to clarify for the Panel. 19 paragraph 11, Keyera states it did not cancel 20 Brookfield's existing proximity agreement, as alleged 21 in paragraph 58 in Brookfield's submissions. 22 Keyera understands that the agreement expired on its 23 terms. At that particular time in question, April 2021, 24 25 Brookfield was a party to a hydrovac crossing agreement 26 with Keyera that was valid until October 2021.

- 1 Brookfield was also still awaiting approval of a
- 2 submitted application for a earthworks proximity
- 3 agreement from Keyera submitted January 27, 2021.
- 4 Keyera advised Brookfield mid-March 2021 that this
- 5 request was in the field for approval and the agreement
- 6 would be provided as soon as possible.
- 7 On April 15th, 2021, without prior notice or
- 8 advisement, Keyera advised Brookfield that it was
- 9 suspending the hydrovac crossing agreement for an
- 10 indefinite period and as well had rejected the
- 11 submitted proximity -- pardon me -- proximity
- 12 agreement. No explanation for these were provided at
- 13 the time by Keyera other than their indication that:
- 14 (as read)
- 15 There were larger agreements in play right
- now that Brookfield can speak to, and for now
- 17 can we keep you [meaning Brookfield]
- 18 30 metres away for the time being?
- 19 My recollection was that Brookfield was -- did not know
- 20 why Keyera had cancelled the agreement. We can only
- 21 surmise that Keyera was reacting to Brookfield's
- 22 advising that it intended to bring an application
- 23 forward to the AER at that point in time.
- 24 As set out in Brookfield's evidence submitted in
- 25 the proceeding, Keyera's retaliatory actions in
- 26 cancelling or failing to issue what otherwise would

- 1 have been routine agreements to the course of business
- was why Brookfield did not bring its own application
- 3 through Section 33 of the Pipelines Act to the AER and
- 4 why it initially refrained from intervening in
- 5 Qualico's application.
- 6 Q And, Mr. Tsoukalas, can you confirm that during the
- 7 time period you just described that you were
- 8 responsible for corresponding and coordinating with
- 9 Keyera on behalf of Brookfield in respect of its
- 10 Orchards developments, as discussed in your written
- 11 evidence?
- 12 A Yes, I had overall responsibility for the project at
- the time, but the primary correspondence and
- 14 communications were with our consultant Stantec, but I
- 15 was copied on all correspondence.
- 16 Q Thank you, Mr. Tsoukalas.
- 17 And does this conclude your direct evidence at
- 18 this time?
- 19 A Yes.
- 20 O Mr. Westren, turning to you. Can I please have you
- 21 confirm your name and current position with Brookfield.
- 22 A MR. WESTREN: Yes. Rich Westren, senior
- vice president of land development.
- 24 Q And, Mr. Westren, can you confirm for the Panel that
- 25 your curriculum vitae was filed the Regulator as
- 26 Exhibit 77.03 in this proceeding?

- 1 A Yes, it was.
- 2 Q And, Mr. Westren, does your CV accurately describe
- 3 your education, work background, and professional
- 4 qualifications?
- 5 A Yes.
- 6 Q And, Mr. Westren, can you please describe for the Panel
- 7 what your role and responsibility was with respect to
- 8 the evidence that has been filed on behalf of
- 9 Brookfield as Exhibits 25.01, namely Brookfield's
- 10 request to participate, and 65.01 of Brookfield's
- 11 written submission, and what aspects of the evidence
- 12 you will be speaking to in this proceeding.
- 13 A Yes. I was involved in the preparation of the written
- evidence filed on behalf of Brookfield. I will be
- 15 providing Brookfield's corporate evidence and position
- for all aspects of this proceeding other than what has
- been spoken by Mr. Tsoukalas next to me.
- 18 O And, Mr. Westren, can you confirm that all of the
- materials/evidence previously mentioned were prepared
- 20 under your direction and control?
- 21 A Yes, that is correct.
- 22 Q And do you have any corrections that you wish to make
- 23 to the evidence at this time?
- 24 A No, I don't.
- 25 O And, Mr. Westren, is the evidence that has been filed
- on behalf of Brookfield in this proceeding accurate and

1 true, to the best of your knowledge and belief? 2 Α Yes. 3 And, Mr. Westren, do you adopt this evidence as the 0 4 evidence of Brookfield in respect of this proceeding? 5 Yes, I do. Α 6 And, Mr. Westren, I understand that you have prepared 7 an opening statement on behalf of Brookfield. 8 ask you now to please read your opening statement into 9 the record. 10 Α Good afternoon, Members of the Panel, Counsel, and 11 participants. My name is Rich Westren. I am senior 12 vice president for land development in Alberta for 13 Brookfield. I am joined by my colleague Peter 14 Tsoukalas, director of planning and development for Brookfield. We are pleased to be here today 15 representing Brookfield and acting as Brookfield's 16 17 witnesses in these proceedings. Brookfield is a large North American land 18 19 development and housing company. We have significant 20 operations in Alberta dating back over 65 years. 21 entitle and develop land to create communities; we also 22 build and sell homes. 23 Brookfield's position with respect to the subject 24 matter of these proceedings is fairly straightforward. 25 Brookfield believes and is advocating for a fair, 26 transparent, and efficient process with respect to the

- 1 interaction between developers and pipeline owners when
- 2 it comes to working together to move, lower, upgrade,
- 3 or simply cross or work in proximity to existing
- 4 pipelines.
- In Brookfield's experience, as has been set out in
- 6 the evidence filed on behalf of Brookfield and as will
- 7 be borne by our testimony here, the current process is
- 8 none of these things.
- 9 Brookfield strongly believes that there is an
- 10 intersection between the public good that pipelines
- 11 provide and the public good that real estate
- 12 development provides. Both endeavours contribute to
- 13 Alberta's economy, employ -- and employ tens of
- 14 thousands of people as well as supplying goods and
- 15 services vital to Albertans' well-being.
- Both endeavours represented by the applicant and
- 17 its supporters and the respondent pipeline companies
- 18 are in the public interest, and what -- what -- pardon
- 19 me -- and whatever other evidence is provided by
- 20 Brookfield at this hearing, Brookfield's position is
- 21 not that the public good provided by one industry or
- 22 the other is of greater importance or value; rather,
- 23 Brookfield's position is that the construction and
- 24 production of communities as well as the existence of
- 25 pipelines must both continue to exist and to coexist.
- 26 This requires a predictable, fair, and equitable

- 1 solution to how costs are to be allocated in situations
- 2 where pipelines must be relocated or altered to allow
- 3 development to proceed.
- 4 This can only be accomplished by a positive
- 5 decision from the Alberta Energy Regulator in this
- 6 proceeding confirming that such a mechanism is
- 7 available in the overall public interest.
- 8 It is where existing and proposed roads cross
- 9 pipelines where consider -- considerations of what is
- 10 in the public interest are most on display as is -- as
- 11 in the present case. Fair, transparent, and efficient
- 12 cooperation between developers and pipeline companies
- 13 serve the interests of the public.
- 14 Conversely, it can be a disservice if it is
- 15 allowed to become bogged down in corporate bureaucracy
- 16 or -- or petty "who matters most" philosophies. We can
- 17 and should work together to create successful, safe
- 18 communities where developers and pipelines coexist and
- 19 where both players contribute collaboratively to the
- 20 safety and success, all contributing to the public
- 21 well-being.
- 22 Some of the respondents have questioned the
- 23 appropriateness of Brookfield's involvement in this
- 24 hearing. They have collectively argued that
- 25 Brookfield's experience in other developments or with
- 26 different pipeline operators is irrelevant to the

- 1 question at hand. In response to that, we say that it
- 2 is precisely this uncooperative, misaligned, and
- 3 unproductive attitude that has too long characterized
- 4 Brookfield and many other developers' interaction with
- 5 pipelines as developers work to build new communities
- 6 and provide much-needed housing for Alberta's growing
- 7 cities and towns.
- 8 Further, as Brookfield discussed in its request to
- 9 participate in this hearing, Brookfield originally
- 10 refrained from participating in the original proceeding
- 11 at the time it was negotiating the relocation of
- 12 pipeline infrastructure with Keyera, and Brookfield was
- 13 concerned that seeking to participate as an intervenor
- in respect to Qualico's amended application or even
- 15 filing its own separate application would prejudice its
- 16 negotiation -- negotiating position and negatively
- 17 impact its ability to meet the commercial timelines
- 18 associated with this development.
- 19 You will also hear the pipeline companies arguing
- 20 that since the pipeline predated the purchase of or the
- 21 development of the land it runs beneath, the developer
- 22 knew or ought to have known that there would be cost to
- 23 protecting, relocating, or altering the pipeline in
- 24 some way. To this, we say: Of course we do.
- 25 But there is a major difference between
- 26 conceptually knowing that there might be some work

- 1 required to run municipally required roadways overtop
- 2 of a pipeline and the realities of how communities and
- 3 cities are actually built and who ultimately pays the
- 4 cost for that.
- 5 To conclude these opening remarks, allow me to
- 6 provide some colour surrounding the process that we are
- 7 hoping can emerge from this hearing. Brookfield is
- 8 advocating for the AER to make the correct decision
- 9 which would greatly assist in establishing a fairer
- 10 playing field and would undoubtably assist in creating
- 11 an industry-wide standard process for negotiating with
- 12 pipelines that is fair, transparent, and efficient.
- In order to be fair, the costs of the
- 14 investigation, design work, and work for pipeline
- 15 crossings and alterations needs to be shared. We will
- 16 argue that each of the pipelines and the developers
- 17 receive benefit from the work, and so each should
- 18 contribute financially to it. That is fair. A process
- 19 that requires one party to bear the entirety of the
- 20 cost for the work that benefit both is commercially
- 21 unreasonable.
- In order for the process to be transparent, both
- 23 parties engaged in negotiation need access to the same
- 24 information. The asymmetry and access to information,
- 25 particularly with respect to the age, status, and life
- 26 cycle of pipelines, as well as the costs associated

- 1 with the work that is strictly required and then what
- 2 is nice to have has led to an inequity of bargaining
- 3 powder -- power that exacerbates the relationship
- 4 between the parties and can lead to bad faith
- 5 negotiations.
- 6 This asymmetry to -- pardon me. This asymmetry in
- 7 access to information can be highlighted by the fact
- 8 that during the course of this proceeding, Brookfield
- 9 asked Keyera to respond to an informal request relating
- 10 to two integrity digs in late 2017 on the Rimbey
- 11 pipeline in -- in proximity to the 66th Street crossing
- 12 discussed in Brookfield's written evidence at
- 13 paragraphs 49 to 62.
- 14 Brookfield's request was made in response to
- 15 Keyera refuting the notion that certain alterations or
- 16 upgrades to pipelines that are paid for by developers
- 17 may represent a potential windfall or other type of
- 18 benefit to the pipeline companies. In response, Keyera
- 19 refused to respond or provide any information
- 20 officially on the proceeding record relating -- related
- 21 to these two integrity digs on the basis that the
- 22 information isn't relative -- sorry -- isn't relevant
- 23 while also indicating that it would be happy to discuss
- 24 with Brookfield directly, a promise which rings hollow
- 25 given Brookfield's experience to date.
- And, thirdly, in order for the process to be

