THE ALBERTA ENERGY REGULATOR

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

AER PROCEEDING

VOLUME 5

Calgary, Alberta
March 13, 2024

	300	
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2		
3	Description	Page
4		
5	March 13, 2024 Morning Session	587
6	Final Submissions by G. Fitch	589
7	Final Submissions by E. Dixon	659
8		
9	March 13, 2024 Afternoon Session	691
10	Final Submissions by T. Myers	692
11	Final Submissions by D. Naffin	732
12	Final Submissions by S. Duncanson	773
13	Final Submissions by G. Fitch (Reply)	799
14	Certificate of Transcript	824
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

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

		300
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 THE CHAIR: Good morning. Please be
- 3 seated.
- 4 Good morning, everyone, and welcome back to
- 5 Govier Hall. So as every day of the hearing, there's
- 6 a little bit of a reminder that video cast is going to
- 7 be streamed -- live-streamed on a link on AER
- 8 website -- from a link on the AER website. We don't
- 9 record the video cast, and the video cast is not the
- 10 transcript.
- 11 So the court reporters will prepare the only
- 12 transcript that we -- that's official transcript of
- this hearing, and any viewers who are observing, please
- 14 refrain from recording or rebroadcasting the live
- 15 stream. For the benefit of the court reporters, please
- 16 speak slowly and one at a time. And if you have
- 17 difficulty hearing us, just point to us.
- 18 Any preliminaries today? None.
- 19 Okay. So going with the schedule we had, we have
- 20 Qualico's final argument.
- 21 Whenever you are ready.
- 22 Final Submissions by G. Fitch
- 23 G. FITCH: Good morning, Madam Chair,
- 24 Hearing Commissioners, AER staff.
- 25 On behalf of our clients, Qualico Developments
- 26 West Limited and the members of the Developers Group,

we would like to begin by thanking the AER for a fair 1 2 and efficient hearing. It's been our honour and 3 pleasure to spend the last number of days in the 4 hearing room with you and look forward to presenting Qualico's final argument this morning. 5 6 So I want to begin, believe it or not, in 1958, 7 which was 10 years before the Pembina pipeline was built and 13 years before the Plains pipeline was built 8 9 because that was the year that the Alberta Legislature 10 passed what was then Bill 14, a new version of the 11 Pipeline Act. And that bill contained Section 34, 12 which basically stated, in subsection (1): (as read) 13 The minister may, upon such terms and 14 conditions as he deems proper, direct a licencee to alter or relocate any part of his 15 pipeline if, in the minister's opinion, the 16 alteration or relocation would be in the 17 public interest. 18 And Subsection 2 of Section 34 stated that: 19 (as read) Where the minister directs the alteration or 20 21 relocation of any part of a pipeline, he may 22 order the payment of such compensation as he 23 may determine and by whom and to whom the 24 compensation is payable. 25 So today that provision is Section 33 of the Pipeline

The reference to the "minister" has changed to

26

- 1 the "Regulator", but substantively the section is the
- 2 same. And, of course, Qualico's application is brought
- 3 pursuant to Section 33. And I raise this at the outset
- 4 because my friends for -- representing Plains and
- 5 Pembina would have the Hearing Commissioners believe
- 6 that what Qualico is requesting in this application is
- 7 somehow extraordinary or unusual, and it is not at all.
- 8 It has been possible for a party to bring an
- 9 application to relocate or alter a pipeline and to see
- 10 cost sharing for 65 years or so in this province.
- 11 Applications have been made under Section 34 and
- 12 Section 33 before, and cost sharing has been ordered by
- 13 the ERCB and the AER before.
- 14 Qualico is simply exercising a right which the
- 15 legislature has given to persons in this province in
- 16 1958. So Qualico's application, obviously, is brought
- on the basis that alteration of the Plains and Pembina
- 18 pipelines is in the public interest, and we seek an
- 19 order that the cost of the alterations be shared as
- 20 between the two pipeline companies and Qualico.
- 21 In our amended application, we have suggested a
- 22 50-50 cost sharing. This is on the basis that the
- 23 continued safe operation of the pipelines, on the one
- 24 hand, and the construction of arterial roads required
- 25 to accommodate new growth mandated by the
- 26 City of Edmonton's statutory plans, on the other hand,

- 1 are both in the public interest, and there is no reason
- 2 to favour one over the other. And I'm going to be
- 3 expanding on this point later in my argument.
- 4 But before commencing the substantive portion of
- 5 my argument, I just want to briefly summarize the
- 6 evidence that Qualico relies on in support of its
- 7 application. So there's, obviously, the written
- 8 evidence that was filed prior to the hearing, and then
- 9 the oral evidence that you have heard over the past
- 10 week and a half.
- 11 So with regard to the written evidence, Qualico
- 12 expressly relies on Exhibit 5.01, which is our amended
- 13 application, and I'll just be referring to it as our
- 14 application. We rely on Qualico's response to the
- 15 Regulator's Supplemental Information Reguest Number 2,
- 16 and that's Exhibit 4.01 at PDF 51, and that includes
- 17 Mr. Morrison's first report, which is in the same
- 18 exhibit at PDF 58. We will be relying on Qualico's
- 19 written submissions in response to the notice of
- 20 reconsideration, and those are in Exhibit 6.01 at
- 21 PDF 280. We will be relying on Qualico's reply to the
- 22 submissions of Pembina and Plains, again, in response
- 23 to the notice of reconsideration, also contained in
- 24 Exhibit 6.01, PDF page 416. We will be relying on
- 25 Qualico's written submissions for the public hearing,
- 26 which are Exhibit 64.01 and which include

- 1 Mr. Morrison's second report at PDF page 20. We will
- 2 be relying on the Developers Group written submissions
- 3 for the public hearing, and that's Exhibit 66.01. And,
- 4 finally, Qualico's reply to the joint submissions of
- 5 Plains, Pembina, and SECURE, which is Exhibit 79.02
- 6 and which includes Mr. Morrison's final report at
- 7 PDF page 24.
- 8 So just for the record, those are the main
- 9 portions of the documentary record that Qualico will be
- 10 relying on.
- 11 With respect to the oral evidence adduced at this
- 12 hearing, obviously we will be relying on the evidence
- 13 given by the members of the witness panels for both
- 14 Qualico and the Developers Group. In our submission,
- 15 all of the witnesses called for both Qualico and the
- 16 Developers Group were entirely credible and
- 17 well-informed. They had firsthand knowledge of the
- 18 crossings in question and the discussions and the
- 19 negotiations that they were involved in.
- 20 By contrast, Pembina, Plains, and also Keyera
- 21 chose to seat senior officers and employees, none of
- 22 whom had firsthand and personal knowledge of these
- 23 matters, the result being that they were frequently
- 24 unable to answer very basic questions about the events
- 25 which gave rise to Qualico's application.
- 26 You heard from Mr. Gerein and Mr. Dal Bello of

- 1 WSP. These are folks that were there. They had the
- 2 conversations with the folks at Pembina and Plains.
- 3 They sent the emails, received the emails. They
- 4 participated in all of these discussions.
- 5 By contrast, Mr. Trim and Mr. Torr for Plains and
- 6 Mr. Sprott and Mr. Balfour for Pembina were not there.
- 7 They had no firsthand knowledge; they had no personal
- 8 knowledge. Therefore, our submission is that where the
- 9 evidence of Plains and Pembina and the evidence of
- 10 Qualico conflicts on a factual question, i.e., what
- 11 actually happened, the Hearing Commissioners should
- 12 prefer the evidence of the Qualico witnesses.
- So why are we here? What is this hearing about?
- 14 So the most basic procedural facts are that Qualico
- 15 filed its application originally on -- in
- 16 November 2020. It filed its amended application in
- 17 January 2022. The amended application was dismissed
- 18 by the AER in April 2022, and then the Regulator issued
- 19 a notice of reconsideration in November 2022.
- 20 One argument you have heard or read from my
- 21 friends at Plains and Pembina is that there is no
- 22 legitimate -- no legitimate dispute with respect to the
- 23 need for the alterations, and, therefore, so they
- 24 argue, there's no need for an order under Section 33(1)
- 25 of the Pipeline Act.
- 26 And you will recall my friend Mr. Myers spent the

- 1 first half hour of his cross-examination taking the
- 2 Qualico witness panel through the black line version of
- 3 our application in an attempt to show that in our
- 4 original application Qualico acknowledged there was no
- 5 disagreement regarding the need for the alterations and
- 6 that the only dispute is about cost.
- 7 And then you also heard the witnesses for Plains
- 8 and Pembina self-servingly repeating again and again
- 9 that they are willing and able to undertake the work,
- 10 ergo, no dispute.
- In our submission, in Qualico's submission, this
- 12 argument and that whole line of cross-examination and
- 13 evidence was incorrect and improper. It is incorrect
- 14 and improper because it was dismissed by the AER in the
- 15 reconsideration decision issued November 14, 2022, and
- 16 that's Exhibit 6.01 at PDF page 3. Quote -- and
- 17 they're talking about the original decision in
- 18 April 2022: (as read)
- 19 In the decision, the AER declined to decide
- 20 the application made to it under
- 21 Subsection 33(1) of the Pipeline Act on the
- 22 basis that there was no dispute that the work
- 23 should be done; however, the legislative test
- set out in Subsection 33(1) requires in
- respect of Subsection 33(1), paragraph (a)
- 26 that direction to a licencee to alter its

- pipeline must be in the public interest.

 It does not require dispute regarding the
- alteration. Failing to apply the legislative
- 4 test set out in Subsection 33(1) constitutes
- 5 a prima facie error.
- 6 So this was a prima facie error that constituted
- 7 exceptional and compelling grounds, justifying the
- 8 exercise of the AER's reconsideration power.
- 9 Now, Pembina and Plains both filed requests that
- 10 the AER reconsider the reconsideration decision. Those
- 11 requests were denied. So the reconsideration decision
- 12 was issued in November 2022; the denial of the request
- 13 to reconsider the reconsideration decision was in
- 14 December of 2022, so all of this was about a year and a
- 15 half ago.
- Regardless, since then, Pembina and Plains have
- 17 continued to argue in their written evidence and
- 18 submissions that there must be a dispute that the work
- 19 be done in order for the AER to issue an order under
- 20 Section 33, and Qualico submits to you that this Panel,
- 21 in fact, does not have the authority to deny Qualico's
- 22 application on the basis that there is no dispute that
- 23 the work needs to be done because that issue has been
- 24 decided. It was decided by the AER in its
- 25 reconsideration decision. If you were to do that now
- 26 at the end of this hearing, you would be repeating the

- 1 prima facie error made by the AER in its April 2022
- 2 decision which led to this reconsideration and this
- 3 hearing.
- 4 So that's what the hearing is not about. It's not
- 5 about whether there is a dispute as to the need for the
- 6 work. What the hearing is about are the two issues
- 7 identified by the Regulator in the notice of
- 8 reconsideration: one, the nature of the requested
- 9 pipeline alterations, whether the pipeline alterations
- 10 are in the public interest and why; and, two, should
- 11 the AER direct the work, the cost of the work, and by
- 12 whom and to whom it should be paid and why. So that's
- 13 what this hearing is about.
- 14 Having just submitted to you that the hearing is
- 15 not about whether there is a dispute, I do want to just
- 16 briefly address the evidence, 'cause there actually was
- 17 a fair bit of it, about the nature of the dispute.
- In our submission, the record is clear that there
- 19 has never been any agreement between Qualico and
- 20 Pembina and Plains with respect to the crossings other
- 21 than everyone understood something has to be done. But
- 22 what that something is, what that work is, which
- 23 methodology, how extensive, that has never been agreed
- 24 to.
- 25 You will recall that I began my cross-examination
- 26 by referring the Pembina and Plains witnesses to

1 Section 28(2) of the Pipeline Rules, which states: 2 (as read) 3 Prior to the initiation of any construction related to the building, improving or 4 widening of a road or highway over an 5 6 existing pipeline or extending a road or highway right-of-way over an existing pipeline, the pipeline at such locations must 8 9 either be upgraded or otherwise meet the 10 requirements of CSA Z662 respecting crossings 11 of existing pipelines. 12 So that's the source of this requirement to ensure that when roadwork is being done overtop a pipeline, the 13 14 pipeline is going to continue to comply with CSA Z662, either because it's being upgraded or because it just 15 doesn't need to be, but you have to have figured that 16 17 out. So after doing that, I then had this guestion and 18 answer with Mr. Torr from Plains, and this was at 19 20 transcript page 344: (as read) 21 All right. Is it fair to say that until 0 22 the integrity assessment is done, nobody knows what work may or may not be 23 24 required? Is that fair? MR. TORR: 25 Α Yes, that is fair. 26 So the reality is that it remains the case today that

- 1 nobody, neither Plains and certainly not Qualico, knows
- 2 what work actually is going to be required at -- at the
- 3 Plains crossing.
- 4 And staying with the Plains crossing,
- 5 Exhibit 86.01, you will recall, is the cost recovery
- 6 agreement for the 167th Avenue/Meridian Street
- 7 crossing, and I cross-examined on that document, and
- 8 you will recall that the scope of work included things
- 9 such as excavation, inspection of the pipeline, and
- 10 construction of the concrete slab.
- 11 And -- and in cross-examination, the witnesses for
- 12 Plains agreed that as of the date of that agreement,
- which was March 11, 2019, the pipeline had not yet been
- 14 inspected, and, in fact, they also agreed that as of
- 15 today, Plains has not done any excavation work at the
- 16 167th Avenue intersection.
- 17 That led, then, to this exchange with Mr. Torr at
- 18 transcript page 351: (as read)
- 19 Q Okay. So would you agree with me,
- Mr. Torr, that as of today, there has
- 21 been no final determination made as to
- 22 what alteration work will, in fact, have
- 23 to be carried out at that crossing
- 24 location?
- 25 A Yes, that's correct. Because there has
- 26 been no agreement between us and, in

- 1 this case, Horse Hills or Qualico.
- 2 So there has been no final determination made what work
- 3 has to be carried out.
- 4 So that's Plains. With regard to Pembina and the
- 5 crossing at 167th Avenue, we talked during the hearing
- 6 about Exhibit 88.01, which is the interim support
- 7 agreement or backstopping agreement dated April 11,
- 8 2019. This is the one where Qualico agreed to pay
- 9 Pembina \$60,000. And we talked about the scope of work
- 10 under that agreement, which basically was a
- 11 fit-for-service engineering assessment by a third-party
- 12 engineering company and an integrity review by Pembina.
- So during cross-examination, I asked whether this
- 14 scope of work was to, in effect, conduct the integrity
- 15 assessment required by CSA Z662. In response -- and
- 16 this is at transcript page 357 -- Mr. Balfour said that
- 17 the scope of work was to come up with a "detailed scope
- 18 of work". So Qualico paid \$60,000 to Pembina to let
- 19 them prepare a detailed scope of work.
- 20 So I -- I asked again after that, Was the intent
- 21 of the work covered by the interim support agreement to
- 22 carry out the integrity assessment required to meet the
- 23 requirements of CSA Z662? Mr. Balfour's answer, "No".
- 24 That was at transcript page 358.
- 25 He also confirmed that Pembina has never done any
- 26 excavation at 167th Avenue and there has been no

- 1 physical or external inspection of the pipeline at that
- 2 crossing location. That was at transcript page 359.
- 3 So then after Mr. Balfour and I talked about the
- 4 interim support agreement, he confirmed that Pembina
- 5 provided Qualico with a final support agreement. And
- 6 that's the one that's referred to in our amended
- 7 application where Pembina basically told Qualico it's
- 8 going to cost \$559,000 to do the work at that crossing
- 9 location.
- 10 And I asked Mr. Sprott at transcript page 366:
- 11 (as read)
- 12 So it's fair, is it not, to conclude that as
- of today, there has not been a determination
- made of what alteration work will, in fact,
- have to be carried out at that crossing
- location, has there?
- 17 And Mr. Sprott -- Mr. Sprott answered: (as read)
- No. We would definitely need to go out and
- 19 re-evaluate the situation.
- 20 So Qualico submits, in short, that the evidence is
- 21 clear. The work required at the 167th intersection
- 22 both for Plains and Pembina has, to this date, never
- 23 been determined. That being the case, there has also
- 24 never been any agreement on the work that needs to be
- 25 done, and there is a dispute, and there is a need for
- 26 an order under Subsection (1) of Section 33.

- So I'd now like to return to Section 33, the -
 the wording of Section 33 and its purpose and the fact

 that a version of Section 33 has existed since 1958.

 And my first submission on this point is what that

 means is that since 1958, all pipeline operators in

 Alberta must be taken to be aware whenever they build a
 - 7 pipeline that the AER may, in the future, issue an
 - 8 order to relocate that pipeline and may require the
 - 9 operator to pay some or all of the costs of doing so.
- 10 An operator's right to quiet enjoyment under its 11 right-of-way agreements that they need to construct and 12 operate their pipeline, that right does not and cannot 13 shield them from the application of Section 33 and the
- 14 possibility that the AE -- that the AER may make an
- 15 order under Section 33 and that it may -- and that --
- 16 and that that order may include cost sharing.
- 17 But that is the logic and clear implication of
- 18 Plains and Pembina's first-in-time, first-in-right
- 19 theory. They say, We have the right to quiet enjoyment
- 20 under our right-of-way agreements, and that right
- 21 cannot be interfered with, not even by the AER under
- 22 Section 33. They don't say that part out loud, but
- 23 that's the clear implication. And, in response,
- Qualico submits that that position, if accepted by this
- 25 Hearing Panel, would make Section 33 a meaningless
- 26 remedy.

1 So, again, what is the meaning of Section 33? 2 What is its purpose? So, unfortunately, there is no 3 Hansard from -- excuse me -- the enactment of the 1958 4 version of the Pipeline Act that sheds light on what the Legislature's intention was when it enacted 5 6 Section 34, but as we state in Exhibit 79.02, which is Qualico's reply submission from February 14th of this year, there are other statutes, such as the Canadian 8 9 Energy Regulator Act and the Hydro and Electric Energy 10 Act, which have provisions very similar, practically 11 identical, to Section 33. 12 So, for example, Section 17 of the Hydro and 13 Electric Energy Act states: (as read) 14 The Commission [being the Alberta Utilities 15 Commission] may, on any terms and conditions it considers proper, direct a permittee or 16 17 licencee to alter or relocate any part of the permittee or licencee's transmission line if, 18 in the Commission's opinion, the alteration 19 or relocation would be in the public 20 21 interest. 22 So very similar to Section 33(1) of the Pipeline Act. And then Subsection (2) states: 23 (as read) The Commission may, in an order under 24 Subsection (1), provide for the payment of 25 26 compensation and prescribe the persons by

1	whom and to whom the compensation is payable.
2	Again, very similar to the wording of Subsection 2 of
3	Section 33 of the Pipeline Act.
4	As stated in Qualico's reply submission, again,
5	Exhibit 79.02, the Alberta Utilities Commission
6	considered the purpose and the meaning of Section 17 of
7	the Hydro and Electric Energy Act in an application to
8	alter the Heartland Transmission Line, which,
9	interestingly, is also on the urban periphery of the
10	city of Edmonton in the transportation and utility
11	corridor parallel to Anthony Henday drive.
12	So this decision is Decision 2012-333. We refer
13	to it in our written submissions. In paragraph 24 of
14	that decision, the Commission stated: (as read)
15	Section 17 empowers the Commission to do two
16	things: (a), direct a transmission facility
17	owner to alter or relocate an approved
18	transmission line when it is in the public
19	interest to do so, and, (b), decide who
20	should be responsible for paying the costs of
21	the alteration or relocation if the party
22	requesting the alteration and the
23	transmission facility owner cannot reach a
24	cost-sharing agreement for the alteration.
25	Then in paragraph 27, the Commission stated: (as read)
26	When the Commission receives an application

1	to alter or relocate a previously approved
2	transmission line under Section 17, that
3	application relates to a transmission line
4	that the Commission has already determined to
5	be in the public interest. Accordingly, for
6	the alteration or relocation proposed and the
7	Section 17 application to be in the public
8	interest, the proposed alteration or
9	relocation must necessarily be premised upon
10	changed circumstances, which could include
11	the existence of new material information
12	since the transmission line was approved.
13	In the next paragraph of the decision, the Commission
14	refers to Hansard related to the enactment of
15	Section 17 on and the purpose of Section 17, and one
16	of those purposes, according to the Hansard, is to
17	allow for a transmission line and relocations as a
18	result of: (as read)
18 19	result of: (as read) Rapid growth and more severe land use
19	Rapid growth and more severe land use
19 20	Rapid growth and more severe land use conflicts.
19 20 21	Rapid growth and more severe land use conflicts. So after having gone through that analysis, in
19 20 21 22	Rapid growth and more severe land use conflicts. So after having gone through that analysis, in paragraph 29 of Decision 2012-333, the AUC concluded:
19 20 21 22 23	Rapid growth and more severe land use conflicts. So after having gone through that analysis, in paragraph 29 of Decision 2012-333, the AUC concluded: (as read)

- 1 after the approval of a transmission line.
- 2 Such a conflict could result from urban
- 3 growth or the need for other infrastructure
- 4 in the area.
- 5 So this is exactly what we're dealing with in this
- 6 case. These pipelines need to be altered to
- 7 accommodate the conversion of Meridian Street [sic]
- 8 from a two-lane roadway to a four-lane arterial road as
- 9 a result of urban growth.
- 10 So the AUC, in Decision 2012-333, talking about
- 11 Section 17, which is so similar to Section 33 of the
- 12 Pipeline Act, in our view, correctly identified this
- 13 very type of situation as being -- this type of
- 14 situation, Section 17, and we argue, by analogy,
- 15 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act is expressly aimed to
- 16 deal with.
- 17 Now, this leads me to the next thing I'd like to
- 18 talk about, which is you will, of course, recall
- 19 hearing the Pembina and Plains witnesses say over and
- 20 over again that Qualico is the "cause" of the work that
- 21 needs to be done; therefore, Qualico should pay. And I
- 22 am here to submit to you that that is not correct. The
- 23 cause is not Oualico; the cause is the accommodation of
- 24 urban growth in -- in -- in northeast Edmonton.
- 25 Qualico is not the cause of the work.
- The evidence on this point, Qualico's evidence,

- 1 which is largely set out in our application but was
- 2 also spoken to by our witness panel, is uncontested.
- 3 As stated in the Edmonton metropolitan regional growth
- 4 plan, the population of Edmonton is projected to
- 5 increase from 1.2 million to 2.2 million by 2044, so in
- 6 just the next 20 years.
- 7 Horse Hills is expressly identified as a priority
- 8 growth area in the City of Edmonton's planning
- 9 documents. Horse Hills is projected to increase in
- 10 population from 3,000 in 2020 to 65 to 70,000 in 2044,
- 11 so only 16 years from now.
- 12 There is an approved area structure plan and
- 13 neighbourhood structure plan -- area structure plan for
- 14 Horse Hills and neighbourhood structure plan for
- 15 Marquis. As per the neighbourhood structure plan,
- 16 Marquis is anticipated to be complete in approximately
- 17 2035, and this one neighbourhood alone -- and this is
- 18 the neighbourhood Qualico has already started
- 19 developing -- will, at full buildout, have 13,000
- 20 dwellings and approximately 29,500 residents. And that
- 21 was testified to by Mr. Gerein.
- The area structure plan for Horse Hills is an
- 23 indication of the City of Edmonton's belief that
- 24 development in Horse Hills and Marquis is needed and is
- 25 in the public interest. Even Mr. Romanesky agreed with
- 26 the proviso that if by "public interest" you mean that

- 1 the development planned in the ASP will achieve the
- 2 City's vision of sustainable development, then, yes,
- 3 it's in the public interest.
- 4 So there's really no disagreement that this growth
- 5 in Horse Hills and in Marquis is in the public
- 6 interest. The City of Edmonton wants it. And Qualico
- 7 is one of several developers that is going to be
- 8 carrying out the work required to achieve that vision.
- 9 So it is the growth in population in the City of
- 10 Edmonton that is the cause of the upgrading to
- 11 Meridian Street from basically an old two-lane country
- 12 road to a four-lane city standard arterial road, an
- 13 arterial road that will be a public road owned by the
- 14 City on public land owned by the City.
- 15 Qualico is the applicant here because of the
- operation of the City's ARA bylaw, the arterial roadway
- 17 assessment bylaw. And, basically, Qualico is the
- 18 applicant because it is the first developer in, so to
- 19 speak, and, therefore, it has to build the road.
- 20 But if Qualico wasn't the first developer in, it
- 21 would be someone else. So, indeed, this is what
- 22 happened with the Meridian Street and 172nd Avenue
- 23 crossing. It turned out Qualico was not the first
- 24 developer in. Rather, the MLC Group through its joint
- 25 venture Marquis JV Limited went first. And so it ended
- 26 up being Marquis JV who had to do the work, not

- 1 Qualico.
- 2 And I -- I -- I point -- point this out to -- to
- 3 address this argument that it's somehow the individual
- 4 developer, be it Qualico or Marquis JV, that is, (a),
- 5 the cause of this, and, (b), therefore should pay the
- 6 costs. But whether it's Qualico, Marquis JV, Melcor,
- 7 Cantiro Group, whomever, it's all to the same end. The
- 8 goal is to construct a public road on public land that
- 9 is required to accommodate growth called for in the
- 10 City of Edmonton's various statutory and other plans.
- 11 So, again, Qualico is not the cause of the work
- 12 required to be done to these pipelines. I think a
- 13 better way to think of it is that Qualico is the agent
- 14 by which the work which, first and foremost, is for the
- 15 benefit of the City of Edmonton -- so Qualico is the
- 16 agent by which this work will be carried out.
- 17 So I've talked about the fact that during the
- 18 hearing the Plains and Pembina witnesses repeatedly
- 19 referred to Qualico as being the cause of the work.
- 20 They also repeatedly referred to Qualico as the
- 21 "second-in-time party". And this, of course, was all
- 22 part of reiterating their key message that the
- 23 second-in-time party is responsible for costs.
- 24 So we have already submitted -- Qualico has
- 25 already submitted that the first-in-time,
- 26 first-in-right principle does not trump Section 33 of

- 1 the Pipeline Act; in fact, it's the other way around.
- 2 The intention of the legislature as expressed through
- 3 Section 33 trumps the first-in-time, first-in-right
- 4 principle.
- 5 In Canada, property rights are not inviolable.
- 6 They are subject to all manner of regulation. And, in
- 7 fact, the Supreme Court of Canada recently confirmed in
- 8 Annapolis Group Inc. v Halifax Regional Municipality
- 9 2022 SCC three six six that: (as read)
- 10 Government may validly regulate the use of
- 11 property even if it devalues the property so
- long as the regulation does not result in the
- effective confiscation of the property, in
- 14 which case, it would constitute a
- 15 constructive taking or a de facto
- 16 expropriation.
- 17 So Annapolis -- the Annapolis Group case was a case
- 18 about de facto expropriation or what the Supreme Court
- 19 of Canada now calls "constructive taking".
- 20 But the point for our purposes today is that there
- 21 is nothing sacrosanct about property rights in Canada,
- 22 and there's nothing sacrosanct, in particular, about
- 23 the rights of Plains and Pembina under their
- 24 right-of-way agreements, as they would have you
- 25 believe.
- 26 But there is a further flaw in Pembina and Plains'

- 1 argument, and that is that they are not, in fact,
- 2 first-in-time at the crossing locations. Sturgeon
- 3 County, now the City of Edmonton, is first-in-time, and
- 4 that's because the crossings are not on land owned by
- 5 Qualico but on land owned by the City. 1968, 1970,
- 6 this was a public road allowance; Meridian Street, I
- 7 believe, existed. So there's no question about this.
- 8 And you will recall I cross-examined Mr. Telford
- 9 on this point. And I'm just going to quote from some
- 10 of that cross-examination starting at transcript
- 11 page 459. So at lines 5 to 8, I'd asked: (as read)
- 12 Q Where a pipeline right-of-way crosses a
- public road, you can't register the
- 14 right-of-way because there's no title to
- 15 the road, is there?
- 16 A That is correct.
- 17 And then at line 11, same page: (as read)
- 18 O And would you agree with me that no
- 19 pipeline can be constructed across a
- 20 public road without the approval of the
- 21 local authority?
- 22 A I don't know if there's any appeal, but
- in all instances I've dealt with, we've
- 24 always got an approval.
- 25 O Okay. So if you imagine a pipeline
- 26 right-of-way that runs through private

1	land and then crosses a public road
2	allowance and then carries on running
3	through another parcel of private land,
4	you have this situation where the
5	pipeline operator has a right-of-way
6	agreement where the pipeline crosses the
7	private land on either side of of the
8	road, but its rights to cross the road
9	are by virtue of a crossing agreement
10	with the local authority; isn't that
11	right?
12	A I am not sure if that's a hundred
13	percent the case, but I would say it's
14	common that you have a crossing
15	agreement, whether it's Crown land,
16	whether it's municipal land, or
17	provincial.
18	So now this is on page 460, line 4: (as read)
19	Q And, sir, would you agree with me that,
20	in this case, Meridian Street was
21	already existing when these two
22	pipelines were constructed?
23	A I think we're starting to get into
24	legal, but I believe there is a road
25	allowance surveyed there.
26	So skipping ahead a little bit. Transcript page 461,

1	line 3: (as read)
2	Q So, sir, doesn't that mean the County's,
3	now the City's, interest in the public
4	road right-of-way is first-in-time to
5	Plains' and Pembina's interest under the
6	crossing agreement it had to enter into
7	with the County?
8	A I'm not sure if I understand that
9	question. Is it to do with rights,
10	like, the County was there first?
11	Q The County was there first.
12	A I'll agree with that.
13	So Pembina and Plains' argument, this first-in-time,
14	first-in-right argument, is predicated on the premise
15	that they have rights in their right-of-way agreements
16	that are first-in-time to Qualico's rights, but they
17	do not have a right-of-way agreement across the
18	Meridian Street road allowance. As a matter of law,
19	it is impossible because public roads are not titled
20	parcels of land, so there is no title against which you
21	can register a right-of-way agreement.
22	And I'm going to refer as authority for that
23	proposition to Section 17 of the Municipal Government
24	Act, which is titled "Disposal of Estate or Interest in
25	Roads": (as read)
26	Subject to any other act or agreement, the

council of a city has the power and is deemed 1 2 always to have had the power to dispose of an 3 interest in a road in the city so long as the disposition does not amount to a sale or 4 5 lease or require a road closure under 6 Section 22. 7 So granting a consent or entering into a crossing agreement with a pipeline owner to allow that pipeline 8 to cross a road, that is a disposal by the City of an 9 10 interest in its road, and that's permissible because 11 it's something less than granting a lease or selling fee-simple title. 12 Subsection (2) of Section 17 of the Municipal 13 14 Government Act states: (as read) No interest disposed of under Subsection (1) 15 may be registered in a land titles office. 16 17 And, again, that's just confirmation that you can't do it because there's no title to the road. 18 And then, finally, Section 39(1) of the Pipeline 19 Act states -- well, it's titled "Pipeline Crossing 20 21 Road", and it states: (as read) 22 No pipeline should be constructed on, across, 23 over, or under a road without the approval of 24 the local authority concerned. 25 So although Mr. Telford did not want to offer a legal 26 opinion, and fair enough, it is clear that the right of

- 1 the -- of Plains and Pembina to have their pipelines
- 2 cross Meridian Street does not arise under any
- 3 right-of-way agreement. It arises under some form of
- 4 consent or agreement that it has to the City, and
- 5 there's -- you can't go to Land Titles and check to see
- 6 this.
- 7 And that leads me to paragraph 21 of the Keyera
- 8 written submission which Commissioner Robinson,
- 9 actually, picked up on and asked some questions about
- 10 the other day.
- 11 So this is -- this is where Keyera is articulating
- 12 the first-in-time, first-in-right principle. And
- 13 Keyera states: (as read)
- Qualico's position on cost sharing is also
- inconsistent with the buyer beware principle
- of Alberta's land titles laws. A purchaser
- of property has the opportunity and the onus
- 18 to review existing encumbrances on title,
- including pipeline rights-of-way, which have
- 20 priority over subsequently registered
- 21 interests before purchasing the property so
- the purchaser can properly determine whether
- 23 such encumbrances could limit how it intends
- to use the property. Any decision -- [that
- is decision by the AER] any decision that
- 26 would allow a purchaser to adversely effect

the quiet enjoyment of a person with a prior 1 2 interest in land by demanding alterations to 3 such interest and forcing unexpected costs on the prior interest holder would be 4 inconsistent with the buyer beware principle 5 6 and would create a precedent with serious 7 implications for AER-regulated pipelines. With respect, this argument is misguided because the 8 9 buyer beware principle has no application to pipeline 10 crossings of public roadways. It just simply does not. 11 Again, the pipeline right-of-way agreement is not 12 registered as an encumbrance against the title to the 13 public roadway because there is no title to the public 14 roadway. Fundamentally -- and I think maybe this is a 15 critical point that we haven't really thought much 16 17 about -- this is not really a contest between Plains' and Pembina's rights at the crossing and Qualico's 18 rights at the -- at the crossing, and the reason is 19 20 that Qualico has no rights at the crossing. Oualico has is an obligation to build the arterial 21 22 road, an obligation imposed by the City. It's the City that has rights at the crossing at Meridian Street, not 23 24 Oualico. 25 And, as we know, the City of Edmonton, through the ARA steering committee, expressly directed Qualico to 26

1	file the application, and the City supports the
2	application. And this is evidenced by the letter of
3	support issued by the City, which is attached to
4	Qualico's application at PDF page 35 of Exhibit 5.01.
5	It is a short letter, but I think it's important
6	because there's been a lot of talk in this hearing
7	about the City and the position of the City.
8	But, of course, unfortunately, the City elected
9	not to appear at the hearing, but they did send this
10	letter, and it's short, so I'm going to read it:
11	(as read)
12	As per the subdivision approval dated
13	April 25, 2019, Qualico is required to
14	undertake a number of different activities,
15	including the construction of portions of
16	certain arterial roadways. The
17	City of Edmonton confirms that the
18	ARA steering committee directed Qualico to
19	approach the Alberta Energy Regulator to seek
20	direction with respect to the sharing of the
21	costs associated with constructing pipeline
22	crossings along Meridian Street Northeast.
23	The City agrees that some type of cost
24	sharing with respect to the Meridian Street
25	Northeast pipeline crossings is in the public
26	interest. This letter confirms that the City
ı	

- is supportive of Qualico's application to the
- 2 AER in this case.
- 3 End of quote. The City is -- sorry. The letter is
- 4 signed by Neal Upshall, the general supervisor
- 5 subdivision and development coordination for the
- 6 City of Edmonton.
- 7 So as is clearly indicated in this letter, this is
- 8 not a case of Qualico attempting to assert so-called
- 9 second-in-time rights over Pembina and Plains'
- 10 first-in-time rights. Qualico has a subdivision
- 11 approval, and pursuant to that approval, it is
- 12 required, it is obligated to construct arterial
- 13 roadways. So there's no issue of Qualico's rights
- 14 trumping Pembina and Plains' rights. Qualico doesn't
- 15 even have any rights in this crossing. It's the City.
- So this brings me to discuss an issue raised by
- 17 Mr. Telford and Mr. Romanesky in their reports. And
- 18 they basically say the developer, as a second-in-time
- 19 party, "is responsible for costs". And I
- 20 cross-examined each of these gentlemen on those
- 21 assertions in their reports, and as was disclosed
- 22 during the cross-examination, neither Mr. Telford nor
- 23 Mr. Romanesky could point to anything in writing
- 24 anywhere, whether in legislation, regulations,
- 25 policies, or directives, stating that the initiating
- 26 party must pay. It doesn't exist.

- 1 What is written down in legislation is Section 33
- 2 of the Pipeline Act, which expressly empowers this
- 3 regulator to allocate costs when it makes an order that
- 4 alteration or relocation of a pipeline is in the public
- 5 interest.
- 6 Okay. I'm now going to switch gears and talk
- 7 about this issue of transparency or, as Qualico and the
- 8 Developers Group sees it, the complete lack of
- 9 transparency with respect to both, Number 1, what work
- 10 will have to be done, and, Number 2, how much it will
- 11 cost.
- 12 So both Pembina and Plains' witnesses claimed at
- various times during their evidence that, in fact, they
- 14 are very transparent. We disagree vehemently. You
- 15 heard Mr. Gerein testify, We paid for integrity
- 16 assessments, and they won't share them with us. And in
- 17 cross-examination, I explored this with the witnesses
- 18 for Pembina and Plains, and, in particular, I explored
- 19 the distinction between maintenance and repair work on
- 20 the pipelines that the companies would have to carry
- 21 out regardless of the crossing request versus work that
- 22 is actually required as a result of the crossing
- 23 request.
- 24 And at page thirty -- 381 -- sorry -- of the
- 25 transcripts, I asked: (as read)
- 26 O Would you agree that it would be

1	reasonable for the developer who has
2	approached you as part of its due
3	diligence to inquire about your
4	integrity and maintenance plans for the
5	location in question?
6	A MR. TRIM: No.
7	[To which I followed up and said]
8	Q Okay. The developer doesn't want to end
9	up paying for work you have to do
10	anyways, but you don't think it would be
11	reasonable for the development to
12	inquire into that?
13	A That's correct.
14	So, basically, You, developer, have to pay, but you
15	can't even see what you paid for. It's none of your
16	business.
17	Similarly, when I was cross-examining the Pembina
18	witnesses about whether they provided one of the
19	integrity reviews to Qualico, I asked at transcript
20	page 360 I asked that question at transcript
21	page 360, and the answer was: (as read)
22	A We did not provide that to Qualico. And
23	we typically don't provide that
24	information to crossing parties. The
25	results of the engineering assessment
26	contained proprietary information

1	related to our operational philosophy,
2	our risk management. It can contain
3	customer information that is
4	confidential. But we do want to work
5	with parties, and we provide what the
6	scope of work is, what the estimated
7	costs are, what the schedule would be.
8	It is our practice.
9	[To which I responded]
10	Q And the developer just has to take it on
11	faith?
12	A MR. SPROTT: I would say that the
13	developer doesn't have to take it on
14	faith. I'm here as a professional
15	engineer. I work at a public company
16	that is required by significant
17	regulation to be a pipeline operator.
18	Well, in our submission, that is the very definition
19	of, You have to take it on faith. Oh, don't worry.
20	I'm a professional engineer. Oh, don't worry. I work
21	at a public company. You can trust me, so I don't have
22	to provide you the information you sought. I just
23	basically tell you, Here's how much it's going to cost,
24	and you have to pay.
25	It is interesting that in the case of Keyera, they
26	did provide Brookfield with one integrity assessment

- 1 though Mr. Beztilny was careful to say, Oh, but that's
- 2 not our regular practice. But he was not able to offer
- 3 any explanation for why Keyera departed from that
- 4 practice in providing Brookfield with -- with the one
- 5 report. So clearly there is a serious lack of
- 6 transparency here. There's -- and that's with regard
- 7 to what work has to be done, but there's also a lack of
- 8 transparency, and I think maybe a better way to
- 9 describe it would be a lack of reliability with regard
- 10 to information provided about cost.
- 11 So you recall I -- I took the Pembina and Plains
- 12 witnesses through the various cost-recovery agreements
- or backstopping agreements. So to begin with, the
- 14 Plains crossing at 167th Avenue, the March 11, 2019,
- 15 cost-recovery agreement, which is Exhibit 86.01. That
- 16 agreement estimated the cost of the crossing to be
- 17 \$858,000. So that's the Plains crossing at
- 18 167th Avenue.
- 19 With regard to the Pembina crossing at
- 20 167th Avenue -- I think it's important to remember when
- 21 you look at the maps and the materials, the Pembina and
- 22 Plains pipelines are parallel to one another as they
- 23 cross the -- as they diagonally cross the intersection
- 24 of Meridian Street and 167th Avenue, so they are right
- 25 next to each other.
- So Plains says, Oh, it's going to cost \$858,000.