- 1 efficient, there needs to be regulatory guidance issued
- 2 by the AER that provides much-needed clarity to all
- 3 parties. A positive decision by the AER applying
- 4 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act will encourage more
- 5 constructive dialogue and, hopefully, serve to limit
- 6 undue and potentially vindictive delays and the
- 7 resultant financial hardship such as those encountered
- 8 by Brookfield in respect to its Orchards development.
- 9 In summary, Brookfield submits that the original
- 10 decision under reconsideration -- pardon me. In
- 11 summary, Brookfield submits that the original decision
- 12 under reconsideration incorrectly concludes that
- developers cannot rely on Section 33 of the Pipeline
- 14 Act when a dispute arises over the allocation of costs
- 15 of a pipeline relocation.
- 16 The result of the decision exacerbates --
- 17 exacerbated the difficulties already faced by property
- 18 developers and had a number of negative consequences on
- 19 the development of lands in proximity to or crossing
- 20 pipeline facilities.
- 21 For the reason discussed in my opening statement
- 22 as well as the evidence filed on behalf of Brookfield
- 23 in this proceeding, Brookfield respectfully requests
- 24 the AER confirm that an equitable -- sorry -- confirm
- 25 that an equitable cost sharing formula for the pipeline
- 26 crossings at issue in Qualico's application is in the

1		public interest.
2		Brookfield respectfully submits that it is
3		imperative for the AER to establish a workable
4		precedent that parties like Brookfield, Qualico, and
5		other land developers, and, in fact, all all
6		industries represented in this proceeding, can rely on
7		in order to move development projects ahead in a
8		predictable and timely manner. This would align with
9		the economic, orderly, and efficient development of
10		pipelines called for by the Pipeline Act and would
11		clearly be in the best interest of the public.
12		Thank you.
13	Q	Thank you, Mr. Westren.
14		I have one final question for you. Just to be
15		clear, Mr. Westren, does Brookfield support Qualico's
16		current application?
17	A	Yes, we do.
18	Q	Thank you.
19		E. DIXON: Madam Chair, that concludes
20		Brookfield's direct evidence, and the panel is now
21		available for cross-examination.
22		THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
23		So I'm going to turn to counsel from Pembina,
24		Plains, and SECURE. Do you wish to conduct your
25		cross-examination now, or you would rather to do it
26		after lunch, maybe 12:30?

1		D. NAFFIN: Madam Chair, Plains, Pembina,
2		and SECURE have no questions for this panel, so at
3		least there's no timing issue. Thank you.
4		THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you.
5		So I'm turning to counsel and staff for AER.
6		D. BREZINA: We have no questions. Thank
7		you.
8		THE CHAIR: Thank you.
9		So we have a couple of or maybe one, depending
10		on the answer, question for the panel.
11		The Panel Questions Brookfield Residential Alberta
12		Limited Witness Panel
13	Q	THE CHAIR: Thank you for coming and thank
14		you for your statement. My question is I if I
15		heard you correctly, you mentioned the work alteration,
16		relocation, et cetera, benefits both pipeline companies
17		and development companies. Can you elaborate on how it
18		would benefit the pipeline companies?
19	А	R. WESTREN: Thank you.
20		What what we're referring to by that work that
21		benefits the pipeline companies I think, similar to
22		earlier statements that were made is relating to the
23		upgrading or replacing or alterations of aging
24		infrastructure that that would clearly benefit both
25		parties.
26	Q	Thank you very much.

- 1 THE CHAIR: You're good?
- Okay. That summarizes our evidence, so --
- 3 sorry -- our questions. My apologies.
- 4 We don't have any further questions for your
- 5 panel, Mr. Dixon, so they can be released. Thank you
- 6 very much -- oh, do you have any re-direct?
- 7 E. DIXON: We do not have any re-direct,
- 8 and I wish to thank the Panel for its time this
- 9 morning. Thank you.
- 10 THE CHAIR: Thank you.
- 11 Thank you very much.
- 12 (WITNESS PANEL STANDS DOWN)
- 13 Discussion
- 14 THE CHAIR: So we are quite ahead of the
- 15 schedule, and we can adjourn for the day, or if you're
- 16 ready, Pembina, Plains, SECURE, we could go to your
- 17 direct.
- 18 T. MYERS: Thank you, Madam Chair.
- 19 As we indicated in one of our prior filings, the
- 20 witness panel is not ready to appear until tomorrow due
- 21 to a couple of the witnesses who aren't available
- 22 today, so, unfortunately, we'll have to get started in
- 23 the morning.
- 24 THE CHAIR: And you propose that you may
- 25 want to start a little bit earlier. Was that just
- 26 Friday or as well tomorrow?

- 1 T. MYERS: So the Pembina witness -- one
- of the Pembina witnesses is only available tomorrow, so
- 3 to the extent there are questions for Pembina
- 4 specifically, we'd ask that those questions get asked
- 5 tomorrow, given that he won't be available on Friday.
- 6 The rest of the panel as well as one of the Pembina
- 7 representatives is available on Friday, so, certainly,
- 8 they'll be ready to continue on the stand on Friday if
- 9 we don't get through everything tomorrow, but that was
- 10 the only scheduling issue.
- 11 And then the other scheduling issue is that two of
- 12 our expert witnesses are not available after the end of
- 13 the day on Friday, so we'd like to be wrapped up on
- 14 Friday, if at all possible, given that the -- the
- 15 current schedule has the Plains, Pembina, and SECURE
- 16 panel going into Monday. But, again, we heard back
- 17 from the AER on that advising that we think we can
- 18 likely get finished up by -- by the end of the day on
- 19 Friday.
- 20 THE CHAIR: I would suspect that we can.
- 21 Counsel, is it possible to ask your questions
- 22 tomorrow for Pembina witness -- that particular -- I
- 23 don't know if you know or not who that particular
- 24 witness may be.
- 25 G. FITCH: Madam Chair, it's Mr. Fitch
- 26 for Oualico.

- 1 So long as there's one Pembina witness available
- 2 on Friday, I don't see the fact that the other witness
- 3 is not available as a problem, so that would be my
- 4 first comment.
- 5 Secondly, I provided the AER with what were fairly
- 6 generous time estimates for cross-examination. I doubt
- 7 I will need all of that time, so I think there's a
- 8 reasonably good chance we could wrap everything, in
- 9 terms of the cross-examination of the Pembina, Plains,
- 10 SECURE witness panel, tomorrow, and if we don't, it
- 11 would just be a few kind of cleanups -- questions on
- 12 Friday morning.
- So I don't think we're going to have any problem
- 14 scheduling-wise if we adjourn now and reconvene
- 15 tomorrow.
- 16 THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you very much.
- 17 And is that satisfactory for you, Mr. Myers?
- 18 T. MYERS: Yeah, that's fine. And -- and
- 19 just in terms of the comment about one of the Pembina
- 20 witnesses still being available on Friday, it would be
- 21 our preference to have the panel appear as a complete
- 22 panel, both in terms of responding to -- to any
- 23 questions from my friends as well as responding from
- 24 questions from the Panel and AER counsel and staff.
- 25 So, again, if we can perhaps sit a little bit late
- 26 if it looks like we have a good chance of finishing up

- <u>?</u>	tomorrow, that would be our	proforman just to onguro
)		preference just to ensure
	you've got the benefit of ou	ur full panel before you
	for for any questions that	at might be asked.
	THE CHAIR: Tha	at is probably very doable.
	T. MYERS: That	ank you.
	THE CHAIR: Tha	ank you.
	So, with that, today's	session is adjourned, and
	see you tomorrow at 9:00.	
	PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED UNTIL	9:00 AM, MARCH 7, 2024

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT:
I, Derek Lopez, certify that the foregoing pages
are a complete and accurate transcript of the
proceedings taken down by us in shorthand and
transcribed from our shorthand notes to the best of our
skill and ability.
Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta,
this 6th day of March 2024.
/ ceny
2) Love y
D. Lopez, CSR(A), RPR
Official Court Reporter

	20-metre 233:18		accommodated	address 219:12
\$	2008 229:13	6	219:7	270:15
\$1.3 245:20	2010 227:22	62 284:13	accomplished 281:4	adds 226:9
259:12	2012 234:15	65 220:1 279:20	accounted	adjacent 228:24 231:23 240:23
\$20,000 245:8	2014 227:23	65.01 274:16	225:21	241:12 242:12,23
258:14	2017 247:6	278:10	accurate 216:11	adjourn 288:15
\$300,000 258:7,	284:10	66.01 216:5 228:8	228:11 235:3	290:14
9,23	2019 225:16	66th 240:23	240:3,10 244:12	adjourned
\$60,000 230:24	2021 238:15	284:11	274:22 278:26	291:7,10
\$830,000 241:15	248:24 275:24,26 276:3,4,7	6th 292:9	292:4	ADJOURNME
\$900,000-plus	2022 234:15		accurately 274:8	NT 257:4
230:25	241:7 242:1	7	278:2	adjustment
	248:24 253:7		achieve 226:14	267:12
1	2023 219:2,19	7 228:6 291:10	acquire 221:17	administered
4.200 - 1 - 1 - 1	238:15 242:14	72.01 275:2	acquired 221:17	214:23
1,300 247:14	253:10 270:6	77.03 277:26	237:18	administrative
1.5 219:4	2024 291:10	77.2 274:6	acquiring 221:5 235:9 239:17	222:17 224:5
10 234:24 275:10	292:9	7th 260:17		adopt 279:3
10th 260:18	25.01 274:15		Act 256:15,18 277:3 285:4,14	adopted 216:8
11 216:4 275:17,	278:9	9	286:10	224:19 240:1 248:10
19	25th 240:22		acting 279:16	advance 219:22
12 239:11	27 276:3	9 233:23	actions 276:25	
12:30 286:26		90 238:9	activate 265:13	advances 217:8
13 219:1 222:1	3	90-day 235:17	activation	advantageous 223:23
270:6	30 235:18 276:18	237:10 260:3	263:19,22	advise 213:20
15 228:2		9:00 291:8,10	active 249:13,20	advised 276:4,8
15th 276:7	300,000 258:24 33 263:10 270:1	9:01 213:1	253:23	advisement
16 238:15 244:2	277:3 285:4,13		actively 222:23	276:8
260:15 270:5	277.3 203.4,13	A	activities 224:9	advising 276:22
172 268:20	4	ability 221:4	actual 255:23	289:17
172nd 232:3	4	234:2 261:25	264:26	advocacy 219:19,
18 233:6 242:15	41st 232:22	265:13 282:17	adapt 226:8	21 247:20 252:19
180 216:20 235:19	45 225:15	292:7	added 218:24	254:10 267:15,20
1A 244:26	49 284:13	absorb 268:21	addition 222:19	advocate 249:2
1A 244.20		269:14,15	224:19 250:14	advocating
2	5	absorbed 269:8,9	263:17	266:3 267:4,5
		accept 230:3	additional 219:2	279:25 283:8
2 219:5	56,000 219:2	access 283:23,24	254:7,9,10	AER 213:15
20 215:23 219:6	58 275:21	284:7	258:18	255:1 270:4
240:16 257:2		accommodate	Additionally 242:11	276:23 277:3 283:8 285:2,3,24
		242:8	272.11	286:3 287:5

	l .		1	
289:17 290:5,24	Alberta 214:20	amendments	application	236:11,13 249:17
AER's 256:1	215:24 217:4,5,7,	224:23	226:21,26 228:15	256:15
affect 223:11	8,17,19 218:18	amenities 236:8	229:1 232:13	areas 217:11
224:20 234:2	219:11 234:20	America 218:17	238:25 239:1	225:4 237:18
affects 218:7	244:6 247:4,6,12	American	244:16,18 248:15 270:1 276:2,22	246:4
affirmation	248:1,10,14 251:8 252:1,18,	279:18	270:1 276:2,22 277:2,5 282:14,	argue 283:16
214:22	21 253:13,14	amounts 262:13	15 285:26 286:16	argued 281:24
affirmed 215:9	254:8 256:8	analysis 248:26	applies 213:22	arguing 282:19
273:6,11	264:24 268:11	and/or 239:22	255:16	argument 270:16
affordability	273:2,12 279:12,	261:7 269:9	apply 221:12	arisen 230:18
234:3 247:24	20 281:5 287:11	Anderson 214:14	1	arises 285:14
249:8 250:22,23	292:8	215:10,14,15,19	applying 285:3	arterial 269:1,5
251:18	Alberta's 226:2	216:7 217:22	appreciated 235:15	ascertain 249:3
affordable	248:19 280:13	226:20 227:11,12		asks 249:26
226:10	282:6	228:5 235:6,25	approach 220:16 229:9	
afternoon 279:10	Albertans	247:25 262:18		aspects 238:2 278:11,16
age 237:24 260:1	226:11	267:14,23	approaches 220:4	•
283:25	Albertans'	Anderson's		assessing 223:18
agencies 262:16	280:15	237:14	approaching	assessment
agenda 271:23,	align 275:10	anecdotal 271:10	246:21	231:8 236:4
25 272:9	286:8	angles 220:14	appropriateness	245:6,7 258:20
aging 287:23	alignment 261:4	Anne 233:24	281:23	assessments 236:3
agreed-upon	alleged 275:20	annexed 225:16	approval 276:1,5	
241:24	allocated 281:1	answers 265:16	approvals	assist 283:9,10
agreement	allocation 285:14	267:13	235:23,25 237:4 239:18 265:9	Assistant 253:10
230:1,5,15 232:9	allowable 242:11	anticipate 242:5,	approve 237:6	assisted 274:18
233:8 235:17	allowed 281:15	9	approve 237:6 approved 222:1,	association
238:14,16,18,19	alongside 238:17	anticipated	approved 222:1,	226:6 247:4
241:14,15,22,24	alter 270:2	242:21		associations
243:9 245:16,17,	alteration 218:11	anticipation	approximately 240:15 244:2	247:7
19 259:7,11	232:6 241:6	268:8	245:8 258:14	assume 258:25
260:16,18 275:20,22,25	287:15	apologies 288:3	April 238:15	assuming 271:20
276:3,5,9,12,20	alterations	apologize	275:24 276:7	assumption
agreements	261:13 283:15	257:23,24 262:20	ARA 268:16	263:5
220:4,12 229:9,	284:15 287:23	263:26 267:11		assumptions
15,19,20 230:10,	altered 281:2	272:14	arbitrary 231:6 246:17	221:14 236:15
24 238:12 243:8,	altering 282:23	appeal 253:12	architects 216:22	asymmetry
11 245:12,21	alternative	Appelt 214:2,4,		283:24 284:6
246:8 276:15	260:24	23,26 215:2,5,13,	area 218:17	ATCO 228:26
277:1	amalgamation	14 227:9,12	221:24 222:5,8 224:12 225:14,	attention 213:6,
ahead 215:2	247:5	254:16 272:11	18,22 226:13	25
252:17 257:7	amended 222:11	applicant 214:5	228:1 231:26	attitude 282:3
262:20 269:23	282:14	217:14 280:16	233:18 235:22	audio 213:21
286:7 288:14	202.11			
•				

	1	1	1	1
Avenue 232:3,22	basis 231:15	280:7	287:11	271:12 292:8
240:22	284:21	brand-new	Brookfield's	call 226:11 245:7
average 265:3	bear 225:1	233:24 267:2	274:16,17	261:24
Avillia 214:18	283:19	break 254:20	275:20,21	called 219:23
243:24 244:1,3,4,	begin 236:14	255:2 256:26	276:21,24 278:9,	224:18 232:8
15,18 246:3	264:23 265:26	272:15	10,15 279:16,23	286:10
257:13	behalf 216:24	breakdown	280:5,20,23	Canada 239:14
Avillia's 244:21	227:16 243:21	241:16 242:2	281:23,25	cancel 275:19
245:25 246:1,14	244:9 274:14,19	breakdowns	284:12,14,25	cancelled 276:20
avoid 223:4	275:6 277:9	231:8	286:20	
avoidable 213:12	278:8,14,26	Brezina 255:4,6	brought 213:5	cancelling
	279:7 280:6	256:23 269:19,	225:1 226:17,21	276:26
awaiting 276:1	285:22	21,24,26 270:11,	228:15 249:11	Cantiro 214:16
aware 230:14	belief 216:12	17,20 287:6	251:16	234:10,12,14,17,
240:26 250:20	228:12 235:4	briefly 214:13	budget 258:24	18,24 235:8,12
271:3	244:13 274:23	230:11 233:11	259:4	236:22 238:3,6,
	279:1	235:6 246:13	budgeted 258:7,	10,13,24
В	believes 220:3	247:11	9,23 259:3	capacity 261:14
	279:25 280:9	bring 213:25	build 234:18,19	capital 228:2
back 231:7 233:7	beneath 282:21	222:6 225:11	264:13 279:22	careful 268:5
249:24 254:3	benefit 213:10	264:7 276:22	282:5	case 222:26
257:1 260:6	283:17,20 284:18	277:2	builder 251:22	232:25 233:1,9,
261:5,25 263:14	287:18,24 291:2	brings 244:17	252:10	16,19 237:18
267:10 279:20	benefits 287:16,	248:15,25	builders 239:22	281:11
289:16	21	British 234:21	building 226:10	cash 236:16
background	BILD 214:19	244:6	247:3,15 252:8	cast 213:16,20
238:21 274:9	217:4,5,7,8,17,19		265:1,2	caucus 256:26
278:3	247:12 248:1,10,	broad 234:16	built 224:10	263:24
backstopping	14,19 252:1,18,	broader 249:1,3	229:13 265:2	Cavanagh
229:20 230:1,10,	21 254:8	267:26	283:3	240:17
14 233:8 245:17,	BILD's 250:15,	broadly 217:2	bureaucracy	central 218:19
19 246:8 259:7, 11	19	Brookfield	281:15	
		240:25 241:12	business 223:5	Centre 228:25
bad 284:4	bit 213:13 219:18 225:23 227:6	243:2,3,6 271:25	244:3 261:24,26	CEO 215:19
bank 263:4	241:13 248:26	272:4 273:1,3,4,	262:12,23 263:6	222:2 247:3
bargaining	268:17 272:15	12,17 274:1,14,	277:1	certainty 226:16
284:2	288:25 290:25	19 275:15,18,25	businesses 224:7	CERTIFICATE
base 251:26	board 219:3	276:1,4,8,16,17,		292:1
based 220:22	221:22 222:1,2	19 277:2,9,21	buy 265:8	certify 292:3
223:9 236:16	· ·	278:9,14,26	bylaw 222:14	cetera 237:25
238:6 251:26	boards 216:23	279:4,7,13,15,16,	224:20	287:16
266:19 269:1,7	bodies 222:17	18,25 280:6,9,20 282:4,8,9,12		Chair 213:3
275:8	body 253:12	283:7 284:8,24	C	214:2,21,25
basically 231:15	bogged 281:15	285:8,9,11,22,23		215:1,4,7,12
251:14 254:2	borne 252:2	286:2,4,15	Calgary 247:9	227:4,10 254:16,
		200.2, 1,13	249:14 265:1,4	

circle 254:3 colleague 279:13 concludes 254:14 18,23,26 256:21, 19.24 235:9.13 285:12 286:19 24 257:5,8 240:18 279:21 circumstances colleagues 259:22,24 264:5, 280:24 281:18 226:22 232:6 245:18 condition 237:25 7 265:22.23.25 282:5 283:2 260:2 261:7 cities 226:2 282:7 collection 223:12 267:9,11,13 community 283:3 conditions collectively 269:20,23 239:9,16 236:11 252:15 **city** 216:24 281:24 271:18,23 272:3, companies 218:23.25 222:4 conduct 236:3 collector 233:16. 7,13,21,23,25 216:20 224:15 292:8 286:24 17.22 269:6.9 273:5,7,14,15 226:17 247:14 confidence 224:7 city-building **colour** 283:6 286:19,22 287:1, 249:23 260:5 224:26 confidently 4,8,13 288:1,10, Columbia 261:13 267:8,21, citywide 222:5 265:14 14,18,24 289:20, 234:21 244:6 24 280:17 281:12 25 290:16 291:4, **civic** 220:10 **confirm** 216:2 comfortable 282:19 284:18 217:4 220:20 clarification 254:6 287:16,17,18,21 226:24 228:8 chairing 267:12 266:1 **COMMENCED company** 227:22, 231:21 232:19 challenge clarifies 269:16 213:1 23 234:15,18 234:23 235:1 267:16,17 clarify 254:8 239:5,14 266:4, **comment** 290:4, 238:23 240:1 14 279:19 challenges 264:10 275:18 19 243:15 244:15 232:23 233:12 **clarity** 223:14 compares 246:1 commentary 247:26 248:13 challenging 224:6 225:24 237:14 complaints 251:26 252:21 237:9 226:7,14 253:19, 220:22 250:16 comments 275:4 274:1,4,21,25 20 255:18 259:19 **chance** 248:5 complete 221:5 commercial 277:6,21,24 264:20 265:12 290:8,26 224:18 290:21 278:18 285:24 227:26 234:19 285:2 **change** 229:8 292:4 239:21 282:17 confirming classification 230:9,12,26 completed 232:7, commercially 281:6 237:25 249:10 253:18,25 9 236:14 241:10, 283:20 conflicts 220:8 254:7 255:8 **cleanups** 290:11 12.20 245:9.21 commission conjunction 266:22 **clear** 223:7,15 completely 253:15.23 241:11 **changed** 230:17 272:18 286:15 241:21 Commissioner connected 241:13 259:6 **close** 237:11 comprehensive 257:7 259:22 223:26 changing 223:9 236:26 closely 243:6 **Commissioners** connection 226:8 **closer** 222:7 concept 221:7 214:3 216:16 226:26 228:14 characterized 235:7 264:7 219:14 229:3,21 238:24 243:16 225:22 282:3 232:5 233:11 conceptually 248:14 **closest** 214:17,19 **charged** 258:14 241:4 244:20 273:17,18 282:26 connectivity **CHB** 217:9 committee concern 221:2 **coexist** 280:25 218:22 249:12 269:12 **CHBA** 247:6 281:18 concerned consecutive communication **cheat** 254:20 collaborate 282:13 265:9 223:16 217:12 check 235:24 consequences **concerns** 217:10 communications collaboration 219:13 233:3 285:18 checking 254:20 245:15 277:14 216:24 262:14 250:19 252:23 considerations **choice** 269:1,11 253:8 communities collaborative 281:9 **chose** 268:20 214:16 225:2 conclude 277:17 220:16 considered **Chris** 214:15 226:10 228:2 283:5 collaboratively 253:19 215:8 227:17 234:10,13,14,17, 281:19