- 1 So what did Pembina say? Well, originally in 2014 when
- 2 they were first approached by CIMA+ on behalf of
- 3 Walton, they said it would be \$1,135,000, so a roughly
- 4 \$300,000 difference between what Pembina said it would
- 5 cost and what Plains later said it would cost.
- 6 Then in 2019, Qualico was provided with a new cost
- 7 estimate for the same crossing of \$559,000, half the
- 8 original estimate. And, remember, between 2014 and
- 9 when the first estimate of 1.1 million was given and
- 10 2019 when the second estimate of, we'll just call it,
- 11 \$560,000 was given, it's not like there had been any
- 12 work done in the interim to inspect the pipe, so it's
- 13 not like Pembina really had any better information in
- 14 2019 than it had in 2014, and yet their estimate is
- 15 half of what it was.
- So you have the Plains pipeline which is, you
- 17 know, right here, \$858,000; you have the Pembina
- 18 pipeline directly next to it, first it's 1.1 million,
- 19 now it's \$560,000.
- 20 With regard to the Pembina crossing at Marquis
- 21 Boulevard, so this is the one that Qualico basically
- 22 held its nose and paid for so it could start its
- 23 development, Exhibit 85.01, there was a backstopping
- 24 agreement for \$974,000. Mr. -- I think it was --
- 25 Balfour confirmed that the actual cost was \$482,000.
- 26 So clearly these cost estimates are all over the

- 1 map, and, frankly, it is simply not possible for
- 2 developers to reasonably rely on them. It would be
- 3 foolish, in fact, to take it on faith that these are
- 4 reliable cost estimates.
- 5 So next I want to talk about a related issue. So
- 6 we've talked about lack of transparency. Now I want to
- 7 talk about lack of timeliness.
- 8 So certainly, I think, the Hearing Commissioners
- 9 heard loud and clear from the witnesses for Qualico and
- 10 the Developers Group about the lack of timeliness of
- 11 pipeline companies responding to inquiries for
- 12 crossings. Ms. Rowe of Cantiro testified that the
- 13 typical due diligence period when a developer is
- 14 acquiring land for a proposed development is 90 days,
- 15 so that's three months or 12 weeks. She also testified
- 16 that it is very uncommon for developers to get useful
- 17 information from pipeline companies within 90 days,
- 18 within the due diligence period.
- 19 And this was, I think, unintentionally confirmed
- 20 by the evidence of Mr. Beztilny for Keyera the other
- 21 day when he testified -- and this is at transcript
- 22 page 573 -- he testified that for a simple process,
- 23 which he defined as those where no mitigation is
- 24 required, "We aim for a processing time of four to six
- 25 weeks". So six weeks, that's half of a due diligence
- 26 period -- typical due diligence period, and that's for

- 1 a simple crossing with no mitigation. It takes half
- 2 the time. And that's what they -- what Keyera says
- 3 they aim to achieve. He also said that for complex
- 4 crossings, which he defined as those where mitigation
- 5 is required, "There really is no standard timeline".
- 6 Well, the evidence is clear that whatever the
- 7 standard timeline is, if there is one, it is a lot
- 8 longer than six weeks. And I think it's fair to -- for
- 9 us all to understand that the crossings at issue in
- 10 this proceeding and the crossings in the Orchards
- 11 development that Brookfield dealt with and the Mattson
- 12 development are all complex in the sense that they need
- 13 mitigation. So we're dealing with, here, complex
- 14 crossings. There's no standard timeline.
- 15 Mr. Beztilny's evidence was, as I say, I think
- 16 unintentionally consistent with the evidence of the
- 17 witnesses for the Developers Group. So, for example,
- 18 Ms. Rowe testified that it has taken -- it took them
- 19 16 months to get a proximity agreement. That's at
- 20 transcript page 237. Mr. Nicholas for the MLC Group
- 21 testified with respect to their Desrochers development
- 22 that they waited for a response to a crossing request
- 23 for 18 months. That's at transcript page 233.
- Well, they're still waiting, and, in fact, the
- 25 result of not being able to get a crossing agreement in
- 26 the Desrochers development is that they haven't been

- 1 able to complete the construction of a collector road
- 2 that -- that gives access to a K to 9 school and a
- 3 brand-new high school. There is a 20-metre gap where
- 4 the road is unfinished because they can't get the
- 5 crossing agreement.
- 6 So there is clearly a problem and a lack of
- 7 transparency with respect to both work that has to be
- 8 done and timing. And this brings me to another of the
- 9 principal arguments made by Mr. Telford and
- 10 Mr. Romanesky which is that the developers: (as read)
- 11 Would have known about the crossings and
- would have factored those costs into their
- 13 acquisition.
- 14 So there's basically no loss.
- The evidence of Qualico and the Developers Group
- 16 was very clear that that is not how it works.
- 17 Mr. Armstrong was very clear about this in his
- 18 testimony. He was asked at transcript page 37:
- 19 (as read)
- 20 O Can you please explain how the existence
- of the Plains and Pembina pipelines
- factored into Qualico's due diligence?
- 23 A Certainly. Obviously, we knew the
- 24 pipelines were there. We -- we
- 25 understood that there could be costs
- associated with respect to crossing the

1		pipelines. We've got a lot of
2		experience around the region doing
3		community development. So we do have
4		experience in crossing them. So we did
5		view it as a potential risk in terms of
6		the cost, just as we do with other
7		potential constraints that we see.
8	Q	And how would you characterize the level
9		of detail or clarity that Qualico had
10		when it was doing due diligence with
11		respect to crossing costs?
12	А	I'd I would characterize it as very
13		high level. I mean, we rely on
14		external consultants to help us
15		understand what those risks are, and
16		we've also got experience crossing
17		pipelines in the past, and historically
18		[we've seen those costs as being] quite
19		negligible.
20	Q	So, sir, in this case, did Qualico
21		specifically reduce or lower the price
22		it paid for the Walton lands because of
23		expected pipeline crossing costs?
24	А	No.
25	Now, Mr.	Armstrong's evidence was supported by the
26	evidence	of other members of the Qualico witness panel

1	and the Developers Group witness panel to the effect
2	that during the due diligence period developers
3	obtained little, if any, useful or actionable
4	information regarding the cost of pipeline crossings.
5	Ms. Rowe of Cantiro stated, at transcript page 237:
6	(as read)
7	Pipeline rights-of-way are especially
8	challenging, as we can't usually find much
9	information within a 90-day period. We look
10	at what rights-of-way exist, where they're
11	located, how close to them we are, and what
12	regulations we understand to exist at that
13	time.
14	Further to Ms. Anderson's commentary, it
15	is not possible for an individual land
16	developer to know all possible future
17	outcomes that would impact where specific
18	crossings may or may not be required. This
19	is particularly the case in areas where land
20	is acquired for development prior to any
21	high-level or detailed planning taking place.
22	We do not know the expense of a
23	potential pipeline crossing even if we know
24	that a pipeline crossing will be required.
25	We're not provided timely or consistent
26	information regarding the age of the

1	pipeline's depth, classification, condition,
2	et cetera by operators within a due diligence
3	period or sometimes ever at all.
4	She went on: (as read)
5	Inquiries can be made and almost always are;
6	however, based on past experiences, Cantiro
7	is unlikely to receive a response by the
8	operator within the due diligence period,
9	which, again, is usually 90 days. No urgency
10	is shown by the operators in these
11	situations, which makes it impossible for
12	Cantiro to fully understand the scope and
13	cost of any crossing agreements at an early
14	stage.
15	And as Ms. Anderson of UDI Edmonton testified, if a
16	developer becomes concerned during the due diligence
17	period about the impact of pipelines on their proposed
18	development, it simply is not like they can pick up and
19	go somewhere else. So she stated at transcript
20	page 223: (as read)
21	It's not possible to simply avoid traversing
22	or crossing a pipeline as a proactive
23	business decision of some type, either
24	practically speaking or
25	economically [because] developers must
26	grow contiguously, they have to meet the

1 density targets that are set out by the 2 different plans. They are also not able to 3 develop wherever they might see fit to be the most advantageous for them at the time. 4 Their decisions are highly constrained. 5 need to grow the region in a logical and 6 7 connected way. 8 So, as I said, the evidence clearly supports that for 9 "complex crossing", in other words, where something has 10 to be done to the pipeline to protect its integrity, 11 developers are waiting years, not just months. 12 So returning to, again, Section 33 of the Pipeline 13 Act and its predecessor, Section 34, one point which my 14 friends Pembina and Plains make in their written materials is there are -- is that Oualico has been 15 unable to point to a single example of where cost 16 17 sharing has been ordered, and I just want to make sure that we're all clear here that there have been a number 18 of ERCB decisions on applications made under Section 34 19 20 now Section 33 of the Pipeline Act, and we have referred to these in our written materials, but just 21 22 briefly. The first one is decision 80-10, so this was an 23 24 ERCB decision from 1980 on an application by the Town 25 of Sundre for a relocation of a pipeline. 26 basically in that case, there was a pipeline that ran

1	diagonally through a couple of quarter sections. The
2	position of the Town, as stated by the Board in
3	Section 3.1 of that decision, was that: (as read)
4	The Town contended that the present pipeline
5	location would adversely affect orderly
6	development under its annexation plans and
7	would result in restrictions to planned
8	residential and industrial development. It
9	believes such restrictions would cause
10	land use classification problems and thus
11	preclude optimum use of property within the
12	proposed town limits.
13	So similar sort of arguments.
14	Now, the position of the pipeline owner in that
15	case was stated by the Board in Section 4.1 of the
16	decision to be so this is Alberta Gas Trunk Line or
17	AGTL. So: (as read)
18	AGTL stated that it could see no demonstrated
19	need for moving its pipeline and that the
20	future subdivision plans of the Town could
21	accommodate the pipeline right-of-way with no
22	detrimental effects on the overall plan. It
23	said that, in general, pipelines have been
24	successfully incorporated in the subdivisions
25	in the past and it saw no difference in the
26	pending plans of the Town.

1 So, again, similar arguments that were made by 2 Mr. Romanesky and Mr. Telford, Oh, it doesn't matter 3 because you can incorporate pipelines into your 4 development. So the Board in its decision in Section 7 stated: 5 6 (as read) The Board notes from the evidence presented that the timing and pace of the Town's 8 9 proposed development is still quite 10 uncertain, and, therefore, the need for 11 upgrading the existing AGTL line is 12 indeterminate. In the opinion of the Board, 13 upgrading of the existing AGTL pipeline does 14 not appear to be warranted at this time, but if or when it is, the Board notes from AGTL's 15 16 testimony that the company is prepared to pay 17 the upgrading costs and to cooperate with developers. This would effectively relieve 18 19 the Town of any major expenditures in this 20 regard. 21 So there are, in our submission, two important points 22 that arise from this case. Firstly, the application was denied, but it was denied because the Board 23 24 considered it premature because the development for 25 which the relocation was sought was too uncertain.

Well, that is clearly not the case here. Not only is

26

- 1 the development not uncertain, the development is
- 2 underway.
- 3 And the second important point is that AGTL was
- 4 prepared to pay the upgrading costs when necessary to
- 5 accommodate development. That's important because if
- 6 Pembina and Plains' position is correct -- and that
- 7 position is, It is always the developer who pays -- why
- 8 would AGTL have agreed to pay to upgrade its pipeline
- 9 to accommodate future development? Why would they have
- 10 done that? Why didn't -- why wouldn't they just simply
- 11 rely on their first-in-time rights?
- So, I mean, this is a clear signal, in our
- 13 submission, that it's not always the way that Pembina
- 14 and Plains tell you it is.
- So the second decision we'd like to refer you to
- is Decision 85-22, another ERCB decision, from 1985,
- 17 and it was an application made by the Municipal
- 18 District of Foothills pursuant to Section 34, as it
- 19 then was, of the Pipeline Act.
- 20 So in that case, the MD decided it wanted to
- 21 upgrade a secondary road, and that entailed widening
- 22 the road right-of-way from 30 to 40 metres. So as
- 23 stated by the Board's decision in Section 1.3:
- 24 (as read)
- Due to this upgrading, the vault is -- [this
- is a vault in which there was equipment for

1	the pipeline] the vault is now located well
2	within the road right-of-way, and the
3	proposed road profile would result in the
4	pipeline being partially exposed in the
5	ditch. Although the parties agreed that the
б	pipeline needed to be lowered and the vault
7	removed, no agreement on the matter of costs
8	could be negotiated. This impasse on cost
9	sharing could not be resolved by the parties
10	and resulted in the MD submitting an
11	application to the Board requesting a Board
12	direction under Section 34 of the Pipeline Act.
13	So I pause here to note that this completely undermines
14	the position of Plains and Pembina that there must be a
15	dispute on the need for the work and that a
16	disagreement on costs only does not engage the
17	Regulator's jurisdiction.
18	Clearly that's not true. In Decision 85-22, there
19	was no dispute on the need for the work and basically
20	
	what that work entailed, which was lowering the
21	what that work entailed, which was lowering the pipeline. The only dispute was on costs, yet the ERCB
21 22	
	pipeline. The only dispute was on costs, yet the ERCB
22	pipeline. The only dispute was on costs, yet the ERCB heard the application and rendered a decision.
22	pipeline. The only dispute was on costs, yet the ERCB heard the application and rendered a decision. So moving, though, on in the decision. In

1	CWNG stated that lowering was necessary only
2	to accommodate the levels of the proposed
3	road ditch. It pointed out that it was
4	CWNG's policy ("policy") to require municipal
5	districts to pay for pipeline alterations
6	made necessary by road improvements; however,
7	in this case, because the pipeline will be
8	lowered to conform to current standards, CWNG
9	indicated that it was willing to pay half the
10	costs of lowering the line even though it
11	believed there was no legal obligation to do
12	so.
13	And in Section 4, the Board stated its conclusion:
14	(as read)
15	The Board agrees that CWNG should bear the
16	cost of lowering the pipeline across the
17	original 20-metre road right-of-way but that
18	the MD should assume the cost of alterations
19	imposed on the pipeline outside the original
20	road right-of-way. The Board accepts that
21	the cost of lowering below the original road
22	right-of-way is about equal to the cost
23	involved in the work beyond the original
24	20-metre road right-of-way. Accordingly,
25	each party should bear half the cost.
26	So, again, in our submission, two very important points

- 1 arise from this decision. Firstly, it's a second
- 2 example of where the pipeline owner agreed to cost
- 3 share contrary to Plains and Pembina's position that it
- 4 has always and forever been the practice that the party
- 5 requesting the alteration pay. Secondly, and most
- 6 importantly, the Board did, in fact, order cost
- 7 sharing.
- 8 So Pembina and Plains and -- and, I would say, in
- 9 particular, Keyera submit in their written materials
- 10 that granting Qualico's application will set some kind
- of earth-shattering precedent. And, in response, we
- 12 say, no, it will not. It has been done before, and you
- 13 can do it again.
- 14 The third case I will very briefly refer to is the
- 15 City of Calgary case, which is Decision 2011 ABERCB 29,
- 16 and that one involved the relocation of a pipeline to
- 17 accommodate a road widening, and that was at
- 18 52nd Street South East here in Calgary.
- Now, while parties ultimately reached agreement
- 20 and the ERCB did not have to deal with cost sharing,
- 21 the Board did find that relocating the pipeline to
- 22 accommodate the road widening was in the public
- 23 interest. And I -- so I think you can see a parallel
- 24 that you have to widen the road, there's a -- there's a
- 25 dispute about whether a pipeline needs to be altered or
- 26 relocated. In this decision, the ERCB had no problem

- 1 finding that it was in the public interest to relocate
- 2 the pipeline to accommodate road widening within a
- 3 city.
- 4 Finally -- and I can deal with this one quickly
- 5 too -- there is the case of Douglas and Dorothy
- 6 Hollands' Section 33 application for pipeline removal,
- 7 and that's Decision 2014 ABAER 3. This one was only
- 8 concerned with relocation, not cost sharing. The
- 9 applicants were private landowners near Leduc. They
- 10 argued that an existing pipeline had sterilized
- 11 20 acres of land on the east side of their property and
- 12 submitted that this impeded development which was
- 13 projected for industrial and urban growth.
- 14 Somewhat like the Town of Sundre case, the
- 15 application was denied on the basis that the Hollands
- 16 had provided insufficient evidence to support the need
- 17 for relocation because the AER was not satisfied that
- 18 there were any clear development plans. It noted that
- 19 the ASP, area structure plan, for the area had not yet
- 20 been approved, and the -- the AER stated: (as read)
- In the absence of any clear plans, the Panel
- is unable to determine whether the pipeline
- is incompatible with area development. The
- 24 Panel believes that to relocate the pipeline
- at this time would be premature.
- 26 So, again, like the Town of Sundre, it was simply that

- 1 the development plans which were the basis for the
- 2 request to relocate were premature, and, again, that
- 3 can be completely factually distinguished from our case
- 4 where the development plans are actually happening.
- 5 So Qualico submits it's very clear from this
- 6 review of these four precedents from the 'A' -- ERCB
- 7 and the AER that there is nothing extraordinary or even
- 8 unusual about Qualico making an application under
- 9 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act and seeking cost
- 10 sharing, nor, as Pembina and Plains seem to think, is
- 11 Qualico asking for some new "rule" to be established.
- 12 So, as we understand the submissions of our
- 13 friends, they seem to believe that Qualico is asking
- 14 that the AER issue a ruling that henceforth and in all
- 15 cases there must be cost sharing. We are not asking
- 16 for that.
- 17 As noted by Ms. Anderson of UDI in her testimony
- 18 at transcript page 218: (as read)
- 19 The Edmonton Metro Region contains the
- 20 highest density of pipelines of any major
- 21 metro area in North America.
- 22 We're not asking for some new blanket rule that would
- 23 apply everywhere in the province; rather, what we are
- 24 asking is that the Regulator find that where, as here,
- 25 pipeline alteration work is required to accommodate
- 26 pressing and substantial growth in urban periphery

- 1 areas such as Horse Hills in Northeast Edmonton and
- 2 Orchards and Mattson in Southwest Edmonton, that in
- 3 that -- in these specific circumstances, cost sharing
- 4 is appropriate.
- 5 It's appropriate because there is a public
- 6 interest in facilitating growth that is expressly
- 7 called for by the City's land use planning documents,
- 8 just as there is a public interest in the
- 9 continued safe transportation of oil and gas.
- 10 So, again, I want to be clear. Qualico and the
- 11 Developers Group are not asking for some new general
- 12 rule that would apply across the province. We -- we
- 13 do expect that your decision in this case, should you
- 14 order cost sharing, will set a precedent for these
- 15 types of situations, high growth urban periphery. But,
- in our submission, such an order will not affect in any
- 17 way the majority of pipeline crossings in Alberta on
- 18 agricultural land and in the more remote parts of the
- 19 province.
- 20 So that brings me, then, to the question of public
- 21 interest, and as the Commission knows --
- 22 THE CHAIR: Mr. Fitch, sorry to interrupt
- 23 you. I just want to do a time check since we indicated
- 24 a 10:15 break.
- 25 G. FITCH: Sure. I'm --
- 26 THE CHAIR: If you wish to continue,

- 1 that's okay, but if you have an hour, as contemplated
- 2 previously, we may want -- is this a natural break for
- 3 you?
- 4 G. FITCH: Well, it -- it -- it could be,
- 5 but I -- I -- my preference, if it's all the same for
- 6 the Panel, is just to finish in one go. I -- I'm not
- 7 going to be another hour. Probably another half hour
- 8 to 40 minutes would be my guess. But I'm in your
- 9 hands.
- 10 THE CHAIR: Let me check with our court
- 11 reporter.
- 12 How are you doing? Do you need a break?
- 13 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm all right.
- 14 THE CHAIR: You're okay.
- 15 Okay. Carry on.
- 16 G. FITCH: All right. Thank you.
- 17 So, as I said, I'm going -- I'm going to finish
- 18 our substantive submissions directly addressing the
- 19 issue of public interest. As the record is clear,
- 20 Qualico retained Mr. Morrison of Stantec, who provided
- 21 some expert reports on this issue, and Pembina, Plains,
- 22 and SECURE retained Dr. Makholm of NERA to provide
- 23 reports, also on the public interest.
- 24 So I'm going to just briefly talk about
- 25 Mr. Morrison and his evidence. Plains and Pembina have
- 26 in their written materials prior to the hearing and

- 1 then, of course, in their cross-examination, obviously,
- 2 tried to discredit Mr. Morrison. But, in our
- 3 submission, the key points in Mr. Morrison's evidence
- 4 remain unimpeached.
- 5 So what are those key points? Firstly, when
- 6 considering the public interest, the AER should
- 7 consider equity as between the parties, Qualico on the
- 8 one hand, Pembina and Plains on the other. When the
- 9 AER is thinking about equity, it should remember that
- 10 the developer -- actually, Qualico's predecessor,
- 11 Walton -- has already accommodated the pipelines in the
- 12 design of the neighbourhood.
- 13 For example, you heard Mr. Dal Bello testify that
- 14 Meridian Street was actually raised to ensure the
- 15 design in the design was raised to ensure that there's
- 16 correct depth of cover over the pipeline. And that was
- 17 to remove the need for relocation. So that was
- 18 Mr. Dal Bello's evidence.
- 19 And then Mr. Gerein testified that: (as read)
- There are areas of the NSP that are
- 21 constrained by the existence of pipelines
- 22 that will ultimately have a net -- negative
- impact on the developability or of the
- salability of certain parcels of land ...
- 25 That was transcript page 48.
- 26 So the point is -- is that when you're thinking

- 1 about the relative positions of Qualico on the one hand
- 2 and Plains and Pembina on the other hand, Qualico has
- 3 already paid, in one respect, for the constraints
- 4 imposed -- the constraints on development imposed by
- 5 these pipelines.
- 6 Another factor, we submit, the Hearing
- 7 Commissioners should -- should think about is ability
- 8 to pay, like the impact of a cost-sharing order. It is
- 9 clear from Exhibit 95.01, which is the Pembina 2023
- 10 annual report excerpt, and Exhibit 96.01, which is the
- 11 Plains investor presentation, that -- that these are
- 12 billion-dollar corporations and they can afford to
- 13 contribute to pipeline crossing costs, and these
- 14 protests that you've heard that cost sharing will
- 15 materially impact these companies and cause chaos are
- 16 not credible and not believable.
- 17 So another critical point Mr. Morrison makes that
- 18 we urge upon the Commission -- or -- sorry -- the
- 19 Regulator is that the public interest is not just or
- 20 even primarily about who was there first, as
- 21 Dr. Makholm seems to think. And the principal reason
- 22 why this is the case is that the context has changed so
- 23 dramatically since the pipelines were first constructed
- in the late 1960s and early 1970s.
- 25 And I -- I want to be clear on one point because I
- 26 think, admittedly, it was unclear in earlier written

- 1 evidence. Neither Qualico nor Mr. Morrison take
- 2 issue with the amount of compensation awarded to the
- 3 landowner 50 years ago. Whether the landowner received
- 4 fair compensation 50 years ago, as I say, we don't
- 5 dispute that, but that's not the point. This is the
- 6 point. Having regard to the dramatic change in
- 7 circumstances -- so it was just this undeveloped
- 8 farmland in 1970 on the periphery of the
- 9 city of Edmonton, not far from the TUC, but that's what
- 10 it was then. Having regard to what it is now and the
- 11 incredible change in circumstances, what Mr. Morrison
- 12 was saying, is saying, that what was paid then has
- 13 turned out to be a fraction of the impact that the
- 14 pipelines are having today, as measured, for example,
- 15 by crossing costs of between half a million to a
- 16 million dollars.
- 17 Mr. Morrison correctly, in our submission,
- 18 characterizes Plains' and Pembina's position based on
- 19 first-in-time, first-in-right as basically being: We
- 20 paid fair market value for our right-of-way 50 years
- 21 ago, and that absolves us forever from having to pay
- 22 for future costs associated with the pipeline. And we
- 23 and Mr. Morrison disagree.
- 24 Now, Plains and Pembina criticized Mr. Morrison
- 25 for suggesting that anyone could have foreseen 50 years
- 26 ago the development that is occurring today, but, as

- 1 Mr. Gerein testified, the Horse Hills area was annexed
- 2 into the city of Edmonton in 1982, and future
- 3 development and urban growth in this very area has been
- 4 anticipated for a long time, likely 50 to 60 years.
- 5 And that was transcript page 45.
- 6 What Mr. Morrison is saying and what Qualico
- 7 submits is correct is that Plains and Pembina
- 8 effectively want a get-out-of-jail card in perpetuity.
- 9 We never will have to ever pay for any crossing costs
- 10 or costs associated with the impact to our pipelines in
- 11 perpetuity as long as we have our right-of-way
- 12 agreement. And we submit that is both incorrect in law
- 13 and cannot possibly be in the public interest. In the
- 14 particular circumstances of this case where the
- 15 surrounding land use has changed so dramatically, that
- 16 can't be right and is not right.
- 17 Now, Dr. Makholm, by contrast, gave testimony that
- 18 I am going to characterize as hard to comprehend at
- 19 times and -- and sometimes even somewhat bizarre. For
- 20 example, he suggested that cost sharing might lead to
- 21 these pipelines becoming rate-regulated. I'm not sure
- 22 where he came up with that opinion, but that was at
- transcript page 476 and 477.
- He acknowledged or -- yeah, he acknowledged under
- 25 cross-examination that in his report he criticized
- 26 Mr. Morrison for saying that the AER has not

- 1 established a definition of what "public interest" is,
- 2 but then he said the same thing himself. He
- 3 acknowledged that he "overstated" his criticism that
- 4 Mr. Morrison said, according to Dr. Makholm, that the
- 5 AER must inherently become involved in a matter between
- 6 private parties. He acknowledged that, in fact,
- 7 Mr. Morrison never said any such thing.
- 8 He claimed that NERA was not here to give
- 9 direction to the Regulator on their public interest
- 10 mandate when that is precisely why he was retained and
- 11 what he has been doing. He claimed that if cost
- 12 sharing were ordered, pipeline companies will not be
- 13 able to raise capital in financial markets. Again, I'm
- 14 not sure where that comes from, but that was at
- 15 transcript page 488 to 489. I mean, talk about an
- 16 overstatement.
- 17 Dr. Makholm's position on public interest, as far
- 18 as I was able to figure out, seemed to be based on what
- 19 he described as "cost causation". That is public
- 20 interest favours Qualico paying the crossing costs
- 21 because they are caused by Qualico. I've already
- 22 addressed this, and the answer is, no, they are not
- 23 caused by Qualico. They are caused by urban growth and
- 24 the pressure to develop affordable housing in the
- 25 city of Edmonton.
- When Dr. Makholm wrote his report, he stated that

- 1 Qualico was asking Plains and Pembina to share in the
- 2 cost of reinforcing pipelines which cross Qualico's
- 3 land. When I pointed out to him on cross-examination
- 4 that the crossing is on City land, not Qualico land,
- 5 his response was: (as read)
- 6 Public land, public road. You were right to
- 7 bring that up with Mr. Telford and
- 8 Mr. Romanesky. I don't know.
- 9 That was at transcript page 486 87.
- In his report, he stated that the requirement to
- 11 reinforce pipeline crossings is a local authority
- 12 requirement. When I pointed out that, no, it's
- 13 actually a requirement of the Pipeline Act and rules,
- 14 his response was, "I don't really care". And that was
- 15 at transcript page 487.
- I then pressed him on whether he understood that
- 17 it is the City of Edmonton that requires that arterial
- 18 roads be constructed and that the roads will be public
- 19 roads. I asked him this: (as read)
- 20 O What I'm asking you, sir, is: If the
- 21 City were the proponent of this road
- and, therefore, it was the City that had
- 23 to obtain the crossing and get the
- crossing done by Plains and Pembina,
- 25 would that affect your public interest
- 26 analysis?

- 1 A No.
- 2 That's at transcript page 496.
- In our submission, it can't be any clearer than
- 4 that. Dr. Makholm has an incredibly narrow and
- 5 exclusively economic conception of public interest
- 6 which, not coincidentally, entirely favours his
- 7 clients, and it should be rejected by the AER. This
- 8 is not a rate hearing. That's where Dr. Makholm has
- 9 experience and expertise.
- 10 Not only did Dr. Makholm refuse to acknowledge the
- 11 obvious public interest elements to this dispute, he
- 12 had no answer to the evidence of Qualico and the
- 13 Developers Group that crossing costs will end up
- 14 getting passed on to homeowners.
- 15 So, again, during cross-examination, and this was
- 16 at paragraph -- or -- sorry -- pages 493 of the
- 17 transcript, I asked: (as read)
- 18 O You've heard the evidence of Qualico and
- 19 the Developers Group; correct?
- 20 A Yes, we have.
- 21 Q And so you know that every single
- developer has said these costs will get
- 23 passed on to the homeowners. Do you
- 24 just not believe this evidence? Do you
- 25 think it's false?
- 26 A That's not why I'm here.

[And then a little further.] 1 2 Are you saying that -- notwithstanding 3 what the developers have all said, are you saying these costs will not get 4 5 passed on to homeowners, and, if so, 6 what is the basis for that statement? 7 And then after a brief objection from my friend, he provided this answer: (as read) 8 9 It's not my conclusion that any of those 10 individual developers have market power 11 in this province. I -- I -- I don't really know what that answer 12 All I know is that it didn't answer the 13 14 question. The fundamental fact is that Dr. Makholm fails to 15 address one of the most important public interest 16 considerations in this case, which is the impact of 17 pipeline crossing costs on housing affordability. 18 The evidence of Mr. Fjeldheim, which was somewhat 19 20 confirmed by Mr. Romanesky, is that if developers are 21 required to pay 100 percent of all arterial road 22 crossing costs in the Horse Hills basin, this could 23 lead to an increase in per-unit prices of a thousand 24 Mr. Romanesky's math was \$670, but there, you 25 know, you have a range. And that's for arterial roads. 26 Mr. Fjeldheim further testified that there are

- 1 likely over 100 local road crossings in Horse Hills.
- 2 And local roads, like arterial roads, will be
- 3 City of Edmonton roads. Their right-of-ways will be
- 4 public. And Mr. Fjeldheim testified that if you factor
- 5 those crossings in, the cost per housing unit could
- 6 increase by as much as \$3,000 per property. In our
- 7 submission, this is a critical public interest
- 8 consideration that must be taken into account by the
- 9 AER and which was completely ignored and dismissed by
- 10 Dr. Makholm.
- 11 So maybe it's obvious, but I want to talk about it
- 12 anyways. What is Qualico and what are the Developers
- 13 Group asking for here in this application? As I said
- 14 at the outset, the application asks for a cost sharing
- on a 50-50 basis. And we acknowledge there's no
- 16 quantitative analysis supporting that, and there's no
- 17 quantitative analysis because the cost sharing -- or --
- 18 sorry -- the cost information from the pipeline
- 19 operators is so unreliable that we -- it's impossible,
- 20 really, to give a quantitative analysis.
- 21 As I said at the outset, really, our -- our
- 22 position on -- in the application that it should be
- 23 shared 50-50 is based on the fact that both
- 24 activities -- so continued safe transportation of oil
- and gas on one hand and development of new affordable
- 26 housing on the other, both of these are in the public

- 1 interest.
- 2 So where does this leave us? Well, at the
- 3 conclusion of Qualico's evidence on the first day of
- 4 the hearing, the Chair asked the Qualico witness panel
- 5 about potential terms and conditions in an order. And
- 6 after caucusing for a moment, the response provided was
- 7 basically, We agree that protection of the pipeline is
- 8 of utmost importance, but we also believe that the --
- 9 that this -- sorry -- that that is the area of
- 10 responsibility that lays directly with the pipeline
- 11 company.
- 12 So our thoughts on this matter are that if we were
- 13 to be granted pipeline crossings to facilitate
- 14 community growth and neighbourhood development, that
- 15 any upgrades to the road surfaces and the engineering
- 16 that's required to spread out the load to protect the
- 17 pipeline, that would be taken on by the development
- 18 industry. Any upgrades and replacements to existing
- 19 pipelines that would -- and that would include bringing
- 20 it up to CSA requirements and all the rest of that,
- 21 that should remain with the pipeline companies.
- 22 So it is the position of Qualico and the
- 23 Developers Group that this represents a principled and
- 24 conceptually logical approach to analyzing the sharing
- of costs between pipeline companies and the development
- 26 industry in areas of significant new urban growth.

1	Before wrapping up, I just want to briefly address
2	the status of the Plains pipeline crossing at
3	172nd Avenue. So this is the one that excuse me
4	ended up getting constructed by Marquis JV Limited,
5	which, of course, was the joint venture established by
6	MLC Group.
7	Our position is it's part of this application. If
8	you order cost sharing with respect to the 167th Avenue
9	crossings, you should also order cost sharing with
10	respect to the 172nd Avenue crossing.
11	So Mr. Nicholas thank you. Mr. Nicholas of the
12	MLC Group testified to this point, and this was at
13	transcript page 232: (as read)
14	Q Can you describe for the Hearing
15	Commissioners the circumstances
16	surrounding the alteration work that was
17	completed at that intersection?
18	A Our joint venture called Marquis JV
19	Limited, we entered into an agreement
20	with Plains who completed the work in
21	order to proceed with development.
22	Marquis paid for the crossing under
23	protest, understanding it would be
24	encompassed by Qualico's application.
25	Again, it was out of necessity because
26	the crossing is right across the

- 1 entrance to our neighbourhood.
- 2 So, in other words, what happened is Plains took the
- 3 same position with Marquis JV Limited as it has with
- 4 Qualico and all the other developers, which is that in
- 5 order to do the work, Marquis JV would have to pay
- 6 100 percent of the costs. Because it needed to get on
- 7 with its development, it had no choice, and it agreed.
- 8 But that agreement in no way changes the position of
- 9 Qualico, the position of the members of the Developers
- 10 Group, including Marquis JV and the MLC group, that the
- 11 cost of the alteration work should be shared.
- 12 And -- and MLC Group and MG -- MJ -- sorry --
- 13 Marquis Joint Ventures did not need to bring their own
- 14 Section 73 application because the 172nd Avenue
- 15 crossing was -- was, at the time they did the work,
- 16 already in front of the Regulator as part of Qualico's
- 17 application. So it is -- the question of cost sharing
- 18 at 172nd Avenue is not moot, as my friends will
- 19 undoubtedly suggest, and if cost sharing is ordered
- 20 with respect to the crossings at 167th Avenue, it
- 21 should also be ordered with respect to the 172nd Avenue
- 22 crossing.
- 23 So, in conclusion, I would like to bring us all
- 24 back to the first day of the hearing. It is a matter
- of record. It's not disputed that Qualico was directed
- 26 to bring this application to the Regulator pursuant to

1	Section 33 of the Pipeline Act by the ARA steering	
2	committee.	
3	So Qualico had a witness from the ARA steering	
4	committee on its panel, Mr. Fjeldheim. So I asked	
5	Mr. Fjeldheim at transcript page 21: (as read)	
6	Why did the ARA steering committee give that	
7	direction?	
8	And his answer was: (as read)	
9	The ARA steering committee at the time was	
10	getting multiple requests for pipeline	
11	crossings to be included as a cost in the	
12	arterial road levy, and while the committee	
13	has accepted these costs in the past, the	
14	costs of the more recent requests were	
15	substantially higher. The committee is used	
16	to seeing costs in the area of 15 to \$20,000	
17	per crossing, but the new requests were in	
18	the hundreds of thousands and even millions	
19	of dollars.	
20	And this particular case with Qualico,	
21	it is in what's known as the Horse Hills area	
22	structure plan in Northeast Edmonton. In	
23	that plan, there are 45 arterial road	
24	crossings. If each crossing is now expected	
25	to average \$800,000, that would add	
26	\$35 million to the levy, which would increase	

1 the levy by about 10 percent or about \$1,000 2 per housing unit. 3 Also in the Horse Hills area structure plan, there are likely over 100 local road 4 5 crossings. They have not been planned yet, but just given the neighbourhood layouts, 6 that's probably a conservative estimate. if all of those crossings are also included, 8 9 we're talking about \$3,000 per housing unit. 10 And so given my experience with Section 33 applications and the fact that 11 12 affordable housing is very much in the public 13 interest, the committee requested that 14 Qualico pursue an application to the AER. 15 The appeal was meant to set a precedent for 16 all developers in the area and the Edmonton 17 region. So, in a nutshell, that's why we're here, because of 18 this concern among developers in the working --19 20 actively working in the greater Edmonton area that 21 these costs -- when you consider all the neighbourhoods 22 that are either under development now or will shortly become under development, that these crossing costs are 23 24 going to become significant, they are going to add to the costs of the -- the per-unit cost of homes, and it 25 is going to affect affordability. There is no reason, 26

- 1 in our submission, to disbelieve the evidence of
- 2 Qualico and the Developers Group that pipeline crossing
- 3 costs are ultimately passed on to homebuyers.
- 4 As stated by Mr. Fash of BILD Alberta,
- 5 developer -- developers recover increased costs through
- 6 the sale price of the lot, and the builder recovers
- 7 costs through the sale of the home. The ultimate
- 8 consumers of housing, often first-time homebuyers, in
- 9 the context of suburban communities like Horse Hill,
- 10 they bear the ultimate price.
- 11 Similarly, there is no reason to disbelieve
- 12 Mr. Fash's evidence that the lack of responsiveness on
- 13 the part of pipeline operators in processing crossing
- 14 applications leads to delays. It leads to lost
- 15 construction seasons which are already short in our
- 16 northern climate. There's no reason to disbelieve his
- 17 evidence that lost construction time results in a
- 18 reduction of the supply of housing units and that if
- 19 supply does not meet demand, housing prices go up.
- There's no reason to disbelieve Mr. Fash's
- 21 evidence that delays also lead to additional financing
- 22 costs incurred by developers and that where those
- 23 financing costs become significant, developers may
- 24 cancel a project altogether, and that, again, will
- 25 affect market supply and, thus, overall housing prices.
- And, finally, there's no reason to believe

- 1 Mr. Fjeldheim's evidence that his company,
- 2 TAG Developments, had been required, had been asked, by
- 3 Pembina to pay \$3.2 million to cross a pipeline in
- 4 order to develop 32 lots and that this would have
- 5 cancelled the project. And that's at transcript page
- 6 PDF 18.
- 7 Qualico submits, having regard to all of this
- 8 evidence adduced in this proceeding, we have
- 9 demonstrated that alteration of the Plains and Pembina
- 10 pipelines is in the public interest and that an order
- 11 directing that Plains and Pembina contribute to the
- 12 cost of the alteration work is, in all the
- 13 circumstances, fair and equitable and in the public
- 14 interest.
- 15 And that concludes the closing argument of
- 16 Qualico. Thank you very much. I'm more than happy to
- 17 take any questions the Commissioners may have.
- 18 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Fitch. Just a
- 19 clarification for the record. So that was Qualico and
- 20 Developers Group?
- 21 G. FITCH: Correct.
- 22 THE CHAIR: Thank you.
- 23 Thank you very much, Mr. Fitch. So we --
- 24 depending on -- we have one hour. At this point we
- 25 will take a break because I'm sure others in the room
- 26 would like a break. We may, may not, have questions

- 1 for you at this point.
- 2 I'll say 20 minutes' break because it's too early
- 3 for lunch, and then we will go to -- after questions
- 4 from you, if we have any, we'll go to Brookfield and
- 5 then have lunch after if that works for everyone.
- 6 Yeah. Okay. So it seems like somebody has fixed
- 7 our clocks here, so 10 past. Is that reasonable,
- 8 20 minutes?
- 9 G. FITCH: Yes. Thank you.
- 10 THE CHAIR: Thank you.
- 11 (ADJOURNMENT)
- 12 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Please
- 13 be seated.
- 14 Mr. Fitch, we have one question for you, this
- 15 Panel, and the question is -- there has been concerns,
- 16 and you mentioned it in your argument, about
- 17 transparency and predictability. Now, if this Panel
- 18 were to make -- direct the work or issue an order, how
- 19 would this Panel might, in your view, address those
- 20 questions?
- 21 G. FITCH: Thank you.
- 22 So if the Regulator issues an order for cost
- 23 sharing of the -- at the specific crossings that are
- 24 the subject of this application -- well, firstly, we
- 25 know that the 172nd Avenue crossing is built, so that's
- 26 not a concern.