consistency	contributing	269:5 282:22	229:9,19 230:5,	dates 275:9
246:20	281:20	283:4,20 285:25	16 231:25 232:2,	dating 279:20
consistent	control 278:20	costs 218:11	11,14 233:19	Davis 214:17
237:23	convenient 273:5	220:11 226:13	237:22 238:11,18	215:8 239:3,6,7,
consistently	conversation	231:14 234:1	240:8 241:2,5,11,	23 243:14
250:2	218:2	241:13,14,17	14 242:8,13	day 225:25 252:3
constituent	conversations	242:1,5 246:9	243:8 245:13,22	288:15 289:13,18
217:6 247:7	266:20	249:19 251:20	250:26 252:2	292:9
constrained		252:2,9,11,14	257:26 258:6,8,	days 235:18,19
223:25	conversely 236:23 281:14	255:21 281:1	13,16,22 259:17	238:9
construct 229:16		283:13,26 285:14	260:16 266:3,12, 24 267:2 268:22	deal 249:16,21
264:12	cooperation 281:12	councils 222:9	275:25 276:9	253:14 262:6,8,
constructed		counsel 214:5,21	284:11 285:19	15 267:18
229:12	coordinating 239:18,19 277:8	255:2 256:24	crossings 218:2	dealing 229:4,26
construction	·	273:1 279:10	219:16,20 220:7,	232:24 244:21
222:15 241:9,25	copied 277:15	286:23 287:5	17 224:2 225:5,	246:14,20 249:18
242:1 247:23	core 262:26	289:21 290:24	19 226:12 228:18	dealings 230:13
250:4 251:7,13,	Corp 241:3	county 225:17	229:5 231:11	231:10 243:4
15 252:7 261:7	242:24 243:4	246:6	232:25 237:17	246:1 261:12
264:23 265:10	275:1	couple 213:5	240:9 244:22	263:21
280:23	corporate 278:15	224:9 230:19	245:23 246:15,21	deals 217:9
constructive	281:15	231:2 265:5	248:22 249:16,23	dealt 228:18
285:5	correct 216:9,10	287:9 288:21	255:22 261:14	240:9 246:3
consultant	220:24 232:4	court 213:10,17	267:19 283:15	December
247:18 277:14	234:26 235:5	214:24 292:15	285:26	238:15 260:17,18
consultants	240:11 244:13,14 248:2 257:14	covers 217:9	CSA 242:19	270:6
239:19	248:2 257:14 258:3,9,11,23	create 279:21	CSR(A) 292:14	decision 223:5
consulting	259:10,13 262:14	281:17	curious 255:6	254:4 255:15
247:18	266:19,25 278:21	created 220:24	270:2,7	256:6 260:3
consumer 226:8	283:8	creating 283:10	current 219:5	268:10 281:5
consumers 252:4	corrections	critical 264:21	255:15 274:1	283:8 285:3,10,
context 219:8	278:22	cross 224:17	277:21 280:7	11,16
223:3	correctly 266:6	246:10 254:22	286:16 289:15	decision's 256:11
contiguously	287:15	258:26 259:12	curriculum	decision-makers
223:20	correspondence	273:25 280:3	274:5 277:25	270:4
contingencies	233:7 277:13,15	281:8	CV 274:8 278:2	decisions 223:24
243:11	cost 226:21	cross-	cycle 283:26	261:15
continue 280:25	230:2,3,15 231:8,	examination		dedicated 220:25
289:8	11,12 238:11,25	254:17 286:21,25		Deer 247:9
	241:16,17,19	290:6,9		249:14 271:12
contractors 239:20	242:18 245:8,11,	Cross-examines	database 261:4	defer 255:13
	19 250:9,18,24	255:4	date 241:24	deferred 256:11
contribute 280:12 281:19	252:6 258:5,15	crossed 242:16	284:25	
280:12 281:19	259:3,16,17	crossing 220:4,	Dated 292:8	degree 226:15
203.10	261:20,22 268:21	11 223:4 225:16		

delay 233:10,14	detailed 222:5,14	217:1,2 218:8	264:11,22 265:7	display 281:10
251:12	237:19 241:16	219:11 220:6	diligently 226:7	dispute 240:8
delayed 233:6	242:2	221:20,23 222:4	diminishes	285:14
242:13 251:15	details 268:23,26	223:8,13 224:15,	261:14	disservice 281:14
delays 234:1	determine	21 225:26	direct 214:11	distant 260:10
249:19 251:5,20	235:20 236:12,17	227:25,26 228:2	215:5,11 246:23	division 239:10,
285:6	261:19	229:6 232:10,26	249:12 254:14,19	17
delineated	determined	235:21,22 237:6,	270:1,8 273:12	Dixon 257:20
236:25	222:16	19 239:9,13,16	277:17 286:20	272:3,17,24,25
deliver 218:19	develop 223:22	240:24 242:17 244:4 245:26	288:17	272.3,17,24,23
234:3	224:17 238:16	244.4 243.20 247:4,15,23	direction 216:8	24,26 286:19
demand 220:9	279:21	247.4,13,23	222:22 224:14	288:5,7
265:6	developed 221:6	261:16 266:15,16	228:9 235:2	doable 291:4
demographics	235:11	267:3,8,18 274:3	255:19 278:20	dollar 262:26
236:12	developer 225:3	277:23 279:12,	direction's 222:3	
	237:15 242:12	14,19 280:12	254:4	dollars 259:18
density 218:16 223:21	243:1 244:4	281:3 282:18,21	directions	double 264:25
	251:22 263:3	285:8,19 286:7,9	222:12	doubt 290:6
department 252:26	270:5 282:21	287:17	directly 267:24	due 221:5,7,13
	developer's	developments	284:24	223:8 235:7,11,
departments	252:8	214:6,17,18	director 274:2	17 236:18,22,26
252:23	developers	217:15 239:7,8,	279:14	237:26 238:7
dependent 241:9	213:26 214:8,9	11,13,25 243:16,	Directors 269:24	242:5,10,21
depending	215:11 216:1,4,	24 244:3,16	270:24	259:26 260:14
229:26 245:7	21 220:1 221:5,	277:10 281:25		261:2,13,15,26
287:9	14 223:20 224:24	dialogue 285:5	disagree 250:12	263:16 264:11,22
depth 237:24	228:7 234:22	difference 271:8	discretion	265:7 288:20
260:2 261:5	239:24 240:6	282:25	263:11,13,20,23	
depths 261:6	244:9 248:5	differences	264:3,9,15	E
Deputy 253:10	249:5,13,15,17,	271:1	265:15	
Derek 292:3	20 250:2 252:3	differentiating	discuss 254:10	earlier 224:1
describe 216:15	254:15 255:4	271:9	284:23	231:17 235:6
229:3 230:11	257:9 260:26	difficult 213:13	discussed 277:10	247:26 252:18
232:5 241:4	266:8 270:3	271:4	282:8 284:12	287:22 288:25
244:20 246:13	271:11 280:1	difficulties	285:21	early 219:19
253:3 274:8,12	281:12,18 282:5	285:17	discussing 243:8	238:12
278:2,6	283:16 284:16		discussion 266:7	earthworks
design 222:14	285:13,18 286:5	difficulty 257:21	268:3 272:22	276:2
283:14	developers'	digs 284:10,21	288:13	easiest 269:7
designed 224:11	282:4	diligence 221:5,	discussions	east 233:17
Desrochers	developing	7,13 223:8 235:7,	216:26 241:14	240:23
228:24 232:18,26	218:23 225:2	11,17 236:18,23,	243:3 252:1,22	economic 217:2
233:3	231:20 240:13	26 237:26 238:8	253:4,26 256:10	226:9 286:9
detail 241:17	242:12	242:5,22 259:26	266:23 268:8	economically
253:25	development	260:14 261:2,15, 26 263:16	271:11	223:6
	215:20 216:21	20 203.10		

economy 280:13	encompassed	entirety 283:19	278:8,11,14,15,	expense 237:21
Edmonton	232:12	entitle 279:21	23,25 279:3,4	experience
214:15 215:20	encounter		280:6,19 284:12	229:4,23 230:12
214.13 213.20 216:3,9,17,24	232:26	entrance 232:14	285:22 286:20	231:1 233:4
217:4,15,20	encountered	environment	288:2	236:24 244:21,24
218:3,15,19,20	285:7	226:3 262:25	exacerbated	245:5,14,25
219:17 220:3,21,		environmental	285:17	246:1,14 253:22
23 221:8,22,24	encourage 264:9 285:4	235:26 236:4	exacerbates	257:13,26 258:14
223:19 224:8,20		equitable 280:26	284:3 285:16	280:5 281:25
225:15,16 226:25	encumbrance	285:24,25	exact 225:6	284:25
228:1,19,26	241:1	equity 226:15	229:14	experienced
229:6 232:19,20,	end 222:25,26	Eric 214:4	excellent 226:10	249:4
21 235:25 238:14	223:1 225:25	escalating		experiences
240:12,16,19,21	226:5 239:22	249:19	Excuse 269:19	217:24 238:6
244:22 247:9	251:23,26 252:3, 11 261:21 268:2	establish 223:16	executed 245:11	245:4 248:21
249:13,17 250:2	269:15 289:12,18	286:3	execution 241:23	260:13
253:9 265:2,5	endeavours	established	executives 267:7	expert 255:13
266:9 267:16,17 271:1,4,12,13,21	280:12,16	216:1 224:12	exercise 224:17	289:12
2/1:1,4,12,13,21 Edmonton's	energy 219:9	establishing	261:26	expertise 216:26
217:23 218:23	253:2,5,13 281:5	283:9	exhaustive 256:5	expired 275:22
		estate 216:20	Exhibit 216:5	explain 245:26
educated 236:15	engage 234:17 268:10	217:1 225:26	228:8 274:6	247:11
education 274:9		234:18 239:13	275:2 277:26	explanation
278:3	engaged 222:24 267:21,23 283:23	280:11	Exhibits 274:15	229:21 276:12
effective 219:9		Estates 240:18	278:9	extent 256:4
220:17	engagement 262:11	estimate 230:3	exist 236:2,8	289:3
effects 263:15		258:6 259:3,19	237:7,11,13	external 223:9
efficacy 261:25,	engineering 222:14 225:7	estimates 259:16	280:25	
26 262:23 263:6	231:8 236:1,5	290:6	existence 280:24	extremely 218:25 245:4
efficient 219:8	239:19 245:6	ethics 262:10,12	existing 221:18	210.23 243.4
220:6 279:26	258:15	evaluation	266:24 275:20	
281:11 283:12	engineers 216:22	255:14,15	280:3 281:8	F
285:1 286:9	engineers 216:22 ensure 222:25	Evan 272:26	exists 236:2	faced 265:4
elaborate 268:22	224:6 291:1	everybody's	expand 264:20	285:17
287:17		250:25 254:6	expands 265:18	facilities 220:10
elected 222:16	ensuring 262:24	evidence 214:7,	expansion	264:12 285:20
element 262:19	entail 235:12	11 215:5,11	218:26 221:25	
elements 263:10	259:20	216:8,11 221:4	expect 223:9	facing 265:4
Ellerslie 240:24	entailed 253:5	228:11 231:18	225:2 258:6	fact 217:6 220:24 284:7 286:5
emerge 283:7	enter 245:16	235:3 240:2,3	expectations	284:7 286:5
emerging 218:13	entered 215:6	248:10 254:15	223:17 262:12	factor 271:10
employ 280:13	232:8	257:11 268:18	expected 258:21	
enable 225:26	entertain 256:8	273:12 274:14,	expecting 265:3	factors 221:15
226:7	entertaining	21,26 275:5	expecting 203.3	235:14 236:22,24 238:1
220.7	265:19	276:24 277:11,17		230.1
	ı	ı	1	1