1 With regard to the 167th Avenue crossing -- and 2 I'll give my answer, and I'll just make sure my client 3 is in agreement, but my expectation is if there's an 4 order from the Regulator that the pipelines be altered and an order on cost sharing, our expectation is that 5 6 Plains and Pembina would, of course, comply with the 7 So I don't think there would be any timeliness issue in relation to the compliance with the order. 8 9 With respect to costs -- so I think, probably, the 10 fair way to characterize the evidence is that both 11 Pembina and Plains would need to have a fresh look at 12 what the costs would be for each crossing, and, 13 certainly, Qualico would appreciate it if the Regulator 14 were to provide some direction to Plains and Pembina about the sharing of enough information to Qualico such 15 that Qualico as a commercially reasonable entity could 16 17 satisfy itself that the costs are appropriate. Because even if -- I mean, if there's cost sharing, Qualico is 18 going to pay some amount, so it's either, you know, 19 20 some percentage of a million dollars, or maybe it's 21 some percentage of \$500,000. Qualico would still like 22 to get some direction from the Panel, who -- who have heard all the evidence, about the level of cost 23 24 information which it would be appropriate for the 25 operators, the pipeline operators, to share with the 26 developers so the developers can satisfy themselves

- 1 that, yes, these costs seem reasonable. We will pay
- 2 our share.
- 3 Does that answer your question?
- 4 THE CHAIR: It does.
- 5 But if you wish to check -- just -- I'm mindful
- 6 that you also have the reply opportunity. If you want
- 7 to check and address it then, or you can -- after the
- 8 other parties have ...
- 9 G. FITCH: No. I think Mr. Gerein has
- 10 confirmed that -- that my response is satisfactory from
- 11 Qualico's perspective.
- 12 THE CHAIR: Wonderful. Thank you.
- 13 G. FITCH: Thank you.
- 14 THE CHAIR: And that's our question for
- 15 you and Qualico. Now, next on the agenda -- thank you
- 16 very much.
- 17 Next on the agenda we have Brookfield.
- 18 Final Submissions by E. Dixon
- 19 E. DIXON: Good morning, Madam Chair,
- 20 Panel Members, and Panel staff. I am pleased to be
- 21 here today to present the final argument of Brookfield
- 22 Residential Alberta LP, which I will refer to as
- 23 "Brookfield" throughout this final argument in respect
- 24 of this matter.
- 25 At the outset, I just wish to advise the Panel
- 26 that representatives of Brookfield, Mr. Tingle and

- 1 Ms. Martin, are in attendance, and I am advised that
- 2 they have a hard stop at noon, so I have advised them
- 3 that they can leave, and I just want to let the Panel
- 4 know so that they don't think that there's anything I'm
- 5 saying that they disagree with or that they are
- 6 concerned with the direction things are going.
- 7 So if -- in the event my friends get up and leave,
- 8 that's simply because they have another commitment, and
- 9 it is not indicative that they're not interested in
- 10 this proceeding or that they disagree with what I am
- 11 saying.
- 12 So given that my friend Mr. Fitch has accurately
- 13 set out the procedural history that has led us to this
- 14 proceeding, I will not repeat it here in my final
- 15 argument. Suffice it to say, we agree with Mr. Fitch's
- 16 recitation of the facts that have led us here and the
- 17 fundamental issues that are at play.
- 18 However, at the outset, I do think it's important
- 19 to note that pursuant to Subsection 34(2) of the
- 20 Alberta Energy Regulator Rules of Practice where the
- 21 Regulator sets a reconsideration down for a hearing,
- 22 all the rules concerning hearings on applications, as
- 23 set out in Part 2 of the Rules of Practice, apply to a
- 24 reconsideration hearing. In other words, a
- 25 reconsideration hearing is to be conducted no
- 26 differently than had the Regulator originally set

- 1 Qualico's application down for a hearing.
- 2 So why is Brookfield here? Brookfield elected to
- 3 participate in this -- in this proceeding because the
- 4 issues that are being dealt with in this proceeding are
- 5 of fundamental importance to Brookfield individually
- 6 and as a member of the broader development industry.
- 7 This proceeding is of obvious importance to the
- 8 pipeline industry as well as the municipalities who are
- 9 seeking to grow and expand to accommodate population
- 10 growth in furtherance of their municipal growth plans.
- 11 As stated succinctly by Mr. Westren of Brookfield
- in his direct evidence, Brookfield has a vested
- interest in the outcome of this proceeding, has been a
- 14 party to similar negotiations with pipeline companies
- 15 regarding proposed relocations and crossings, and fully
- 16 supports Qualico's application.
- 17 Brookfield believes the developers and pipeline
- 18 operators need to exist and coexist. Indeed, the
- 19 development of new housing and commercial properties
- 20 together with the safe and orderly operation of vital
- 21 infrastructure, like pipelines and other utilities, are
- 22 the collective backbone of what it means to build a
- 23 community.
- 24 Through its evidence, Brookfield has been clear
- 25 that it is not seeking to avoid all costs associated
- 26 with pipeline relocations; rather, Brookfield advocates

- 1 for an equitable division of costs based on the
- 2 significant public interest served by both industries.
- 3 In Brookfield's submission, this objective can only be
- 4 accomplished by a positive decision from the AER in
- 5 this proceeding, confirming the availability of a
- 6 regulatory remedy when pipelines must be relocated or
- 7 altered to allow land development.
- 8 Brookfield is seeking a decision which recognizes
- 9 the inherent public interest of the activities of land
- 10 development, particularly when land developers are
- 11 acting in furtherance of municipal planning and
- 12 development requirements, which is frequently the case
- when dealing with the construction or upgrading of
- 14 municipal road infrastructure.
- 15 Brookfield submits the evidence before the Panel
- 16 supports the following conclusions: The decision under
- 17 reconsideration was both detrimental and wrong at law,
- 18 and the AER should vary the decision and grant the
- 19 orders requested by Qualico. Granting the orders
- 20 requested by Qualico would be in the public interest of
- 21 all Albertans.
- 22 That it is imperative for the AER to establish a
- 23 workable precedent that recognizes the public interest
- 24 provided by land developers and pipeline operators in
- 25 order to level the playing field in negotiations of
- 26 future roadway crossings between land developers and

- 1 pipeline companies. This will assist parties like
- 2 Brookfield and Qualico and the other land developers
- 3 involved in this proceeding as well as the pipeline
- 4 companies in moving development projects ahead in a
- 5 predictable and timely manner.
- 6 Brookfield believes there are a number of systemic
- 7 issues which underlie the interactions between pipeline
- 8 companies and land developers when negotiating pipeline
- 9 crossings that can only be remedied through regulatory
- 10 guidance issued by the AER. My argument will canvass a
- 11 number of these factors that Brookfield believes
- 12 supports the conclusion that the AER should grant
- 13 Qualico's application.
- 14 Through this proceeding, Brookfield submits that
- 15 the evidence has demonstrated that the current system
- 16 is broken. Although Brookfield and the other
- 17 developers are competitors in business, their evidence
- in this proceeding has been remarkably consistent in
- 19 their description of the respective interactions with
- 20 the pipeline companies and how these interactions have
- 21 impacted their respective projects.
- The evidence provided by Brookfield and the
- 23 Developers Group provides important factual context for
- 24 the AER to consider in making its determination of what
- 25 is in the public interest. The evidence in this
- 26 proceeding has established the significant difficulties

- 1 that have more recently characterized the interactions
- 2 between the pipeline companies and land developers in
- 3 the context of new development in the Edmonton area and
- 4 the work that is being undertaken in furtherance of
- 5 municipal planning objectives and pursuant to
- 6 directions from the City of Edmonton.
- 7 Brookfield and other land developers are
- 8 frequently faced with one-sided negotiations and an
- 9 unfair cost split for pipeline work related to the need
- 10 to build the roads and infrastructure that are both
- 11 integral to the safe development of communities and
- 12 mandated by municipal authorities.
- Given that developers and pipeline operators both
- 14 have a vested interest in safely building or rebuilding
- 15 these pieces of vital infrastructure that move both
- 16 people and the petroleum products people rely on to
- 17 fuel their daily life, in an ideal world, the pipeline
- 18 companies and the developers would be able to work
- 19 together collaboratively to serve the broader public
- 20 interest inherent in both undertakings.
- 21 Unfortunately, the current position of the
- 22 pipeline companies completely ignores the important
- 23 public interest served by land development, including
- 24 that much of the work is municipally directed and
- 25 sanctioned. This opposition is based on the pipeline
- 26 companies' narrow of -- interpretation of the

- 1 first-in-right principle and the rights that they
- 2 purport to hold under their respective right-of-way
- 3 agreements.
- 4 The inequality of bargaining power and dysfunction
- 5 that has characterized the relationship between the
- 6 pipeline companies and the developers has essentially
- 7 come down to a take-it-or-leave-it proposition, which
- 8 is reflected in the pipeline companies' unified
- 9 position that they will not undertake any work to
- 10 accommodate what they have described as a
- 11 "second-in-time counterparty" without an agreement that
- 12 said party pay 100 percent of the cost of the work and
- 13 without any ability for the counterparty -- in this
- 14 case, the developers -- to assess the reasonableness of
- 15 the work or the associated costs.
- 16 The increasingly acrimonious relationship between
- 17 the pipeline companies and developers such as
- 18 Brookfield was borne out in the testimony of
- 19 Brookfield's witness Mr. Tsoukalas, who spoke to
- 20 Brookfield's experience of having the pipeline
- 21 companies use proximity agreements and other routine
- 22 agreements as leverage in negotiations regarding
- 23 pipeline crossings, including having cancelled an
- 24 agreement after Brookfield indicated it would seek
- 25 recourse to the Regulator regarding at -- its project
- 26 at The Orchards. That can be found at transcript

- 1 page 276.
- 2 Mr. Dal Bello also indicated both Qualico and MLC
- 3 encountered similar issues relating to the cancellation
- 4 of routine proximity and other related agreements as
- 5 those described by Brookfield. And that can be found
- 6 at transcript page 31.
- 7 I'd like to turn to the AER's public interest
- 8 mandate at the outset because I think it's important to
- 9 frame things as we move forward. As the Regulator of
- 10 energy development in Alberta, the AER is mandated to
- 11 provide for the efficient, safe, orderly, and
- 12 environmentally responsible development of the energy
- 13 resources in Alberta.
- 14 The AER's public interest mandate with respect to
- 15 pipelines, including the assessments required by this
- 16 application, are expressly provided for in
- 17 Sections 4(a) of the Pipeline Act as well as the
- 18 express language of Section 33 of the Pipeline Act.
- 19 Additionally, the AER has broad authority to do
- 20 all things that are necessary for or incidental to
- 21 carry out any of its functions or duty.
- 22 In addition, the AER has extremely broad
- 23 rulemaking authority under Section 3 of the
- 24 Pipeline Act. In this case, the Regulator is tasked
- 25 with making a determination of the public interest
- 26 based on the evidence presented during this proceeding.

- 1 It is clear that the activities of the pipeline and
- 2 land development industries contribute to the public
- 3 interest.
- 4 Brookfield acknowledges that there is a compelling
- 5 public interest associated with the safe transportation
- 6 of hydrocarbons via pipeline but that there is an
- 7 equally important public interest associated with the
- 8 development of new housing and new development
- 9 activities that are required more broadly in order to
- 10 provide much-needed housing for Alberta's growing
- 11 cities and towns.
- 12 As set out by Mr. Westren, Brookfield strongly
- 13 believes there is an intersection between the public
- 14 good provided by pipelines and the public good provided
- 15 by land development. And in this proceeding, the AER
- 16 is tasked with assessing all of the public interest
- 17 factors and making a decision that aligns with the
- 18 overall public interest of all Albertans. There is no
- 19 question the Regulator has the requisite authority to
- 20 grant the relief requested by Qualico.
- 21 As was discussed by Mr. Fitch and in a number of
- 22 the submissions that have been filed during this
- 23 proceeding, there are relatively few decisions of the
- 24 AER and its predecessors that have considered a reply
- 25 to Section 33 of the Pipeline Act. Brookfield submits
- 26 that the current proceeding is fundamentally

- 1 distinguishable from many of the previous decisions of
- 2 the Regulator wherein the Regulator has denied
- 3 Section 33 applications either on the basis that the
- 4 application was premature, such as in the Hollands case
- 5 and the other cases referred to by my friend Mr. Fitch,
- 6 or in the earlier decision of the -- of the ERCB, in
- 7 Examiner's Report Application 800416, which considered
- 8 an application by a landowner of the name Martyshuk,
- 9 who sought to relocate a gas pipeline on the basis --
- 10 basis that it would render his ability to construct a
- 11 homesite on his farmland more difficult, if not
- 12 impossible.
- 13 The current application is fundamentally different
- 14 from more recent decisions wherein the AER concluded
- 15 there was insufficient evidence to support an
- 16 application under Section 33, such as in the Voltarix
- 17 decision which was referred to in the submissions of
- 18 Qualico.
- 19 As set out by Mr. Fitch in this case, the
- 20 development is currently underway. This hearing has
- 21 provided the AER with a significant and fulsome
- 22 evidentiary record pertaining to the public interest
- 23 considerations that are engaged by the application and
- 24 which arise from the conflict between developments in
- 25 the periphery of Alberta's urban areas and the
- 26 extensive network of energy pipeline infrastructure

- 1 that has been put in place over the years.
- 2 Throughout this hearing, evidence was provided by
- 3 the developers in the Edmonton area that the issue of
- 4 pipeline crossings has become a major issue and,
- frankly, one that is not going to resolve without
- 6 regulatory guidance from the AER.
- 7 While Qualico is requesting that the AER exercise
- 8 its discretion and make a decision as pertains to this
- 9 particular application, the rest of the developers,
- 10 including Brookfield, are here to support Qualico in
- 11 hopes that a positive decision on Qualico's application
- 12 will provide much-needed clarity and certainty in the
- 13 process for facilitating pipeline crossings agreements
- 14 that includes an equitable cost-sharing formula and
- 15 accurate and timely disclosure of pertinent information
- 16 between the parties that recognizes the public interest
- 17 goals of both parties.
- 18 For example, Ms. Anderson, who is the CEO of the
- 19 Urban Development Institute of Edmonton, a nonprofit
- 20 organization, stated in her direct evidence that the
- 21 issue of pipeline crossings has been a frequent topic
- of discussion among UDI's members working in the
- 23 Edmonton Metro Region, which, as Mr. Fitch alluded to,
- 24 the Edmonton area contains the highest density of
- 25 pipelines of any major metro area in North America.
- 26 In fact, I have seen the Edmonton area be referred to

- 1 as the "Edmonton transportation and diluent hub" in
- 2 certain filings or certain publicly available documents
- 3 relating to the pipeline companies.
- 4 I think common themes expressed in the testimony
- 5 provided by the individuals representing the developers
- 6 include a lack of predictability when it comes to
- 7 timelines, pipeline alteration costs and sharing costs,
- 8 as well as a lack of transparency and the asymmetry in
- 9 access to information with respect to both the cost of
- 10 investigation, design, and work required, as well as
- 11 with respect to the age, status, and life cycle of the
- 12 pipelines in questions.
- 13 The reason a clear direction is needed from the
- 14 AER was highlighted by the evidence of Brookfield and
- 15 the other land developers with respect to the
- 16 interactions with the pipeline companies in negotiating
- 17 the pipeline crossings needed to facilitate new
- 18 development and how the complete lack of transparency
- in these interactions, coupled with the fact that there
- 20 is significant active pipeline infrastructure where
- 21 development is occurring in all of the major growth
- 22 corridors in Alberta, has made it difficult, if not
- 23 impossible, for developers like Brookfield to assess
- 24 the reasonableness of the cost they are being asked to
- 25 bear.
- The asymmetry in access to information with

- 1 respect to the pipelines makes it next to impossible
- 2 for land developers to conduct the type of due
- 3 diligence prior to acquiring lands that would be
- 4 required to account for the potential cost being forced
- 5 on land developers by pipeline relocations.
- 6 As Mr. Fitch discussed in argument, with
- 7 reference, there was, obviously, significant timelines
- 8 associated with getting -- hearing back from the
- 9 pipeline operators in many cases, which makes
- 10 exercising due diligence extremely difficult at the
- 11 outset.
- 12 And while there certainly is some information on
- 13 pipelines available by reviewing a land title and even
- 14 more substantive information that may be available,
- 15 this type of information is generally limited to the
- 16 line size, wall thickness, the material of
- 17 construction, and substance class.
- 18 As Mr. Beztilny testified, that information is --
- 19 is -- is readily available in AbaData or other similar
- 20 programs. That's about the extent of the information
- 21 that's readily available from a public perspective.
- 22 As discussed by Mr. Fitch, the engineering
- 23 assessments the developers are required to pay for are
- 24 not typically shared by the pipeline companies, and the
- 25 age, suitability, and status of the pipelines are not
- 26 discussed in any detail with the developers or are

- 1 shared only anecdotally. And even if reports are
- 2 shared, they may not be shared, even with respect to
- 3 the same pipeline, as was the case regarding Brookfield
- 4 and Keyera at its 66th Street crossing, which was
- 5 discussed at page 581 of the transcripts.
- 6 All of this places land developers at a -- at a
- 7 significant disadvantage and, as stated by Mr. Westren
- 8 in his opening statement, has led to an inequality of
- 9 bargaining power that exacerbates the relationship
- 10 between the parties and can lead to bad-faith
- 11 negotiations.
- 12 The quantity of current and potential pipeline
- 13 crossings in the Edmonton region is highlighted by the
- 14 fact that Qualico and Brookfield are essentially facing
- 15 identical issues in their interactions with pipelines
- 16 as part of their developments at both ends of Edmonton,
- 17 Qualico being active in North Edmonton and Brookfield
- 18 being active in South Edmonton.
- 19 Pipelines in Edmonton are ubiquitous. The
- 20 prevalence of pipelines in the areas being developed
- 21 means it is simply not possible for land developers to
- 22 avoid crossing a pipeline as some type of business
- 23 decision, and this is not a problem that is just going
- 24 to go away.
- 25 The cloak of secrecy pipeline companies operate
- 26 under when negotiating pipeline crossings was on full

- 1 display during the cross-examination of the
- 2 Plains/Pembina/SECURE panel, wherein Mr. Sprott, in
- 3 responding to a question from Mr. Fitch regarding the
- 4 sharing of information and whether developers in
- 5 essence had to take it in -- on faith that the cost
- 6 estimates and scope of work typically provided by the
- 7 pipeline companies are reasonable and necessary in all
- 8 cases -- and Mr. Fitch went through this with you
- 9 before, so I don't intend to repeat it, but the answer
- 10 provided by Mr. Sprott was, in essence, Trust us.
- 11 We're engineers.
- 12 Unfortunately, this exchange is entirely
- 13 indicative of the attitude that has characterized the
- 14 unproductive and one-sided discussions between the
- 15 parties, including that the pipeline companies are
- 16 typically unwilling to enter into NDAs with the
- 17 developers in order to share information that is
- 18 confidential and proprietary, as Mr. Balfour testified,
- 19 despite such agreements being extremely common in the
- 20 oil and gas business more generally.
- 21 And Mr. Fitch referred you to the same passage,
- 22 and I believe it's the same passage I'm referring to,
- 23 and that's at pages 360 through 362 of the transcripts,
- 24 and I won't repeat it here, but I -- I put it to you,
- 25 Panel, that it would be well worth a read in the
- 26 process of making your deliberations.

Brookfield believes, as set out in its evidence, 1 2 that certain alterations or upgrades to pipelines that 3 are paid for by developers may benefit the pipeline 4 companies by upgrading aging infrastructure that would otherwise have to be upgraded by the pipeline companies 5 6 at their own expense. Even if the infrastructure being 7 replaced or upgraded is potentially years away from requiring work, one cannot deny that value is being 8 9 added to the pipeline at historically zero cost to the 10 pipeline operator. This is the textbook definition of 11 a windfall, regardless of who initiates the crossing 12 discussion. Unfortunately, nothing that has been put on the 13 14 record in this proceeding has allayed Brookfield's As pertains to its experience at The 15 concerns. Orchards, the evidence in this proceeding confirms that 16 17 integrity digs were completed by Keyera shortly before 18 the line was upgraded to accommodate the roads needed to advance The Orchards' development. 19 20 And although Mr. Beztilny attempted to -- to distinguish between protection of the pipeline, as 21 22 discussed in his direct evidence and under 23 cross-examination, with Keyera's use of the word "upgrade" in its evidence, his explanation did little, 24 25 if anything, to assuage Brookfield's concerns. 26 Taken together and coupled with the reluctance of

- 1 the pipeline companies to share relevant information
- 2 with the developers, despite the fact that developers
- 3 are required to pay for upgrades, supports Brookfield's
- 4 concerns.
- 5 In the case of line replacement, we're dealing
- 6 with aging infrastructure. Pipeline companies are
- 7 receiving a betterment, and they should be making
- 8 contributions accordingly. This practice is accepted
- 9 in the electrical transmission industry in Alberta,
- 10 such as in cases of a third-party funded relocation,
- 11 wherein certain transmission providers credit some
- 12 value back to the third party, recognizing the
- 13 betterment to the electrical company's infrastructure.
- 14 I'd like to turn to the right to quiet enjoyment
- 15 and the first-in-time principle that has been a great
- 16 topic of debate in this proceeding. Throughout this
- 17 hearing, we have heard the pipeline companies'
- 18 suggestion that the first-in-time principle is, for all
- 19 intents and purposes, determinative of this
- 20 application, including the intentional and deliberate
- 21 use of the term second-in-right party on countless
- 22 occasions throughout this proceeding.
- With respect, this is not true. As discussed by
- 24 my friend Mr. Fitch, in the case of municipal roadways,
- 25 the roads are owned by the municipalities, pursuant to
- 26 Section 16 of the Municipal Government Act, and the

- 1 pipelines in those cases are there for second in right.
- 2 As such, the principle may be of limited utility.
- To be clear, the first-in-time, first-in-right
- 4 principle cited by the pipeline companies is, no doubt,
- 5 a principle of the Torrens system of land titles in
- 6 Alberta. Indeed, this principle is codified in
- 7 Sections 15 and 56 of Alberta's Land Titles Act.
- 8 However, the mere fact that the pipeline
- 9 companies' registration was duly noted on title or the
- 10 fact that the developers may have purchased the land
- 11 with knowledge of the registration does not mean that
- 12 the developers cannot seek to rely on specific
- 13 statutory authority, such as Section 33 of the Pipeline
- 14 Act.
- The first-in-time, first-in-right principle, as it
- 16 pertains to registrations under the Torrens systems,
- 17 including the registration of pipeline companies'
- 18 easements, is to provide notice. It is not intended,
- 19 as suggested by Mr. Beztilny, to provide a chronology
- 20 or set the stage for anything that's proposed to come
- 21 next on that land.
- 22 Similarly, the position advanced by the pipeline
- 23 companies that the property rights they hold pursuant
- 24 to their right-of-way are somewhat -- somehow absolute
- 25 and the right to quiet enjoyment under their
- 26 right-of-way agreement trumps all does not accord with

- 1 Canadian property law. And Mr. Fitch discussed this
- 2 with you this morning, but I do have some additional
- 3 authority and context I'd like to provide.
- 4 In Canada, property rights, including the right to
- 5 the quiet enjoyment of property, are subject to all
- 6 kinds of limitations and restrictions, a fact that it
- 7 even acknowledged by Keyera in paragraph 20(c) of its
- 8 submission, which is Exhibit 72.01.
- 9 There is no quarantee of property rights in the
- 10 Charter, and while the 1960 Bill of Rights does affirm
- 11 the right of individuals to the enjoyment of property,
- 12 that right is subject to the right not to be deprived
- 13 thereof, except by due process of law.
- In Harrison v Carswell, a decision of the
- 15 Supreme Court from 1975, the Supreme Court of Canada
- 16 stated at paragraph 83 of the decision: (as read)
- 17 Anglo-Canadian jurisprudence has
- traditionally recognized, as a fundamental
- 19 freedom, the right of the -- of the
- 20 individual to the enjoyment of property and
- 21 the right not to be deprived thereof of any
- interest therein, saved by due process of
- 23 law.
- 24 Brookfield submits that an examination of the
- 25 legislative and regulatory scheme governing the oil and
- 26 gas business, including how pipeline companies can

- 1 acquire the rights-of-way needed for a pipeline, is a
- 2 powerful illusion of statutory limitations on property
- 3 rights or an interference with the enjoyment of
- 4 property by due process of law using the language from
- 5 the Supreme Court case I just referred to.
- 6 In Alberta, the Land and Property Rights Tribunal
- 7 and its predecessors routinely grant right-of-entry
- 8 orders to allow resource extraction activities, such as
- 9 the drilling of a well, the construction of a pipeline,
- 10 or to facilitate the construction of electrical
- 11 transmission infrastructure.
- 12 The activities for which a right-of-entry may be
- 13 made are delineated at Section 12 of the Surface Rights
- 14 Act, and the Alberta Courts have made it clear that
- once a licencing authority, such as the AER or the AUC,
- 16 as the case may be, has issued a permit or licence to
- 17 the operator, and, provided that the operator meets the
- 18 technical requirements of the Surface Rights Act and
- 19 regulations, that the tribunal has very limited
- 20 discretion to refuse to grant a right-of-entry order.
- 21 Indeed, the role of the Surface Rights Board, as
- 22 it pertains to right-of-entry orders, has been
- 23 judicially described as, in essence, a "rubber stamp".
- 24 And I quote that from paragraph 34 of the
- 25 Mueller v Montana Alberta Tie Line case, citation being
- 26 2011 ABOB 738.

- 1 The ability to expropriate land for certain
- 2 statutory purposes is indicative that the right of
- 3 land -- the rights of landowners, including the right
- 4 to quiet enjoyment of property, are not absolute and
- 5 are always subject to limitations, restrictions, or
- 6 even expropriation in accordance with the due process
- 7 of law.
- Indeed, and as pointed out by my friend,
- 9 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act is simply another type
- 10 of statutory limitation or government-sanctioned
- 11 intrusion on property rights.
- 12 When read in the context of the entirety of the
- 13 statutory scheme applicable to pipelines in Alberta,
- 14 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act and its predecessors,
- 15 which have existed in some form since 1958, reflect a
- 16 counterbalance to the power to expropriate land that
- 17 has been granted to the pipeline companies Alberta --
- 18 in Alberta pursuant to the Pipeline Act and the Surface
- 19 Rights Act.
- 20 Respectfully, the rules of statutory construction
- 21 strongly suggest that part of the bargain of having
- 22 been granted the power of expropriation is that a
- 23 pipeline company can be directed to move or alter a
- 24 pipeline if the relocation is found to be in the public
- 25 interest.
- 26 This concept that I have just referred to and

- 1 interpretation is evidenced in the similar provisions
- 2 that exist in the other statutes where a regulatory
- 3 taking is contemplated, such as the statutes
- 4 administered by the AUC and the CER. Mr. Fitch ably
- 5 went over with you the provisions of Section 17 of the
- 6 HEEA and the case law that supports that. I don't
- 7 intend to canvass it on that basis, other than to note
- 8 that the wording of Section 17 is virtually identical
- 9 to the Pipeline Act.
- 10 Similarly and as discussed by Mr. Fitch, the
- 11 Canadian Energy Regulator also has jurisdiction to a
- 12 order a relocation of a pipeline and to allocate the
- 13 costs to do so pursuant to Section 212 of the Canadian
- 14 Energy Regulator Act.
- 15 Accepting the construction of the legislation
- 16 urged by the pipeline companies would, in essence, make
- 17 the pipeline companies the decision-maker of
- 18 whether relocation and cost sharing is in the public
- 19 interest. This would be tantamount to giving pipeline
- 20 companies a veto. Respectfully, this interpretation
- 21 would severely circumscribe the AER's proper role and
- the mandate that has been granted under the statutory
- 23 scheme.
- 24 Pursuant to Section 33 of the Pipeline Act, it is
- 25 the AER, not the pipeline companies, who have been
- 26 tasked to determine whether relocation or alteration of

- 1 a pipeline is in the public interest, and the power to
- 2 determine who should bear the costs of the relocation
- 3 or alteration work.
- 4 I will now address an issue that was raised
- 5 earlier in the hearing regarding Section 28 of the
- 6 Pipeline Rules. Again, relying on the rules of
- 7 statutory interpretation, read in their proper context
- 8 and in accordance with the -- with the ordinary
- 9 principles of statutory interpretation, Section 28 of
- 10 the Pipeline Rules clearly places the onus on the
- 11 pipeline companies to upgrade their pipelines to
- 12 accommodate the required roadwork and is a strong
- indicia that the pipeline companies ought to bear the
- 14 financial responsibility of complying with that
- 15 requirement. And, obviously, when I'm referring to the
- 16 entire context, I'm referring to the fact that the --
- 17 the Pipeline Act is -- is -- must be read in
- 18 conjunction with the Pipeline Rules, and pipe -- the
- 19 Pipeline Act under Section 39, which Mr. Fitch went
- 20 through -- you -- this morning, requires the pipeline
- 21 company to obtain consent of the municipality to go
- 22 through the road. And so in my submission, Section 28
- 23 places the onus on the pipeline company to be paying
- 24 for the road if you interpret the statute correctly and
- 25 the rules correctly.
- 26 Throughout this proceeding, we have heard that the

- 1 Pipeline Act and the Pipeline Rules are intended to
- 2 apply to pipeline companies. This is borne out in the
- 3 testimony of the pipeline companies. Properly
- 4 interpreted, the legislation applies to pipeline
- 5 companies primarily, not those that are forced to
- 6 engage with pipeline companies. It is the pipeline
- 7 companies that are obligated to be good licencees and
- 8 abide by the rules and regulations.
- 9 The testimony of each of the pipeline companies
- 10 has been clear that the accountability for the safe
- 11 operation of the pipelines properly rest with them.
- 12 The Act and the Rules place positive obligation on the
- 13 pipeline companies to make sure the pipelines are in a
- 14 safe operating condition.
- 15 Section 28 of the Pipeline Rules, which Mr. Fitch
- 16 read to you, and so -- which I won't read to you again,
- is triggered in a situation where someone wants to
- initiate construction of a road, either a new road or a
- 19 widening of an existing road over an existing pipeline.
- 20 In such cases, the pipeline at that location must
- 21 either be upgraded or otherwise meet the requirements
- 22 of CSA Z662 respecting crossings of an existing
- 23 pipeline.
- 24 The pipeline operator is under an obligation under
- 25 the Pipeline Rules to determine whether it needs to
- 26 upgrade the pipeline or whether it will otherwise meet

- 1 the requirements of CSA Z662. In cross-examination,
- 2 the Plains/Pembina/SECURE panel agreed that this
- 3 section places an obligation on them as pipeline
- 4 operators to comply with the requirements of CSA Z662,
- 5 and if work is proposed over an existing pipeline, the
- 6 pipeline operator must carry out work to determine
- 7 whether the pipeline at that location needs to be
- 8 upgraded or whether it will otherwise meet the
- 9 requirements of the CSA provision.
- 10 But they just -- but they indicated that the
- 11 Section 28 does not say who should pay for such work.
- 12 Respectfully, this position makes no sense and ought to
- 13 be rejected by the Regulator. To the extent the
- 14 Pipeline Act and the Pipeline Rules govern the
- 15 activities of the pipeline companies, the only
- 16 reasonable construction of Section 28 of the Pipeline
- 17 Rules is that it both places an onus on the pipeline
- 18 companies to comply with the direction, which of
- 19 necessity means that they must be able to pay for such
- 20 upgrades in the absence of an agreement with the
- 21 counterparty to share the costs.
- 22 As discussed by Mr. Fitch in his argument, the
- 23 absence of any precedent where a pipeline operator has,
- over their own objections, been ordered to share in the
- 25 cost of a pipeline alteration or relocation does not
- 26 support the position of the pipeline company, so this

- 1 is consistent with a longstanding, well-established
- 2 industry practice in Alberta.
- 3 The fact that there are no reported decisions does
- 4 not somehow nullify the purpose of Section 33; rather,
- 5 we have heard in this proceeding about how the context
- 6 has changed so much in terms of where developments are
- 7 happening and that perhaps the reason there are
- 8 currently no other decisions are because these issues
- 9 are only now becoming more commonplace.
- 10 Here we have almost every land developer in
- 11 Edmonton represented and supporting Qualico's
- 12 applications all saying they are dealing with the same
- issues and that these issues have become increasingly
- 14 more difficult to navigate.
- 15 Further and as I discussed with you earlier, there
- 16 were a number of decisions wherein the -- the AER and
- 17 its predecessors concluded that the applications were
- 18 premature. As Mr. Fitch discussed, that's clearly not
- 19 the case here. There is ample information before the
- 20 Board. The reality is the position taken by the
- 21 pipeline companies would render Section 33 virtually
- 22 useless and meaningless. Finding Section 33 of no
- 23 force and effect would be tantamount to violating the
- 24 presumption against absurdity and other rules of
- 25 statutory interpretation. As pointed out by Mr. Fitch,
- 26 some version of Section 33 has been in the Pipeline Act

- 1 since 1958.
- 2 If the Legislature had intended it only be limited
- 3 to circumstances put forth by the pipeline companies,
- 4 it is reasonable it would have been removed from the
- 5 Act in one of the many amendments the Act has undergone
- 6 since it was first enacted. The Act says what it says.
- 7 Brookfield submits that the arguments that the AER
- 8 granting the orders requested by Qualico would result
- 9 in a dangerous precedent with far-reaching impacts on
- 10 pipeline companies frankly has no merit. Pipeline
- 11 companies could absorb costs via contracts with
- 12 shippers or choose to bear the costs themselves.
- 13 Further, as acknowledged in cross-examination of
- 14 the Plains/Pembina/SECURE panel and based on the annual
- 15 reports of the pipeline companies for 2023, there would
- 16 be little to no actual financial impact on these
- 17 companies should the AER grant the order requested by
- 18 Qualico.
- 19 Respectfully, there is simply no air of reality to
- 20 the argument that directing the sharing of cost of
- 21 pipeline relocation would harm the financial interests
- 22 of the pipeline companies or the future prosperity of
- 23 the oil and gas business in Alberta.
- 24 The strenuous objections lodged by the pipeline
- 25 companies regarding questions related to their economic
- 26 health is clear evidence that the concerns they have

- 1 expressed in this proceeding regarding the impacts of a
- 2 cost-sharing order are grossly overstated. If the
- 3 risks were as great as suggested, such risks ought to
- 4 have been included in their annual reports and investor
- 5 presentations, some of which have -- have been put on
- 6 the record of this proceeding.
- Respectfully, the pipeline companies are telling
- 8 the AER one story in this proceeding and expressing to
- 9 the public, including their investors, an entirely
- 10 different story. Respectfully, the AER ought not to
- 11 countenance such behaviour.
- 12 In terms of requested relief, Brookfield is not
- 13 asking for cost certainty and is not seeking to
- 14 transfer all the costs to the pipeline companies.
- 15 Rather, Brookfield is seeking a workable precedent that
- 16 recognizes an equitable cost-sharing formula for the
- 17 pipeline crossings at issue is in the public interest.
- To be clear, Brookfield does not seek to avoid all
- 19 costs; it seeks an equitable division based on the
- 20 public interest served by both industries. A workable
- 21 precedent from this Panel would facilitate the
- 22 advancement of development projects in a predictable
- 23 and timely manner. Densification of the urban
- 24 periphery of Alberta cities is reaching the point where
- 25 conflicts with existing pipeline infrastructure is
- 26 becoming a critical issue. Without clear regulatory

- 1 guidance from the AER, this conflict will likely
- 2 continue to escalate.
- 3 Brookfield submits it is up to the AER to
- 4 determine a fair and equitable cost-sharing formula
- 5 that recognizes the inherent public interest of the
- 6 activities of all parties. The AER ought to establish
- 7 a workable precedent along with suggested timelines and
- 8 information requirements that must be shared between
- 9 the parties and confirm that Section 33 of the Pipeline
- 10 Act can be relied upon by land developers when a
- 11 dispute arises over the allocation of the costs of a
- 12 pipeline relocation.
- 13 As I noted before, the AER has broad rulemaking
- 14 authority under the Pipeline Act, and if nothing else,
- 15 I think this proceeding establishes that all parties
- 16 would be well-served by additional guidance,
- 17 potentially in the form of additional AER rules
- 18 pertaining to crossings or ground disturbance, given
- 19 the testimony we've heard here about the systemic
- 20 asymmetry and access to information and the way that
- 21 these negotiations have proceeded as has been discussed
- 22 at length in this proceeding.
- To summarize, Brookfield is, at a high level,
- 24 seeking access to information. As I've discussed,
- 25 Brookfield believes there is a systemic asymmetry in
- 26 access to information with respect to the pipelines.

- 1 The reviews of engineering the developers are required
- 2 to pay for are done internally, and the age,
- 3 suitability, and status of the pipelines are either not
- 4 shared with the developers or are only shared
- 5 anecdotally.
- 6 Brookfield seeks clarity of process,
- 7 predictability of timelines, timely access to the
- 8 Regulator when Pipeline Rules are not being followed,
- 9 and, most of all, Brookfield is advocating for a
- 10 decision from the Regulator that establishes a workable
- 11 precedent that recognizes the public interest of both
- 12 parties.
- 13 I'd like to thank the Panel for its
- 14 professionalism throughout and for conducting its
- 15 hearing in a respectful manner.
- And subject to any questions from the Panel, those
- 17 are my submissions on behalf of Brookfield.
- 18 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Dixon. Just
- 19 give us a second.
- 20 Commissioner Robinson has a question for you -- I
- 21 apologize. Commissioner Robinson is going to ask you a
- 22 question.
- 23 H. ROBINSON: Thank you very much,
- 24 Madam Chair.
- 25 And thank you for your presentation and closing
- 26 arguments.

- 1 To the extent that this is an exercise in
- 2 statutory interpretation and application,
- 3 understanding, I think, the purpose of Section 33 is
- 4 critical to our work on the go forward.
- 5 Mr. Fitch, I believe, spoke to the purpose of
- 6 Section 33 from Qualico and Developers' point of view
- 7 this morning, walked us through a Driedger-like sort of
- 8 review in terms of statutory interpretation.
- 9 Maybe I missed it. But I was wondering whether
- 10 you might articulate for us now Brookfield's
- 11 understanding of the purpose of Section 33.
- 12 E. DIXON: If I might have a moment to --
- 13 as I indicated to you before, it appears my clients
- 14 have left due to their other commitment. So I will
- 15 go -- I will try to answer to the -- to the best of
- 16 my -- my understanding.
- 17 But I -- I think that Brookfield understands that
- 18 Section 33 is a remedy available under the Pipeline Act
- 19 wherein a party can seek recourse to the AER in the
- 20 event that a pipeline needs to be relocated and an
- 21 agreement cannot be reached, and it also provides a
- 22 mechanism to obtain a cost order from the AER dividing
- 23 the cost of the work that is required to be completed.
- 24 H. ROBINSON: Thank you very much,
- 25 Mr. Dixon.
- 26 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. And

	thanks everyone.		
	So we are at lunch hour now. I'm going to ask		
,	counsel to Pembina, Plains and and thank you. You		
!	may be seated.		
	Counsel to Pembina/Plains/SECURE, we have		
	allocated an hour for lunch, but if you require more		
	time, please let us know, or you can let us know		
	through Ms. Arruda later if so you wish.		
	T. MYERS: One hour is just fine with us		
	THE CHAIR: Perfect.		
	Okay, then. Based on this newly fixed clock,		
	let's try to reconvene at 1:15. Thank you very much.		
	PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED UNTIL 1:15 PM		

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

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	A. Porco, CSR(A)	Official Court Reporter	
15			
16	(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 1:16 PM)		
17	THE CHAIR:	Thank you very much. Please	
18	be seated.		
19	So next we have Plains Pembina, Plains, and		
20	SECURE to deliver their argument. Thank you. Final		
21	submissions by Mr. Myers.		
22	Final Submissions by T. Myers		
23	T. MYERS:	Good afternoon. And thank	
24	you, Madam Chair, Panel Members.		
25	I'd like to start by thanking yourselves, AER		
26	counsel, AER staff, and	the court reporters for	

- 1 facilitating an organized and efficient hearing process
- 2 for the past several days.
- 3 Just for clarity at the outset, while SECURE
- 4 adopts and supports the positions advanced by Pembina
- 5 and Plains throughout this proceeding, SECURE was not
- 6 granted a right to present final argument in this
- 7 proceeding, so for the purposes of this afternoon, our
- 8 submissions are being advanced on behalf of Pembina and
- 9 Plains only, and I'll refer to those two companies from
- 10 time to time as "the pipeline companies".
- 11 This afternoon, Mr. Naffin and I have organized
- 12 our closing remarks as follows: I'm going to start by
- discussing a few key points, but I'd ask you to keep in
- 14 mind as you consider the evidence before you and the
- 15 submissions that you've heard this morning from our
- 16 friends, and you'll hear it from us this afternoon.
- 17 Second, I'll provide a brief overview of the key
- 18 facts and issues within the scope of this
- 19 reconsideration proceeding. I'll also outline what the
- 20 pipeline companies submit are the clear motivations
- 21 behind Qualico's cost-sharing application.
- 22 Third, I'll briefly discuss the concept of the
- 23 public interest as it relates to the AER's
- 24 decision-making process and, in particular, the
- 25 decision-making process under Section 33 of the
- 26 Pipeline Act.

- 1 Fourth, I'll provide a summary of the applicable
- 2 legislative and regulatory regime in Alberta as it
- 3 relates to pipeline crossings and pipeline alteration
- 4 work.
- 5 After that, you'll have probably heard enough from
- 6 me. I'll turn it over to Mr. Naffin, who will discuss
- 7 the evidence submitted by the pipeline companies in
- 8 this proceeding as well as SECURE and Keyera, which in
- 9 totality demonstrates why the orders sought by Qualico
- 10 are not in the public interest and should not be
- 11 granted. Mr. Naffin will then address the various
- 12 flaws and deficiencies in Qualico's approach to and
- 13 evidence in this proceeding.
- And, finally, he'll briefly discuss the positions
- 15 taken by Brookfield and the Developers Group in this
- 16 proceeding. The two of us will also have some
- 17 additional comments in response to what we heard from
- 18 our friends Mr. Fitch and Mr. Dixon in their closing
- 19 remarks before the lunch break.
- 20 Of course, we'll be happy to respond to any
- 21 questions that the Panel may have. And you'll be happy
- 22 to hear that it's not our intention to repeat the
- 23 contents of our various submissions and other filings
- 24 on the record of this proceeding; however, to be clear,
- 25 the pipeline companies continue to rely on those
- 26 materials and the positions that are advanced therein.

- 1 So to begin, the key points that I'd ask the Panel
- 2 to keep in mind as you weigh the evidence in this
- 3 proceeding and come to your determination: The first
- 4 is that at no point has there been a legitimate dispute
- 5 between Qualico and Pembina or Plains regarding the
- 6 need for the alteration work that's necessary to
- 7 facilitate Qualico's road crossings despite Qualico's
- 8 transparent attempt to manufacture such a dispute in
- 9 its amended cost-sharing application.
- 10 That's made abundantly clear in our submission by
- 11 the black line of Qualico's amended cost-sharing
- 12 application where it specifically confirms that when it
- 13 filed its original cost-sharing application, the only
- 14 dispute between the parties was -- was with respect to
- 15 cost.
- It's also made clear by the testimony you heard
- 17 from the Pembina and Plains witnesses, all of whom
- 18 confirmed that both companies are ready, willing, and
- 19 able to complete the work necessary to allow Qualico's
- 20 crossings to proceed, provided Qualico agrees to pay
- 21 for the cost of that work that it alone is causing.
- The second point is that in their testimony last
- 23 Tuesday, Qualico's witnesses effectively confirmed that
- 24 there is no longer any dispute related to the costs of
- 25 the alteration work, having regard to the scope of that
- 26 work as set out in the cost recovery agreement related

- 1 to Plains' pipeline at 167th Avenue and Meridian
- 2 Street -- that cost recovery agreement is at
- 3 Exhibit 86.01 -- and the description of that work
- 4 provided by Mr. Balfour on behalf of Pembina during his
- 5 testimony with respect to the pipeline at the same
- 6 intersection. That's in Transcript Volume 3 at PDF
- 7 pages 199 and 200.
- 8 It didn't appear to -- to me, Madam Chair, this
- 9 morning that my friend recognized the import of his
- 10 witnesses' testimony in this regard. Mr. Armstrong was
- 11 clear on behalf of Qualico that: (as read)
- 12 Any upgrades to the road's surfaces and the
- engineering that's required to protect the
- 14 pipeline and the load forces, that would be
- taken on by the development industry.
- 16 That's at Transcript Volume 1, PDF 189.
- 17 While that newly articulated position represents a
- 18 departure from the 50-50 cost-sharing orders that
- 19 Qualico was seeking in the original cost-sharing
- 20 application and in the amended cost-sharing
- 21 application, you heard it directly from Qualico's lead
- 22 witness, Mr. Armstrong, who described himself as the
- 23 Qualico panel chair and policy witness when he
- 24 introduced himself on the first day of the hearing.
- 25 Mr. Armstrong's testimony in this regard aligns
- 26 with the position Pembina and Plains have taken from

- 1 the very outset of this proceeding and, indeed, the
- 2 same position they have taken since 2014 when they
- 3 first engaged with CIMA+ to discuss the crossings in
- 4 this development.
- 5 Mr. Armstrong's evidence also aligns with the
- 6 well-established industry practice that a
- 7 second-in-time user pays when linear facilities or
- 8 features cross one another. You heard the witnesses
- 9 from Pembina, Plains, and SECURE describe that
- 10 practice, you heard Mr. Telford describe that practice,
- 11 and you heard the witness from Keyera describe that
- 12 practice yesterday -- or on Monday.
- 13 Contrary to the unsubstantiated assertions made by
- 14 some of the developers, that practice has not changed
- in decades, it isn't variable, and it is not
- 16 unpredictable. It's grounded in relevant and
- 17 long-standing legal and regulatory principles, and it
- 18 is applied consistently across the pipeline industry
- 19 and other industries.
- 20 Mr. Armstrong's evidence aligns with the cost
- 21 causation principle you heard Dr. Makholm discuss and
- 22 which you've seen discussed by the pipeline companies
- 23 in their written submissions. Mr. Armstrong's evidence
- 24 aligns with the findings of the AER itself in the April
- 25 2022 decision where it dismissed Qualico's cost-sharing
- 26 application. Mr. Armstrong's evidence is supported by

- 1 various of the other developers who participated in
- 2 this proceeding based on the testimony that they
- 3 provided.
- 4 And, finally, Mr. Armstrong's evidence is even
- 5 supported by Mr. Fjeldheim, the lone representative
- from the ARA steering committee who testified that:
- 7 (as read)
- 8 Anything to do with the road structure, so if
- 9 there needs to be concrete slabs or a thicker
- 10 road structure in order to dissipate the
- loads that are transferred down to the
- 12 pipeline would be the development industry's
- 13 cost 'cause that's what we do. We build
- roads.
- 15 That's at Transcript Volume 1, PDF page 190.
- 16 As I mentioned a moment ago, based on the evidence
- 17 on the record of this proceeding, this is the exact
- 18 type of work that needs to be performed on Plains' and
- 19 Pembina's pipelines at the 167th Avenue crossing, and
- 20 both Qualico and the ARA steering committee have
- 21 acknowledged on the record that developers should pay
- 22 for it.
- 23 I emphasize these points because they go to the
- 24 heart of this matter, and they confirm exactly what
- 25 Pembina, Plains, and the other pipeline companies have
- 26 been saying all along, that it is the second-in-time

- 1 party who always pays for pipeline alteration costs in
- 2 these circumstances because it is that party who's
- 3 causing those costs.
- I would respectfully suggest to you that your
- 5 assessment of Qualico's cost-sharing application can
- 6 end right here. There is absolutely no need for the
- 7 AER to direct Pembina or Plains to perform work they
- 8 are willing to undertake voluntarily, and there is
- 9 absolutely no need for the AER to allocate the costs of
- 10 that work here or where, based on its own evidence,
- 11 Qualico is prepared to take responsibility for the very
- 12 costs the City of Edmonton and the ARA steering
- 13 committee directed it to dispute through the
- 14 cost-sharing application.
- To be clear, while our position is that's all you
- 16 need to consider as part of this proceeding, I want to
- 17 be very clear that, that said, upholding the practice
- of the second-in-time pays should equally apply where
- 19 alteration work caused by the crossing relates to the
- 20 pipeline itself. In both of those circumstances, it is
- 21 the crossing party that is causing those costs.
- The third key point that I'd ask you to keep in
- 23 mind is that the AER does not need to endeavour to fix
- the well-established and long-standing process for
- 25 pipeline crossings in Alberta through its decision in
- 26 this matter. That process is not broken, in our

- 1 submission, it does not lack transparency, and it is
- 2 not unfair or inequitable to any party involved.
- 3 As we heard from every single one of the pipeline
- 4 company witnesses, including SECURE and Keyera, as well
- 5 as Dr. Makholm, a decision that upsets that process
- 6 would result in significant uncertainty and inequity
- 7 for the pipeline industry in Alberta. That type of
- 8 decision would not be in the public interest, in our
- 9 submission.
- 10 The fourth point is that Qualico purchased the
- 11 subject lands and development with full knowledge of
- 12 the presence of the pipelines and with full knowledge
- 13 that it would be responsible for constructing roads
- 14 across those pipelines as a condition to the
- 15 development approvals it was purchasing. In other
- 16 words, it purchased the development eyes wide open.
- 17 Qualico had access to detailed documentation in the
- 18 form of the Horse Hill area structure plan, the
- 19 neighbourhood structure plan, the CIMA+ concept plan
- 20 during the due diligence process, and it confirmed that
- 21 it reviewed those materials and accounted for the
- 22 pipelines in its purchase of the lands and the
- 23 development.
- 24 That information included cost estimates of the
- 25 crossings themselves that are actually higher than the
- 26 more recent estimates included in Oualico's

- 1 cost-sharing application. It still went ahead and
- 2 purchased the development in the face of those
- 3 potential pipeline alteration costs.
- 4 There is nothing inequitable or unfair about a
- 5 private for-profit enterprise bearing known costs that
- 6 it willingly accepted. What would be -- but what would
- 7 be inequitable, unfair, and prejudicial, in our
- 8 submission, is shifting any portion of those costs to
- 9 Pembina and Plains in these circumstances.
- 10 The fifth point is that this cost-sharing
- 11 application isn't being driven by Qualico; it's being
- 12 driven by the City of Edmonton and the ARA steering
- 13 committee with a view to achieving broader policy and
- 14 political objectives which extend far beyond the scope
- of this proceeding and which are not appropriately
- 16 raised in this forum, in our submission.
- 17 What you've got is the City of Edmonton and the
- 18 ARA steering committee, which is comprised exclusively
- 19 of representatives from the City and the development
- 20 industry, requiring Qualico to pay for the costs of
- 21 roads within its development pursuant to the ARA bylaw.
- 22 At the same time, you've got the City of Edmonton and
- 23 the ARA steering committee directing Qualico to try and
- 24 do an end run around those requirements by having the
- 25 AER allocate a portion of those costs to Pembina and
- 26 Plains under Section 33 of the Pipeline Act.

In our respectful submission, this constitutes an 1 attempt to usurp the jurisdiction of the AER over 2 3 pipelines in the province based on Sections 619 and 620 4 of the Municipal Government Act. In this regard, Section 619 of the Municipal Government Act provides 5 6 that an AER licence prevails over any planning and 7 development instrument enacted by a municipality and that any bylaw must not conflict with an AER licence or 8 9 must be amended to conform with an AER licence. 10 includes the ARA bylaw. 11 Section 620 similarly says that a condition of a 12 licence issued by a provincial agency like the AER 13 prevails over any condition of a development permit 14 that conflicts with it. In our submission, these provisions of the MGA preclude the City of Edmonton or 15 the ARA steering committee from requiring Pembina and 16 17 Plains to pay for any portion of road costs which are properly borne by developers based on the City's very 18 19 own bylaws. 20 It's not appropriate for the City to attempt to 21 use Qualico to try and circumvent these clear statutory 22 provisions in an effort to have the AER burden Pembina 23 and Plains with these costs, particularly where the City chose not to participate in this proceeding apart 24 25 from providing a one-page letter of support for the 26 original cost-sharing application.

- 1 It's no surprise to us that Qualico's cost-sharing
- 2 application is supported by the Developers Group and
- 3 Brookfield. They're all either developers themselves,
- 4 members of the ARA steering committee, or development
- 5 industry advocacy groups who clearly see this
- 6 proceeding as an opportunity to shift costs they are
- 7 otherwise required to bear onto the pipeline industry.
- 8 We heard from Ms. Anderson on behalf of the UDI of
- 9 which Qualico is a member that, for 2023, the UDI:
- 10 (as read)
- 11 ... identified the issue of pipeline
- 12 crossings as one of our top ten advocacy
- 13 priorities.
- 14 That's at Transcript Volume 2, PDF 7.
- We also heard from Mr. Fash with BILD Alberta that
- 16 his organization is actively trying to pursue
- 17 legislative change with respect to certain of the
- 18 issues raised in Qualico's cost-sharing application.
- 19 This is not the appropriate forum for any of these
- 20 parties to be pursuing these political objectives or
- 21 the type of legislative change we heard the UDI and
- 22 BILD Alberta witnesses speak about during their
- 23 testimony.
- 24 Dr. Makholm summarized the motivation behind these
- 25 developers and development industry advocacy groups
- 26 well when he said the following: (as read)

1	The fact that they are all in here as a group
2	looking for an advantage as an interest group
3	is also not surprising. We live in a land
4	where interest groups come before agencies
5	like the AER or the AUC or the CER and make
6	their case. The idea that there would be a
7	smaller charge for them for land crossings
8	and that they would all support it is not an
9	unsurprising thing. I think that doing so
10	would violate a number of principles like
11	cost-based user pay and also breach the
12	difference between public interest and
13	private interest even if requested by a
14	collective group of private actors. But I
15	don't think the fact that they were all there
16	breaches our definition of public interest
17	and how that's distinct from what
18	Mr. Morrison has concluded.
19	That's at Transcript Volume 3, PDF 194.
20	The sixth and final key point that I'd ask you to
21	bear in mind is that you do not have a single example
22	of another regulator in Alberta or anywhere else in
23	Canada having issued the type of cost-sharing order
24	that Qualico is seeking in circumstances that are
25	similar to this case.
26	Based on the information before you in this

- 1 proceeding, what Qualico is asking for in its
- 2 cost-sharing application is unprecedented. The reason
- 3 for that is because it doesn't make any sense. It
- 4 doesn't make sense to direct a party to take action
- 5 they're willing to take voluntarily, and it doesn't
- 6 make sense to impose costs on a party where they have
- 7 not caused any aspect of those costs and do not benefit
- 8 in any way from those costs. Put very simply, there is
- 9 no justification for the relief that's being sought in
- 10 Qualico's cost-sharing application.
- I'm now going to move to an overview of the key
- 12 facts and issues in this proceeding. At this stage the
- only two crossings that are properly in-scope are
- 14 Pembina and Plains' pipelines at the intersection of
- 15 Meridian Street and 167th Avenue.
- 16 As we heard this morning, Qualico continues to
- 17 seek a cost-sharing order for Plains' pipeline at
- 18 172nd Avenue and Meridian Street despite the fact that
- 19 this work has already been completed and has been paid
- 20 for by Marquis JV pursuant to a cost recovery
- 21 agreement. We've got a copy of that agreement at
- 22 Exhibit 6.01, starting at PDF 399.
- 23 You don't need to direct Plains to do this work
- 24 because it's already been done, and you don't need to
- 25 make a decision with respect to who should pay for that
- 26 work because Marquis JV has already paid for it

- 1 pursuant to a valid and binding contract.
- 2 The next key fact is the two pipelines at issue
- 3 have been in place for more than 50 years. They're
- 4 each covered by valid and subsisting surface
- 5 dispositions: Pembina is by a right-of-entry order,
- 6 and Plains by an easement agreement. Those
- 7 dispositions grant the pipeline companies rights like
- 8 the right to quiet enjoyment which the requested orders
- 9 from Qualico would violate.
- 10 As the party requesting the crossings, Qualico is
- 11 the second-in-time party and is responsible for the
- 12 costs associated with crossing existing linear
- 13 infrastructure. This is reflective of the widely
- 14 accepted legal principle of first-in-time,
- 15 first-in-right, and the foundational principle of cost
- 16 causation which is frequently applied in the regulatory
- 17 context. And I'm going to come back to -- to those
- 18 principles and the purpose for which the pipeline
- 19 companies are relying on them in this proceeding in a
- 20 moment.
- 21 With respect to Mr. Fitch's suggestion during
- 22 cross-examination that the road or the road allowance
- 23 was there first such that Pembina and Plains'
- 24 right-of-entry order and easement are second-in-time to
- 25 that road, we would submit to you as follows: There is
- 26 no record -- or no evidence on the record that the

- 1 existing road or road allowance was actually there
- 2 first. Even if the existing road or road allowance was
- 3 there first, there's no evidence with respect to the
- 4 terms of any consent the County might have provided for
- 5 the pipelines to cross the road or the road allowance
- 6 at that time, and none of this changes the fact that
- 7 Qualico's upgraded arterial road is second-in-time to
- 8 Pembina and Plains' pipelines and that the upgraded
- 9 arterial road is solely responsible for causing the
- 10 pipeline alteration costs.
- 11 The next fact. The Horse Hill area structure plan
- 12 was approved on May 22nd, 2013. The ASP clearly
- 13 explains that there are ten pipelines within the plan
- 14 area and that the existing pipeline shall be
- 15 accommodated and incorporated into the development
- 16 concept. That's at Exhibit 5.01, PDF pages 663 and 709.
- 17 The ASP also provides detailed pipeline
- 18 information, including licence number, status, sour gas
- 19 content, pressure, product, and diameter broken down
- 20 for each quarter section within the plan area. That's
- 21 Exhibit 5.01, pages 7 -- 728 to 732.
- The Marquis neighbourhood structure plan was
- 23 approved on April 28th, 2015, and includes further
- 24 information regarding the existence of pipelines within
- 25 the subject area, including mapping, and sets out an
- 26 objective to: (as read)

Ensure the development respects the ongoing 1 2 operation and integrity of existing pipeline 3 infrastructure. 4 Detailed pipeline information is also provided at Table 1 of the NSP. Again, those are in Exhibit 5.01 5 6 at pages 734, 746, 754, and 814. The CIMA+ concept plan report for Meridian Street was issued in January of 2015. Section 3.3.4 of that 8 concept plan specifically discusses the interaction 9 10 between Qualico's development plans and Pembina and Plains' existing pipelines. The concept plan explains 11 that Plains' existing pipeline can be left in the 12 13 current location based upon the proposed conceptual 14 design; however, it is likely that recoating and installation of bridging blocks will be required to 15 protect the existing infrastructure. 16 That's at Exhibit 5.01, page 995. 17 And with respect to Pembina's pipeline, the 18 concept plan also indicates that protection of the 19 20 existing pipeline crossing is the preferred option. This will need to be confirmed during detailed design 21 22 through an inspection of the existing facility by The estimated cost for the installation of a 23 Pembina. 24 pipeline protection slab is approximately \$1,135,200. 25 That's at Exhibit 5.01. 996 is the page number.

Qualico purchased the subject lands and these

26

- 1 plans in 2018 after each one of these detailed planning
- 2 documents was approved or prepared and after completing
- 3 robust due diligence on those plans and on the lands.
- 4 Consistent with the well-established industry practice
- 5 and the typical crossing process, we heard each of
- 6 Mr. Balfour, Mr. Sprott, Mr. Trim, and Mr. Torr,
- 7 described on April 1st of 2019, Qualico, through its
- 8 subsidiary, Horse Hill Land Company, entered into two
- 9 cost recovery agreements with Plains which established
- 10 Qualico's responsibility for approximately \$1.1 million
- in pipeline alteration costs for the crossings at 167th
- 12 Avenue and 172nd Avenue. Copies of those agreements
- 13 are at Exhibit 86.01 and 87.01.
- 14 Then on May 7th of 2021, Qualico entered into a
- 15 final support agreement with Pembina which outlined
- 16 Qualico's responsibility for an additional \$974,000 in
- 17 pipeline alteration work for another Pembina Pipeline
- 18 at Marguis Boulevard crossing, which is Exhibit 85.01
- 19 for a copy of the agreement.
- 20 All of these agreements were based on the premise
- 21 that Qualico, as the party causing the need for the
- 22 pipeline alteration work, would pay for the cost of
- 23 that work. Again, this is entirely consistent with the
- 24 cost causation principle that I referenced a few
- 25 moments ago.
- 26 It wasn't until the City of Edmonton and the ARA

- 1 steering committee got involved that Qualico
- 2 subsequently terminated these agreements in order to
- 3 pursue the cost-sharing orders that are or were being
- 4 requested in the application. There was no lack of
- 5 transparency in the process that led to Qualico
- 6 executing those agreements. They all clearly set out
- 7 the scope of work to be performed and provided a
- 8 breakdown of the costs for which Qualico agreed it
- 9 would be responsible.
- 10 The record also shows that it's not just Qualico
- 11 that has followed this well-established practice.
- 12 Marquis JV did the exact same thing with respect to the
- 13 crossing of Plains' pipeline at 172nd Avenue and
- 14 Meridian Street.
- The best evidence on the record of this proceeding
- 16 is that, contrary to the political direction of the
- 17 City of Edmonton and the ARA steering committee,
- 18 sophisticated developers like Qualico understand the
- 19 industry practice applicable to crossings and continue
- 20 to follow that practice by voluntarily agreeing to
- 21 cover the cost they cause as a result of their
- 22 crossings.
- We also know, based on those agreements and based
- 24 on the testimony from the pipeline companies'
- 25 witnesses, that they have specific details regarding
- 26 the scope of work and the costs that are applicable to

- 1 those crossings in the agreements that they enter into,
- 2 and they also have a clear understanding of what
- 3 they're paying for when they're invoiced for the
- 4 amounts that are actually spent to perform that work.
- 5 I'm now going to move to the legislative and
- 6 regulatory framework governing pipeline crossings in
- 7 Alberta under Section 33. These are set out in detail
- 8 at section II(b) of the pipeline companies' joint
- 9 written submission in Exhibit 71.01. I'll try to be
- 10 brief and -- and not repeat the entirety of those
- 11 submissions.
- 12 The first thing I'd like to note is that Qualico
- 13 bears the onus in this proceeding. Qualico
- 14 acknowledges as much in its letter to the Panel
- 15 regarding the -- regarding its participation in this
- 16 proceeding at Exhibit 24.01. The pipeline companies
- 17 submit that it is clear that Qualico has failed to meet
- 18 its onus in this proceeding.
- 19 As I mentioned at the outset, given that Qualico
- 20 appears to have abandoned its request for a 50-50
- 21 cost-sharing order in the amended cost-sharing
- 22 application, it's difficult to envision any
- 23 circumstance in which the Panel could arrive at the
- 24 conclusion that Qualico did satisfy its onus.
- 25 Even if Qualico had stood by its request for a
- 26 50-50 cost-sharing order, the evidence that came out of

- 1 the hearing was that Qualico would likely only be
- 2 responsible for approximately 5 percent of the crossing
- 3 costs after it was reimbursed through the ARA levy
- 4 that's paid by other developers in the basin or the
- 5 catchment area. 5 percent.
- 6 The Panel's basic task in this reconsideration
- 7 proceeding is to confirm, vary, suspend, or revoke the
- 8 AER's decision in accordance with Section 42 of the
- 9 REDA. This question turns on whether the relief sought
- 10 by Qualico satisfies the requirements under Section 33
- 11 of the Pipeline Act.
- 12 Section 33, as the Panel I'm sure is well aware,
- 13 has three components. In their proper and logical
- 14 order, they can be summarized as follows:
- 15 Subsection (1). The AER may, on any terms and
- 16 conditions that it considers appropriate, direct a
- 17 licencee to alter its pipeline when the AER is of the
- 18 opinion that it would be in the public interest to do
- 19 so.
- 20 Subsection (2). If the AER decides that it's in
- 21 the public interest to direct alteration work and
- 22 directs a licencee to undertake this work, the AER may
- 23 also order by whom and to whom payment for the cost of
- 24 this alteration work should be made.
- 25 And subsection (3) says that if a dispute arises
- 26 regarding the amount to be paid pursuant to the AER's

- order, this dispute must be referred to the AER, and
- 2 the AER's decision is final.
- 3 So the first component of Section 33 requires a
- 4 public interest determination by the AER with respect
- 5 to the alteration of a pipeline, not with respect to
- 6 the -- the associated cost. Accordingly, the success
- 7 of Qualico's cost-sharing application first depends on
- 8 whether it is in the public interest for the AER to
- 9 order Pembina and Plains to alter their pipelines.
- 10 Cost allocation is not a consideration at this stage of
- 11 the analysis.
- 12 As I've mentioned and as is evident based on the
- 13 record of this proceeding, there is no dispute or
- 14 disagreement as to whether Pembina and Plains need to
- 15 alter their pipelines to accommodate Qualico's
- 16 development. This was confirmed by the pipeline
- 17 companies numerous times in writing and at the hearing.
- 18 It follows, in our submission, that the Panel must
- 19 first decide whether it is in the public interest to
- 20 issue an order directing the alteration work where both
- 21 Pembina and Plains have made it clear that they are
- 22 ready, willing, and able to complete the required work.
- 23 That's at Transcript Volume 3, PDF page 2 hundred --
- 24 216, PDF page 27, and PDF page 28.
- In the pipeline companies' respectful submission,
- 26 it is not in the public interest for a regulator like

- 1 the AER to intervene in a private matter where there is
- 2 no need for it to do so, and the Regulator should
- 3 exercise caution in engaging in the private commercial
- 4 realm as was reflected in the AER's April '22 -- 2022
- 5 decision.
- 6 While the pipeline companies are of the view that
- 7 the AER's April 2022 decision was rightly decided, the
- 8 interpretation of Section 33 that I've just outlined is
- 9 also consistent with the comments made by the AER in
- 10 its November 14th, 2022, letter initiating this
- 11 proceeding, which focused on the public interest
- 12 considerations as they relate to the alteration work
- 13 itself and not the associated costs. That letter's at
- 14 Exhibit 6.01 on page 3.
- 15 Qualico fails to grasp this important point
- 16 throughout its submissions and its witnesses' testimony
- 17 and the submissions that we heard this morning.
- 18 Instead, Qualico's singular focus throughout this
- 19 proceeding has been on whether or not cost sharing
- 20 would be in the public interest, which is a question
- 21 that is based on an incorrect interpretation of
- 22 Section 33.
- 23 Moreover, Qualico's and its experts' formulation
- 24 of what constitutes the public interest is plain wrong.
- 25 The notion of ESG does not equate to the public
- 26 interest as Mr. Morrison suggested during his

- 1 testimony. The public interest is not determined with
- 2 reference to the fact that the road is a public road.
- 3 It's not determined with reference to the fact that a
- 4 piece of public infrastructure or a development
- 5 approved by a public authority doesn't automatically
- 6 make those things in the public interest simply because
- 7 that infrastructure is used by some members of the
- 8 public or that development is being pursued by a public
- 9 entity.
- 10 Dr. Makholm was unequivocal in confirming that
- 11 these factors would have absolutely no impact on his
- 12 and Dr. Olive's public interest analysis. That's at
- 13 Transcript Volume 3, page 196.
- 14 The public interest is not determined with
- 15 reference to the fact that members of the public may
- 16 ultimately purchase the homes in Qualico's development.
- 17 These prospective purchasers of Qualico's homes do not
- 18 represent the public interest as that term applies to
- 19 regulators like the AER. These prospective homebuyers
- are simply private parties who may choose to engage in
- 21 a private transaction to buy a home in Qualico's
- 22 development.
- The relief requested by Qualico in its amended
- 24 cost sharing application is not in the public interest
- 25 simply because Edmonton City Council approved the
- 26 Horse Hill area structure plan as Mr. Fitch tried to

- 1 suggest during his cross-examination and as he
- 2 suggested this morning. As confirmed by Mr. Romanesky,
- 3 all that approval of the ASP indicates is that it
- 4 accords with the City's vision of sustainable
- 5 development.
- 6 In this case the public interest assessment is
- 7 properly formed by whether Pembina and Plains should be
- 8 directed to undertake alteration work on their
- 9 pipelines where they're already willing to do that
- 10 work. The public interest is a much broader concept
- 11 than Qualico would have the AER believe. There is a
- 12 significant difference between a residential
- development and pipeline being in the public interest
- 14 and the alterations of pipelines being in the public
- 15 interest in these circumstances.
- 16 As Dr. Makholm stated during cross-examination:
- 17 (as read)
- 18 The private interest of the earnings of
- 19 Qualico cannot be confused reasonably by this
- agency or any other that does this kind of
- agency's work with the public interest.
- 22 That's what Mr. Morrison conflates. That's one of the
- 23 reasons we're here, to try and make it plain that the
- 24 public interest is a larger matter, not just Qualico's
- 25 earnings. That's at Transcript Volume 3, page 192.
- 26 The second component of Section 33 or

- 1 Subsection 33(2) is only engaged after the AER has made
- 2 a positive public interest determination regarding the
- 3 alteration work. Again, if this Panel determines that
- 4 it is not in the public interest to order the
- 5 alteration work for -- for Pembina and Plains'
- 6 pipelines, that is a full answer to the ultimate
- 7 question in this proceeding. Subsection 33(1) would
- 8 not be satisfied, and the analysis comes to an end.
- 9 Put differently, the Panel's public interest
- 10 analysis in this proceeding should not conflate the
- 11 physical alteration work on Pembina and Plains'
- 12 pipelines with the cost of this work or who is
- 13 responsible for the cost of this work. From a public
- 14 interest perspective, the question that the Panel must
- 15 answer is whether it is in the public interest to
- 16 direct Pembina and Plains to alter their respective
- 17 pipelines.
- 18 While the pipeline companies submit that the
- 19 foregoing interpretation of Section 33 is correct and
- 20 that it is not in the public interest to direct
- 21 alteration work in this case, it is similarly not
- 22 appropriate having regard to the public interest or
- 23 otherwise to issue corresponding cost-sharing orders as
- 24 requested by Qualico for the reasons Mr. Naffin --
- 25 Mr. Naffin and I will present today.
- In approaching Section 33 of the Pipeline Act, the

Panel can be guided by the findings of the Supreme 1 Court of Canada in Vavilov. The cite for that case is 2 3 2019 SCC 65. At paragraphs 119 to 121 -- and I'll read a brief passage of the Court's findings from 4 5 paragraph 121 where the Supreme Court held as follows: (as read) 6 The administrative decision-maker's task is to interpret the contested provision in a 8 9 manner consistent with the text, context, and 10 purpose, applying its particular insight into 11 the statutory scheme at issue. It cannot 12 adopt an interpretation it knows to be 13 inferior, albeit plausible, merely because 14 the interpretation in question appears to be available and is expedient. 15 The decision-maker's responsibility is to discern 16 meaning and legislative intent, not to 17 reverse-engineer a desired outcome. 18 In the pipeline companies' submission, the 19 20 interpretation of Section 33 that I've just outlined is consistent with the text, context, and purpose of the 21 22 provision, and it is superior to an interpretation which suggests that the public interest should be 23 24 assessed with respect to the cost-sharing orders 25 requested by Qualico. 26 The interpretation of Section 33 that I've just

outlined is also supported by Ruth Sullivan's The 1 Construction of Statutes which describes the 2 3 presumption of orderly and economic arrangement. In 4 that regard, Sullivan states: (as read) It is presumed that, in preparing the 5 6 material that is meant to be enacted into law, the legislature seeks an orderly and 8 economical arrangement. Each provision expresses a distinct idea. 9 Related concepts 10 and provisions are grouped together in a 11 meaningful way. The sequencing of words, 12 phrases, clause, and larger units reflect a 13 rational plan. 14 I'd submit to you that Section 33(1) represents the distinct idea that it must be in the public interest 15 for the AER to order the alteration or relocation of a 16 17 pipeline. Further, based on the implied exclusion rule to 18 statutory interpretation, in other words, to express 19 20 one thing is to exclude another, if the legislature had 21 intended for the AER to engage in a public interest 22 assessment with respect to whether or not a cost order 23 should be issued under subsection 33(2), it would have 24 done so, given that the public interest is expressly 25 referenced under subsection 33(1). It did not, which 26 represents grounds for inferring that assessment of the

- 1 public interest was deliberately excluded from the
- 2 ambit of subsection 33(2).
- 3 In addition to Section 33 of the Pipeline Act, I'd
- 4 like to address a few other legislative provisions on
- 5 which Oualico relies in its submissions and which
- 6 Mr. Fitch discussed this morning.
- 7 First, Qualico suggests that it's a landowner for
- 8 the purposes of Section 15 of the REDA, which provides
- 9 that the AER must, in addition to any other factor that
- 10 it -- that it may or must consider in the
- 11 circumstances, consider the interests of landowners
- 12 when conducting a reconsideration.
- In our submission, Qualico is much different from
- 14 a typical landowner that would participate in an AER
- 15 proceeding, and the interest that Qualico has in this
- 16 proceeding are also much different.
- 17 Qualico's interests in the context of this
- 18 proceeding are readily apparent as a result of the
- 19 relief that it is seeking. It is only Qualico's profit
- 20 margins that are affected by this proceeding.
- 21 In addition, Pembina and Plains have rights and
- 22 interests in the subject lands that must be considered
- 23 and respected. Qualico's business is not the only
- 24 interest at play.
- 25 Qualico also points to Section 3 of the REDA
- 26 General Regulation which states that, for the purposes

- 1 of Section 15 of the REDA, the AER must consider the
- 2 impacts on a landowner as a result of the use of the
- 3 land on which the energy resource activity is or will
- 4 be located.
- 5 Again, this provision does not indicate that the
- 6 impacts on the landowner, which in this case are the
- 7 potential impacts to Qualico's bottom line, are the
- 8 driving consideration.
- 9 Moreover, based on the cross-examination conducted
- 10 by Qualico's counsel and based on his submissions this
- 11 morning, Qualico has emphasized the point that it isn't
- 12 the owner of the roads where the alteration work will
- 13 be carried out. So if you accept their position in
- 14 that regard, they're not a landowner at all.
- The pipeline companies further submit that these
- 16 statutory provisions relied upon by Qualico must not be
- 17 viewed in isolation. The AER's general mandate under
- 18 paragraph 2(1)(a) of the REDA is to provide for the
- 19 efficient, safe, orderly, and environmentally
- 20 responsible development of energy resources and mineral
- 21 resources in Alberta.
- 22 Section 4 of the Pipeline Act also authorizes the
- 23 AER to: (as read)
- 24 ... on its own motion inquire into or examine
- any matter relating to the economic, orderly,
- and efficient development in the public

- interest of pipeline facilities in Alberta.
- 2 In our submission, it's not economic, it's not orderly,
- 3 and it's not efficient for pipeline companies to have
- 4 to pay for alterations to existing pipelines solely for
- 5 the purpose of subsidizing the business endeavours of a
- 6 sophisticated for-profit developer like Qualico,
- 7 especially where they derive no benefit from doing so
- 8 and where such an order from the AER would have broader
- 9 impacts on the economics of the pipeline industry and
- 10 capital investment in Alberta, more broadly.
- 11 Outside the legislative context of this
- 12 proceeding, Qualico and Brookfield also point to
- 13 certain provisions of the Canadian Energy Regulator Act
- 14 and the Hydro and Electric Energy Act. In this regard,
- 15 all Qualico has done is identify other statutory
- 16 provisions under those statutes which allow the CER or
- 17 the AUC to order the alteration or relocation of an
- 18 existing facility. Section 33 gives the AER the same
- 19 authority. It doesn't mean that that authority should
- 20 be exercised in these circumstances.
- 21 What Qualico has not done is provide any
- 22 indication, in a reported decision or otherwise, that
- 23 any of these statutory provisions have been used to
- 24 order a facility owner to alter its existing
- 25 infrastructure and to shoulder the cost of altering or
- 26 relocating its existing facility where that facility

- 1 owner is willing to do the work voluntarily over its
- 2 own objections.
- 3 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act, Section 212 of the
- 4 CER Act and Section 17 of the HEEA all say what they
- 5 say. None of these provisions have been applied in the
- 6 manner that Qualico has asked for in its amended
- 7 application.
- 8 The final statutory provision that I'll point you
- 9 to, and it relates to the issue of -- of responsiveness
- 10 and transparency through this process, is Section 43 of
- 11 the Pipeline Rules. It specifically sets out a
- 12 timeline by which pipeline companies are required to
- 13 respond to crossing requests or ground disturbance
- 14 requests when they're received. It provides specific
- 15 recourse to parties requesting those crossings to come
- 16 to the AER if they're not getting a response.
- 17 So contrary to the submissions that we heard this
- 18 morning, and as I've already mentioned, there is a
- 19 clear process in this province under the Pipeline Act.
- 20 You don't need to embark upon the exercise of creating
- 21 new rules or a new framework that would overhaul or
- 22 upset the existing process.
- 23 I've got a few comments before I turn it over to
- 24 Mr. Naffin in response to some of the specific
- 25 submissions that we heard from Qualico and Brookfield
- 26 this morning.