failing 276:26 financial 221:15 friends 290:23 goals 219:16 25 267:17 fair 279:25 285:7 front 241:22 good 213:3 214:2 growth 21 283:12,13,18 236:17 283:18 full 228:17 234:7 234:6,9 239:3 225:18 22 fairer 283:9 find 237:9 243:20 244:18 243:19,23 246:25 236:11 fairly 225:13 finding 261:8 256:3 291:2 254:23 272:3,25 guess 221:2 faith 284:4 fine 270:20 227:3 236:25 279:10 280:10, 11,21 288:1 290:8,26 fall 241:26 242:14 finished 289:18 fulsomely 268:11 goods 280:14 285:1 finishing 290:26 fulsomely 268:11 government 285:1	19:4,10 2:5 6:2,7 :3 5:24
280:26 281:11 financially 253:14,23 215:14,15 227:14 221:25 22 283:12,13,18 236:17 283:18 full 228:17 234:7 234:6,9 239:3 225:18 22 fairly 225:13 finding 261:8 256:3 291:2 254:23 272:3,25 guess 221:2 faith 284:4 fine 270:20 227:3 236:25 279:10 280:10, 252:21 25 fail 241:26 242:14 finished 289:18 fully 222:25 11,21 288:1 264:1 Fash 214:19 finished 289:18 fully 241:22 goods 280:14 guidance	2:5 6:2,7 :3 5:24
283:12,13,18 236:17 283:18 full 228:17 234:7 234:6,9 239:3 225:18 22 fairer 283:9 find 237:9 243:20 244:18 243:19,23 246:25 236:11 fairly 225:13 finding 261:8 256:3 291:2 254:23 272:3,25 guess 221: faith 284:4 fine 270:20 227:3 236:25 11,21 288:1 264:1 fall 241:26 242:14 290:18 243:18 248:16 290:8,26 guidance finished 289:18 fully 222:25 243:18 248:16 goods 280:14 guidance	6:2,7 :3 5:24
fairer 283:9 find 237:9 243:20 244:18 243:19,23 246:25 236:11 fairly 225:13 finding 261:8 256:3 291:2 254:23 272:3,25 guess 221: faith 284:4 fine 270:20 227:3 236:25 279:10 280:10, 252:21 25.21	:3 5:24
fairly 225:13 finding 261:8 256:3 291:2 254:23 272:3,25 guess 221: faith 284:4 fine 270:20 227:3 236:25 279:10 280:10, 252:21 25 fall 241:26 242:14 fine 270:20 238:11 239:1 290:8,26 guidance Fash 214:19 finished 289:18 fulsewells 268:11 goods 280:14	5:24
fairly 223.13 finding 201.8 223.13 fully 222:25 279:10 280:10, 11,21 288:1 252:21 25.25 faith 284:4 fine 270:20 227:3 236:25 238:11 239:1 290:8,26 guidance 285:1 Fash 214:19 finished 289:18 fully 222:25 279:10 280:10, 11,21 288:1 264:1 290:8,26 264:1 guidance 285:1 285:1 285:1 285:1 285:1	5:24
faith 284:4 fine 270:20 227:3 236:25 11,21 288:1 264:1 fall 241:26 242:14 290:18 238:11 239:1 290:8,26 guidance Fash 214:19 289:18 243:18 248:16 goods 280:14 285:1	
fall 241:26 242:14 290:18 Fash 214:19 finished 289:18 227:3 230:23 290:8,26 238:11 239:1 290:8,26 243:18 248:16 goods 280:14 285:1 285:1	223:14
Fash 214:19 finished 289:18 243:18 248:16 goods 280:14 285:1	223.17
Fash 214:19 Innished 209:10 fulcomology 200:11 government government	
I at a a t a a least a least a limit	2.2
215:9 217:3 finishing 290:26 fundamenty 200:11 217:11 252:22 guided 22	
253:16 256:7,15, Couther 2	
254.12 255.7 11 FICH 214:3 207:9 18 262:15 268:4,	,33:1
264.10.266.2.7	
267:15 268:2 272.6 269.25 Table 2 17.21 governmental 17.25 1	
271:6 helf 210.6	
fast 227:7 lixes 242:11 19 237:16 242:14 governs 221:23 Hell 212:4	
Fige Proof Fige Proof Fige Proof Fige Proof Fige Proof Fig. 17 	
Govier 213:4 Govier 213:4 Govier 213:4	9 250:1
February 253:10 floated 229:18 grades 242:8 happen 24	47.10
February 233:10 flow 236:16 grading 239:20 liappen 253:9	+/.19
feeder 233:23 focus 247:21 gain 230:5 Grande 247:8 happened	275.11
fees 229:15 231:5 folks 249:25 gap 233:18,20 249:13 271:12 happening	
fellow 248:4 follow 222:21 gas 220:26 great 273:9,16 236:19 23	_
follow-up 262:22 gave 260:15 greater 280:22 ,	
field 276:5 283:10 Same 200:13 Greatly 283:9 happy 221 268:17 greatly 283:9 happy 221 272:16 28	
fifteen 230:24 foregoing 292:3 Gavin's 270:11 ground 222:7 hard 231:	
form 233:7 262:1 gaza 221:11 group 213:26 250:24.25	
figure 271:7 figure 271:7 263:18 gaze 221.11 general 216:16 230.24 25 Hardisty	218:20
nguring 250.0 forma 236:15 219:15 221:26 215:11 216:1,4 hardship	
formed 247:4 275:14 227:18,19 228:6, Hot 247:14	
formula 285:25 generally 236:3 7234:22 239:24 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
275:5 277:25 278:8,14,25 Fort 247:8 generous 290:6 240:6 244:9 heads 267 heads 267 heads 267	
280:6 285:22 forum 222:9 gentlemen 254:15 255:4 282:19	10
filing 282:15 forward 276:23 273:21 254:13 253:4 262:17 heard 229 heard 229)·14 18
filings 288:19 found 216:5 geotechnical 269:24 270:3,5, 250:1,15 2	,
filled 227:20 249:14,23 236:1,3 24 259:16,25	
fills 252:18 frame 236:19 germane 219:10 groups 223:13 261:18 28	
final 232:16 frequent 220:8 give 224:14 258:5 267:15 289:16	
241:14 242:1 2 Friday 288:26 268:25 grow 220:10 hearing 2	13:8,
270:16 286:14 289:5,7.8,13,14, Glenridding 223:20,25 14,19,21,2	
19 290:2,12,20 240:18 growing 218:2, 214:3 216	
218:9 219	:14,22

227.24.222.224	1, 25,	1	1.	1 255 40
225:24 229:3,21	homes 265:1	impacted 218:21	incorrectly	initial 265:18
232:5 233:11	279:22	242:24 266:8	285:12	266:20
241:4 244:20 248:23 257:21	Honestly 271:6	impacting	increases 220:9	initially 241:19
261:10 263:14	hope 265:16	275:14	242:18	277:4
274:26 275:12	hopeful 226:16	impacts 223:9,18	indefinite 276:10	input 226:4
280:20 281:24	hoping 225:23	226:9	indicating	inquire 238:3
282:9 283:7	283:7	impassable	284:23	inquiries 238:5
hearings 271:15	Horse 225:15	233:21	indication	260:1
helpful 214:12	228:24 229:11	impediments	276:13	Institute 215:20
236:21 261:3	231:9,24 244:25,	220:5	indiscriminant	Institute's
Heritage 228:25	26 257:15	imperative 286:3	231:6	223:13
hesitate 257:20	housekeeping	Imperial 245:3,	individual 225:3	insurance 243:11
	228:4 244:7	5,13 258:2,16	237:15 257:6	integrated
high 233:24	houses 234:19	Imperial's	industrial 239:22	234:18
high-functioning	housing 220:9	258:13	244:5	integrity 245:7
225:26	234:3 236:13	implemented	industries	246:10 258:26
high-level 237:19	247:24 251:15,17	222:17 230:9	247:17 286:6	266:12 284:10,21
253:3,8 255:23	252:4 264:25	importance	industry 216:21	intend 221:17
268:7	265:10 279:19	280:22	217:1 222:23	intended 276:22
highest 218:16	282:6	important 218:6,	224:23 226:1	intense 236:18
highlighted	huge 233:25	15,18,24 219:12	247:3 255:21	intensity 221:26
284:7	hundreds 251:3	221:19 222:19	265:13 266:3,11,	interaction
highly 223:24	Huxley 270:22,	223:17	15,16 267:16,18 280:21	280:1 282:4
highway 232:21	24,26	impossible		interactions
269:4	hydrovac 275:25	238:10	industry-wide 283:11	224:2
Hill 225:15	276:9	impression		interchangeable
231:24		246:14	inequity 284:2	229:25
Hills 228:24	I	improve 226:7	influence 218:22	interest 220:18
229:11 231:9		improvements	influences 225:1	226:23 238:25
244:25 245:1 257:16	ideally 246:19	251:1 255:22	inform 263:19,22	251:20 259:15
	identical 233:2	in-migration	informal 284:9	261:20,22 262:2
Hit 262:16	identified 219:20	264:26	information	263:10,18 264:10
hold 252:14	241:16 269:1,2	include 216:21	236:16 237:10,24	280:18 281:7,10
holds 240:26	immediately	228:26	238:4 245:10	286:1,11
hollow 284:24	228:23 229:11	includes 218:4	260:14,22,24	interested 261:1
home 225:12	231:23 240:23	239:17	261:8 283:24	interests 217:8
226:11 247:15	244:26	including 216:23	284:7,19,22	281:13
251:22 252:8,11	impact 217:1	240:16 247:8	informed 226:4 260:3 261:15	interface 219:9
homebuyer	218:6 221:16	inconsistencies		221:1 247:24
223:2 251:23	224:10 225:5 233:25 237:16	243:10,13	infrastructure 221:18 225:10	interfaces 256:17
252:12	247:22 249:8	inconsistency	230:22 249:25	interject 227:5
homebuyers	250:23 251:5,17	246:18	250:7,24 282:12	internal 275:11
252:4	258:19 282:17	inconsistent	287:24	
		224:3		