- 1 Qualico started by saying that its request in this
- 2 proceeding is not unusual in any way. As you heard
- 3 from us, Qualico hasn't provided a single example or
- 4 precedent of the relief it's requesting in this
- 5 proceeding in analogous circumstances.
- 6 Mr. Fitch was critical of Pembina and Plains for
- 7 not seating witnesses with firsthand knowledge of
- 8 discussions that occurred between those companies and
- 9 Qualico. First, I'd suggest that it's not necessary,
- 10 or it wasn't necessary because there are no relevant
- 11 facts that are in dispute. The various backstopping
- 12 agreements that Qualico entered into are also very
- 13 clear in terms of the work the parties agreed needed to
- 14 be done, and the amount Qualico would be required to
- 15 pay for that work.
- Second, as you'll have noticed last Thursday when
- 17 the pipeline companies' panel was -- was seated,
- 18 Pembina and Plains, as well as SECURE, put forward
- 19 senior representatives of their organization. I'd
- 20 suggest you should take that as an indication of how
- 21 seriously all of these companies take this proceeding
- 22 and the importance of the outcome of this proceeding to
- 23 both them and the pipeline industry more broadly.
- 24 Third, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Trim, and Mr. Torr all
- 25 confirmed that they were responsible for the teams that
- 26 were dealing directly with Qualico. It's not

- 1 unreasonable that a senior executive would not attend
- 2 every single meeting involving a pipeline crossing,
- 3 particularly considering that they deal with thousands
- 4 of those crossing requests every year.
- 5 Mr. Fitch brought up my cross-examination of the
- 6 Qualico panel regarding the clear statements that had
- 7 been made in the original cost-sharing application and
- 8 the pipeline companies' willingness to carry out the
- 9 necessary alteration work. I believe he suggested that
- 10 that line of questioning was improper and inaccurate.
- 11 I certainly didn't hear any objection to any of those
- 12 questions while that cross-examination was being
- 13 conducted. And I don't believe any of the witnesses
- 14 disagreed with any of the questions that had been put
- 15 to them, so I'm not sure how that adds up to being
- 16 improper or inaccurate cross-examination.
- 17 He suggested that the issue of whether or not
- 18 there's a dispute regarding the alteration work is not
- 19 relevant and has been fully and finally determined by
- 20 the AER in its notice of reconsideration. This is an
- 21 important point. Qualico and Brookfield, the
- 22 Developers Group, they fundamentally misapprehend the
- 23 point. The critical point is that the issue of whether
- 24 or not there is a dispute with respect to the work goes
- 25 directly to your assessment of whether or not it is in
- 26 the public interest to direct that work. You've

- 1 already heard my submissions on why it's not in the
- 2 public interest to direct the work in these
- 3 circumstances.
- With respect to Mr. Fitch's suggestion that the
- 5 AER does not have authority to make a decision on this
- 6 issue because it was decided in the notice of
- 7 reconsideration, that's not right, and it overlooks the
- 8 fact that you're specifically authorized to confirm the
- 9 April 2022 decision under Section 42 of the Responsible
- 10 Energy Development Act.
- 11 Finally, if there ever -- if there has never been
- 12 agreement on the work that needs to be performed, as my
- 13 friend suggested this morning, why did Qualico go to
- 14 the length of amending its application where, for the
- 15 first time, suggested that there is a dispute with
- 16 respect to that work? Why in its original application
- 17 would Qualico specifically say that the only dispute
- 18 was with respect to costs?
- 19 Qualico suggested this morning that Pembina and
- 20 Plains' right to quiet enjoyment under their easement
- 21 agreement or right-of-entry order does not override
- 22 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act. Again, that's not what
- 23 we're suggesting. The point is that these rights
- 24 shouldn't be interfered with in these circumstances,
- 25 but, consistent with the comments that I just made,
- 26 these rights need to be considered in your assessment

- 1 of whether or not it is in the public interest to
- 2 direct the alteration work.
- We're not here to argue the fine legal points
- 4 around the first-in-time, first-in-right principle, the
- 5 buyer-beware principle, the technical requirements
- 6 around land titles in Alberta, or that any of these
- 7 principles override the AER's authority under
- 8 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act. Our simple point is
- 9 that these principles and legal requirements are
- 10 directly relevant to your public interest assessment
- 11 under subsection 33(1).
- 12 Mr. Fitch asked this morning, What's the purpose
- 13 of Section 33? I'd suggest that's very clear. It's --
- 14 it's to resolve disputes between a second-in-time
- 15 party, like a developer, and a pipeline company where
- 16 they can't agree on the need for the alteration work or
- 17 the relocation work. You don't need to resolve that
- 18 sort of dispute here because there is no dispute.
- 19 My friend suggested this morning that Qualico
- 20 isn't actually the cause of the work. He says the
- 21 cause is the accommodation of growth in northeast
- 22 Edmonton. I think it's very clear that Oualico is the
- 23 cause of the work. It's the one asking to cross
- 24 Pembina and Plains' pipelines because it's the one
- 25 that's required to construct the road to cross those
- 26 pipelines.

- 1 The growth that Mr. Fitch referenced, it's growth
- 2 that Qualico stands to profit from, it's growth that
- 3 Qualico is voluntary -- voluntarily pursuing, and, one
- 4 final point, contrary to what my friend suggested this
- 5 morning, Mr. Romanesky never agreed that this growth
- 6 was in the public interest. The excerpt of the
- 7 testimony was mischaracterized. Mr. Romanesky never
- 8 agreed to that, and you heard my comments on that
- 9 earlier.
- 10 Again, this notion that Sturgeon County's road or
- 11 road allowance was first-in-time to Pembina and Plains'
- 12 pipelines, as I'd mentioned, there's no evidence on the
- 13 record of this proceeding to demonstrate that. You
- 14 can't find that anywhere on the record that's before
- 15 you.
- So in that respect, I'd suggest you can completely
- 17 disregard that argument by my friend. And, again,
- 18 these submissions represent a continued misapprehension
- 19 of the primary point that's being advanced by the
- 20 pipeline companies. Again, it's that the Pembina and
- 21 Plains pipelines are first-in-time to Oualico's
- 22 crossings, and, on that basis, it should be Qualico as
- 23 the second-in-time party and the party who is driving
- 24 the costs of those crossings who should pay for those
- 25 costs.
- 26 My friend discussed what he characterized as a

- 1 lack of transparency and a lack of reliability with
- 2 information about crossing cost estimates provided by
- 3 pipeline companies. This was all addressed by the
- 4 Pembina and Plains witnesses in their testimony who
- 5 explained the iterative process that is required to
- 6 arrive at scopes of work and cost estimates for more
- 7 complex crossings. They explain that cost estimates
- 8 are dependent upon, to a degree, the information that's
- 9 provided to them by the developer regarding the
- 10 crossing. They explain why two pipelines in close
- 11 proximity to one another might require different
- 12 protective measures and why the costs of that work
- 13 might differ. Every crossing is unique, especially
- 14 when it's two different companies operating those
- 15 pipelines.
- In terms of the precedence that my friend
- 17 referenced this morning, there wasn't anything we
- 18 haven't already seen in their prior written
- 19 submissions. They're all distinguishable, and none
- 20 grant cost-sharing orders in circumstances similar to
- 21 the present case. Oualico itself acknowledged that all
- 22 of these authorities are distinguishable in its written
- 23 submission. You can find that at Exhibit 64.01,
- 24 paragraph 31.
- 25 The one case that I don't think we had seen until
- 26 this morning was AUC Decision 2012-333. What my friend

- 1 did is simply pull obiter* out of that decision to
- 2 suggest that it provides guidance to the AER in this
- 3 case. It doesn't, and what he failed to mention is
- 4 that there was no cost-sharing request made in that
- 5 proceeding, and he also failed to mention that the
- 6 application was ultimately denied by the AUC, so I'd
- 7 suggest that it's of no value to your determination
- 8 here.
- 9 On the issue of the pipeline companies' financial
- 10 wherewithal or their ability to pay for these crossings
- 11 because they're profitable corporations, this is not
- 12 a -- even a remotely relevant consideration in your
- 13 assessment in this case. It doesn't go to the public
- 14 interest, and it represents a very flawed view of how
- 15 disputes are appropriately resolved by decision-makers
- 16 like the AER, like the Courts. It also ignores the
- 17 fact that, clearly, Qualico and other developers in the
- 18 catchment can afford to pay for these crossings. We've
- 19 got numerous examples on the record of this proceeding
- 20 of those developers entering into contracts, agreeing
- 21 to pay for the costs of these very crossings.
- 22 It was suggested that Pembina and Plains want a
- 23 get-out-of-jail-free card in terms of never wanting to
- 24 pay for crossings of their pipelines. That's not at
- 25 all what we heard from the pipeline companies'
- 26 witnesses. They want to maintain the well-established,

- 1 logical, and fair industry practice in this province.
- 2 As we heard from the pipeline companies' witnesses,
- 3 that practice is a two-way street. When they are the
- 4 second-in-time party crossing someone else's linear
- 5 infrastructure, they reasonably expect to and they do
- 6 pay for the costs of those crossings. That's how this
- 7 practice works.
- 8 The one final comment I'll -- I'll leave you with
- 9 before I -- well, I'm going to first propose a break,
- 10 if -- if anyone wants one, but before I turn it over to
- 11 Mr. Naffin -- relates to the suggestion at the end of
- 12 my friend's remarks that Qualico isn't looking for a
- 13 blanket precedent through this proceeding.
- 14 Qualico and the other developers have gone back
- and forth on this point throughout the course of the
- 16 proceeding. The UDI and BILD Alberta appear to want
- 17 the AER to somehow direct legislative change. Qualico
- 18 says it doesn't want a blanket precedent this morning
- 19 that applies to all areas of the province, but what I
- 20 did hear is that it wants a blanket precedent that
- 21 applies to the parts of Alberta that it's active in.
- 22 And I'd suggest to you that that perfectly sums up the
- 23 self-interested nature of Qualico's entire application.
- 24 That concludes my closing remarks this afternoon,
- 25 Madam Chair and Panel Members. I recognize that I've
- 26 been going for a while. I'm ready to turn it over to

- 1 Mr. Naffin, but if anyone would like a break, then
- 2 we're -- we're certainly happy to break here before he
- 3 proceeds. Thank you very much.
- 4 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Myers.
- 5 Let's take a 15-minute break, and we will be back
- 6 at 2:25. Thank you.
- 7 (ADJOURNMENT)
- 8 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Please
- 9 be seated.
- 10 Go ahead, Mr. Naffin.
- 11 Final Submissions by D. Naffin
- 12 D. NAFFIN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair,
- 13 Panel Members. Thanks for the opportunity to provide
- 14 closing remarks on behalf of Plains and Pembina this
- 15 afternoon.
- 16 Thanks to Mr. Myers for leading the charge and
- 17 being gracious enough to let me get up next.
- 18 Madam Chair, Panel Members, I'm first going to
- 19 speak to the pipeline companies' position and evidence
- 20 in this proceeding. It's not my intention to go
- 21 through the pipeline companies' evidence in great
- 22 detail, as I believe it speaks for itself, but I will
- 23 highlight the key conclusions arising out of this
- 24 evidence as they relate to the issues before the Panel
- 25 in this proceeding.
- So, first, Madam Chair, Panel Members, I'd like to

- 1 speak about the pipeline companies' general approach to
- 2 pipeline crossing work. In my respectful submission,
- 3 it's abundantly clear that the pipeline companies, as
- 4 well as Keyera and SECURE, adhere to the first-in-time,
- 5 first-in-right or cost-based user pay principle with
- 6 respect to crossing work, and as Mr. Myers clarified in
- 7 his remarks, we're not talking about esoteric land
- 8 titles priorities and so on and so forth when we refer
- 9 to the first-in-time as first-in-right principle.
- 10 What we're getting at is that Plains and Pembina
- 11 were on the subject lands first, they have rights and
- 12 privileges that should be considered by you in
- 13 evaluating the public interest, and that Qualico, as
- 14 the second-in-time user who is driving the need for the
- 15 pipeline alteration costs to take place, should pay for
- 16 those alteration costs.
- 17 So we can dispense with discussions of the Alberta
- 18 Bill of Rights, the Canadian Charter of Rights and
- 19 Freedoms, expropriation law concepts, and so on because
- 20 that's exhibiting a fundamental misunderstanding of
- 21 what's a fairly simple position on the part of the
- 22 pipeline companies, as I've just explained.
- 23 So with respect to that principle, Mr. Balfour for
- 24 Pembina, Mr. Torr for Plains explained in detail the
- 25 pipeline companies' respective processes that are
- 26 followed in each case when a request is received for

- 1 crossing an existing pipeline, and that's at transcript
- 2 Volume 3, PDF page 206 and PDF page 210. These
- 3 processes are consistent, transparent, and effective.
- 4 You also heard from Mr. Balfour that these
- 5 processes are dependent on the amount of information
- 6 received from the party requesting the crossing, and
- 7 that's at transcript Volume 3, PDF page 39.
- 8 Mr. Trim also confirmed that Plains' processes
- 9 upwards of 3,500 crossing requests every year. It's at
- 10 Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF page 113. This further
- 11 establishes that the pipeline companies' processes are
- 12 well-tested and work effectively in the vast majority
- 13 of cases.
- 14 You also heard from the pipeline companies'
- 15 witnesses that this is an iterative process that
- 16 requires coordination and cooperation between a
- 17 pipeline company and the second-in-time party looking
- 18 to cross the pipeline to develop an appropriate scope
- 19 of work to estimate the costs and to execute the work.
- 20 And, Madam Chair, Panel Members, in my respectful
- 21 submission, it's not responsible to expect this all to
- 22 occur overnight or in a number of days. It's a process
- 23 that does take some time to get it right. That
- 24 discussion from the pipeline companies' witnesses is at
- 25 transcript Volume -- pardon me -- Volume 3 of the
- 26 transcript, PDF pages 205 to 210.

Mr. Sprott also explained that Pembina follows 1 this rule as well, that being the second-in-time or 2 3 person driving the cost pays rule. If Pembina were to 4 undertake a new development across another company's pipeline, Pembina would fully expect to pay those costs 5 as the second-in-time party. And that's at transcript 6 7 Volume 3, PDF page 22. As further explained by Mr. Sprott, and as 8 9 Mr. Myers referenced this morning: (as read) 10 It's a two-way street. We very commonly are 11 crossing other people's assets. We, being 12 pipeline operators, are crossing other 13 people's assets, and we do that solely 14 100 percent at our costs. That's at Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF page 123. 15 In addition to the fact that the pipeline 16 17 companies consistently follow established practices for pipeline crossings, Subsection 28(2) of the Pipeline 18 Rules, as we discussed a bit earlier, obligates 19 20 pipeline owners to upgrade a pipeline crossed by a road to meet the standards set out under CSA Z662. 21 22 the pipeline companies are subject to a statutory 23 obligation to do the work necessary to satisfy these 24 requirements. In the pipeline companies' submission, 25 complaints regarding those costs or processes required 26 to meet the requirements of CSA Z662 are not reasonable

- 1 where there's a legislative obligation for those
- 2 particular requirements to be met.
- Further, nothing in Subsection 28 (2) of the
- 4 Pipeline Rules or elsewhere in the Pipeline Act states
- 5 that the licencee should be responsible for the cost of
- 6 complying with CSA Z662 when a third party, such as
- 7 Qualico, is the driver of those costs.
- 8 Now, I found it curious this morning, Madam Chair,
- 9 Panel Members, when Mr. Dixon suggested on his read of
- 10 Rule 28(2) that companies were obligated or required to
- 11 pay the costs by virtue of the fact that they're
- 12 directed to comply with CSA Z662. As I just said, that
- 13 is not at all reflected in the actual text of
- 14 Subsection 28(2) of the Pipeline Rules, but, moreover,
- 15 that would do exactly what Mr. Fitch and Mr. Dixon were
- 16 being critical of the pipeline companies for doing,
- 17 what -- that was embracing an interpretation that
- 18 ignored Section 33 of the Pipeline Act -- or -- pardon
- 19 me -- of the Pipeline Act, yes, and rendered it
- 20 useless, in their words. I disagree with their
- 21 characterization of the -- the topic they were levying
- 22 that accusation at us over, but this would have the
- 23 same effect. If Rule 28(2) was as plain as Mr. Dixon
- 24 suggests, there would be no need to be here today. And
- 25 also, curiously, if it were that clear and there was an
- 26 obligation that the pipeline operator pays the costs,

- 1 why has the second-in-time party consistently paid for
- 2 alteration costs when it needs to cross someone else's
- 3 linear infrastructure for decades in this province? So
- 4 with all due respect to Mr. Dixon and his
- 5 interpretation, I'd suggest that doesn't make any
- 6 sense.
- 7 With respect to Qualico and other developers'
- 8 suggestions that they be provided with an opportunity
- 9 to opine on the alteration work necessary to facilitate
- 10 their crossings, Mr. Sprott was clear in his opening
- 11 statement that the scope of pipeline alteration work
- 12 and compliance with applicable regulations, codes, and
- technical standards, more broadly, are not items that
- 14 pipeline companies like Pembina and Plains negotiate or
- 15 seek input on.
- Those obligations rest with the pipeline licencee
- 17 who bears ultimate responsibility for ensuring
- 18 regulatory compliance and the continued safe operation
- 19 of their pipelines. And that's at Volume 3 of the
- 20 transcript, PDF page 21.
- 21 In response to the suggestion that it is unfair
- 22 for Qualico to have to pay for engineering assessments
- 23 and then not get to review or challenge those
- 24 engineering assessments, Mr. Balfour, among others,
- 25 confirmed that they: (as read)
- 26 ... typically do not provide that information

1 to crossing parties. The results of the 2 engineering assessment contain proprietary 3 information related to our operational 4 philosophy, our risk management. contain customer information that's 5 6 confidential. But we do want to work with parties, and we provide what the scope of work is, what the estimated costs are, what 8 the schedule would be. That's our practice. 9 10 And that's at Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF page 62. 11 Mr. Balfour also noted at the time Oualico entered 12 into the backstopping agreements with Pembina, it agreed pursuant to the terms of those agreements that 13 14 it wouldn't receive or have any interest in the 15 information that was generated as a result of it. That's at Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF page 63. 16 17 To summarize, the record shows that the pipeline companies follow a long-standing and well-established 18 practice to address the need for pipeline crossing 19 Qualico's amended application seeks to upset 20 21 that practice, and Qualico has not provided any cogent 22 evidence or rationale in our submission as to why doing so would be appropriate. 23 24 Moving on, Madam Chair and Panel Members, to land 25 acquisition and value considerations for rights-of-way. 26 While the pipeline companies submit that matters of

- 1 land acquisition and related compensation with respect
- 2 to the subject pipelines were determined long ago and
- 3 ought not factor into the Panel's analysis in this
- 4 proceeding, the evidence on the record is clear that
- 5 Pembina and Plains' surface dispositions, a
- 6 right-of-way agreement -- or easement in the case of
- 7 Plains -- and a public utilities board order in the
- 8 context of Pembina were required through a legitimate
- 9 process where compensation in the form of the full fee
- 10 simple fair market value of the acreage acquired was
- 11 paid to the landowner at the time of acquisition. And
- 12 that's notwithstanding the fact that the company
- 13 acquired lesser than -- or -- pardon me -- less than
- 14 fee simple rights. The compensation paid is still the
- 15 full fee simple value of the land as if they'd
- 16 purchased the property outright.
- 17 The NERA report of Dr. Makholm and Dr. Olive
- 18 confirms that there is no indication that the rights
- 19 now held by Pembina and Plains were acquired for
- 20 anything less than fair market value and that the
- 21 amounts paid for these rights are: (as read)
- 22 ... reasonably reflective of competitive
- 23 markets in land, surface dispositions, or
- 24 construction costs at the time they were
- acquired.
- 26 That's Exhibit 71.03, PDF page 14.

- 1 In his testimony, Mr. Telford also explained that
- 2 pipeline operators pay a price that represents the full
- 3 fee simple fair market value for the area that is taken
- 4 by way of the agreement or order. That's Volume 3 of
- 5 the transcript, PDF page 31.
- 6 Qualico has not produced any credible evidence in
- 7 support of its suggestion that the easements and orders
- 8 held by Pembina and Plains were not acquired for fair
- 9 consideration beyond Mr. Morrison's unsupported musings
- 10 on the topic.
- And it appears from my friend Mr. Fitch's closing
- 12 remarks that, in any event, Qualico seems to have moved
- away the position outlined in Mr. Morrison's report as
- 14 I believe Mr. Fitch indicated this morning that Qualico
- is not taking the position that the original landowner
- 16 was paid an amount that was inferior or insufficient,
- 17 so I'm prepared to move on from this point.
- Moving on to planning and routing considerations,
- 19 Madam Chair and Panel Members, with respect to the
- 20 topics of municipal planning and pipeline routing, the
- 21 pipeline companies respectfully submit that the area
- 22 structure plan, neighbourhood structure plan, and CIMA+
- 23 concept plan provide detailed examples of how urban
- 24 development can occur in an area that is occupied by
- 25 existing pipelines and other energy infrastructure.
- 26 Indeed, the planning of the Horse Hill area was

- 1 executed in a manner that gave Qualico and other
- 2 developers the confidence to purchase lands in the area
- 3 and to develop those lands with a view to making a
- 4 profit. Mr. Romanesky's initial report confirms that:
- 5 (as read)
- 6 The integration of pipelines into urban
- 7 development and communities has been and
- 8 continues to be a common occurrence.
- 9 The report also explains that: (as read)
- 10 The presence of a pipeline informs the
- developer of a potential limitation of the
- 12 land and must be incorporated into the
- 13 planning process.
- 14 That's at Exhibit 6.01, PDF page 319.
- This is exactly what was done in the context of
- 16 the area structure plan, neighbourhood structure plan,
- 17 and CIMA+ concept plan. Regarding the suggestion that
- 18 the existence of Pembina and Plains' pipelines has
- 19 negatively impacted the developability of the subject
- 20 lands, Mr. Romanesky explained that the existence of
- 21 pipelines does not necessarily have a negative impact
- 22 on development and that pipelines can sometimes even
- 23 result in a gain, as he put it, to a developer if they
- lead to the removal of a road. And that's at Volume 3
- of the transcript, PDF page 156.
- And Mr. Romanesky provided a response to the

- 1 suggestion of one of the Qualico witnesses --
- 2 Mr. Gerein, I think it may have been -- that planning
- 3 in triangles was problematic, and Mr. Romanesky
- 4 confirmed that triangular parcels don't make things
- 5 automatically less efficient by any means and can be
- 6 incorporated and accommodated through the planning
- 7 process.
- 8 So, Madam Chair and Panel Members, in my
- 9 respectful submission, there is simply no credible
- 10 evidence on the record in this proceeding that
- 11 pipelines make development problematic or less
- 12 efficient, and that's been confirmed by Mr. Romanesky
- 13 and Mr. Telford.
- 14 The subject pipelines certainly haven't resulted
- in any negative impact to Qualico's development of the
- 16 land as Mr. Myers discussed. Qualico purchased the
- 17 development from Walton after the pipelines had already
- 18 been incorporated into the various development plans,
- 19 and it, along with other developers, has advanced their
- 20 development and construction of homes in the subject
- 21 area.
- Mr. Romanesky also indicated in his second report
- 23 at Exhibit 75.01 and his testimony at Volume 3, PDF --
- 24 or of the transcript -- pardon me -- PDF pages 157 and
- 25 158 that the presence of pipelines does not impact the
- 26 efficiency of a development and that through the use of

- 1 proper planning techniques, including the distribution
- 2 of density throughout a development, the overall goals
- 3 of a development can be achieved.
- 4 Indeed, the evidence on the record in this
- 5 proceeding is that the development is proceeding in the
- 6 Horse Hill catchment area, clearly evidencing that the
- 7 cost of adjusting development to account for the
- 8 presence of pipelines or the cost of crossing pipelines
- 9 is in no way prohibitive.
- 10 Madam Chair, Panel Members, moving to alleged
- 11 impacts on housing prices. While the pipeline
- 12 companies dispute the alleged impact of the Panel's
- decision on the price of homes in the Horse Hill area,
- if, indeed, cost sharing was not ordered, the evidence
- of Mr. Romanesky is clear that these costs aren't
- 16 actually passed on to homebuyers. Rather, the ARA levy
- 17 is paid at the subdivision approval stage or the
- 18 development permit stage by the developer. It is not a
- 19 tax that is added on or directly invoiced to the
- 20 ultimate homebuyer. That's at transcript Volume 3, PDF
- 21 page 32.
- 22 Moreover, even if these costs were passed on to
- 23 homebuyers, the impacts are not anywhere near the
- 24 magnitude alleged by Qualico. If Qualico is made to
- 25 bear the entire cost of the alteration work associated
- 26 with these two pipelines, Mr. Romanesky determined in

- 1 his initial report that this would represent an
- 2 additional cost of only \$35 per residential dwelling
- 3 unit in the Horse Hills area. That's at Exhibit 6.01,
- 4 PDF page 320.
- 5 And, indeed, some different numbers have been
- 6 thrown about in this proceeding, being \$670 or a
- 7 thousand dollars and so on, but, in any event, those
- 8 amounts are not passed on to homebuyers. And I'll come
- 9 back to that in a moment in terms of what sets the
- 10 price of a house and what doesn't set the price of a
- 11 house.
- 12 So, in reality, Madam Chair and Panel Members,
- 13 given the structure of the ARA levy and the involvement
- of other developers in the Horse Hill area, even if the
- 15 Panel denies Qualico's applied-for cost-sharing orders,
- 16 Qualico would ultimately absorb only 5 percent of the
- 17 costs associated with the subject pipeline alterations,
- 18 given that other developers in the subject catchment
- 19 area would contribute to the cost of the subject
- 20 crossings. And that's at Volume 1 of the transcript,
- 21 PDF page 183 and PDF page 184.
- 22 Yet, Oualico's amended cost-sharing application
- 23 asked the AER to order that the pipeline companies
- 24 cover 50 percent of these costs with no ability to
- 25 enjoy reimbursement of same. While Qualico asked the
- 26 pipeline companies whether they could recover costs via

- 1 their own customers, Mr. Sprott, Mr. Balfour, and
- 2 Mr. Trim all confirmed that, given the nature of the
- 3 contracts in place with shippers and customers, there
- 4 is no ability to recover costs as they unexpectedly
- 5 arose. That is at Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF
- 6 pages 126 to 128.
- 7 And I -- I took interest in Mr. Dixon's comments
- 8 this morning in reference to the annual reports of
- 9 Plains and Pembina and the fact that they enjoy
- 10 significant profits and, therefore, they should pay for
- 11 the costs.
- 12 I think Mr. Dixon argued that that impact was --
- or the impact on the pipeline companies of cost sharing
- 14 was ordered was overstated, which I found interesting
- 15 when we think about the impact to Qualico. As I've
- 16 just mentioned, \$35 per house, even up to a thousand
- 17 dollars a house, and you're only paying 5 percent of
- 18 that because you're getting reimbursement from other
- 19 developers in the catchment area.
- 20 I'm always hesitant, Madam Chair, Panel Members,
- 21 to embark on the lawyer math exercise. One of the
- 22 reasons I became a lawyer was because I'm rather
- 23 terrible at math, but we'll try it on for size. If we
- take the \$35-a-house number or even the
- 25 thousand-dollar-a-house number, I think 5 percent of
- 26 those numbers is \$1.75 in the case of the \$35-a-house

- 1 figure and \$50 in the case of the
- 2 thousand-dollar-a-house figure, which would be
- 3 Qualico's 5 percent share if, indeed, their requested
- 4 cost-sharing order was denied.
- 5 Madam Chair and Panel Members, I would also
- 6 suggest it's also illogical to suggest that home prices
- 7 will consistently vary as Qualico's expenses and input
- 8 costs vary. That doesn't accord with reality. All is
- 9 confirmed by Mr. Telford, the only appraisal expert put
- 10 forward in this proceeding. As he said, the market
- 11 sets the sale price of homes. Qualico describes the
- 12 presence of pipelines as a risk that is present when
- 13 purchasing a parcel of land for development. That's at
- 14 Volume 1 of the transcript, PDF page 32. And the
- 15 Developers Group has mentioned other risks such as
- 16 potential issues obtaining development approvals from a
- 17 municipality. That's at Volume 2 of the transcript,
- 18 PDF page 25.
- 19 From this perspective, in my respectful
- 20 submission, the Panel should consider the following in
- 21 relation to these other risks that developers face:
- 22 If Qualico's municipal development approvals are
- 23 delayed and the project budget is negatively impacted,
- 24 will the price of Qualico's homes in that neighbourhood
- 25 go up?
- 26 If Qualico endures a particularly challenging and

- 1 inefficient -- inefficient construction season, will
- 2 the price of its homes go up as a result?
- 3 If Qualico experiences significant delays in the
- 4 provision of building materials from a supplier which
- 5 increases project costs, will the houses constructed
- 6 through this project be more expensive?
- 7 The pump -- pump line -- pipeline companies
- 8 respectfully submit that the answer to all of these
- 9 questions is clearly no.
- 10 These situations, like the present case, are
- 11 examples of business risks, which developers knowingly
- 12 assume and are an inherent part of their business. The
- 13 notion that the cost of the required pipeline
- 14 alteration work will be passed on directly to the
- 15 purchasers of Qualico's homes should be disregarded by
- 16 the Panel because it's simply not correct.
- 17 More generally, if costs are simply flowed through
- 18 to the ultimate purchaser of a home, why have multiple
- 19 developers expended such a great deal of time and
- 20 effort to participate in this proceeding? The pipeline
- 21 companies, as well as SECURE and Keyera, take their
- 22 positions in this proceeding on the basis that the
- 23 requested cost-sharing orders, if granted, will result
- 24 in direct costs to them and their businesses that will
- 25 cause significant business disruptions in terms of the
- 26 instability and uncertainty associated with such an

1 order. Yet, Qualico and the other developers involved in 2 3 this proceeding want the Panel to believe that their 4 participation is based on purely altruistic motives and relates only to the interests of their customers rather 5 6 than the profits enjoyed by these entities which the 7 pipeline companies respectfully submit is not credible. Moving on to notions of risk allocation and 8 considerations of fairness. As highlighted in the 9 10 pipeline companies' opening statements, the pipeline 11 companies stand to bear all the risk if Qualico's 12 applied-for cost-sharing orders are granted. 13 The pipeline companies have no way of knowing if, 14 when, where, or how development might proceed in proximity to their pipelines, and if it does, what type 15 of pipeline crossing will be required. Accordingly, 16 17 they have no way to plan for these costs. Mr. Sprott also explained that if the requested cost-sharing 18 orders were granted: (as read) 19 20 The impact to Pembina and Plains and others 21 in the province -- [or pardon me] in the 22 pipeline industry is going to be a 23 significant amount of uncertainty and a 24 significant amount of chaos. 25 And that's at Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF page 123. And that same view was expressed by Mr. Trim on behalf 26

- 1 of Plains and Mr. Beztilny on behalf of Keyera.
- 2 In contrast, the developers will incur these costs
- 3 only if they take voluntary and deliberate steps to
- 4 purchase a piece of land and develop it with a view to
- 5 making a profit, a decision which is completely within
- 6 their control, while Qualico's reply submission
- 7 suggests that the pipeline companies: (as read)
- 8 ... must live with the consequences of their
- 9 pipelines impeding orderly surface
- 10 development.
- 11 And that's Exhibit 79.02, PDF page 15.
- 12 The pipeline companies instead submit that Qualico
- 13 has to live with the consequences of its decision to
- 14 proceed with the acquisition and development of the
- 15 lands with full knowledge of the presence of the
- 16 pipelines and potential associated pipeline crossing
- 17 costs.
- 18 To summarize, fairness considerations weigh
- 19 heavily in favour of denying Qualico's requested
- 20 relief, given the significant advantages the developers
- 21 possess with respect to their knowledge of and control
- 22 over their development plans.
- Now I'll provide -- I'll move on to providing some
- 24 comments on the various flaws in Qualico's approach to
- 25 this proceeding and, with all due respect, deficiencies
- 26 in its evidence, dealing first with Qualico's

- 1 acquisition of the lands.
- 2 Throughout this hearing, Qualico has tried to
- 3 minimize the fact that it purchased the subject lands
- 4 with full knowledge of Pembina and Plains' existing
- 5 pipelines as I just indicated. In the pipeline
- 6 companies' submission, this is a key consideration that
- 7 the Panel ought not disregard as Qualico suggests.
- 8 In his direct evidence, Mr. Armstrong explained
- 9 that Qualico has "a lot of experience" in this area and
- 10 that existing restrictions on developments such as
- 11 pipelines are things that are factored into Qualico's
- 12 decision and plans to purchase and develop a parcel of
- 13 land. That's at Volume 1 of the transcript, PDF
- 14 page 32.
- 15 In response to questions from the Panel,
- 16 Mr. Armstrong provided further comments on Qualico's
- 17 due diligence process and explained that: (as read)
- 18 There is a loss of developable acres as a
- 19 whole as a result of previous pipeline
- alignments and those sorts of things. It
- 21 makes our land less efficient. But these are
- all things that we factor into the pricing of
- our land and how we acquire it, and we're
- 24 living with that.
- 25 And that's at Volume 1 of the transcript, PDF page 188.
- 26 Ms. Anderson on behalf of the Urban Development

- 1 Institute further described the typical due diligence
- 2 process and explained that developers look at:
- 3 (as read)
- 4 ... any relevant features or amenities and
- 5 rights-of-ways that exist, especially
- 6 pipeline rights-of-way.
- 7 That's at Volume 2 of the transcript, PDF page 24.
- 8 Yet, after describing the detailed due diligence
- 9 that Qualico ordinarily conducts before purchasing a
- 10 parcel of land and did conduct in this case,
- 11 Mr. Armstrong stated that he was surprised by the cost
- 12 of the necessary pipeline alterations. That's at
- 13 Volume 1 of the transcript, PDF page 35.
- In my respectful submission, there are really no
- 15 surprises in these circumstances. As Mr. Myers already
- 16 explained and is clear on the record, Qualico purchased
- 17 these lands after admittedly having conducted detailed
- 18 due diligence, including in relation to the existing
- 19 pipelines and associated rights-of-way on the land.
- As we said previously, the area structure plan,
- 21 neighbourhood structure plan, CIMA+ concept plan were
- 22 all fully developed and available to Qualico at the
- 23 time it purchased the subject lands in 2018. Those
- 24 plans contained information regarding the existence of
- 25 Pembina and Plains' pipelines, importantly including a
- 26 cost estimate for the work required in connection with

- 1 Pembina's pipeline, among other information acquired by
- 2 CIMA+ throughout its discussions with Plains and
- 3 Pembina. That's at Exhibit 5.01, PDF page 996.
- 4 As of March 2019 and April 2021, Qualico had been
- 5 furnished with enough information regarding the
- 6 required alteration work for Qualico to execute
- 7 agreements setting out Qualico's responsibility for
- 8 more than an estimated \$2 million in alteration work.
- 9 And those are Exhibits 85.01, 86.01, and 87.01.
- 10 Under cross-examination, Mr. Gerein acknowledged
- 11 that at the time they signed these agreements, it was
- 12 Qualico's understanding that it would be responsible
- 13 for all of the costs associated with the required
- 14 pipeline alteration work and that taking responsibility
- 15 for these costs was necessary in order to advance its
- 16 development. That's at Volume 1 of the transcript, PDF
- 17 page 106.
- Hence, in the pipeline companies' respectful
- 19 submission, it is simply not credible for Qualico to
- 20 suggest that it was surprised by the existence of the
- 21 subject pipeline crossings and their associated
- 22 alteration costs except for having voluntarily chosen
- 23 to purchase the subject lands and undertake development
- 24 with full knowledge of those details and after having
- 25 entered into valid contracts pursuant to which it took
- 26 full responsibility for those costs.