	ı	ı		1
interpreting	232:23 238:20	253:8,21,24	276:15	lines 255:13
262:13	249:18	255:14 263:5	lastly 250:11	link 213:15
intersection	item 269:13	265:7,13 266:22	late 284:10	list 219:18
232:7 268:20	272:8	268:3,7,10	290:25	
280:10	items 228:5	290:11		live 219:7
intervening	1tems 228.3	knew 282:22	Laurin 246:5	live-streamed
277:4		knowing 265:14	lead 284:4	213:15
intervenor	J	282:26	leader 215:22	local 218:21
282:13	T 240.17	knowledge	leading 248:24	222:13 269:9
	Jagare 240:17	216:12 217:18	leads 250:6	located 232:20
introduce 214:10	James 232:22	235:3 244:13	learn 237:7	237:11 240:21,22
215:16 227:15 239:4 273:16	January 276:3	256:9 258:18	led 253:9 284:2	locations 218:19
	job 261:19	274:23 279:1	Leduc 225:17	242:17
introduced	Joe 214:18 215:9	271.23 277.1		logical 223:25
214:3	243:23		legacy 247:5	long 227:20
introductory	joined 219:3	L	legal 270:8,14	238:19 260:22
268:7	279:13	lack 218:9 250:2,	legislation	262:7 282:3
investigated	joint 232:8	16 251:6 261:11	247:21 252:19	290:1
235:14	jumped 261:21	264:14	255:16,19 256:1,	long-term
investigation	jurisdiction	laid 219:13	2,15	221:24 263:1
283:14	256:2	land 218:8 219:9	legislative	longest 235:19
investment	jurisdictions	222:1,13 224:21,	249:10 253:18,	Lopez 292:3,14
226:8 234:20	218:21 249:21	22 225:3,17	21,25 254:7,11	losing 220:13
involved 224:4,	266:10	227:25 228:24	255:8,12,25	
24 240:13,15		233:14 236:6,7,	266:22	lost 250:3 251:13
247:15 271:9	JV 232:8 268:15, 20	10 237:15,18	lesson 268:17	lot 236:19 252:9,
278:13	20	239:17,19,20	Lethbridge	11
involvement		242:6 244:4	247:9	lots 239:22
281:23	K	247:3,15,23	letter 253:6	Love 264:3,8
involves 253:12	Kalen 214:14	249:11 253:15	level 221:11,26	lower 280:2
irrelevant	215:10,19	265:8 269:10	224:5 225:13	lowered 242:7
281:26		277:23 279:12,	267:26	lowering 241:8,
irrespective	Katrina 214:16 215:8 234:9	18,21 282:21	levels 222:10	11
266:24 267:3		286:5	leviable 269:13	LP 273:2
isolate 262:2	Keyera 241:3,7 242:24 243:4,9	Landing 244:25	levy 268:18,21	luck 261:8
issue 218:1,7	242:24 243:4,9 275:1,6,15,17,19,	245:26 246:7	269:5	lunch 271:26
219:12,20 221:13	22,26 276:3,4,8,	257:14 258:1	Lewis 240:17	272:1 286:26
226:12,26 248:25	13,20,21 277:9	lands 221:6,16	life 283:25	272.1 200.20
249:1,3,4 253:11	282:12 284:9,15,	235:10,20 237:3	lifelong 267:11	7.4
263:13,20 266:11	18	241:12 245:2	lifetime 257:23	M
276:26 285:26	Keyera's 275:8	285:19		M-HM 233:13
287:3 289:10,11	276:25	large 250:16	limit 285:5	256:13
issued 285:1	kind 224:20,22	279:18	limited 250:11	Madam 214:2
issues 216:26	225:11 247:16,18	largely 249:23	273:13 287:12	254:16,23 257:8
219:19 221:1,3	248:26 250:25	larger 250:7	limiting 251:15	259:24 265:22
				257.21 203.22

267:9 272:3,25	Marquis 228:23	member 216:20	millions 251:4	Mowatt 232:22
273:5,15 286:19	230:13 231:18,21	217:5,6,15,17,19	mind 226:5	much-needed
287:1 288:18	232:8,11 268:15,	226:17 247:14	minister 253:4,6,	282:6 285:2
289:25	20	248:1,25 268:16	11	mumble 257:23
made 230:26	material 260:21	member's 249:2	Ministry 253:2	mumbling 259:7
238:5 250:20	275:13	members 216:21,	minor 251:12	municipal
256:11 275:16	materials/	25 217:24 218:5	minutes 272:18	216:26 217:8
284:14 287:22	evidence 278:19	220:23 226:6	misaligned 282:2	222:3,9 235:21
main 233:23	matter 214:6	248:4,20 250:15,		239:18 256:14,17
maintain 226:2	253:18,23 254:1	20 252:1,24	missed 257:17 272:8	municipalities
major 218:17	279:24	257:6 272:26 279:10		216:23 218:4
225:17 233:17	matters 253:14		missing 263:6 265:9	219:1
282:25	265:16 281:16	members' 219:13		Municipality
make 217:17	Mattson 240:19,		mitigated 225:21	237:5
219:18 224:4	20,22 241:2	membership	MLC 214:15	municipally
236:13 247:19	242:23	218:3,14 226:13	227:18,24 228:6,	262:9 283:1
255:15,26 260:1,	mayors 222:1	mentioned 218:5	18 230:8 231:19 233:14	Myers 288:18
3 261:15 262:2 278:22 283:8	Mclennan 214:4	224:1 230:7 231:18 232:18	MLC's 228:14	289:1 290:17,18
	Mcmurray	233:5,10 240:20	229:4,23 230:12	291:5
makes 213:13 238:10	247:8	251:7 252:17	231:10 234:2	
	Mcnaughtan	256:10 257:13,25	moment 263:24	N
making 236:15 252:19	257:7,8,10,22,25	264:21 266:2	272:5	
	meaning 249:1	278:19 287:15	moments 221:10	NAFFIN 254:23
managed 240:24	276:17	Meridian 232:2		287:1
management	meaningful	267:1	Monday 289:16	narrative 275:14
227:25 233:15 239:14	260:14	met 222:26	money 250:7,17	National 217:9
	means 249:11	metres 276:18	monies 250:5	necessarily
manager 239:9, 16 244:5	meant 229:22	metro 215:20	month 263:1	271:8
	mechanism	218:4,15,17,20	months 233:6	necessity 232:13
manages 221:23 244:23	281:6	223:19 271:4	237:3 238:15	needed 226:14
	Medicine 247:10	Metropolitan	242:15 244:2	229:16 245:16,20
managing 228:1 240:14	meet 223:21	221:22	251:9 260:15	254:8 258:22
	242:20 264:25	MGA 256:17	morning 213:3	264:24
mandate 247:13	282:17	mic 264:7	214:2 215:14,15 227:14 229:19	negate 253:20
manner 234:3	meeting 253:10	Michaela 214:17	232:16 234:5,7,9	negative 285:18
286:8	254:1	215:8 239:6	235:6 239:4	negatively
March 291:10	meetings 254:9	mid-march	243:19,23 246:25	282:16
292:9	Melcor 214:17	276:4	254:23 257:11,26	negotiate 231:12
Marchese 214:18 215:9 243:19,23	239:7,8,11,12,13,	midst 240:8	272:3,25 288:9,	negotiating
246:22 257:12,17	25 240:2,7,13,15	Mike 253:11	23 290:12	282:11,16 283:11
258:3	242:16 243:6,9,	million 219:4,5,6	move 280:2 286:7	negotiation
market 229:8	16	245:20 259:12,18	Moving 234:6	250:18 282:16
236:10 252:12	Melcor's 239:16	273.20 237.12,10	239:3	283:23
200.10 202.12				
		•	•	1

negotiations 284:5 neighbourhood 222:6,8 224:13 229:10,12,13,16 230:13 231:9,22, 24 232:15,19 235:23 240:20 241:2 242:23 243:1 244:26	notion 284:15 notwithstanding 225:9 November 253:7 number 247:7 249:15 259:16 285:18 numbers 258:5	operate 224:7 266:10 operating 239:14 operational 247:13 operations 216:17 233:14 279:20 operator 229:26	organizations 247:5 original 258:24 282:10 285:9,11 originally 259:13 282:9 outcome 225:5 254:4 267:6 268:9	288:5,8,12,20 289:6,16 290:10, 21,22,24 291:2 Panel's 264:2 panels 255:14 paragraph 220:1 275:10,17,19,21 paragraphs 284:13
245:1 264:13 269:10 neighbourhoods 218:23 223:1	oath 214:22 objectives	230:2 233:9 238:7 240:8,26 251:2 operators 217:25 228:18,21,26	outcomes 224:3 237:16 outlined 245:17 outlines 221:25	parcel 224:22 pardon 276:11 280:18 284:6 285:10
224:10,16 228:19,21,23 231:19 240:12,16 244:22 newly 218:23	219:17 obliged 230:4,20 observance 213:23 observing 213:19	229:5 230:10 231:1,10,13 232:25 237:25 238:3,9 240:9 244:21 246:2,15	outreach 249:12 outset 214:12 overlap 217:12 overseeing 231:20	Park 246:5 part 216:1 257:18 261:19,22 262:1 263:1,18 partial 241:23
nice 251:25 284:2 Nicholas 214:15 215:8 227:14,17 229:4 232:17 246:16 261:3 263:26 264:6,8 268:25	obtain 230:15 238:16 obtained 237:4 occur 221:26 occurred 262:5 occurs 263:1	248:22 250:3,17 260:1 261:9 268:13 271:14 281:26 operators' 220:4 229:9 opportunity	oversees 244:23 overtop 283:1 overview 255:24 owners 280:1 ownership 269:10	participants 279:11 participate 222:25 274:16 278:10 282:9,13 participates 216:25
nodding 261:17 267:7 nonpolitical	October 275:26 offering 231:11 office 258:9	231:12 options 241:7 Orchards 240:24	P pages 292:3	participating 282:10 parties 252:13
253:16 nonprofit 216:19 nonresidential 226:1	official 213:17,18 292:15 officially 284:20 oil 220:26 245:3,5	277:10 285:8 order 230:4,15 232:10 245:16,20 258:25 259:11	paid 232:11 241:20,21 284:16 panel 215:11,18,	268:19 271:8 283:23 284:4 285:3 286:4 287:25
North 218:17 279:18 notably 214:6 note 214:13	one-off 249:1 ongoing 218:26 221:2 224:10 online 219:25	263:14,20 283:13,22 284:26 286:7 orderly 286:9	26 245:18 248:4 254:16,25 255:5 256:25 257:6,9 262:6 264:16 265:16 268:16	parts 239:15 party 275:25 283:19 passed 252:3
218:6,15,25 221:19 222:19 225:4 233:3 240:6 242:4	251:17 Ontario 215:24 234:20 open 223:15	orders 217:11 organization 215:17,21 216:2, 19 217:7 227:15,	269:25 270:3,7, 19,23,25 271:20, 22,24 272:6,10, 18,26 273:13,16,	past 217:25 218:1 224:3 229:8 230:8,19 231:2 238:6 240:10
notes 292:6 notice 276:7 noticed 230:8 231:2 243:13	opening 213:2 273:22 279:7,8 283:5 285:21	19,20,25 229:7 233:15 234:8,23 239:25 243:21,25 247:1,20	25 274:12 275:6, 18 277:24 278:6 279:10 286:20 287:2,10,11,12	246:3,7 248:20 250:20 252:22 257:2 260:11 265:4