1 Mr. Armstrong also went on to -- to explain that: 2 (as read) In short, you know, we felt that we did our 3 due diligence. We could only rely on the 4 information that was provided to us at the 5 6 time. 7 And that's Volume 1 of the transcript at PDF page 35. In my respectful submission, this perfectly 8 9 captures the concept of risk that Oualico and other 10 developers have mentioned during this hearing. These 11 are sophisticated developers who take on a wide variety 12 of risks in the ordinary course of doing business, yet 13 in this case they want Pembina and Plains to provide a 14 50 percent subsidy to mitigate that risk. In aggregate, it is clear that Oualico identified 15 and understood the nature and scope of the potential 16 costs associated with Pembina and Plains' pipelines 17 before purchasing the subject lands. The fact that 18 Qualico and other developers are dissatisfied with the 19 status quo as to how pipeline crossing work is 20 addressed in Alberta is also in no way a public 21 22 interest consideration warranting AER intervention. 23 Moving on to Qualico's and the Developers Group 24 references to other crossing costs. Oualico and other 25 developers alluded to other low-cost or no-cost 26 crossing agreements that have been executed in other

- 1 circumstances; however, Qualico has provided no
- 2 verifiable evidence regarding the existence of these
- 3 agreements or that the cost of alteration work in other
- 4 circumstances has been orders of magnitude less, as
- 5 suggested by Mr. Armstrong during his testimony.
- 6 When asked specifically about these low-cost
- 7 crossing -- crossings -- pardon me -- by the Panel,
- 8 Mr. Gerein provided no detail whatsoever, other than
- 9 stating that Qualico: (as read)
- 10 Had examples where there hasn't been any
- 11 applicable cost other than essentially moving
- 12 forward with the surface construction.
- 13 That's at Volume 1 of the transcript, PDF page 173.
- 14 There's also no specific evidence on the record
- 15 regarding the nature of these other crossings
- 16 circumstances alluded to by Qualico, which could very
- 17 well involve sewer, water, or low-pressure
- 18 gas-distribution lines, all of which would be subject
- 19 to entirely different crossing work requirements than
- 20 the subject pipelines. And that was discussed in
- 21 Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF page 219.
- 22 Consistent with the pipeline companies' evidence,
- 23 such crossings could also be "simple crossings" or
- 24 proximity requests requiring no alteration work as
- 25 opposed to the "complex crossings" at issue in this
- 26 proceeding, as was explained by Mr. Balfour and

- 1 Mr. Trim. That's at Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF
- 2 page 110.
- 3 Mr. Torr also clearly explained that the process
- 4 is dependent on whether the crossing at issue is simple
- 5 or complex in nature. And that's at Volume 3 of the
- 6 transcript as well, PDF page 210.
- 7 In my respectful submission, the Panel should not
- 8 rely on these unsupported and anecdotal cost figures or
- 9 alleged experiences as an indication of the
- 10 reasonableness of the cost to alter the Pembina and
- 11 Plains pipelines at issue in this proceeding. In each
- 12 case, the pipeline alteration work is dictated by
- 13 CSA Z662 and not by the whim or subjective views of the
- 14 pipeline companies.
- The Panel also noted during its questioning of the
- 16 Developers Group witness panel that the range of costs
- 17 associated with other pipeline crossings referenced
- 18 during the hearing ranges from zero dollars all the way
- 19 up to \$1 million. In the pipeline companies'
- 20 submission, this range accurately reflects the fact
- 21 that the Alberta pipeline industry contains a
- 22 significant number of private pipeline operators who
- 23 own a multitude of different pipelines which vary in
- 24 purpose, depth, size, capacity, and other
- 25 specifications.
- In this regard, in my respectful submission, the

- 1 Panel can dispense with any notion that crossing costs
- 2 are arbitrary or seem to be increasing for no reason.
- 3 The variation in crossing costs is a natural
- 4 consequence of the multitude of factors that I just
- 5 mentioned.
- 6 Mr. Balfour explained that "Every crossing is
- 7 unique", and there's clearly not a one-size-fits-all
- 8 approach, and to take such an approach in this
- 9 proceeding would be inappropriate, in my respectful
- 10 submission. And Mr. Balfour's comment is at transcript
- 11 Volume 3, PDF page 116.
- 12 Losing my voice apparently, so I'll try to rectify
- 13 that.
- Moving on to Qualico's dealings with Plains and
- 15 Pembina. Qualico has alluded to a lack of transparency
- on the part of Pembina and Plains and has suggested
- 17 that the pipeline companies did not furnish Qualico
- 18 with sufficient information regarding the nature,
- 19 scope, and cost of the required alteration work.
- 20 Mr. Balfour clearly explained that the accuracy and
- 21 detail of the cost estimates and other information
- 22 generated and provided by the pipeline companies is
- 23 entirely dependent upon the stage of the development
- 24 process.
- When asked about Pembina's process for responding
- 26 to due diligence requests, Mr. Balfour explained:

4	
1	(as read)
2	Typically, at that stage of the process,
3	we're provided with very little information
4	from the developer in terms of the scope of
5	the proposed crossing, given that they
6	haven't even purchased the land yet, so
7	there's not often very detailed drawings;
8	there's not often detailed scope of work on
9	their end, so it makes it very difficult for
10	Pembina to undertake a detailed assessment of
11	what work needs to be required given their
12	proposed crossing, and without being able to
13	do the detailed work, it's very tough to give
14	a detailed estimate.
15	And I think that makes sense. That's at Volume 3 of
16	the transcript, PDF page 39.
17	And we've had some discussion from my friend
18	Mr. Fitch and maybe others in terms of what was alleged
19	to be Mr. Sprott's comment that I'm a professional
20	engineer, there are other professional engineers who do
21	the engineering assessment work and so on, so I think,
22	as Mr. Fitch characterized it, Don't worry, trust us,
23	or words to that effect. Clearly what Mr. Sprott was
24	getting at is that the parties conducting the
25	engineering assessment under CSA Z662 are qualified
26	engineers, presumably, members of APEGA, and who put

- 1 their stamp on that work and have their professional
- 2 reputations to guide them and make sure they're doing
- 3 work that's appropriate. They're also regulated by
- 4 their various professional bodies and so on. And that
- 5 was the point that Mr. Sprott was making, is that these
- 6 are qualified, regulated individuals who are
- 7 undertaking a complicated assessment under CSA Z662,
- 8 such that there is oversight over their activities and
- 9 their conclusions on behalf of their respective
- 10 professional organizations. So that was the point that
- 11 was made, and so I think that both Mr. Fitch and
- 12 Mr. Dixon were a little bit unfair to Mr. Sprott in
- 13 their comments this morning.
- In essence, Madam Chair, Panel Members, Qualico
- 15 and the other developers appear to want information
- 16 that is simply not available at the time their
- 17 development plans and road crossings are not fully
- 18 understood or at a time when they haven't even
- 19 purchased the relevant lands. In my respectful
- 20 submission, it's not reasonable for Qualico or any
- 21 other developer to expect a pipeline operator to be
- 22 able to provide detailed information as to how an
- 23 unknown, undefined crossing will impact its pipeline,
- 24 often prior to the developer having even purchased the
- 25 lands.
- 26 This uncertainty is also the exact reason why the

pipeline companies require up-front payment under their 1 2 backstopping or cost-recovery agreements. Mr. Trim (as read) 3 explained that: To minimize the risk and the burden on 4 5 Plains, we request up-front payment when we 6 enter into cost recovery agreements. It also gives us assurance that the party wishing to cross our pipelines is actually committed to 8 the work and the undertaking required to do 9 10 that. 11 And that's at Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF page 36. 12 Mr. Trim also explained that Plains' practice in 13 this regard is largely due to: (as read) 14 Experience with Marquis on the 172nd Avenue crossing where Plains entered into a cost 15 16 recovery agreement to execute the pipeline 17 crossing work and, subsequently, Marquis had refused to reimburse Plains when they were 18 back-invoiced. 19 20 That's at Volume 3 of the transcript, PDF page 36. So -- so if there's a purported change in the 21 22 structuring of having people pay up-front, you have a good rationale for why that's done, and you also have 23 24 the fact that one of the parties involved in this 25 proceeding was the driver for that process, given a refusal to pay as acknowledged by Mr. Trim. 26

- 1 In the pipeline companies' respectful submission,
- 2 no reasonable pipeline operator would dig up its own
- 3 pipeline and undertake detailed engineering and
- 4 inspection activities at its own expense for any reason
- 5 other than the fact that the third party had proposed
- 6 work in proximity to its pipeline.
- 7 Further, without this work occurring, the
- 8 pipeline operator cannot possibly have a complete
- 9 understanding of the nature and scope of the alteration
- 10 work required. The record also shows that Qualico did
- 11 have specific information regarding the work required
- 12 and the associated costs after Qualico purchased the
- 13 lands. For example, this is apparent in the agreements
- 14 located at Exhibits 86.01 and 87.01 of the proceeding
- 15 record.
- In addition, Qualico and other developers have
- 17 suggested that there's been a shift in the way that the
- 18 pipeline companies approach crossing -- crossing work
- 19 arrangements. There are no specific examples of this
- 20 on the record, nor is there any evidence beyond the
- 21 vague anecdotal claims by the developers that the
- 22 pipeline companies' practice in this regard have
- 23 changed at all. So I'd ask you to think about what's
- 24 actually on the record as opposed to anecdotal or vague
- 25 comments about purported circumstances or situations
- 26 that exist.

- 1 Briefly dealing with the late information requests
- 2 that were provided by Qualico to Plains and Pembina,
- 3 the refusal by Pembina and Plains to respond to the
- 4 majority of information requests in those letters at
- 5 the very late stage of this proceeding at which they
- 6 were provided is not at all indicative, in my
- 7 respectful submission, of a lack of transparency in the
- 8 pipeline crossing process described by the Pembina and
- 9 Plains witnesses.
- 10 Those information requests are an entirely
- 11 distinct circumstance from a developer or other third
- 12 party asking a pipeline company for information related
- to a pipeline crossing at first instance or when you're
- 14 actually doing the crossing.
- Despite the fact that Plains' and Pembina's
- 16 correspondence in the response to the Qualico IRs
- 17 invited further discussion, there was no follow-up and
- 18 certainly no follow-up referenced on the record.
- 19 Similarly, this is also confirmed by the record. No
- 20 motion was filed by Qualico seeking further and better
- 21 responses in accordance with Section 14(2) of the AER
- 22 Rules of Practice. The majority of the questions put
- 23 to the pipeline companies in those IRs were also
- 24 irrelevant to this proceeding and were refused on that
- 25 basis. So, again, asking those questions as part of --
- 26 they're irrelevant, I would suggest, to the crossings

- 1 at issue; they're even more irrelevant given the time
- 2 frame that they were asked as part of this proceeding,
- 3 even detracting further from the relevance given what
- 4 we're here to talk about.
- 5 In terms of Qualico's interpretation of the public
- 6 interest, throughout this proceeding, Qualico has
- 7 advocated that its requested cost-sharing orders are in
- 8 the public interest. We already heard from Mr. Myers,
- 9 however, as to why that's based on a flawed and
- 10 incorrect interpretation of Section 33 of the
- 11 Pipeline Act and an incorrect formulation of what
- 12 constitutes the public interest in the context of this
- 13 proceeding, so I won't repeat those submissions here,
- 14 and what Mr. Myers had to say is sufficient.
- 15 Lastly, I'd like to briefly address the evidence
- of Mr. Morrison, which was purportedly tendered to
- 17 address public interest considerations. In short, and
- 18 with all due respect, the pipeline companies submit
- 19 that the Panel should assign no weight to
- 20 Mr. Morrison's evidence in this proceeding.
- 21 Mr. Morrison generally appears to view this
- 22 proceeding as an opportunity to revisit and overturn
- 23 the fundamental principles upon which the Alberta
- 24 pipeline industry has successfully operated for decades
- 25 as well as fundamental legal principles in Alberta.
- In this regard, the pipeline companies submit that

- 1 this proceeding was not convened to conduct a broader
- 2 inquiry into the merits of cost-sharing arrangements
- 3 across the pipeline industry or to debate matters of
- 4 fairness arising in the private dealings between
- 5 pipeline operators and developers.
- 6 The NERA report, which incidentally was authored
- 7 by both Dr. Makholm and Dr. Olive -- she seems to get
- 8 passed over on occasion -- I would suggest to you is
- 9 authored by two credible experts in the fields of both
- 10 economics and public interest assessment. And, of
- 11 course, they commented on Mr. Morrison's evidence.
- But before I get to -- to what they had to say, I
- 13 just want to address some of Mr. Fitch's criticisms of
- 14 Dr. Makholm and Dr. Olive's evidence this morning.
- 15 Mr. Myers touched on this already, but Mr. Fitch seemed
- 16 critical of Dr. Makholm for not being willing to accept
- 17 that because it's a public road or allegedly a public
- 18 road and that the development is being sanctioned by a
- 19 public body and it'll be -- the road will be used by
- 20 members of the public, it's automatically in the public
- 21 interest to make the cost-sharing order sought.
- Dr. Makholm, to my recollection, properly
- 23 explained that the public interest is something broader
- 24 than that, and having a public entity undertaking an
- 25 infrastructure project or so on and so forth clearly
- 26 doesn't make that project necessarily in the public

- 1 interest just by virtue of the party who's pursuing it.
- 2 So I don't think that Mr. Fitch's criticism was
- 3 fair in that regard at all. And I think what
- 4 Dr. Makholm had to say was quite salient on the issue
- 5 of public interest.
- 6 Mr. Fitch expressed confusion as to what
- 7 Dr. Makholm meant by the fact that Qualico had no
- 8 market power. I can help with that. What Dr. Makholm
- 9 was referring to is the fact that -- or the
- 10 circumstance that I was referring to or issue that I
- 11 was referring to that the price of homes is set by the
- 12 market, as indicated by Mr. Telford, and that Qualico
- doesn't have the market power to dictate what housing
- 14 prices are going to be in the city of Edmonton or in
- 15 portions of the city of Edmonton. That's why the
- 16 market dictates what houses are worth, not Qualico,
- 17 because Qualico lacks the market power to do that. So
- 18 hopefully that provides the Panel with some explanation
- 19 as to what Dr. Makholm was referring to, if there was
- 20 confusion, that appeared to be held by Mr. Fitch.
- 21 In terms of Dr. Makholm 's comment as to rate
- 22 regulation, Mr. Fitch also expressed confusion or -- or
- 23 he didn't understand what Dr. Makholm was referring to.
- 24 What Dr. Makholm was clearly referring to was the fact
- 25 that if the AER engages in an otherwise private matter
- 26 between two private parties under the quise of a public

- 1 interest determination, that would be akin to rate
- 2 regulation or regulating the affairs of those private
- 3 entities.
- 4 So that's clearly what Mr. -- Dr. Makholm --
- 5 pardon me -- was referring to when he made those
- 6 comments. And Mr. Fitch took issue with the fact that
- 7 Dr. Makholm indicated he was not telling the Panel what
- 8 to do in terms of the public interest because, in
- 9 Mr. Fitch's view, he clearly was.
- 10 I would suggest to you that the contrary is
- 11 absolutely the case. He clearly, I believe, looked at
- 12 the Panel when making those remarks and said, I'm not
- 13 here to tell the Panel what to do. I'm here to help.
- 14 Or words to that effect. So I don't think Mr. Fitch's
- 15 criticism of Dr. Makholm in that regard is fair either.
- 16 So moving back to Dr. -- pardon me --
- 17 Mr. Morrison's evidence and NERA's report regarding
- 18 Mr. Morrison's evidence. The NERA report responds in
- 19 detail to each of the incorrect assertions made by
- 20 Mr. Morrison in his reports. And, critically, the NERA
- 21 report explains that Morrison's evidence first relies
- 22 on erroneous -- an erroneous definition of the public
- 23 interest, which is circular, and conflates the private
- 24 interests of Qualico with those of the public.
- 25 Second, that Mr. Morrison's report entirely
- 26 ignores the opportunity cost of capital when comparing

- 1 the amounts paid for Pembina and Plains' existing
- 2 surface dispositions to the current value of the
- 3 subject lands, although we appear to have dispensed
- 4 with that issue this morning.
- 5 And, finally, they point out that Mr. Morrison
- 6 disregards the difficulty of anticipating the location
- 7 of future corridors and inappropriately suggests that a
- 8 market-based price signal shall be applied to pipelines
- 9 which are already in the ground. And that's, of
- 10 course, at Exhibit 71.03, PDF pages 8 and 16.
- In the pipeline companies' respectful submission,
- 12 Mr. Morrison also exhibited a complete lack of
- independence and knowledge on AER matters and on
- 14 right-of-way acquisition matters referenced in his own
- 15 reports during his testimony. Several examples of this
- 16 are -- Mr. Morrison repeatedly referred to his
- 17 purportedly independent evidence as being his
- 18 "arguments". That's at Transcript Volume 1, PDF
- 19 page 56, PDF page 57, and PDF page 119.
- 20 Mr. Morrison exhibited a lack of familiarity with
- 21 his own evidence and was unable to answer questions
- 22 that relate specifically to information set out in his
- 23 own reports. Mr. Morrison confirmed that much of his
- 24 evidence regarding Pembina and Plains' predecessors'
- 25 land acquisition and pipeline routing in the 1960s was
- 26 based on speculation because, in his words "he was a

- 1 babe" at the time. And that's at Volume 1 of the
- 2 transcript, PDF page 129.
- Based on Mr. Morrison's testimony, he views this
- 4 proceeding as an opportunity to overturn fundamental
- 5 principles of contract and property law as he stated
- 6 that: (as read)
- 7 The essence of the deal has to continue to
- 8 satisfy both partners.
- 9 Which, according to Mr. Morrison, means that pipeline
- 10 operators, oil companies, electrical utilities, and
- 11 other parties who have similar right-of-way interests
- 12 across the province can no longer rely on the validity
- of their existing surface dispositions, compensation
- 14 paid under those instruments, or the legitimacy of the
- 15 process through which they acquired them. And that
- 16 discussion is at Volume 1 of the transcript, PDF
- 17 page 61.
- And, with respect, I would suggest to you that the
- 19 comments about deals having to be constantly
- 20 re-evaluated over the length of time is -- is, frankly,
- 21 absurd, in my respectful submission.
- 22 Mr. Morrison had to caucus with Oualico to respond
- 23 to questions about his purportedly independent expert
- 24 report and described his answers as being those of both
- 25 him and Qualico. That's at Volume 1 of the transcript,
- 26 PDF page 157.

- 1 Mr. Morrison's reports rely on irrelevant pipeline
- 2 routing and corridor discussions, despite Mr. Morrison
- 3 confirming at the hearing that he is in no way
- 4 suggesting that Pembina and Plains' pipelines be
- 5 relocated into a corridor. That's at Volume 1 of the
- 6 transcript, PDF page 139. And that no such pipeline
- 7 corridors existed in the area when Pembina and Plains'
- 8 right-of-ways were acquired.
- 9 With respect to corridors, Mr. Telford's reply
- 10 report also notes that there were no corridors in the
- 11 subject area at the time Pembina and Plains' pipelines
- 12 were planned and constructed. That's Exhibit 71.04 at
- 13 PDF page 4.
- Despite Mr. Morrison's enthusiasm for central
- 15 planning and pipeline corridors, Mr. Morrison confirmed
- 16 that he would not support the placement of a pipeline
- 17 corridor on the subject lands. And that's at Volume 1
- 18 of the transcript, PDF page 140.
- 19 The pipeline companies submit that this detracts
- 20 from Mr. Morrison's credibility and independence where
- 21 his opinion is clearly aligned with Qualico's
- 22 self-interest.
- 23 Mr. Morrison also included a completely uninformed
- 24 discussion regarding the comparison of amounts paid to
- 25 the original landowner in the late 1960s as
- 26 compensation for the Plains and Pembina rights-of-way

- 1 and the costs incurred by Qualico for the subject
- 2 crossings. With respect, this discussion, in my
- 3 respectful submission, is obviously illogical and
- 4 irrelevant, given that the two amounts are in no way
- 5 connected, relate to two separate private parties
- 6 50 years apart, and given that there was an intervening
- 7 land owner, Walton, among potentially others, who own
- 8 the subject lands.
- 9 Mr. Morrison also suggested that the AER should
- 10 send economic price signals with its decision in this
- 11 proceeding, which ignores the fact that the routing of
- 12 future pipelines and broader economic price signalling
- is entirely outside the scope of the current proceeding
- 14 and, in the case of the latter, outside of the AER's
- 15 jurisdiction and mandate. And that's Volume 1 of the
- 16 transcript, PDF page 62.
- 17 G. FITCH: By our reckoning, my friends
- 18 are 15 minutes over time already. I haven't wanted to
- 19 rise, assuming we were almost at the end, but I
- 20 appreciate that we get to the end.
- 21 D. NAFFIN: Appreciate that guidance from
- 22 Mr. Fitch. The good news, Madam Chair, is I think I
- 23 have five minutes or maybe less than that to go. And I
- 24 don't know that we're beyond the hour and a half. Are
- 25 we?
- In any event, I'll be done in five minutes max,

- 1 Madam Chair, if that meets with your approval.
- 2 THE CHAIR: Yes.
- 3 D. NAFFIN: Thank you.
- 4 THE CHAIR: Five minutes is fine.
- 5 D. NAFFIN: Finally, Mr. Morrison's
- 6 testimony focused a great deal on ESG and irrelevant
- 7 matters in other jurisdictions, and he unequivocally
- 8 stated that ESG is the same thing as public interest,
- 9 which, of course, it's not. Volume 1 of the
- 10 transcript, PDF page 151.
- 11 For all these reasons, the pipeline companies
- 12 submit that the Panel ought not rely on any of
- 13 Mr. Morrison's evidence in making its decision in this
- 14 proceeding. In addition, Qualico's newly articulated
- 15 position that it should bear responsibility for
- 16 pipeline alteration costs completely undermines
- 17 Mr. Morrison's evidence and his suggestion that this
- 18 Panel should somehow overturn or depart from the
- 19 first-in-time, first-in-right principle or, put
- 20 differently, the established practice that the
- 21 secondary user that requires pipeline modification work
- 22 should pay for that work.
- 23 Briefly commenting on the Brookfield and
- 24 Developers Group evidence. As Mr. Myers mentioned
- 25 earlier, the participation of Brookfield and the
- 26 members of the Developers Group in this proceeding is

- 1 underlain by an obvious motivation for these developers
- 2 to have pipeline operators subsidize their private
- 3 for-profit business activities in the respectful
- 4 submission of the pipeline companies.
- 5 The balance of the evidence put forward by
- 6 Brookfield and the Developers Group is completely
- 7 irrelevant to the subject matter in this proceeding and
- 8 is more consistent with an attempt to malign the
- 9 pipeline industry in general in my respectful
- 10 submission.
- 11 In conclusion, Madam Chair, as promised -- I think
- 12 I'm hopefully at about the three-minute mark -- based
- on the evidence presented at this hearing and
- 14 throughout this proceeding, the Panel's decision, in my
- 15 respectful submission, should be very straightforward.
- The Panel has a solid roadmap for the proper
- 17 interpretation of Section 33 of the Pipeline Act in
- 18 its -- in the AER's April 2022 decision. Moreover, the
- 19 evidence it heard over the course of the last week
- 20 clearly indicates that there is no dispute that it
- 21 needs to resolve with respect to the alteration work
- 22 itself or with respect to the cost of that work.
- While a directional order is unnecessary for these
- 24 reasons and the fact that ordering pipeline alteration
- 25 in this instance in no way accords with the public
- 26 interest, if the AER determines that it's appropriate

- 1 to issue a direction for the pipeline companies to
- 2 carry out the alteration work and then determines that
- 3 it's appropriate to issue an order in respect of the
- 4 cost of that work, it should direct Oualico to bear
- 5 100 percent of those costs given that those costs arise
- 6 solely as a result of its development activities, and
- 7 Qualico is the sole party benefitting from them, and
- 8 this would be consistent with the well-established
- 9 industry practice in Alberta.
- 10 In closing, Madam Chair, Panel Members, the
- 11 pipeline companies submit that the Panel should
- 12 confirm, without conditions or variations, the AER's
- decision to deny Qualico's amended cost-sharing
- 14 application.
- 15 Pembina and Plains reiterate that their evidence
- in this proceeding, in their view, including that of
- 17 SECURE and their independent expert witnesses, is the
- 18 most credible, reliable evidence before the Panel and
- 19 ought to form the basis of the Panel's decision.
- Thank you for listening this afternoon, and
- 21 apologies if I am a little bit over time.
- 22 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
- 23 So I would suggest maybe ten minutes' break before
- 24 we come back to Keyera, being mindful that I gave an
- 25 unscheduled break earlier today. So just a short break
- 26 if anybody needs to.

- 1 D. NAFFIN: You bet. Thank you,
- 2 Madam Chair.
- 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you.
- 4 (ADJOURNMENT)
- 5 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. Please
- 6 be seated.
- 7 So next on our agenda, we have Keyera.
- If you're ready, we are ready.
- 9 Final Submissions by S. Duncanson
- 10 S. DUNCANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair and
- 11 Hearing Commissioners. Again, my name is
- 12 Sander Duncanson, and I'm pleased to present final
- 13 argument on behalf of Keyera.
- 14 I'm not going to repeat all of the able
- 15 submissions from my friends Mr. Myers and Mr. Naffin.
- 16 Instead, I plan to just cover a few key points from
- 17 Keyera's perspective.
- 18 First, I plan to discuss Section 33 of the
- 19 Pipeline Act; second, I will discuss the AER's mandate
- 20 in the meaning of the public interest; third, I will
- 21 discuss the concept of equitable sharing; fourth, I
- 22 will cover some basic property law principles that are
- 23 engaged by Qualico's application; and, finally, I will
- 24 provide submissions on why the AER should not mandate
- 25 universal crossing requirements in this proceeding or
- 26 otherwise.

- 1 And before I get going, I'd like to start by
- 2 providing just a few points of context. First, in this
- 3 proceeding, we are discussing existing pipelines that
- 4 were built decades ago. The pipeline companies paid
- 5 full market value for the easements for their pipelines
- 6 based on the circumstances at the time. The pipelines
- 7 have been operating in accordance with the terms of
- 8 their easements ever since. None of that is in
- 9 dispute.
- 10 This proceeding is about what happens when a
- 11 developer is seeking to build a residential community
- 12 in the vicinity of an existing pipeline. Among other
- things, new residential developers typically require
- 14 upgrading existing minor roads to larger, higher-volume
- 15 roads, or, in some cases, constructing new roads where
- 16 there aren't any roads at present.
- 17 This is an issue for buried pipelines running
- 18 below the road because with more weight at surface,
- 19 that places stress on the pipeline underground and
- 20 risks damaging the pipe and its integrity. That's, of
- 21 course, problematic for not only the pipeline company
- 22 and its customers who face direct risks if the pipeline
- 23 were to have a spill or release, but it also risks
- 24 human health and safety, neighbouring property owners,
- 25 and the environment.
- 26 Recognizing those risks, there are well-defined

- 1 technical requirements under CSA Z662 to ensure that in
- 2 circumstances like this, the pipeline company
- 3 implements mitigation measures or alterations as
- 4 necessary to protect the integrity of the pipeline.
- 5 The pipeline company is accountable for complying with
- 6 those CSA requirements.
- 7 And from a context perspective, it's also
- 8 important to understand that, under the terms of the
- 9 pipeline easements, third parties, including the fee
- 10 simple owner of the land, cannot cross the pipeline or
- 11 otherwise conduct certain work in the easement area
- 12 without the pipeline licencee's consent.
- In most instances when developers are seeking to
- 14 cross pipelines, the third parties are seeking to
- 15 conduct work within the pipeline easement that requires
- 16 the pipeline company's consent, and they in the
- 17 pipeline company have been unable to reach an agreement
- 18 on what that consent will look like. That's the
- 19 private dispute that gives rise to the crossing
- 20 discussions that we've been talking about in this
- 21 proceeding.
- 22 So that's a seque to the first topic in my final
- 23 argument, which is Section 33 of the Pipeline Act.
- 24 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act permits the AER to
- 25 direct a pipeline licencee to alter, modify, or protect
- 26 its pipeline if such an order is in the public

- 1 interest.
- 2 Practically, this section of the Pipeline Act
- 3 ensures that pipeline licencees cannot simply veto
- 4 crossing or proximity work. If a third party seeks to
- 5 cross the pipeline and the pipeline company and the
- 6 third party can't agree on what work is required to
- 7 protect the pipeline, the third party can bring that
- 8 dispute before the AER for adjudication. That's what
- 9 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act is all about, but that's
- 10 not the circumstance of Qualico's application before
- 11 you as my friends Mr. Myers and Mr. Naffin have
- 12 outlined.
- Based on a plain reading of Section 33, the AER
- 14 can make orders under subsection 1 if a pipeline
- 15 licencee and a third party cannot agree on the need for
- or scope of pipeline alterations or relocations.
- 17 Again, this means that if a pipeline licencee acts
- 18 unreasonably when a third party seeks to cross its
- 19 pipeline and easement, there can be recourse to the
- 20 AER, and the AER will decide what physical works, if
- 21 any, are in the public interest.
- 22 Subsection (2) of Section 33 allows the AER to
- 23 order by whom and to whom payment of the cost of the
- 24 work directed under subsection 1 should be made. This
- 25 means that orders can only be made by the AER under
- 26 subsection (2) if the required physical work was

- 1 directed by the AER through an order under
- 2 subsection (1). Unless physical work is directed by
- 3 the AER under 33(1), 33(2) is never engaged.
- 4 Similarly, subsection (3) of Section 33 says that
- 5 if a dispute arises as to the amount to be paid
- 6 pursuant to an order under subsection (2), that dispute
- 7 can be referred to the AER. Again, this means that
- 8 unless physical work is directed by the AER under
- 9 subsection (1), subsection (3) is never engaged.
- 10 In the present case, there is no existing order
- 11 under subsection (1) or subsection (2), so the AER, in
- 12 my submission, cannot make any order under
- 13 subsection (3).
- We've heard submissions from the developers today
- 15 about how the AER should interpret Section 33 of the
- 16 Pipeline Act. Those arguments misconstrue the way that
- 17 Section 33 is designed. Now, we set out the proper
- 18 interpretation of Section 33 in Keyera's written
- 19 submission. That's Exhibit 72.01.
- 20 In its reply submission, Qualico stated that it
- 21 was not going to respond to those arguments because it
- 22 viewed them as legal arguments, and it would deal with
- 23 them in its final argument. But we didn't hear any
- 24 submissions from my friend Mr. Fitch this morning about
- 25 those arguments in Keyera's written submissions. I
- 26 presume Mr. Fitch is not waiting for his reply later

- 1 this afternoon to address those points because that
- 2 would be procedurally inappropriate.
- 3 As Keyera set out in its written submissions, if
- 4 the AER directs physical work to be done under
- 5 subsection (1), the pipeline company would have no
- 6 reason to come back to the AER to challenge the cost of
- 7 the work because the pipeline company will fully
- 8 understand the basis for the cost.
- 9 So subsection (3) is not intended to address
- 10 disputes from the pipeline company around the cost of
- 11 physical work. It is only if either the third party
- 12 causing the physical work disputes the amount of costs
- 13 claimed by the pipeline for the physical works directed
- 14 by the AER or if there are multiple third parties
- involved, and they have a dispute around how to
- 16 allocate those costs between themselves that
- 17 Section 33(3) would be engaged.
- In a few minutes, I will go through some of the
- 19 legal reasons why Section 33 of the Pipeline Act should
- 20 not be used to impose cost sharing between pipeline
- 21 companies and developers in circumstances like
- Qualico's application, but it's also important to note
- 23 that, as Mr. Fitch noted this morning, Section 33 of
- 24 the Pipeline Act has existed in substantially the same
- 25 form for more than 65 years.
- The record before you demonstrates that Section 33

- 1 has never been used as Qualico and the other developers
- 2 are now seeking to use it, which is to have the AER
- 3 direct pipelines to cover a portion of the costs of
- 4 pipeline crossings, particularly when there is no
- 5 dispute around the physical works required to be
- 6 conducted.
- 7 While Qualico cited a few ERCB decisions from the
- 8 1980s in its written submission, only one of those
- 9 decisions involved the issuance of a cost order, and in
- 10 that case, the pipeline had already agreed to pay the
- 11 costs it was ordered to pay. Never before has the AER
- or any of its predecessors made the type of order that
- 13 you are now being asked to make.
- 14 Mr. Fitch this morning also referred to an AUC
- 15 decision. Mr. Myers correctly pointed out that the
- 16 passage that Mr. Fitch cited was obiter from that
- 17 decision. But also, to be clear, the AUC's regulatory
- 18 function is materially different than the AER's. The
- 19 AUC's role is regulating utilities, including the
- 20 relationship between the utility and its ratepayers.
- 21 Guidance from the AUC about cost sharing involving
- 22 AUC-regulated utilities has zero relevance to how the
- 23 AER should apply Section 33 of the Pipeline Act.
- We heard clear and compelling evidence from
- 25 Keyera's witness, Mr. Beztilny, on Monday and the other
- 26 pipeline company witnesses last week that the practice

- 1 has always been that the parties seeking to cross an
- 2 existing pipeline is responsible for the costs of that
- 3 crossing, including any alteration or relocation to the
- 4 pipeline that the crossing requires. That standard
- 5 practice applies to anyone seeking to cross or -- or
- 6 perform work in proximity to a pipeline easement the
- 7 same way that it does to developers like Qualico.
- 8 Keyera's interpretation of Section 33 of the
- 9 Pipeline Act respects the way that this section has
- 10 been used and has not been used for the last 65 years,
- 11 and it also respects the AER's mandate and property law
- 12 principles, which I will discuss in a few minutes. As
- 13 such, I submit that Keyera's interpretation of
- 14 Section 33 should be favoured over other
- interpretations that would require you to depart from
- 16 established property law principles and which would
- 17 disrupt the energy industry, contrary to your
- 18 legislated mandate.
- 19 To be clear, however, Panel, we are not saying
- 20 that you should decline to grant Qualico's application
- 21 because you lack jurisdiction to rule on who should pay
- 22 for the cost of work required for safe pipeline
- 23 crossings. Section 33 gives you that jurisdiction.
- 24 What we are saying is that for all of the reasons
- 25 I will discuss in my remarks, you should deny Qualico's
- 26 application because imposing cost sharing between

- 1 pipeline companies and developers in circumstances like
- 2 those in Qualico's application would violate basic
- 3 legal principles and is not in the public interest. It
- 4 is a matter of what decision you should make based on
- 5 the evidence and the law before you, not whether you
- 6 have jurisdiction over this issue.
- 7 That takes me to the next topic in my argument,
- 8 which is the AER's mandate and the term "public
- 9 interest" as that term appears in Section 33(1) of the
- 10 Pipeline Act. As my friends Mr. Naffin and Mr. Myers
- 11 have pointed out, we heard a lot of different
- 12 characterizations during this hearing about what the
- 13 public interest means in a hearing like this. We heard
- 14 from Mr. Morrison that the public interest means the
- 15 same thing as ESG and that it is in the public interest
- 16 to lower the cost of housing in Alberta. That's at
- 17 transcript pages 62 and 158.
- 18 We similarly heard from Mr. Armstrong from Qualico
- 19 that the Developers' objective is to try to keep their
- 20 development costs as low as possible, and that is in
- 21 the public interest. That's at transcript page 193.
- 22 But, Panel, when the AER was established by the
- 23 Alberta Legislature to make decisions in the public
- 24 interest, the Legislature did not task the AER with
- 25 sorting out the types of public policy questions that
- 26 Mr. Morrison and the developers are asking you to

decide in this proceeding. Instead, the AER's mandate 1 under Section 2(1) of REDA is: 2 (as read) 3 To provide for the efficient, safe, orderly, and environmentally responsible development 4 of energy resources and mineral resources in 5 Alberta through the Regulator's regulatory 6 activities. And as Mr. Dixon and Mr. Myers both noted, that same 8 wording is found in Section 4 of the Pipeline Act. 9 10 That's the lens through which you need to look at 11 Qualico's application. How would approval of this 12 application affect the efficient, safe, orderly, and 13 environmentally responsible development of energy 14 resources in Alberta? 15 For the reasons set out in Keyera's written submissions as well as Mr. Beztilny's testimony on 16 17 Monday, approval of Qualico's application would harm the efficient and orderly development of energy 18 resources in Alberta because it would introduce 19 20 additional costs and risks to the energy value chain 21 after decisions have already been made to invest in new 22 pipeline infrastructure and the associated upstream and 23 downstream developments. 24 Mr. Beztilny explained that the energy product 25 value chain is sensitive to changes in costs and risks 26 and certain developments are being shut-in as we speak

- 1 as a result of changes in the costs and revenues across
- 2 the value chain. You can find that at transcript
- 3 pages 545, 546, 576, and 577.
- 4 If the AER establishes the precedent that Qualico
- 5 and the other developers are seeking, Mr. Beztilny
- 6 explained that the energy value chain will be exposed
- 7 to indeterminate risks indefinitely. Not only will
- 8 this harm the economic viability of the basin overall,
- 9 but Keyera's evidence is that this precedent could
- 10 cause some facilities to be stranded prematurely. That
- 11 means environmental impacts have occurred that could
- 12 have been avoided.
- 13 All of that would be contrary to the efficient,
- 14 safe, orderly, and environmentally responsible
- development of energy resources in Alberta and would,
- 16 therefore, be contrary to the public interest that the
- 17 AER has been tasked with advancing.
- I should note that none of Keyera's evidence about
- 19 the harm that would be caused by approval of Qualico's
- 20 application was challenged by Qualico or any of the
- 21 other developers in their evidence or during
- 22 cross-examination.
- The only questions that the developers asked about
- 24 this topic during cross-examination were whether this
- 25 proceeding was discussed in Keyera's financial
- 26 reporting. My friend Mr. Dixon argued this morning

- 1 that if this proceeding was not discussed in Keyera's
- 2 financial reporting, that somehow means the risks that
- 3 Mr. Beztilny testified to under oath are not real
- 4 risks.
- Now, there is no evidence in this proceeding about
- 6 how Keyera's financial reports are prepared and what
- 7 types of risks are and are not discussed in them. But,
- 8 regardless, our position is that granting Qualico's
- 9 application would be precedent-setting and is not
- 10 supported by the law or the evidence before you.
- 11 So that likely explains why this proceeding was
- 12 not discussed in Keyera's financial disclosure. It in
- 13 no way detracts from Mr. Beztilny's clear evidence
- 14 under oath that establishing this new precedent would
- 15 affect the entire energy value chain and could be
- 16 reasonably expected to have a significant impact on the
- 17 overall basin.
- Before leaving this topic of the AER's mandate and
- 19 the meaning of the public interest, I should also note
- 20 that two aspects of Mr. Morrison's testimony are
- 21 directly outside the AER's jurisdiction: First,
- 22 contrary to Mr. Morrison's suggestions, Section 33 of
- 23 the Pipeline Act is not intended to provide a mechanism
- 24 to address landowner compensation issues. Landowner
- 25 compensation for land rights needed for pipelines is
- 26 within the jurisdiction of the Land and Property Rights

- 1 Tribunal, not the AER. So if Mr. Morrison believes
- 2 that the pipeline company did not adequately compensate
- 3 the landowner for the easement rights acquired to
- 4 construct and operate the pipeline, the AER has no
- 5 jurisdiction to remedy that.
- 6 Second, Mr. Morrison was clear in his responses to
- 7 my questions during cross-examination that his
- 8 recommended approach would make the AER responsible for
- 9 land use planning decisions. You can find that in the
- 10 transcript at page 177.
- 11 However, the AER has clearly said that land use
- 12 planning is not within its jurisdiction. And authority
- 13 for that can be found at paragraph 23, Footnote 8 of
- 14 Keyera's written submission, which is Exhibit 72.01.
- 15 So, again, Panel, the AER cannot be used as the forum
- 16 that Mr. Morrison and his clients envision.
- 17 That takes me to the next topic in my argument.
- 18 We've heard arguments throughout the hearing and over
- 19 the course of the day today that what Qualico and the
- 20 other developers are seeking is an equitable sharing of
- 21 development costs.
- Now, first of all, for the reasons I just
- 23 discussed, that's not the AER's role, to adjudicate any
- 24 commercial dispute involving an AER-regulated asset and
- 25 find an equitable compromise between the parties. The
- 26 AER's role is to adjudicate energy resource

- 1 applications based on its legislated mandate.
- 2 But, regardless, we take strong exception to the
- 3 suggestion that the developers' proposed relief in this
- 4 proceeding would be equitable. The pipeline companies
- 5 own their easement rights. They paid full market value
- 6 for those rights at the time they were acquired. The
- 7 record demonstrates that the pipeline companies have
- 8 been willing to work with the developers to accommodate
- 9 their -- their development plans, notwithstanding that
- 10 the pipeline companies gain no benefit from doing that.
- 11 And now the developers suggest that the pipeline
- 12 companies should also pay for a portion of the
- 13 developers' development costs.
- 14 We do not see that as equitable sharing. We see
- 15 that as an attempt to have pipeline companies subsidize
- 16 the costs of new residential developments in Alberta.
- 17 It's obvious why the developers find this appealing,
- 18 but it's a premise that goes beyond the AER's
- 19 jurisdiction and mandate for the reasons I've just
- 20 discussed.
- 21 Let me turn now to some basic principles of
- 22 property law in Alberta. And some of this has been
- 23 canvassed by my friends already, so I'll try not to
- 24 overlap what we've already heard.
- 25 The first basic principle is that when a person
- 26 acquires an interest in land, they pay compensation for

- 1 that interest based on the circumstances at the time.
- 2 There is no look back if property values change over
- 3 time.
- 4 I'm sure we've all experienced a situation where
- 5 we've bought or sold property and the value of that
- 6 property changed for better or for worse. A real
- 7 estate transaction may turn out well or it may turn out
- 8 poorly for a party, but there's nothing unfair about
- 9 that. That's the way that real estate transactions
- 10 work, not just in Alberta, but in most of the world.
- 11 Mr. Morrison seems to accept that principle for
- 12 fee simple ownership, but he thinks that pipeline
- 13 easements should be treated differently, even if the
- 14 pipeline easement was acquired for the same value as
- 15 fee simple ownership. Mr. Morrison argues that, in
- 16 addition to the cost of acquiring the easement rights,
- 17 pipeline companies should be required to ensure that
- 18 the landowner remains satisfied with the deal over
- 19 time, and that means they should pay for any additional
- 20 injurious affection that occurs over the entire life of
- 21 the pipeline over and above the full market value for
- 22 the cost of the easement that was paid at the time the
- 23 easement was acquired. That's found at transcript
- 24 page 66.
- What this means, Panel, is that adopting
- 26 Mr. Morrison's logic would result in pipeline easements

- 1 costing more than fee simple ownership despite being a
- 2 lower form of land rights. And I respectfully submit
- 3 to you that is an absurd proposition.
- 4 It's important to take a step back and think about
- 5 the nature of pipeline easements and the implications
- 6 of what Mr. Morrison is suggesting to you. For an
- 7 easement, despite paying what fee simple ownership
- 8 would cost for the strip of land where the pipeline is
- 9 located, the pipeline company agrees to only take the
- 10 land rights as an easement, which allows the landowner
- 11 to continue to use the surface of the land with certain
- 12 restrictions over the life of the pipeline. That is a
- 13 benefit to the landowner. They get paid as though they
- 14 have saled -- sold the land outright, but they still
- 15 get to legally own the land and use it. That's a good
- 16 deal for the landowner.
- 17 It defies logic to suggest that the pipeline
- 18 companies should pay more than fee simple fair market
- 19 value because they have agreed to let the landowner
- 20 continue using the surface of the land for certain
- 21 purposes after paying full value to use the land for
- 22 the purposes of the pipeline. Again, if the value of
- 23 the land goes up over time and there are negative
- 24 impacts on the land value because the landowner
- 25 previously sold easement rights to the pipeline
- 26 company, there is no unfairness about that. The

- 1 pipeline company paid in full for the rights to be on
- 2 that land.
- 3 There are two other key tenets of property law
- 4 that arise in this case, and we've heard them
- 5 referenced a few times today. The first is the
- 6 buyer-beware principle, also known as caveat emptor,
- 7 and the second is the first-in-time, first-in-right
- 8 principle. These are both very fundamental principles
- 9 that apply broadly to all real estate transactions in
- 10 Alberta, not just pipelines.
- 11 The buyer-beware principle, in essence, means that
- 12 the onus is on the buyer of real estate to be aware of
- 13 what they are buying, and then once they have bought
- 14 that real estate, they own it. That's why when you buy
- 15 a house, your lawyer will confirm title to the property
- 16 and will recommend that you get a survey done to
- 17 confirm that the property complies with city bylaws and
- 18 you are aware of any easements or restrictive covenants
- 19 on the land. That's also why many homebuyers do a home
- 20 inspection as a condition of their purchase offer to
- 21 make sure that they do due diligence on the home to
- 22 ensure that they know what they are buying before the
- 23 sale closes.
- Obviously, the process looks a little bit
- 25 different when you're dealing with sophisticated
- 26 development companies and they're buying large tracts

- of land for the purposes of building a large 1 development project, but the principle is the same. 2 3 You heard from the developer witnesses that they 4 do, in fact, conduct due diligence prior to closing on land sales. When developers like Qualico buy land with 5 6 pipeline easements running through them, they do that 7 with full knowledge that the easements are there and that they will need to work with the pipeline company 8 9 to secure crossing agreements if they want to develop 10 across those easements. Mr. Westren from Brookfield was clear on this 11 12 At transcript page 282, he said: (as read) 13 You will also hear the pipeline companies 14 arguing that since the pipeline predated the purchase of or the development of the land 15 that runs beneath, the developer knew or 16 ought to have known that there would be cost 17 to protecting, relocating, or altering the 18 19 pipeline in some way. To this, we say, Of 20 course we do. 21 The developers may not know with certainty what the 22 crossing costs will ultimately be, but any large
- 22 crossing costs will ultimately be, but any large
 23 developer will have a pretty good idea of what that
 24 will cost.
- 25 Contrary to the claims from some of the developer 26 witnesses that we heard at page 237 of the transcript

- 1 that they have no information at the due diligence
- 2 stage about things like a pipeline's depth, its age,
- 3 its classification, et cetera, Mr. Beztilny explained
- 4 that those types of information are readily available
- 5 through sources like AbaData. He clarified that at
- 6 pages 542 and 543 of the transcript.
- 7 So the claim that developers are totally in the
- 8 dark about the nature of the pipelines in the area and
- 9 can't reasonably discover any information about them
- 10 during due diligence is not credible.
- 11 And, Commissioners, none of this is unique to the
- 12 pipeline industry. There are many types of third-party
- 13 easements that can run across lands, things like power
- 14 lines, fibreoptic cables, waterlines, sewer lines.
- 15 Whenever a buyer decides to purchase land with those
- 16 type of encumbrances on it, they do so with eyes wide
- 17 open that if they want to modify those facilities or do
- 18 work on those easements, there will be further process
- 19 and risk associated with that. There's nothing unfair
- 20 about it. That's the nature of the buyer-beware
- 21 principle.
- Now, my last point on the buyer-beware principle
- 23 is Mr. Fitch claimed this morning that the principle
- 24 has no application to public road allowances because
- 25 there's no title to public roadways. Now, that
- 26 submission completely misses the point.