pathways 249:9	philosophies	284:16 286:10	political 222:9,22	prejudice 282:15
patience 257:1	281:16	place 233:20	224:5 253:16	preliminaries
paved 233:20	phrase 262:5	237:20 245:12,21	population 220:9	213:24
pay 230:4 249:22	pick 230:1	268:6	236:11	preliminary
250:4 266:3	pieces 263:6	places 219:7	portion 239:24	236:5 258:10
paying 250:6	pipe 242:7,10,19	Plains 229:2	242:9 248:9	259:4
258:19	251:2,10 259:12	231:25 232:9	poses 233:14	preparation
	266:12	254:24 270:2	position 219:26	274:18 275:12
payment 241:23, 24 243:10	pipeline 217:25	286:24 287:1	220:20 221:14	278:13
	218:1,10,18	288:16 289:15	226:25 228:14	prepare 213:18
pays 266:4 283:3	219:16,20 220:3,	290:9	234:12 238:23	prepared 216:7
pedestrians	7,17 221:18	plan 221:24	243:15 244:15	222:10 228:9
233:22	223:4 224:2	224:15 235:23	248:14 274:1	235:2 254:22
Pembina 229:1	225:9,18 226:12	planned 254:21	277:21 278:15	270:15 272:2,4,
245:3,14 246:2	228:18,21 229:5,	planner 215:23	279:23 280:20,23	19 273:22 274:22
254:24 258:2,4,	14 231:10,25	-	282:16	278:19 279:6
22 259:12 260:18	232:24 233:19	planners 216:22	positive 281:4	preparing
270:2 286:23	236:9 237:8,21,	planning 218:26	285:3	274:25
287:1 288:16	22 238:2,14,17	219:4 221:20	potential 223:18	present 214:9
289:1,2,3,6,15,22 290:1,9,19	240:8 241:1,18	225:1,8 237:4,20 239:17 263:1	237:21 249:9	281:11
	242:11,14,24	269:3 274:3	253:25 254:10	
pending 254:3	243:5 244:21	279:14	255:7 259:17	presentation 273:2
256:6 267:6	245:13 246:2,11,		284:17	
268:9	18,21 248:21	plans 222:4,6,8, 10,12,16 223:22	potentially	presented 241:7
people 213:22	249:16 251:2	224:12,13 235:22	251:1,4 265:15	presenting 220:5
219:6 280:14	252:2 255:23	•	285:6	presents 225:20
perceive 243:9	256:2 258:2,5	play 276:15	powder 284:3	president 227:22
period 235:17	259:1,12 260:1,2	players 281:19	power 284:3	234:14 244:1
236:18 237:10,26	261:6,13 266:4,	playing 283:10	practically 223:6	277:23 279:12
238:8 242:6,22	14 267:19,21,22, 24 268:13 280:1,	pleased 214:9	1 -	pressures 265:3
243:7,12 260:14	17 281:12,26	279:15	practice 266:11	pretty 218:17
264:11 276:10	282:12,19,20,23	point 223:8	Prairie 247:8	previous 215:22
277:7	283:2,14 284:11,	224:4,8 258:4	249:13 271:12	242:17
permitted 250:6	18 285:4,13,15,	259:15 263:7	precedent 254:5	previously
perspective	20,25 286:10	266:23 272:20	265:15 286:4	229:10 230:20
221:8 225:8	287:16,18,21	275:16 276:23	precisely 282:2	233:5,8 245:18
226:24 235:12	pipeline's 237:24	points 221:19	predated 282:20	278:19
253:3 267:26	pipelines 218:16	225:16	predict 263:3	price 230:25,26
persuade 263:13	245:2,3 246:4,10	policies 222:16	predictability	252:9
Pete 253:7	249:22 257:15,26	223:10 252:20	218:10	primary 277:13
Peter 273:10,19	258:1,26 260:25	policy 216:25	predictable	prior 230:13
274:2 279:13	270:2 277:3	221:11 222:12,22	226:3 262:24	237:19 246:1
petty 281:16	280:4,10,25	224:9,23 225:8	280:26 286:8	276:7 288:19
phase 264:22	281:2,9,18 282:5	267:26 268:3	preference 272:5	priorities 219:21
265:7	283:12,16,26	270:8	290:21 291:1	P

private 218:7	professional	province-wide	286:15	re-direct 272:9,
_	215:23 274:9	249:6		11,13 288:6,7
private-to-	278:3		qualifications	
private 218:7		provincial 217:9	274:10 278:4	reached 220:12
privilege 273:16	prohibited 213:21	222:20 247:21 249:11	quantify 230:23	reacting 276:21
pro 236:15			Quarry 229:10	read 219:24
proactive 223:5	project 236:17	provincially	244:25 245:26	220:2 268:19
problem 290:3,	244:25 246:7	262:9	246:7 257:14	276:14 279:8
13	249:2 251:4	proximity	258:1	ready 265:8
problems 233:1	265:8 277:12	238:13,16,19	quarter 219:1	272:23 288:16,20
proceed 214:1	projects 244:5	260:16,18 275:20	question 226:20	289:8
227:4 232:10	249:22 286:7	276:2,11 280:3	229:14 235:8	real 216:20 217:1
245:12,22 254:22	promise 284:24	284:11 285:19	257:12 260:12	224:4 225:26
255:3 272:2,4,7,	proper 258:25	public 216:25	262:23 263:9,11,	234:18 239:13
16,19 273:14	properties	218:7 220:13,18,	17,21 264:1,2,18	267:17 280:11
281:3	234:19,20	23 226:23 238:25	265:17 266:1	realities 283:2
proceeding	property 253:15	261:20,22 262:1	267:13,14 268:15	realized 220:15
274:6,15 275:1	285:17	263:10,18 264:9	270:9,14,22	reason 285:21
274:0,13 273:1	propose 288:24	280:10,11,18,21	275:24 282:1	reasonable
278:12,16,26	proposed 281:8	281:7,10,13,20 286:1,11	286:14 287:10,14	249:25 250:9
279:4 281:6	prospect 235:9	·	questioned	reasoning 271:3
282:10 284:8,20		punctuality	281:22	
285:23 286:6	protect 246:10	257:3	questions 227:13	rebroadcasting
proceedings	258:26 266:12	purchase 235:16	230:7 232:16	213:20
213:1 216:9	protecting	282:20	234:4 244:7	receive 238:4,7
217:13,14 227:1	282:23	purchased 242:6	246:23 254:14,24	241:15,26 260:21
228:16 238:26	protest 232:11	purposes 273:2	256:22,23,25	283:17
240:2 243:17	provide 217:22	pursue 254:7	257:1,5,9 265:20,	received 220:22
244:10 248:7,11	219:14 229:20	pursuit 220:17	25 269:17,22	260:13,19
279:17,24 291:10	230:22 245:6	put 219:21 258:6	273:20 287:2,6,	recent 244:24
292:5	248:18 253:19	putting 265:10	11 288:3,4 289:3, 4,21 290:11,23,	recently 220:25
process 223:15	261:9 275:6	putting 203.10	24 291:3	225:16 238:13
226:18 230:9	280:11 282:6			246:6 260:10
235:11,15	283:6 284:19	Q	quick 262:21	recollection
236:23,26 241:25	provided 222:3	Qualico 214:6	quickly 218:25	276:19
253:21 256:5	230:2 231:14	217:14 226:21,23		recommendatio
262:7 263:1	235:20 236:21	228:15 247:26	R	ns 252:19
264:21 268:6	237:23 242:3	270:1 286:4		reconciled 242:2
269:3 279:26	251:25 254:5	289:26	raise 221:11	reconsideration
280:7 283:6,11,	275:15 276:6,12 280:19,21 290:5	Qualico's 221:4	253:8	285:10,12
18,22 284:26	· ·	226:26 229:1	raised 235:7	reconsidered
processes 247:22	providing 278:15	231:23 232:12	250:19 252:23	254:2
production	province 244:6	238:24 239:1	rank 219:16	
280:24	247:8 249:15	244:16,18,26	Re-cross-	reconvene 290:14
products 252:5	265:1 271:2	248:15 277:5	examines 269:24	
	292:8	282:14 285:26	270:24	record 213:16
				214:13 215:1,17
	l			

	I	I	1	1
234:8 243:20	regulator 249:10	replacing 287:23	research 236:14	249:24
246:26 272:22	253:12,13 274:5	report 245:8	residential 226:1	responsiveness
279:9 284:20	277:25 281:5	reporter 214:24	227:26 239:21	250:3,16 251:6
recording 213:20	regulatory 226:3	292:15	240:25 243:2,4	255:21
records 275:11	254:11 262:7,24	reporters	244:5 247:22	rest 289:6
recourse 250:11	266:22 268:6	213:11,18	252:7 273:1,4,12	result 242:19
	285:1		274:20 287:11	250:4 265:11
recover 252:8,10,	reimbursed	reports 220:22 236:1	residents 219:3	266:5 267:2
_	268:23		233:26 264:26	285:16
Red 247:9 249:14	reinforced	represent 247:14	269:14	resultant 285:7
271:12	242:10,20	267:15 284:17	resolution 249:9	results 251:13
redevelopment	reinforcement	representatives	resolved 253:26	
220:7	230:20 241:8,18	267:22 289:7	respect 244:16	retaliatory
refer 273:3	rejected 276:10	represented	261:16 262:6	276:25
reference 224:12	related 265:16	280:16 286:6	263:7 274:13	review 235:26
referenced 216:3	271:13 284:20	representing	277:9 278:7	248:5 274:18
228:6 233:8		215:18 279:16	279:4,23,26	275:8
234:24 275:9	relates 261:25	represents	282:14 283:25	reviewed 228:5
referred 275:1	relating 284:9,20	233:18	285:8	239:23 244:8
referring 214:7	287:22	request 233:6	respectful 268:5	274:26 275:11
287:20	relation 261:23	260:17,19 264:16	270:21	Rich 273:18
refrained 277:4	264:18	274:16 276:5	respectfully	277:22 279:11
282:10	relationship	278:10 282:8	285:23 286:2	RICHARD
refund 241:26	284:3	284:9,14	respond 284:9,19	273:11
refused 284:19	relative 221:17	requested 231:5,	_	Ridge 229:11
	284:22	13 234:2 241:21	responded 260:19	240:17
refuting 284:15	released 271:24	250:17		right-of-way
region 215:21	288:5	requests 285:23	respondent 280:17	241:1 242:16
218:4,16,20,25	relevant 222:24	require 241:23		right-of-ways
219:3,11 220:10	236:7 260:21	required 225:6,	respondents	236:9
221:1,21,22 223:20,25 225:13	284:22	7,25 231:26	229:1 281:22	rights 224:21
228:3 249:5	relocated 281:2	237:17,23 238:13	responding	235:21 253:15
253:9 266:9	relocating	241:5 242:19	290:22,23	rights-of-way
271:1,13	282:23	245:5 246:9	response 234:1	220:5 237:8
regional 219:3	relocation	250:4,8,26 251:1	238:7 275:5	rights-of-ways
221:23 239:9,15	282:11 285:15	254:12 255:20,26	282:1 284:14,18	236:8 237:7,11
regularly 222:11	287:16	256:4 261:13	responsibilities	Rimbey 284:10
249:16	rely 261:9 285:13	266:5,13 283:1	218:12	rings 284:24
regulation	286:6	284:1	responsibility	rise 257:20
247:21 255:19	remarks 213:2	requirements	274:13 277:12	
regulations	283:5	221:16 222:22	278:7	risk 225:20
222:13,21 223:10	renovations	223:10 236:6	responsible	road 233:16
225:9 237:12	247:16	243:8 246:8 255:21,25	220:6 231:19	251:9 261:14
252:20	replacement		250:10 277:8	266:26 269:5,6
	241:8	requires 280:26 283:19	responsive	roads 230:22
		203.19		264:12,13 269:1,