Even if we're talking about a pipeline crossing of 1 2 a public roadway, the point is that the developers know 3 that the pipelines are there before they make the 4 decision to purchase the land. They know that they will need crossing agreements in order to develop 5 6 across those pipelines. The developer witnesses 7 admitted so much under cross-examination, and there is no basis for Mr. Fitch to now suggest otherwise. 8 9 The related principle which we've heard about 10 today is the first-in-time, first-in-right principle. 11 And in the development context and how we're using the 12 term in this hearing, this principle means that when 13 new infrastructure is constructed, it must address all man-made features that the infrastructure crosses. 14 15 If new infrastructure crosses third-party rights like easements, the new infrastructure must obtain the 16 17 necessary consents from the third party to cross them. But once that new infrastructure is built, it becomes 18 part of the landscape, and if someone else comes along 19 20 after the infrastructure is built, the infrastructure 21 is one of the third-party features that the new project 22 must address. 23 This approach applies regardless of what is being 24 developed or who is developing it. When new pipelines 25 are built, they too must get crossing agreements from 26 other pipeline companies and other third parties.

- 1 once the pipeline is built, it becomes
- 2 indistinguishable from all other existing
- 3 infrastructure on the landscape, and it must be
- 4 accommodated by future pipelines or any other type of
- 5 development that seeks to cross it.
- 6 That's one of the main purposes of the land titles
- 7 registry, to make sure that buyers of property can see
- 8 what they are buying and if there are any prior
- 9 encumbrances on the property that may restrict what the
- 10 buyer does with it before the buyer closes on their
- 11 sale.
- 12 Mr. Morrison acknowledged at page 173 of the
- 13 transcript that what Qualico is essentially asking the
- 14 AER to do in this case is throw away the first-in-time,
- 15 first-in-right principle. We heard from Qualico in its
- 16 written submission and, again, this morning that
- 17 respecting the first-in-time, first-in-right principle
- 18 is inconsistent with the intent of Section 33 of the
- 19 Pipeline Act.
- 20 But Qualico and the other developers have not
- 21 given you any legal authority that would allow you to
- 22 interpret Section 33 of the Pipeline Act in a way that
- 23 disregards this principle by requiring existing
- 24 pipelines to pay to accommodate future developments in
- 25 proximity to them.
- And, factually, as I've discussed, the record

- 1 demonstrates that departing from the first-in-time,
- 2 first-in-right principle would have serious negative
- 3 impacts on the efficient and orderly development of
- 4 energy resources in Alberta, contrary to the AER's
- 5 legislated mandate.
- 6 So this means that you lack both a legal and a
- 7 factual basis to throw away the first-in-time,
- 8 first-in-right principle in this proceeding as Qualico
- 9 and the other developers are asking you to.
- Now, to be clear, to respond to my friend's
- 11 submissions this morning, we are not saying that
- 12 pipelines have an absolute, unfettered right to quiet
- 13 enjoyment and that they can veto crossings. We agree
- 14 that Section 33 of the Pipeline Act makes it clear that
- 15 is not the case.
- But, Panel, that does not mean that existing
- 17 pipelines should pay to accommodate developments
- 18 proposed after the pipeline has been built. There is
- 19 no authority before you that that was ever the intent
- 20 of Section 33 of the Pipeline Act. The record
- 21 demonstrates Section 33 has never been used that way in
- 22 the last 65-plus years, and, again, doing so would
- 23 disregard established property law principles without
- 24 legal or factual justification.
- 25 My last topic of argument is the issue of
- 26 universal crossing requirements. This was not

- 1 something that Qualico included as a relief in its
- 2 application, but this is something that Brookfield and
- 3 the Developers Group asked for in their hearing
- 4 submissions, and we've heard other references to this
- 5 throughout the hearing.
- 6 Now, first of all, Panel, because this relief was
- 7 not part of Qualico's application, it would be
- 8 procedurally unfair, in our submission, for the AER to
- 9 make any form of direction in this proceeding about
- 10 universal crossing requirements because there may be
- 11 other parties in the province who would be affected by
- 12 those requirements, and they chose not to participate
- in this hearing because they had understood that this
- 14 proceeding would be limited to the relief sought by
- 15 Qualico. It would be procedurally unfair to them for
- 16 you to make a decision that could affect their rights
- 17 and interests without giving them proper notice and an
- 18 opportunity to participate.
- 19 In any event, the record before you does not
- 20 support any finding or recommendation for universal
- 21 crossing requirements. Mr. Beztilny explained on
- 22 Monday that pipeline companies are responsible for
- 23 ensuring the integrity of their pipelines, and each
- 24 crossing can put different stresses on the pipeline,
- 25 depending on the design and materials of the crossing,
- 26 the depth of the pipeline, pipe material and wall

- 1 thickness, soil conditions, and other factors. That's
- 2 at transcript page 539.
- 3 Mr. Beztilny explained that some crossings are
- 4 simple and some are more complex and require full
- 5 engineering assessments. So there is no
- 6 one-size-fits-all approach to conducting these types of
- 7 integrity assessments, and this Panel and the AER needs
- 8 to be very cautious, in our submission, about making
- 9 any order or direction that could prevent the pipeline
- 10 company from doing the engineering work that is
- 11 required in the circumstances to ensure the pipe is
- 12 being adequately protected.
- 13 Further, despite some arguments that we've heard
- 14 from the developers, I would argue you don't have any
- 15 evidence before you that pipeline companies are failing
- 16 to reasonably respond to crossing requests. Of the
- 17 many thousands of crossing requests that the pipeline
- 18 companies in this proceeding receive annually, this is
- 19 the first time in over a decade that a dispute has been
- 20 brought before the AER or its predecessor under
- 21 Section 33 of the Pipeline Act.
- 22 If you look at the specific facts of the various
- 23 crossing disputes that have been discussed in this
- 24 proceeding, the development companies themselves are
- often responsible, at least partially, for how long it
- 26 takes the pipeline company to process their request by

- 1 providing inadequate information, by making
- 2 unreasonable requests, and/or delaying authorizing the
- 3 pipeline to proceed with the necessary work.
- 4 There is, similarly, no evidence before you that
- 5 the pipeline companies are giving the developers
- 6 unreasonable cost estimates or are improperly seeking
- 7 to include pipeline maintenance work within the scope
- 8 of crossing costs. This is pure speculation on the
- 9 developers' part.
- 10 On that last point, I have two further points I'd
- 11 like to make. First is any pipeline company that
- 12 deferred necessary maintenance work until a developer
- 13 happened to come along with a crossing request would
- 14 likely be failing to meet its regulatory obligations to
- 15 safely operate the pipeline by knowingly deferring
- 16 maintenance work that it has determined to be
- 17 necessary.
- 18 Second, if developers are truly concerned about a
- 19 pipeline company proposing physical works as part of a
- 20 crossing agreement that are not required to accommodate
- 21 the developers' plans, they have recourse to challenge
- 22 the scope of work under Section 33(1) of the
- 23 Pipeline Act.
- I respectfully submit that this existing recourse
- 25 is the appropriate forum for addressing any specific
- 26 dispute about physical crossing work, and that specific

- 1 dispute would be adjudicated based on actual facts, not
- 2 speculation. There is no evidence before you in this
- 3 proceeding to demonstrate that the existing recourse is
- 4 inadequate and some further recourse for the developers
- 5 is needed.
- 6 So, in conclusion, Madam Chair and Hearing
- 7 Commissioners, I respectfully submit that Qualico and
- 8 the developers have failed to provide the necessary
- 9 legal or evidentiary support that would justify their
- 10 requested relief. The relief that Qualico and the
- 11 developers are seeking would establish a significant
- 12 precedent that would run counter to the AER's mandate
- 13 and well-established property law principles. For
- 14 those reasons, Keyera requests that you deny Qualico's
- 15 application and the other relief requested by the
- 16 Developers Group.
- 17 Thank you, Panel. That concludes my argument this
- 18 afternoon, subject to any questions you may have.
- 19 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Duncanson.
- 20 I misspelled your name. Yeah. Thanks,
- 21 Mr. Duncanson.
- Just give us a second.
- No questions for you. Thank you very much.
- 24 S. DUNCANSON: Thank you.
- 25 THE CHAIR: Mr. Fitch, if you wish, we can
- 26 take a break before you have your final reply. That's

- 1 up to you. 'Cause while -- we are slightly over time,
- 2 but we are not grossly over time, so if you wish to
- 3 take a break, we can accommodate that.
- 4 G. FITCH: Madam Chair, I actually think
- 5 I'm ready to go. So I had the benefit of an earlier
- 6 break or two, so I've had a chance to talk with my
- 7 client. And, at this point, I am not sure much is
- 8 going to be gained from another 15 minutes, so I'm --
- 9 I'm just going to proceed if that's acceptable.
- 10 THE CHAIR: That's acceptable. Please
- 11 proceed.
- 12 Final Submissions by G. Fitch (Reply)
- 13 G. FITCH: All right. So what I'm going
- 14 to do -- I -- I have half an hour, so I don't have a
- 15 lot of time. I'm just going to briefly -- I'm going to
- 16 start by just briefly addressing Mr. Duncanson's
- 17 submissions on behalf of Keyera. That won't take me
- 18 very long at all. And then I'll -- I'll get to Pembina
- 19 and Plains. And I'm just doing that 'cause it's fresh
- 20 in my mind.
- 21 So the first thing I want to reply to from
- 22 Mr. Duncanson's submissions is he said that Keyera
- 23 accepts that Section 33 of the Pipeline Act isn't
- 24 meaningless, and he suggested that practically what it
- 25 means is the pipeline operator has no veto, and if the
- 26 pipeline operator is acting unreasonably, then

- 1 Section 33 provides a remedy.
- We don't disagree with that, and I want to be
- 3 clear that the position of Qualico is that, in this
- 4 case, the pipeline operators have acted unreasonably.
- 5 So -- so I -- I agree with my friend.
- 6 My friend also talked about subsection (3) of
- 7 Section 33. And we have never argued that subsection,
- 8 which seems to me to relate to where an order has
- 9 already been issued under subsection (2), but then
- 10 there's a dispute about the payment. The parties can
- 11 go back to the AER. In our view, it's not relevant.
- 12 We're not relying on it.
- Mr. Duncanson, as well as my friends -- my friend
- 14 Mr. Myers, urged on you that you should ignore,
- 15 essentially, Alberta Utilities Commission
- 16 Decision 2012-233 which I walked you through, and my
- 17 submission to you is do not ignore that decision. It
- 18 is highly relevant. And, in particular, paragraphs 24
- 19 to 29 that I -- I read some of them to you verbatim.
- 20 If you read that decision, fairly put in its
- 21 context, you will see that it is highly relevant. And
- 22 why it is highly relevant, because it is exactly on
- 23 point. It deals with a statutory provision that is
- 24 virtually identical to Section 33, and it provides a
- 25 principal discussion of what the purpose of the
- 26 provision is, which is to deal with conflicts exactly

- 1 like that in this case.
- Mr. Duncanson referred to the evidence -- the
- 3 testimony of Mr. Beztilny, which he made a point of
- 4 saying was under oath, and that evidence was as to the
- 5 indeterminate risk indefinitely, should a cost-sharing
- 6 order be made, and he noted that none of this evidence
- 7 was challenged in cross-examination, and I'm going to
- 8 tell you, Madam Chair, that certainly, on behalf of
- 9 Qualico, the reason why it wasn't challenged is because
- 10 it is clearly hyperbole. It is Chicken Little
- 11 the-sky-will-fall type of evidence.
- 12 And this -- this kind of goes to a -- a difficult
- 13 point about evidence in proceedings before the
- 14 Regulator and the Alberta Utilities Commission. The
- 15 truth is the line between opinion and fact is often not
- 16 very clear in these proceedings, and I'm going to urge
- 17 on you that when Mr. Beztilny said, Oh, if you order
- 18 cost sharing, there will be indeterminate risk
- 19 indefinitely, he was expressing an opinion. That's not
- 20 fact in any way. So there was no point, in our view,
- 21 in challenging what was clear ly a hyperbolic
- 22 over-the-top opinion.
- 23 Mr. Duncanson tried to respond to my argument that
- 24 the buyer-beware principle does not apply when the
- 25 crossing is on public land on a public road
- 26 right-of-way. He said that I missed the point, the

- 1 point being that Qualico would know that there's a
- 2 pipeline and would know that it would have to obtain a
- 3 crossing agreement.
- 4 But that's not the point. The point is that the
- 5 approach by Qualico to Plains and to Pembina was
- 6 required -- is required by the City. Qualico's not
- 7 doing it because it wants to. It's doing it because
- 8 it's been required to do it under its subdivision
- 9 approval and under the rules that the City has enacted,
- 10 and the City was there first. That's the point.
- 11 And, lastly, in response to Mr. Duncanson's
- 12 submissions, he suggested that part of the reason for
- 13 the lack of timeliness that you heard the Qualico and
- 14 Developers Group testify about was because they were
- 15 making "unreasonable requests". And I just simply want
- 16 to say very strongly on the record Qualico and the
- 17 developer -- the members of the Developer Group deny
- 18 strongly that any of their requests for basic
- 19 information on what work needs to be done and how much
- 20 will -- will it cost, those requests were not
- 21 unreasonable. And to try to turn around and pin the
- 22 blame for the lack of timeliness on the developers is
- 23 not appropriate.
- 24 All right. So turning to Pembina and Plains. I
- 25 would say that the submissions of my friends Mr. Myers
- 26 and Mr. Naffin had a -- a theme -- they had several

- 1 themes, but one of the themes was that this was just
- 2 Qualico pursuing a private interest.
- Now, I have already made submissions on why --
- 4 what public interest considerations we think are at
- 5 play here, and we have focused on the fact that these
- 6 crossings are not on Qualico privately owned land, but
- 7 rather in a public road allowance. I'm not going to
- 8 repeat all of that. All I'm going to say is arguing
- 9 that Qualico is pursuing its private interests is truly
- 10 the pot calling the kettle black. Clearly Pembina and
- 11 Plains are also pursuing their private interests.
- 12 And I think, to be fair to Dr. Makholm, one of the
- points he was making is, Well, you have these private
- 14 parties, Qualico on the one hand, Plains and Pembina in
- 15 the other, they're pursuing private interests. We
- 16 don't deny that Qualico is a for-profit corporation
- 17 pursuing private interests, but to suggest that -- or
- 18 to imply that there's something wrong with it and to --
- 19 and to ignore the fact that Pembina and Plains are
- 20 similarly pursuing their own private interests, it's --
- 21 it's -- just doesn't sit right.
- Next, I would like to address Mr. Myers' curious
- 23 submission, if I can put it that way, that the response
- 24 provided by the Qualico witness panel to -- to the
- 25 Chair's question about terms and conditions -- and this
- 26 is the response where they said, We'll pay for the

- 1 things that we do, which is roadwork, and -- but
- 2 anything having to do with the pipe, the pipeline
- 3 operators should pay. He seemed to think that that
- 4 means we have somehow thrown in the towel and
- 5 acknowledged that the position that his clients have
- 6 put forward is correct.
- 7 And I'm here to tell you that is completely not
- 8 the case, and it has completely misconstrued what
- 9 Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Fjeldheim said, which was simply
- 10 that, We accept responsibility when we have to cross
- 11 with -- we're building a new road, and we have to cross
- 12 a pipeline. We -- we accept responsibility basically
- 13 for the surface costs because that's what we do, we
- 14 build roads. But all of the subsurface costs to
- 15 protect your pipeline, whatever work you need to do to
- 16 protect your pipeline, those are your costs. That is
- 17 in no way any kind of admission against our interests.
- 18 Mr. Myers raised Section 619 -- and this is the
- 19 wonders of modern telephones. I'm just going to pull
- 20 it up on my phone here -- of the Municipal Government
- 21 Act, and I'm just simply going to submit that
- 22 Section 619 of the Municipal Government Act is entirely
- 23 irrelevant in this proceeding. Section 619 basically
- 24 deals with where there is a conflict between a licenced
- 25 permit or approval granted by, in this case, the AER,
- 26 and a statutory plan, a land use bylaw, a subdivision

- 1 development -- decision or development decision, well,
- 2 there is no such conflict here.
- 3 And -- and to suggest that you can draw a line
- 4 between a dispute on pipeline crossing costs and a
- 5 conflict between the pipeline licence and, in this
- 6 case, I guess it would be the ASP approval, is a huge
- 7 stretch. The fact is Section 619 is completely
- 8 irrelevant.
- 9 Pembina and Plains also responded to the argument
- 10 advanced by me this morning, again, that the pipeline
- 11 crossings are in a road allowance. My -- my friend
- 12 Mr. Naffin even referred to it as an "alleged road". I
- 13 don't think that's really the case. It's a real road.
- 14 And Mr. Myers said, There's no evidence that the road
- 15 existed before the pipelines. Well, there is evidence
- 16 that the road existed before the pipelines on the
- 17 record of this proceeding.
- 18 Firstly, their own expert Mr. Telford agreed.
- 19 But, secondly, if you look at Exhibit 4.01, there --
- 20 there was a response from Qualico to the first
- 21 supplemental information request issued by the AER, and
- 22 one of the requests was for a map. And if you -- you
- 23 look at that map, and it's -- I think it's on -- I'm
- 24 not sure what PDF page it is. But it's in
- 25 Section 4.01. You'll see that the land that we were
- 26 talking about was the southeast quarter of Section 5.

- 1 It's east of Meridian Street, north of 167th Avenue.
- 2 So that's -- that's the land that the Public Utilities
- 3 Board issued that decision in relation to back in 1971.
- 4 So then if you look at the Public Utilities Board
- 5 decision, and that's Exhibit 64.05 at PDF page 3,
- 6 firstly, you'll see that it relates to the southeast of
- 7 5, and, secondly, you'll see the statement that the
- 8 lands in question are bounded on the east by an
- 9 all-weather, high-grade gravel road. So there -- it is
- 10 simply false to suggest there is no evidence on the
- 11 record that the road, which is now Meridian Street,
- 12 existed before the pipelines. It did, and that was
- 13 acknowledged by Mr. Telford.
- Mr. Myers also submitted or suggested that Qualico
- 15 has -- I think he used the word "abandoned" our request
- 16 for 50-50 cost sharing. I want to be clear. If I left
- 17 that impression, that's not correct. We haven't
- 18 abandoned our request for 50-50 cost sharing.
- 19 All I was intending to say was, obviously, 50-50
- 20 was an arbitrary percentage. We -- I explained that
- 21 the reason we came up with it is because there's two
- 22 different public interests at play here. One is the
- 23 safe operation of the pipeline, and the other is the --
- 24 the development of new affordable housing in Edmonton.
- 25 There's no reason to favour one over the other.
- 26 They're both in the public interest. So 50-50 is the

- 1 split.
- 2 All I'm saying is that when we -- when the answer
- 3 was given to you, Madam Chair, about terms and
- 4 conditions, and the answer was, We'll do the civil
- 5 roadwork on the surface, and the pipeline operator
- 6 should do the underground work to protect the pipeline,
- 7 that could lead to a different percentage. I don't
- 8 know what that percentage is. That's all we were
- 9 saying -- or were trying to say.
- 10 Mr. Myers, in discussing the meaning and the
- 11 purpose of Section 33(1) and -- or Section 33 said that
- 12 we, that is, Qualico, was ignoring the fact that the
- 13 public interest analysis relates to subsection (1),
- 14 that is, is the alteration or relocation work required,
- 15 and that what we were doing is we were -- I think he
- 16 used the word "conflating" -- conflating it with the
- 17 should-the-costs-be-shared analysis in subsection (2).
- 18 So I just want to respond to that.
- 19 And -- and I think, with respect, Mr. Myers was
- 20 unfairly characterizing what our position is, which is
- 21 simply this: We are submitting that alteration of the
- 22 pipeline is in the public interest. So that's
- 23 subsection (1). We are also saying if the AER finds,
- 24 as a result of this hearing, that alteration of the
- 25 pipeline is in the public interest and then it goes on
- 26 to consider the allocation of costs and it allocates

- 1 costs -- we'll just say 50-50 -- the AER must have
- 2 determined that that allocation is also in the public
- 3 interest.
- 4 So we're not -- we're not trying to lift the
- 5 public interest analysis out of subsection (1) and put
- 6 it over in subsection (2). We know that we bear the
- 7 onus to persuade you that the alteration work is -- is
- 8 in the public interest, but the Regulator's job here,
- 9 if it gets over that, will -- surely involves -- when
- 10 you're allocating costs, you're not going to do it
- 11 unless you think that the allocation you arrive at is
- 12 in the public interest. All we're saying is we believe
- 13 a 50-50 allocation or whatever allocation the Regulator
- 14 comes up with, that's also in the public interest.
- 15 Also. Not -- not ignoring subsection (1). So I just
- 16 wanted to be clear about that.
- 17 I'll just see here. Mr. Myers criticized me for
- 18 arguing that it was improper and inaccurate -- my
- 19 words -- to -- for Pembina and Plains to continue
- 20 arguing, as they continue to do, that there's no
- 21 legitimate dispute as to the need for the work. So
- 22 this is when I was saying, Look, the AER, when it
- 23 issued its notice of reconsideration, found that that
- 24 was the wrong analysis. Just -- right.
- 25 So I referred to this paragraph in the
- 26 reconsideration decision: (as read)

1	The AER declined to decide the application
2	made to it under subsection 33(1) of the
3	Pipeline Act on the basis that there was no
4	dispute that the work should be done;
5	however, the legislative test set out in
6	subsection 33(1) requires, in respect of
7	subsection 33(1), paragraph (a), that
8	direction to a licence to alter its pipeline
9	must be in the public interest. It does not
10	require a dispute regarding the alteration.
11	So my submission to you and just to, hopefully, clarify
12	it for my friends at Plains and Pembina, is we're
13	saying you would be making the same error of law if you
14	dismissed Qualico's application on the basis that there
15	is no dispute regarding the regarding the
16	alteration. You can dismiss our application if you
17	don't think it's in the public interest. We get that.
18	But you can't do it on the basis that there's no
19	dispute regarding the alteration because that horse has
20	left the barn. So maybe the better way to put it is
21	all of that is irrelevant, not improper or inaccurate.
2122	
	all of that is irrelevant, not improper or inaccurate.
22	all of that is irrelevant, not improper or inaccurate. And in relation to why did Qualico amend its
22	all of that is irrelevant, not improper or inaccurate. And in relation to why did Qualico amend its application and the differences between the original

- 1 application is not before us; we're making our decision
- 2 on the amended application. So, arguably, all of that
- 3 is irrelevant for another reason.
- 4 But the -- the fact is we knew what Plains and
- 5 Pembina's position was because they told us. So we
- 6 knew that they were saying, Oh, there's no dispute
- 7 regarding the alteration. So we amended the
- 8 application to try to make it clearer that we don't
- 9 agree. We think there is a dispute about alteration.
- 10 That's all that happened in the amendment. There's
- 11 nothing nefarious about it, and that's why, you know,
- 12 my friend taking the witnesses through the black-lined
- 13 version was, with all due respect, a waste of time.
- 14 The other side, both Keyera and Plains and Pembina
- 15 keep arguing that the Regulator and before the
- 16 Regulator, the ERCB, has never done what we're asking
- 17 you to do now, and I merely ask you to review the case
- 18 law, review the precedence, review the Town of Sundre
- 19 decision, review the MD Foothills Canadian Natural Gas
- 20 decision, and review, as I said, decision 2012-333 from
- 21 the AUC. They're not as completely distinguishable as
- 22 my friends would have you believe. In fact, I would
- 23 argue that the CWNG decision, MD Foothills, is actually
- 24 quite on point.
- There was a cost-sharing order issued. There was
- 26 an order that the pipeline be altered by lowering it.

- 1 There was no dispute about that, and yet the Board
- 2 heard it and issued a decision. So a lot of these sort
- 3 of technical points that my friends raise in saying
- 4 that there's -- this has never been done before, it's
- 5 not true.
- 6 Mr. Myers also addressed the issue of, Well, now
- 7 Qualico is saying it doesn't want a blanket rule, but,
- 8 really, they just want a decision that applies to where
- 9 they're doing their work, suggesting, again, this is
- 10 all just about Qualico's private interest.
- In response, I think I was very clear this morning
- 12 that the direction Qualico and the Developers Group are
- 13 seeking from the Regulator relates to urban periphery
- 14 areas because that's where the conflicts are, not
- 15 because it's where Qualico does work. There's a lot of
- 16 developers that do work in these areas, but you heard
- 17 the testimony of the Developers Group witnesses.
- 18 There's -- there's this conflict between this huge
- 19 existing infrastructure of pipelines underground and
- 20 rapidly expanding urban growth. That's the issue, and
- 21 that's why we're seeking an order that would apply to
- 22 these areas, and all I was saying is we're not asking
- 23 for an order that applies to other areas that don't
- 24 have this same land use conflict. It's all about the
- 25 land use conflict.
- 26 Finally, Mr. Myers said -- you know, he referred

- 1 to the various agreements that Qualico signed and
- 2 basically said, Well, they signed the agreements, and
- 3 they shouldn't be coming before you now and taking
- 4 the -- and take the positions that they are taking.
- 5 And I just want to say that I think it's obvious from
- 6 the evidence of Mr. Gerein and Mr. Armstrong that the
- 7 only reason Qualico signed these agreements is because
- 8 they felt they had to. They had to in order to advance
- 9 the development. They did it holding their nose,
- 10 however you want to put it. This is not a case where a
- 11 party is seeking later to resile from a legal
- 12 agreement. I mean, most -- all the agreements for
- 13 167th Avenue never, of course, proceeded, so it's not
- 14 like anyone's alleging breach of contract.
- The fact is Qualico signed the agreements because
- 16 they thought they had no choice, and you heard the same
- 17 thing from Mr. Nicholson [sic] with regard to Marquis
- 18 Joint Venture. They -- they signed the agreement
- 19 because they needed to get the work done. So they had
- 20 no choice.
- 21 With regard to Mr. Naffin's submissions -- and
- 22 this is going to go back to the -- where are these
- 23 crossings issue -- he started off by referring to the
- 24 subject lands and, you know, the application of the
- 25 first-in-time, first-in-right principle to the subject
- 26 lands. Well, again, I submit to you the subject lands

- 1 are not Qualico lands. They're City of Edmonton lands.
- 2 And so the first-in-time, first-in-right principle
- 3 doesn't have the result my friends submit that it
- 4 should.
- I want to address the question of the impact on
- 6 affordability. Mr. Naffin, relying primarily on the
- 7 evidence of Mr. Telford and Mr. Romanesky, basically
- 8 said it's not true that pipeline crossing costs will
- 9 impact the prices of homes in these new developing
- 10 areas, and I just want to say that when you're
- 11 considering this issue, you have -- I think there were
- 12 11 witnesses on the Developers Group panel and the
- 13 Qualico panel combined. If we take Mr. Morrison out,
- 14 10 witnesses. These are developers. The developers
- 15 are telling you, the Hearing Commissioners, yes, it
- 16 will, these pipeline cross -- costs, if applied
- 17 basin-wide, so we'll say 45 for Horse Hills, these
- 18 costs will get passed on to homeowners, and they will
- 19 increase the cost of homes. And that evidence, I would
- 20 suggest, has not been impeached in any meaningful way,
- 21 and you should, without a doubt, prefer the evidence of
- the developers, who are the people on the ground doing
- 23 the work, over the opinion evidence of Mr. Romanesky
- 24 and Mr. Telford, who, with all due respect, don't
- 25 really know.
- 26 Mr. Naffin got into what he called "lawyer math"

- 1 and came up with some percentages and whatnot, and
- 2 the -- the whole point of the argument seemed to be
- 3 that Qualico would actually only absorb 5 percent of
- 4 the costs if it has to pay a hundred percent because
- 5 the rest would get distributed through the ARA levy,
- 6 and to which I say, yes, that's -- that's one of the
- 7 main points here, is that it's not just about Qualico.
- 8 So it's not that -- so it's not that Qualico is trying
- 9 to insulate itself from its legitimate development
- 10 costs; it's that these costs will get spread through
- 11 the basin and through the ARA levy, and, as I've just
- 12 said, will get passed on to homeowners -- homebuyers.
- So Mr. Naffin has -- makes my point, which is that
- 14 it's not just about Qualico, it's not just about
- 15 Qualico pursuing its private interests, it's about
- 16 development in general of these new emerging areas that
- 17 the City of Edmonton needs for affordable housing.
- 18 I am running out of time -- I know -- so I'm just
- 19 going to --
- 20 THE CHAIR: Mr. Fitch, take your time.
- 21 G. FITCH: Okay.
- 22 THE CHAIR: Don't rush.
- 23 G. FITCH: Okay.
- 24 THE CHAIR: If you want a glass of water
- 25 or ...
- 26 G. FITCH: Well, that much, for sure, I

- 1 need. But I'll carry on.
- 2 Maybe I'll address Mr. Naffin's submissions about
- 3 the evidence of Mr. Morrison. So I think what I heard
- 4 him say is that Mr. Morrison seemed to view this
- 5 hearing as an opportunity to revisit fundamental
- 6 principles of law and well-established practices,
- 7 something like that.
- 8 I'm not sure what he means by "revisit". I -- no
- 9 one's saying that first-in-time, first-in-right isn't a
- 10 principle of property law. No one's saying that the
- 11 buyer-beware principle is a principle of property law.
- 12 And Mr. Morrison did not, contrary to what my friend
- 13 has alleged, urge that those be revisited.
- 14 What he said -- and this, I think, responds, in
- 15 part, to what -- one of the things that Mr. Duncanson
- 16 said -- is that the -- and -- and you may recall
- 17 Mr. Duncanson, when he was cross-examining the Qualico
- 18 panel, referred to -- I think it was his
- 19 father-in-law's property in Windsor Park and how his
- 20 father-in-law always said, Oh, I wish I hadn't sold
- 21 that property back in the 1960s when it was worth not
- 22 very much because now it's worth so much, and then
- 23 he -- Mr. Duncanson sort of elaborated on that point in
- 24 his submissions.
- No one is denying that -- that properties transact
- 26 in the market. Generally, over the arc of time,

- 1 they -- they tend to go up in price, but sometimes they
- 2 go down, and a subsequent purchaser may take a loss
- 3 or -- or -- or may -- may make money when they sell the
- 4 property. None of that is being taken issue with.
- 5 The difference between Mr. Duncanson's father's --
- 6 father-in-law's property in Windsor Park and what we're
- 7 dealing with here is -- unless I -- I'm missing it --
- 8 the property in Windsor Park isn't encumbered by a
- 9 right-of-way -- pipeline right-of-way.
- 10 So when you have a property, you sell it, you
- 11 take -- you -- you make money, you take a loss,
- 12 whatever happens, happens. What Mr. Morrison is saying
- is: You have a piece of property, you own the
- 14 fee-simple title. Someone comes along -- the pipeline
- 15 company comes along, and it takes an easement across
- 16 your property. That easement is there for the life of
- 17 the pipeline, and we know that, in this case, that's
- 18 50 years, and there doesn't appear to be any end in
- 19 sight. And all Mr. Morrison is saying is that over
- 20 that 50-year period -- like, if this was a piece of
- 21 farmland in East Central Alberta, the adverse effect of
- 22 that pipeline right-of-way today might be little
- 23 different from the adverse effect of the pipeline in
- 24 1970. But what we're dealing with here is -- is
- 25 development land that's now being developed. It's not
- 26 future development land. It's -- it's present

- 1 development land. And so the adverse effect of the
- 2 pipeline today is markedly different in an adverse way
- 3 to what it was in 1970 and all Mr. Morrison is saying.
- 4 You need to consider that in your review of what's in
- 5 the public interest, and that's the context for the
- 6 get-out-of-jail-free argument.
- 7 And having used the word "argument", I'll now
- 8 address the criticisms my friends made about
- 9 Mr. Morrison not being an independent expert. I -- I
- 10 think they are being very unfair here. When
- 11 Mr. Morrison used the word "argument", so "my argument
- 12 is this", he was using that as a synonym for "opinion".
- 13 "My opinion is this". We talk about that -- that kind
- of thing all the time. You're -- you're expressing an
- opinion, usually -- you might be in an argument, and
- 16 the reality is we are in an argument. That's why we're
- 17 here. We have -- we have one side taking one position,
- 18 we're taking the other, and all Mr. Morrison was
- 19 basically say saying is, My opinion in this argument is
- 20 this. So to suggest that his use of the word
- 21 "argument" somehow makes him not independent, not
- 22 impartial, is just not correct.
- 23 I want to make a brief submission on Section 28 of
- 24 the Pipeline Rules, so Mr. -- you heard Mr. Dixon's
- 25 submissions on that -- on that point, and Mr. -- I'm
- 26 not sure who responded to it, but one of my friends

- 1 responded to it. And so this -- so I think the issue
- 2 is Mr. Dixon was saying that, in Brookfield's view, the
- 3 proper interpretation of Section 28 is that it's the
- 4 pipeline licencee who has to pay for these integrity
- 5 assessments. The response that I heard was, No, it's
- 6 never been that way, and -- and -- so that can't be the
- 7 right interpretation of Section 28 because it's been
- 8 around forever.
- 9 And I just simply want to point out -- and I'm
- 10 sure your legal counsel would do this anyways, but the
- 11 Pipeline Rules were revised and -- well, replaced in
- 12 November 2023, so the previous version of the Pipeline
- 13 Rules were rescinded, and a new version of the Pipeline
- 14 Rules were issued -- I think it was November 15, 2023,
- 15 and that was actually the same date that the AER
- 16 rescinded the old version of Directive 77 and brought
- into force the new current version of Directive 77.
- 18 So -- so the first point is that Section 28 of the
- 19 Pipeline Rules has actually only been around since
- 20 November 15, 2023. If you look -- and, again, I'll --
- 21 I'll leave this to -- to your counsel to advise you on,
- 22 obviously, but when you look at the Pipeline Rules, the
- 23 current version, you'll see that there was a -- a
- 24 different section in the old rules as compared to the
- 25 new rules.
- 26 So, basically, the current version that Mr. Dixon

```
read to you, Section 28, and that I -- I referred to in
 1
     cross-examination is titled "Pipeline Crossing Highway
 2
 3
     or Road".
                It states:
                           (as read)
 4
          When constructing a pipeline across a road,
          highway, right-of-way, or road allowance, the
 5
 6
          licencee must apply the CSA Z662 pipeline
          design requirements [et cetera].
     In the old pipeline rule, the pre-November 15, 2023,
 8
     version, the section was titled "Modifications Due to
 9
10
     Highway, Road, or Railway", and it read as follows:
11
     (as read)
12
          If the construction of a new highway, road,
13
          or railway, or the modification of a existing
14
          highway, road, or railway requires the
          upgrading of an existing pipeline, the
15
          required casing, thicker wall pipe, or other
16
17
          load-bearing structures allowed by CSA Z662
          must extend for the full width of the
18
          right-of-way of the highway, road, or
19
20
          railway.
21
     So the -- the point I would like to make here is that
22
     the old Section 19 did not use the words "the
                 It just said it was -- I'm not sure
23
     licencee".
24
     grammatically how to describe it, but it was -- it was
25
     neutral in the sense that it just said the -- the pipe
     has to do this or look at -- or -- or look like
26
```

- 1 this. Whereas what the new section says is the
- 2 licencee must apply the CSA Z662 requirements.
- 3 So the response to my friend's submission is
- 4 simply that if you compare the new, current version of
- 5 the rule to the old version of the rule, there has been
- 6 a change in the wording, and the change, in our view --
- 7 and we support Brookfield on this -- strongly suggests
- 8 that now there's direction that it be the licencee that
- 9 does this, and, by extension, they should be
- 10 responsible for the costs.
- 11 All right. At this point, Madam Chair, I'm just
- 12 going to maybe take a few moments now to have a final
- 13 consultation with my client to see if there's anything
- 14 else we want to cover if that's acceptable.
- 15 THE CHAIR: That is acceptable.
- 16 G. FITCH: Thank you.
- 17 THE CHAIR: Please go ahead.
- 18 G. FITCH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just
- 19 a -- a couple of small points I intended to address and
- 20 skipped over.
- 21 Mr. Naffin referred to the evidence of
- 22 Mr. Romanesky, who testified that pipelines don't
- 23 necessarily lower the value of development. I would
- 24 suggest that Mr. Romanesky was offering a hypothetical
- opinion, "It doesn't necessarily lower the value", and
- 26 that you should prefer the evidence of Mr. Gerein who

- 1 testified, Yes, it does. His testimony was that, in
- 2 this type of a development, Marquis, urban periphery
- 3 pipelines do lower the value of land. And I'm just
- 4 going to urge on you that you prefer the evidence of
- 5 Mr. Gerein, who is the developer, over the evidence of
- 6 Mr. Romanesky on that point.
- 7 Mr. Naffin also referred to evidence from one of
- 8 the pipeline company witnesses who -- and the way I
- 9 thought I heard Mr. Naffin put it -- said that they
- 10 would not be able to recover additional costs from
- 11 shippers. I urge you to have a look at the
- 12 transcripts. The way I remember that exchange, what
- 13 the pipeline witnesses said is they may not be able to
- 14 recover that it would be a negotiation they would have
- 15 to have with their shippers. They expected their
- 16 shippers would -- would object. I have no reason to
- 17 disbelieve that. I -- but I don't think it was as
- 18 categorical as my friend Mr. Naffin told you in
- 19 argument, which is that they would not be able to
- 20 recover from shippers. I think there's just -- the
- 21 evidence on that is they may be able to, they may not.
- 22 The shippers wouldn't want that, and that's -- and
- 23 that's what the evidence is, in my submission.
- I'm going to resist the temptation to go on. I --
- 25 I have to say this case is somewhat unique procedurally
- 26 in the sense that there has already been a lot of

- 1 written submissions made. In fact, it's -- it's --
- 2 it's unusual because so much of the "evidence", as I'm
- 3 sure you're aware, are letters and submissions written
- 4 by lawyers. So I think -- I feel confident that the
- 5 issues in this hearing have been capably argued on both
- 6 sides, so I don't think you need to hear anything more
- 7 from me.
- 8 So, on that, again, I would just like to thank the
- 9 Regulator, the Commissioners, court reporters, my
- 10 friends on the other side of the aisle for -- for a
- 11 very interesting hearing, and we look forward with
- 12 great interest to the Regulator's decision, which I'm
- 13 assuming will be reserved.
- 14 Thank you.
- 15 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much.
- 16 Just give us a quick minute.
- 17 Give us two more minutes.
- 18 (ADJOURNMENT)
- 19 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, everyone.
- 20 So we have no further questions. If there is no
- 21 other matters that you need to bring to our attention,
- 22 I wish to thank everybody for their patience and
- 23 participation in the past two weeks, and this hear --
- 24 in this hearing, and the Panel will review all the
- 25 evidence and arguments submitted by the counsel, and we
- 26 will make our decision on the amended application.