3 281:8	271:26	service 236:6	similar 287:21	221:7 222:7
		245:11		227:6 235:14
roadways 224:18	scheduling		simple 238:18	255:11 260:7
283:1	289:10,11	services 280:15	simply 223:4	264:5 276:16
Robinson	scheduling-wise	servicing 239:20	273:3 280:3	
259:22,23,25	290:14	session 291:7	Simpson 253:11	speaking 213:7 217:2 223:6
264:17 265:21	school 216:22	set 222:4 223:7,21	sir 227:20 228:4	248:9 259:26
role 218:12	233:23,24	232:16 254:5	231:18 234:4	278:12
239:8,10,15	scope 238:11	262:8 265:15	243:26 244:7	
243:25 244:1	Scott 214:19	276:24 280:5	245:25 247:1	speaks 239:25
252:19 274:13	215:9 217:3	shake 213:9	248:4 274:12,21	specializing
278:7	247:2	share 223:16	sit 290:25	227:26
room 213:22	season 251:7,14	shareable 269:6,	site 236:4	specific 220:25
Rosenthal	seasons 250:4	8	sitting 215:26	225:5 233:3
240:16	265:10	shared 223:17	217:3 273:17	237:17 249:2
Rosewood	seated 272:19	283:15	situation 224:2	250:19 252:22
240:17	secondary 221:3	sharing 218:11	225:12 233:2	255:12 267:16,17 268:15 271:14
Ross 214:4	Secondary 221.3 Second 240:17	226:22 231:11	238:19 263:7	275:4,16
route 266:21		238:25 241:17	situations 238:10	specifically
268:21	section 263:10,12 270:1 277:3	250:18 261:21,22	281:1	230:22 231:9
routine 277:1	285:4,13	285:25	six-month	233:6 235:13
Rowe 214:16	sections 224:17	sheet 254:20	251:12	240:13 247:23
215:8 234:6,9,10,		Sherwood 246:5	skill 292:7	256:1 289:4
11,23 259:25	sector 218:8	short 235:18	Skipping 252:17	spoke 235:6
260:12	SECURE 254:24	236:19 251:8	slowly 213:11	255:7 258:13
RPR 292:14	286:24 287:2	273:20	227:6	spoken 221:3
rules 222:20	288:16 289:15	shorthand 292:5,	small 241:26	278:17
242:19 262:8	290:10	6		spot 234:6
run 283:1	seeking 226:21 282:13	show 224:14	soft 252:6	staff 255:1 287:5
runs 282:21		shown 238:9	softly 213:8	290:24
rural 266:26	seemingly		solution 281:1	
1 u1 a1 200.20	271:13	shut 242:14	sort 241:16	stage 238:12
	segue 251:25	sic 231:6 233:25	258:12 260:3,5,	stages 242:17
S	seldom 260:6	246:6	26 261:14,21	stakeholder
safe 281:17	sell 252:9 279:22	side 250:26	sorts 255:9,16	226:4
safety 281:20	selling 239:21	251:11 253:17	260:2	stakeholders
•	senior 277:22	sides 262:12	south 229:11	267:20 268:12
sale 235:16	279:11	sign 230:3 245:20	240:22 244:26	stakes 223:19
252:11	sense 216:16	significant	257:15 258:1	stand 289:8
Salisbury 246:4	219:15 236:13	218:22 225:13	Southeast 238:14	standard 266:11
satisfactory	255:26 262:3	250:5 279:19	240:19,21	283:11
226:15 290:17	separate 282:15	significantly	Southwest	standards
schedule 288:15	serve 281:13	250:7	228:25 232:21	222:15
289:15	285:5	signing 235:16	240:22,23	STANDS 271:22
scheduled			speak 213:11	288:12

Stantec 277:14	258:25	summarizes	taking 221:2	thirdly 284:26
start 252:21	structures	219:26 288:2	237:20	thought 214:12
253:17 265:5	222:18 245:22	summary 217:23	talk 213:6	260:5
288:25	students 233:26	236:21 248:19	talked 271:1	thoughts 264:17
started 248:23	studies 236:1	285:9,11	talking 260:10	thousands 251:3
288:22	250:5	sums 250:5,7,17	271:14	280:14
starting 216:3	study 258:15	suppliers 247:17	tapped 261:1	three-tiered
266:23	Sturgeon 246:6	supply 251:16	targeting 257:2	217:7
starts 264:25	subcommittee	supplying 280:14	targets 223:21	threshold 220:12
state 219:5 234:7	220:25	support 226:7	technical 222:21	time 223:11,24
243:20 246:26	subdivided	228:17 239:1	223:10 224:17	224:8,11 225:7
statement 273:23	239:21	243:18 244:18	238:2	235:19 236:18,19
279:7,8 285:21	subdivision	248:16 286:15	ten 219:18,19,21	237:13 238:8,20
287:14	235:24 251:11	supported	239:10	242:13,18 243:7,
statements	subject 224:25	222:13	ten-year 265:3	12 251:9 260:20,
287:22	279:23	supporters	tendered 244:9	22 269:18 271:20
states 239:15	submission	280:17	248:6	275:24 276:13,
275:19	216:4,7,11 220:1	supporting	tens 280:13	18,23 277:7,13,
status 283:25	228:7,8,11	247:16		18 278:23 282:11 288:8 290:6,7
statutory 239:18	234:22,25 235:2	supportive 226:3	terms 219:16 223:14 224:11,15	1
269:2	239:24 240:1,6	supports 226:1	229:18,22,25	timelines 218:10 262:7 275:14
steering 269:12	244:8,12 248:6,9	surface 245:22,	233:10 234:16	282:17
step 230:4 254:9	258:4 274:17,19	23 246:9 258:25	241:5 243:10	timeliness
269:4	275:9,17 278:11	surmise 276:21	244:7 247:13	261:12 263:15
Stevenson	submissions	surrounding	249:24 250:15,	timely 234:3
233:25	261:11 268:19	232:6 283:6	22,25 262:11,23	237:23 286:8
stood 272:8	270:6 275:21	suspect 289:20	264:3 275:13,23	times 213:12
straightforward	submits 285:9,11	suspending	290:9,19,22	timing 241:9
279:24	286:2	276:9	test 257:2	243:10 261:24
strategy 222:5	submitted	swear 273:8	testimony 280:7	287:3
streamline 263:2	260:17 274:26	sworn 215:10	theme 261:11	today 214:4
Street 232:2	276:2,3,11,24	273:6,10	themes 218:13	215:18,26 217:12
240:23 267:1	success 281:20	system 221:20	then-minister	219:25 225:24
284:11	successful	230:12,18 268:18	253:7	226:18 227:13
streets 224:18	281:17	systems 218:19	thereof 261:7	244:17 246:23
strictly 213:21	successfully	5/5001115 210.17	thickness 242:20	248:15 254:14
284:1	261:1		thing 213:10	275:7 279:15
stringent 262:8	suggest 261:21	T	things 213:5	288:22
strokes 234:16	suggests 260:6	table 223:19	251:11 255:17	today's 214:7
strongly 280:9	summarize	tag 230:25	260:2 270:8	291:7
structure 222:6,8	233:11 256:21	take-it-or-leave-	271:4 280:8	told 213:7 242:17
224:12,13	summarized	it 231:15	thinking 222:26	245:15 257:23
235:22,23 246:9	219:26	201.10	255:10	tomorrow
,				288:20,26 289:2,

278:17 279:14 266:6 273:21 Utilities 253:14 **webcast** 213:15 5.9.22 290:10.15 291:1,8 279:6 tune 230:23 utilized 243:9 **website** 219:22 **top** 219:18,19,21 understanding turn 214:11 utilizing 264:15 weeds 268:26 228:12 232:12 **topic** 218:2,18 286:23 well-being 240:4 254:1,3 256:14 **turning** 231:17 280:15 281:21 \mathbf{V} 275:10 topography 277:20 287:5 west 228:23 understands 236:7 two-and-a-half **vague** 241:13 231:18.21.23 275:22 **total** 231:12 215:22 **valid** 275:26 232:21 233:17 understood **touched** 235:26 **tvpe** 222:22 223:5 **Western** 239:14 **Valley** 228:25 236:25 246:16 247:11,25 225:6 234:16 **Westren** 273:11, **variety** 220:13 undertakes 284:17 Town 228:25 18,22 277:20,22, vastlv 245:15 216:17 **types** 236:12 24 278:2,6,18,25 towns 226:2 **vehicle** 233:21 undoubtably 279:3,6,11 282:7 typically 235:16 venture 232:8 283:10 286:13,15 287:19 252:2.14 253:11. **tracks** 263:14 **versus** 271:2 **undue** 285:6 17 254:8 256:10 whisperer **trades** 247:17 **viable** 236:17 **United** 239:15 267:12 traffic 269:7 vice 244:1 277:23 units 251:15 wholistic 264:16 IJ **Trail** 232:22 279:12 **unlike** 224:1 **windfall** 284:17 transact 263:4 video 213:14,16, **UDI** 214:15 unproductive **window** 260:4 transcribed 216:3.9.17.19.25 17.19.21 282:3 **withheld** 245:10 292:6 view 263:7 217:4,6,8,15,20, unreactiveness witnesses 214:22 transcribing 23 218:5 219:17 270:21 264:14 273:6,8 279:17 213:13 227:7 220:3,21,23,25 **viewers** 213:19 unreasonable 288:21 289:2,12 transcript 221:8,12 222:23 **Village** 232:18 283:21 290:20 226:6,13,25 213:17,18 292:1, 246:4 **unsafe** 233:21 wondering 235:25 247:6 Villages 232:26 261:23 270:26 **updated** 222:23 ultimate 252:4 transparency 233:4 272:1 upgrade 267:1 218:12 226:15 ultimately 221:6 vindictive 285:6 **wording** 255:12 280:2 231:4,7 249:18 223:1 226:9 **vision** 223:8 work 217:10 255:20 261:12.23 upgrades 266:4 235:10 237:5 **vitae** 274:5 226:6 230:21 263:15 264:14 284:16 239:21 241:22 277:25 232:6,10 234:16 251:13,17,22 upgrading transparent 236:19 238:21 vital 280:15 283:3 279:26 281:11 287:23 239:7 241:6,10, **volume** 269:7 283:12,22 **unable** 245:9 **Uplands** 240:19 18,20 251:10 traversing 223:4 uncertainty upwards 251:3 258:16,17,18,21 225:22 **Tribunal** 253:15 \mathbf{W} urban 215:20 259:17 267:20,21 unchangeable **trigger** 263:13 219:9 221:25 274:9 278:3 **walk** 236:10 223:7 223:13 **trouble** 213:8 280:3 281:17 unclear 238:20 **wall** 242:11,20 267:10 urgency 238:9 282:5,26 283:14, **wanted** 259:19 17,20 284:1 uncooperative **true** 274:22 279:1 user 223:1 252:12 287:15,20 282:2 watershed **Tsoukalas** users 226:5 224:23 workable 286:3 understand 273:10,19,26 239:22 236:23 237:2.12 wavs 260:24 worked 243:6,11 274:2,4,8,25 users' 222:26 238:11 249:7 272:1 275:4 277:6,16 259:6 260:8

working 215:21 218:3 220:26 224:16 225:3 243:7 280:2 works 268:18 wrap 225:11 290:8 **wrapped** 289:13 **written** 216:4 228:7 234:22,25 239:24 240:6 241:22 244:8 248:6 270:6 274:17,19 275:17 277:10 278:11,13 284:12 wrong 262:13 266:19 Y **year** 219:18 264:24 **years** 215:22 217:25 218:1 219:6 229:8 230:8,19 231:3 239:10,11 248:21 250:21 263:22 265:5,11 279:20 yesterday 214:3 221:4 225:14 229:15,19 235:8 251:7 268:16 \mathbf{Z} **zero-cost** 259:19 **zoning** 224:20 235:24