1	We'll issue the decision when the decision is
2	ready, and all parties who are participants in this
3	hearing will receive a copy. And that brings this
4	hearing to a close. Thank you.
5	
6	PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

1	CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIPT:
2	
3	We, Derek Lopez and Angela Porco, certify that the
4	foregoing pages are a complete and accurate transcript
5	of the proceedings taken down by us in shorthand and
б	transcribed from our shorthand notes to the best of our
7	skill and ability.
8	Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta,
9	this 13th day of March 2024.
10	
11	
12	
13	/ Spring
14	
15	Derek Lopez, CSR(A), RPR
16	Official Court Reporter
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	Lingela Jorco
22	Angela Porco, CSR(A)
23	Official Court Reporter
24	
25	
26	

		110 755:2	17 603:12 604:6,	199 696:7
11	(113 734:10	15 605:2,7,15,26	1:15 690:12,14
		116 756:11	606:11,14 613:23	1:16 692:16
"policy 635:4	(1) 590:12 601:26	119 718:3 766:19	614:13 680:5,8	1st 709:7
	603:25 614:15	12 624:15 678:13	723:4	150 707.7
\$	712:15 777:2,9,	12 024.13 078.13 121 718:3,5	172nd 608:22	2
	11 778:5 807:13,	121 718.3,3 123 735:15	651:3,10 652:14,	
\$1 755:19	23 808:5,15	748:25	18,21 657:25	2 590:19 592:15
\$1,000 654:1	(2) 603:23 614:13	126 745:6	705:18 709:12 710:13 759:14	604:2 619:10
\$1,135,000 623:3	712:20 736:3 776:22,26 777:6,		173 754:13	660:23 703:14
\$1,135,200	11 800:9 807:17	128 745:6	793:12	713:23 746:17
708:24	808:6	129 767:2	177 785:10	751:7
\$1.1 709:10	(3) 712:25 777:4,	13 590:8 691:3		2(1) 782:2
\$1.75 745:26	9,13 778:9 800:6	13,000 607:19	18 625:23 656:6	2(1)(a) 721:18
\$2 752:8	(a) 595:25 604:16	139 768:6	183 744:21	2.2 607:5
\$20,000 653:16	609:4 809:7	13th 824:9	184 744:21	20 593:1 607:6
\$3,000 649:6	(b) 604:19 609:5	14 590:10 595:15	188 750:25	637:11 657:2,8
654:9	(b) 004.17 007.3	739:26	189 696:16	20(c) 677:7
\$3.2 656:3	1	14(2) 761:21	19 819:22	20-metre 626:3
\$300,000 623:4	1	140 768:18	190 698:15	635:17,24
\$35 653:26 744:2	1 619:9 696:16	14th 603:7	192 716:25	200 696:7
745:16	698:15 708:5	714:10	193 781:21	2011 636:15
\$35-a-house	744:20 746:14	15 653:16 676:7	194 704:19	678:26
745:24,26	750:13,25 751:13	720:8 721:1	1958 590:6	2012-233 800:16
\$482,000 623:25	752:16 753:7	749:11 769:18	591:16 602:3,5	2012-333 604:12
\$50 746:1	754:13 766:18	799:8 818:14,20	603:3 679:15	605:22 606:10
\$500,000 658:21	767:1,16,25	819:8	685:1	729:26 810:20
,	768:5,17 769:15 770:9 776:14,24	15-minute 732:5	196 715:13	2013 707:12
\$559,000 601:8 623:7		151 770:10	1960 677:10	2014 623:1,8,14
\$560,000 623:11,	1.1 623:9,18 1.2 607:5	156 741:25	1960s 642:24	637:7 697:2
19		157 742:24	766:25 768:25	2015 707:23
\$60,000 600:9,18	1.3 633:23	767:26	815:21	708:8
\$670 648:24	10 590:7 654:1	158 742:25	1968 611:5	2018 709:1
744:6	657:7 813:14	781:17	1970 611:5 643:8	751:23
\$800,000 653:25	100 648:21 649:1	16 607:11 625:19	816:24 817:3	2019 599:13
. ,	652:6 654:4 665:12 735:14	675:26 766:10	1970s 642:24	600:8 617:13
\$858,000 622:17, 26 623:17	772:5	167th 599:6,16	1971 806:3	622:14 623:6,10,
	106 752:17	600:5,26 601:21	1975 677:15	14 709:7 718:3
\$974,000 623:24 709:16	100 732.17 10:15 639:24	622:14,18,20,24	1980 630:24	752:4
107.10		651:8 652:20 658:1 696:1	1980s 779:8	2020 594:16
	11 599:13 600:7 611:17 622:14	698:19 705:15	1982 644:2	607:10
	813:12	709:11 806:1	1985 633:16	2021 709:14
	013.12	812:13	1705 055.10	752:4

2022 594:17,18, 19 595:15,18 596:12,14 597:1 610:9 697:25 714:4,7,10 726:9 771:18 2023 642:9 685:15 703:9 818:12,14,20 819:8 2024 691:3 824:9 2035 607:17 2044 607:5,10 205 734:26 206 734:2 21 615:7 653:5 737:20 210 734:2,26 755:6 212 680:13 723:3 216 713:24 218 638:18 219 754:21 22 614:6 714:4 735:7 223 629:20 22nd 707:12 23 785:13 232 651:13 233 625:23	28(2) 598:1 735:18 736:10, 14,23 280 592:21 282 790:12 28th 707:23 29 605:22 636:15 800:19 29,500 607:20 2:25 732:6 3 3 595:16 613:1 637:7 666:23 696:6 704:19 713:23 714:14 715:13 716:25 720:25 734:2,7, 10,25 735:7,15 737:19 738:10,16 740:4 741:24 742:23 743:20 745:5 748:25 754:21 755:1,5 756:11 757:15 759:11,20 806:5 3,000 607:10 3,500 734:9 3.1 631:3 3.2 634:24	609:26 610:3 619:1 630:12,20 637:6 638:9 653:1 654:11 666:18 667:25 668:3,16 676:13 679:9,14 680:24 684:4,21,22,26 687:9 689:3,6,11, 18 693:25 701:26 711:7 712:10,12 713:3 714:8,22 716:26 717:19,26 718:20,26 720:3 722:18 723:3 726:22 727:8,13 736:18 762:10 771:17 773:18 775:23,24 776:9, 13,22 777:4,15, 17,18 778:19,23, 26 779:23 780:8, 14,23 784:22 793:18,22 794:14,20,21 796:21 799:23 800:1,7,24 807:11 33(1) 594:24 595:21,24,25 596:4 603:22 717:7 719:14,25 727:11 777:3	35 617:4 751:13 753:7 351 599:18 357 600:16 358 600:24 359 601:2 36 759:11,20 360 620:20,21 673:23 362 673:23 366 601:10 37 626:18 381 619:24 39 681:19 734:7 757:16 39(1) 614:19 399 705:22 4 4 612:18 635:13 721:22 768:13 782:9 4(a) 666:17 4.01 592:16 805:19,25 4.1 631:15 40 633:22 640:8 416 592:24	488 645:15 489 645:15 493 647:16 496 647:2 5 5 611:11 712:2,5 744:16 745:17,25 746:3 805:26 806:7 814:3 5.01 592:12 617:4 707:16,21 708:5, 17,25 752:3 50 643:3,4,20,25 644:4 706:3 744:24 753:14 769:6 816:18 50-50 591:22 649:15,23 696:18 711:20,26 806:16,18,19,26 808:1,13 50-year 816:20 51 592:16 52nd 636:18 539 796:2 542 791:6 543 791:6 545 783:3
	•	33(1) 594:24	805:19,25	539 796:2
23 785:13	3,500 734:9			
232 651:13	3.1 631:3			
233 625:23	3.2 634:24	727:11 777:3	42 712:8 726:9	546 783:3
237 625:20 628:5	3.3.4 708:8	781:9 797:22	43 723:10	56 676:7 766:19
790:26	30 633:22	807:11 809:2,6,7	45 644:5 653:23	57 766:19
24 593:7 604:13	31 666:6 729:24	33(2) 717:1 719:23 720:2	813:17	573 624:22
751:7 800:18	740:5	777:3	459 611:11	576 783:3
24.01 711:16	319 741:14	33(3) 778:17	460 612:18	577 783:3
25 617:13 746:18	32 656:4 743:21 746:14 750:14	34 590:11,19	461 612:26	58 592:18
27 604:25 713:24 276 666:1	320 744:4	591:11 603:6	476 644:23	581 672:5
	33 590:25 591:3,	630:13,19 633:18	477 644:23	372.5
28 681:5,9,22 682:15 683:11,16	12 596:20 601:26	634:12 678:24	48 641:25	6
713:24 736:3	602:1,2,3,13,15,	34(2) 660:19	486 646:9	
817:23 818:3,7,	22,25 603:1,11	344 598:20	487 646:15	6.01 592:20,24
	604:3 606:11,15			595:16 705:22

714:14 741:14	754 708:6	ABAER 637:7	accommodate	achieving 701:13
744:3	77 818:16,17	abandoned	591:25 606:7	acknowledge
60 644:4	79.02 593:5 603:6	711:20 806:15,18	609:9 631:21	647:10 649:15
61 767:17	604:5 749:11	ABERCB 636:15	633:5,9 635:2	acknowledged
619 702:3,5	7th 709:14	abide 682:8	636:17,22 637:2	595:4 644:24
804:18,22,23	, 0, 11	ability 642:7	638:25 661:9	645:3,6 677:7
805:7	8	665:13 668:10	665:10 674:18	685:13 698:21
62 738:10 769:16	o	679:1 730:10	681:12 713:15 786:8 793:24	729:21 752:10
781:17	8 611:11 766:10	744:24 745:4	794:17 797:20	759:26 793:12
620 702:3,11	785:13	824:7	799:3	804:5 806:13
63 738:16	80-10 630:23	ably 680:4	accommodated	acknowledges
64.01 592:26	800416 668:7	ABQB 678:26	641:11 707:15	667:4 711:14
729:23	814 708:6	absence 637:21	742:6 793:4	acquire 678:1
64.05 806:5	83 677:16	683:20,23	accommodation	750:23
65 591:10 607:10	85-22 633:16	absolute 676:24	606:23 727:21	acquired 628:20
718:3 778:25	634:18	679:4 794:12	accomplished	739:10,13,19,25
780:10	85.01 623:23	absolutely 699:6,	662:4	740:8 752:1 767:15 768:8
65-plus 794:22	709:18 752:9	9 715:11 765:11	accord 676:26	785:3 786:6
66 787:24	86.01 599:5	absolves 643:21	746:8	787:14,23
66.01 593:3	622:15 696:3	absorb 685:11	accordance	acquires 786:26
663 707:16	709:13 752:9	744:16 814:3	679:6 681:8	acquiring 624:14
66th 672:4	760:14	absurd 767:21	712:8 761:21	671:3 787:16
00th 0/2.4	87 646:9	788:3	774:7	acquisition
	87.01 709:13	absurdity 684:24	accords 716:4	626:13 738:25
7	752:9 760:14	abundantly	771:25	739:1,11 749:14
7 632:5 703:14	88.01 600:6	695:10 733:3	account 649:8	750:1 766:14,25
707:21		accept 721:13	671:4 743:7	acreage 739:10
70,000 607:10	9	763:16 787:11	accountability	acres 637:11
709 707:16		804:10,12	682:10	750:18
71.01 711:9	9 626:2	acceptable	accountable	acrimonious
71.03 739:26	90 624:14,17	799:9,10 820:14,	775:5	665:16
7 1.03 739.20 766:10	629:9	15	accounted	act 590:11,26
71.04 768:12	90-day 628:9	accepted 602:24	700:21	594:25 595:21
72.01 677:8	95.01 642:9	653:13 675:8	accuracy 756:20	603:4,9,10,13,22
777:19 785:14	96.01 642:10	701:6 706:14	accurate 669:15	604:3,7 606:12,
728 707:21	995 708:17	Accepting	824:4	15 610:1 613:24,
73 652:14	996 708:25 752:3	680:15	accurately	26 614:14,20 619:2 630:13,20
	9:01 589:1	accepts 635:20	660:12 755:20	633:19 634:12
732 707:21	303.1	799:23	accusation	638:9 646:13
734 708:6	A	access 626:2 670:9,26 687:20,	736:22	653:1 666:17,18,
738 678:26	A	24,26 688:7	achieve 608:1,8 625:3	24 667:25 675:26
746 708:6	Abadata 671:19	700:17	achieved 743:3	676:7,14 678:14,
75.01 742:23	791:5		acineveu /45.5	18 679:9,14,18,
	I	I	<u> </u>	I

19 680:9.14.24 681:17,19 682:1, 12 683:14 684:26 685:5,6 687:10. 14 689:18 693:26 701:26 702:4,5 712:11 717:26 720:3 721:22 722:13,14 723:3, 4,19 726:10,22 727:8 736:4,18, 19 762:11 771:17 773:19 775:23,24 776:2,9 777:16 778:19,24 779:23 780:9 781:10 782:9 784:23 793:19,22 794:14.20 796:21 797:23 799:23 804:21,22 809:3 acted 800:4 acting 662:11 799:26 action 705:4 actionable 628:3 **active** 670:20 672:17,18 731:21 **actively** 654:20 703:16 activities 617:14 649:24 662:9 667:1,9 678:8,12 683:15 687:6 758:8 760:4 771:3 772:6 782:7 activity 721:3 actors 704:14 acts 776:17 **actual** 623:25 685:16 736:13 798:1 add 653:25 654:24

added 674:9 743:19 addition 666:22 720:3,9,21 735:16 760:16 770:14 787:16 additional 655:21 677:2 687:16,17 694:17 709:16 744:2 782:20 787:19 821:10 **Additionally** 666:19 address 597:16 609:3 648:16 651:1 657:19 659:7 681:4 694:11 720:4 738:19 762:15,17 763:13 778:1.9 784:24 792:13,22 803:22 813:5 815:2 817:8 820:19 addressed 645:22 729:3 753:21 811:6 addressing

645:22 729:3 753:21 811:6 addressing 640:18 797:25 799:16 adds 725:15 adduced 593:11

adequately 785:2 796:12 **adhere** 733:4

656:8

ADJOURNED 690:14

ADJOURNME NT 657:11 732:7 773:4 822:18 **adjudicate** 785:23,26

adjudicated 798:1 adjudication 776:8 adjusting 743:7 administered

680:4 **administrative** 718:7 **admission**

804:17 **admitted** 792:7 **admittedly** 642:26 751:17

adopt 718:12adopting 787:25adopts 693:4advance 674:19

advanced 676:22 693:4,8 694:26 728:19 742:19

752:15 812:8

advancement 686:22

805:10

advancing 783:17

advantage 704:2 advantageous 630:4

749:20 **adverse** 816:21, 23 817:1.2

advantages

adversely 615:26 631:5

advise 659:25 818:21

advised 660:1,2 **advocacy** 703:5, 12.25

advocated 762:7

advocates 661:26 advocating 688:9 **AE** 602:14 **AER** 589:7.8.24 590:1 591:13 594:18 595:14.19 596:10,19,24 597:1,11 602:7, 14,21 615:25 618:2 637:17,20 638:7,14 641:6,9 644:26 645:5 647:7 649:9 654:14 662:4,18, 22 663:10,12,24 666:10,19,22 667:15,24 668:14,21 669:6, 7 670:14 678:15 680:25 684:16 685:7,17 686:8, 10 687:1,3,6,13, 17 689:19.22 691:9,10,11,12 692:25,26 697:24 699:7,9,23 701:25 702:2,6,8, 9,12,22 704:5 712:15,17,20,22 713:1,4,8 714:1,9 715:19 716:11 717:1 719:16,21 720:9,14 721:1, 23 722:8.18 723:16 725:20 726:5 730:2.16 731:17 744:23

753:22 761:21

764:25 766:13

769:9 771:26

773:24 775:24

776:8,13,20,22,

25 777:1,3,7,8,

779:2,11,23

11,15 778:4,6,14

781:22,24 783:4,

17 785:1.4.8.11. 15 793:14 795:8 796:7,20 800:11 804:25 805:21 807:23 808:1,22 809:1 818:15 **AER's** 596:8 666:7,14 680:21 693:23 712:8,26 713:2 714:4,7 721:17 727:7 769:14 771:18 772:12 773:19 779:18 780:11 781:8 782:1 784:18,21 785:23,26 786:18 794:4 798:12 AER-REGULATED

REGULATEI616:7 785:24 **affairs** 765:2 **affect** 631:5
639:16 646:25

639:16 646:25 654:26 655:25 782:12 784:15 795:16

affected 720:20 795:11 **affection** 787:20

affirm 677:10 **afford** 642:12 730:18

affordability 648:18 654:26 813:6

affordable

645:24 649:25 654:12 806:24 814:17

afternoon 691:3 692:23 693:7,11, 16 731:24 732:12,15 772:20 778:1 798:18

(20.26	(0.6.0.705.01	05 670 12 17 10	007.26.000.2.11	770 16 771 21 24
age 628:26	696:2 705:21	25 679:13,17,18	807:26 808:2,11,	770:16 771:21,24 772:2 780:3
670:11 671:25 688:2 791:2	706:6 709:15,19	684:2 685:23	13	
	726:12,21 739:6 740:4 759:16	686:24 691:1,19, 21 694:2 699:25	allowance 611:6	807:14,21,24
agencies 704:4	775:17 797:20	700:7 703:15,22	612:2,25 613:18	808:7 809:10,16, 19 810:7,9
agency 702:12		704:22 711:7	706:22 707:1,2,5	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
716:20	802:3 812:12,18	704:22 711:7	728:11 803:7	alterations
agency's 716:21	agreements	727:6 731:16,21	805:11 819:5	591:19 594:23
agenda 659:15,	602:11,20 610:24	733:17 753:21	allowances	595:5 597:9
17 773:7	613:15 622:12,13	755:21 762:23,25	791:24	616:2 635:5,18
agent 609:13,16	629:13 665:3,21,	772:9 781:16,23	allowed 819:17	674:2 716:14
aggregate 753:15	22 666:4 669:13	782:6,14,19	alluded 669:23	722:4 744:17 751:12 775:3
	673:19 709:9,12, 20 710:2,6,23	783:15 786:16,22	753:25 754:16	776:16
aging 674:4 675:6	711:1 724:12	787:10 789:10	756:15	
	738:12,13 752:7,	794:4 800:15	alter 590:15	altered 606:6
agree 599:19	11 753:26 754:3	801:14 816:21	591:9 595:26	636:25 658:4
611:18 612:19	759:2,6 760:13	824:8	603:17 604:8,17	662:7 810:26
613:12 619:26 650:7 660:15	790:9 792:5,25	Alberta's 615:16	605:1 679:23	altering 722:25
727:16 776:6,15	812:1,2,7,12,15	667:10 668:25	712:17 713:9,15	790:18
794:13 800:5	agrees 617:23	676:7	717:16 722:24	altogether
810:9	635:15 695:20	Albertans	755:10 775:25	655:24
agreed 597:23	788:9	662:21 667:18	809:8	altruistic 748:4
599:12,14 600:8	agricultural	aligned 768:21	alteration	ambit 720:2
607:25 633:8	639:18	alignments	590:17,20 591:17	amend 809:22
634:5 636:2	AGTL 631:17,18	750:20	596:3 599:22	amended 591:21
652:7 683:2	632:11,13 633:3,		601:14 603:19	592:12 594:16,17
710:8 724:13	8	aligns 667:17	604:21,22,24	601:6 695:9,11
728:5,8 738:13	AGTL's 632:15	696:25 697:5,20, 24	605:6,8 619:4	696:20 702:9
779:10 788:19			636:5 638:25	711:21 715:23
805:18	ahead 612:26	all-weather	651:16 652:11	723:6 738:20
agreeing 710:20	663:4 701:1	806:9	656:9,12 670:7	744:22 772:13
730:20	732:10 820:17	allayed 674:14	680:26 681:3 683:25 694:3	809:24 810:2,7
agreement	aim 624:24 625:3	alleged 743:10,	695:6,25 699:1,	822:26
597:19 599:6,12,	aimed 606:15	12,24 755:9	19 701:3 707:10	amending
26 600:7,10,21	air 685:19	757:18 805:12	709:11,17,22	726:14
601:4,5,24	aisle 822:10	815:13	712:21,24 713:5,	amendment
604:24 612:6,9,	akin 765:1	allegedly 763:17	20 714:12 716:8	810:10
15 613:6,17,21,	albeit 718:13	alleging 812:14	717:3,5,11,21	amendments
26 614:8 615:3,4	Alberta 590:9	allocate 619:3	719:16 721:12	685:5
616:11 622:15,16	602:6 603:14	680:12 699:9	722:17 725:9,18	amenities 751:4
623:24 625:19,25	604:5 617:19	701:25 778:16	727:2,16 733:15,	America 638:21
626:5 634:7	631:16 639:17	allocated 690:6	16 737:2,9,11	669:25
636:19 644:12	655:4 659:22	allocates 807:26	743:25 747:14	amount 614:4
651:19 652:8	660:20 666:10,13	allocating 808:10	752:6,8,14,22	643:2 658:19
658:3 665:11,24	670:22 675:9	allocation 687:11	754:3,24 755:12	712:26 724:14
676:26 683:20	676:6 678:6,14,	713:10 748:8	756:19 760:9	734:5 740:16
689:21 695:26		/13.10 / 70.0		

748:23,24 777:5 778:12
amounts 711:4
739:21 744:8 766:1 768:24
769:4
ample 684:19
analogous 724:5
analogy 606:14
analysis 605:21
646:26 649:16,
17,20 713:11
715:12 717:8,10 739:3 807:13,17
808:5,24
analyzing 650:24
and/or 797:2
Anderson 629:15
638:17 669:18
703:8 750:26
Anderson's
628:14
anecdotal 755:8 760:21,24
anecdotally 672:1 688:5
Angela 824:3,22
Anglo-canadian 677:17
Annapolis 610:8, 17
annexation 631:6
annexed 644:1
annual 642:10
685:14 686:4 745:8
annually 796:18
answers 767:24
Anthony 604:11
anticipated 607:16 644:4
anticipating
766:6

anyone's 812:14 **APEGA** 757:26 apologies 772:21 apologize 688:21 **apparent** 720:18 760:13 apparently 756:12 **appeal** 611:22 654:15 appealing 786:17 appeared 764:20 **appears** 689:13 711:20 718:14 740:11 762:21 781:9 **Appelt** 691:16 applicable 679:13 694:1 710:19,26 737:12 754:11 applicant 608:15,18 applicants 637:9 application 591:2,6,9,16,21 592:7,13,14 593:25 594:15, 16,17 595:3,4,20 596:22 601:7 602:13 604:7,26 605:3,7 607:1 616:9 617:1,2,4 618:1 630:24 632:22 633:17 634:11.22 636:10 637:6,15 638:8 649:13,14,22 651:7,24 652:14, 17,26 654:14 657:24 661:1,16 663:13 666:16 668:4,7,8,13,16, 23 669:9.11 675:20 689:2

693:21 695:9,12, 13 696:20,21 697:26 699:5.14 701:1.11 702:26 703:2,18 705:2, 10 710:4 711:22 713:7 715:24 723:7 725:7 726:14,16 730:6 731:23 738:20 744:22 772:14 773:23 776:10 778:22 780:20,26 781:2 782:11,12, 17 783:20 784:9 791:24 795:2.7 798:15 809:1,14, 16,23,24 810:1,2, 8 812:24 822:26 applications 591:11 630:19 654:11 655:14 660:22 668:3 684:12,17 786:1 **applied** 697:18 706:16 723:5 766:8 813:16 applied-for 744:15 748:12 applies 682:4 715:18 731:19,21 780:5 792:23 811:8,23 **apply** 596:3 638:23 639:12 660:23 682:2 699:18 779:23 789:9 801:24 811:21 819:6 820:2 **applying** 718:10 appraisal 746:9 **approach** 617:19 650:24 694:12 733:1 749:24 756:8 760:18

785:8 792:23 796:6 802:5 approached 620:2 623:2 approaching 717:26 appropriately 701:15 730:15 approval 606:1 611:20,24 614:23 617:12 618:11 716:3 743:17 770:1 782:11,17 783:19 802:9 804:25 805:6 approvals 700:15 746:16,22 **approved** 604:17 605:1,12 607:12 637:20 707:12,23 709:2 715:5,25 approximately 607:16.20 708:24 709:10 712:2 **April** 594:18 595:18 597:1 600:7 617:13 697:24 707:23 709:7 714:4,7 726:9 752:4 771:18 **ARA** 608:16 616:26 617:18 653:1,3,6,9 698:6,20 699:12 701:12,18,21,23 702:10,16 703:4 709:26 710:17 712:3 743:16 744:13 814:5,11 arbitrary 756:2 806:20 arc 815:26 **area** 606:4 607:8. 12,13,22 637:19,

23 638:21 644:1. 3 650:9 653:16, 21 654:3,16,20 664:3 669:3,24, 25,26 700:18 707:11,14,20,25 712:5 715:26 740:3,21,24,26 741:2,16 742:21 743:6,13 744:3, 14,19 745:19 750:9 751:20 768:7,11 775:11 791:8 areas 628:19 639:1 641:20 650:26 668:25 672:20 731:19 811:14,16,22,23 813:10 814:16 arguably 810:2 **argue** 594:24 596:17 606:14 727:3 796:14 810:23 **argued** 637:10 745:12 783:26 800:7 822:5 **argues** 787:15 **arguing** 790:14 803:8 808:18.20 810:15 argument 589:20 590:5 592:3,5 594:20 595:12 609:3 611:1 613:13,14 616:8 656:15 657:16 659:21,23 660:15 663:10 671:6 683:22 685:20 692:20 693:6 728:17 773:13 775:23 777:23 781:7 785:17 794:25 798:17

	1		l	1
801:23 805:9	articulate 689:10	asymmetry	automatically	738:12 759:2
814:2 817:6,7,11,	articulated	670:8,26 687:20,	715:5 742:5	bad-faith 672:10
15,16,19,21	696:17 770:14	25	763:20	Baker 692:12
821:19	articulating	attached 617:3	availability	balance 771:5
arguments 626:9	615:11	attempt 595:3	662:5	Balfour 594:6
631:13 632:1	asks 649:14	695:8 702:2,20	Avenue 599:16	600:16 601:3
685:7 688:26	ASP 608:1	771:8 786:15	600:5,26 608:22	623:25 673:18
766:18 777:16,	637:19 707:12,17	attempted	622:14,18,20,24	696:4 709:6
21,22,25 785:18	716:3 805:6	674:20	651:3,8,10	724:24 733:23
796:13 822:25	aspect 705:7	attempting	652:14,18,20,21	734:4 737:24
arise 615:2	aspects 784:20	618:8	657:25 658:1	738:11 745:1
632:22 636:1	assert 618:8	attend 725:1	696:1 698:19	754:26 756:6,20,
668:24 772:5		attendance	705:15,18 709:12	26
789:4	assertions	660:1	710:13 759:14	Balfour's 600:23
arises 605:26	618:21 697:13	attention 822:21	806:1 812:13	756:10
615:3 687:11	765:19	attitude 673:13	Avenue/	bargain 679:21
712:25 777:5	assess 665:14		meridian 599:6	bargaining
arising 732:23	670:23	AUC 605:22	average 653:25	665:4 672:9
763:4	assessed 718:24	606:10 678:15	avoid 629:21	barn 809:20
Armstrong	assessing 667:16	680:4 704:5	661:25 672:22	
626:17 696:10,22	assessment	722:17 729:26	686:18	based 629:6
750:8,16 751:11	598:22 600:11,	730:6 779:14,21 810:21	avoided 783:12	643:18 645:18 649:23 662:1
753:1 754:5	15,22 608:17		awarded 643:2	664:25 666:26
781:18 804:9	620:25 621:26	AUC's 779:17,19	aware 602:6	685:14 686:19
812:6	699:5 716:6	AUC-	712:12 789:12,18	690:11 698:2,16
Armstrong's	719:22,26 725:25	REGULATED	822:3	699:10 702:3,18
627:25 696:25	726:26 727:10	779:22		704:26 708:13
697:5,20,23,26	730:13 738:2	authored 763:6,9	D	709:20 710:23
698:4	757:10,21,25	authorities	B	713:12 714:21
arose 745:5	758:7 763:10	664:12 729:22	babe 767:1	719:18 721:9,10
arrangement	assessments	authority 596:21	back 589:4	748:4 762:9
719:3,8	619:16 666:15	611:21 612:10	652:24 671:8	766:26 767:3
arrangements	671:23 737:22,24	613:22 614:24	675:12 706:17	771:12 774:6
760:19 763:2	796:5,7 818:5	646:11 666:19,23	731:14 732:5	776:13 781:4
arrive 711:23	asset 785:24	667:19 676:13	744:9 765:16	786:1 787:1
729:6 808:11	assets 735:11,13	677:3 678:15	772:24 778:6	798:1
Arruda 690:8	assign 762:19	687:14 715:5	787:2 788:4	basic 593:24
691:10	assist 663:1	722:19 726:5	800:11 806:3	594:14 712:6
arterial 591:24	assuage 674:25	727:7 785:12	812:22 815:21	773:22 781:2
606:8 608:12,13,	assume 635:18	793:21 794:19	back-invoiced	786:21,25 802:18
16 616:21 617:16	747:12	authorized 726:8	759:19	basically 590:12
618:12 646:17		authorizes	backbone 661:22	600:10 601:7
648:21,25 649:2	assuming 769:19 822:13	721:22	backstopping	608:11,17 618:18
653:12,23 707:7,		authorizing	600:7 622:13	620:14 621:23
9	assurance 759:7	797:2	623:23 724:11	623:21 626:14
			023.23 /2T.11	630:26 634:19
		icta Court Reporting I		

643:19 650:7	believed 635:11	black 595:2	636:14 640:24	Brookfield's
804:12,23 812:2	believes 631:9	695:11 803:10	651:1 693:22	662:3 665:19,20
813:7 817:19	637:24 661:17	black-lined	694:14 761:1	674:14,25 675:3
818:26	663:6,11 667:13	810:12	762:15 770:23	689:10 818:2
basin 648:22	674:1 687:25	blame 802:22	799:15,16	brought 591:2,16
712:4 783:8	785:1		bring 591:8	725:5 796:20
784:17 814:11	Bello 593:26	blanket 638:22	646:7 652:13,23,	818:16
basin-wide	641:13 666:2	731:13,18,20	26 776:7 822:21	budget 746:23
813:17	Bello's 641:18	811:7	bringing 650:19	build 602:6
basis 591:17,22		blocks 708:15	brings 618:16	608:19 616:21
595:22 596:22	beneath 790:16	board 631:2,15	626:8 639:20	661:22 664:10
637:15 638:1	benefit 589:15	632:5,7,12,15,23	823:3	698:13 774:11
648:6 649:15	609:15 674:3	634:11,24		804:14
668:3,9,10 680:7	705:7 722:7	635:13,15,20	broad 666:19,22 687:13	builder 655:6
728:22 747:22	786:10 788:13	636:6,21 678:21		
761:25 772:19	799:5	684:20 739:7	broader 661:6	building 598:4
778:8 792:8	benefitting 772:7	806:3,4 811:1	664:19 701:13	664:14 747:4
794:7 809:3,14,	bet 773:1	Board's 633:23	716:10 722:8	790:1 804:11
18	betterment	bodies 758:4	763:1,23 769:12	buildout 607:19
bear 635:15,25	675:7,13	body 763:19	broadly 667:9	built 590:8
655:10 670:25	beware 615:15	borne 665:18	722:10 724:23	657:25 774:4
681:2,13 685:12	616:5,9	682:2 702:18	737:13 789:9	792:18,20,25
703:7 704:21	Beztilny 622:1	bottom 721:7	broken 663:16	793:1 794:18
743:25 748:11	624:20 671:18	bought 787:5	699:26 707:19	burden 702:22
770:15 772:4	674:20 676:19	789:13	Brookfield	759:4
808:6	749:1 779:25		621:26 622:4	buried 774:17
bearing 701:5	782:24 783:5	Boulevard 623:21 709:18	625:11 657:4	business 620:16
bears 711:13	784:3 791:3		659:17,21,23,26	629:23 663:17
737:17	795:21 796:3	bounded 806:8	661:2,5,11,12,17,	672:22 673:20
	801:3,17	brand-new	24,26 662:8,15	677:26 685:23
began 597:25	Beztilny's	626:3	663:2,6,11,14,16,	720:23 722:5
begin 590:1,6	625:15 782:16	breach 704:11	22 664:7 665:18,	747:11,12,25
622:13 695:1	784:13	812:14	24 666:5 667:4,	753:12 771:3
behalf 589:25	BILD 655:4	breaches 704:16	12,25 669:10	businesses
623:2 688:17	703:15,22 731:16	break 639:24	670:14,23 672:3,	747:24
693:8 696:4,11	bill 590:10,11	640:2,12 656:25,	14,17 674:1 677:24 685:7	buy 715:21
703:8 732:14	677:10 733:18	26 657:2 694:19	686:12,15,18	789:14 790:5
748:26 749:1	billion-dollar	731:9 732:1,2,5	687:3,23,25	buyer 615:15
750:26 758:9	642:12	772:23,25 798:26	688:6,9,17	616:5,9 789:12
773:13 799:17		799:3,6	689:17 691:18,20	791:15 793:10
801:8	binding 706:1	breakdown	694:15 703:3	buyer-beware
behaviour	bit 589:6 597:17	710:8	722:12 723:25	727:5 789:6,11
686:11	612:26 735:19	Brezina 691:9	725:21 770:23,25	791:20,22 801:24
belief 607:23	758:12 772:21	bridging 708:15	771:6 790:11	815:11
believable	789:24	briefly 592:5	795:2 820:7	buyers 793:7
642:16	bizarre 644:19	597:16 630:22		
		371.10 030.22		

buying 789:13,	captures 753:9	13 810:17 812:10	640:10,14 650:4	characterize
22,26 793:8	card 644:8	816:17 821:25	656:18,22	627:8,12 644:18
bylaw 608:16,17	730:23	cases 638:15	657:10,12 659:4,	658:10
701:21 702:8,10	care 646:14	668:5 671:9	12,14,19 688:18,	characterized
804:26	careful 622:1	673:8 675:10	24 689:26 690:10	664:1 665:5
bylaws 702:19		676:1 682:20	691:5 692:17,24	673:13 728:26
789:17	carried 599:23	734:13 774:15	696:8,23 731:25	757:22
707.17	600:3 601:15	casing 819:16	732:4,8,12,18,26	characterizes
	609:16 721:13	cast 589:6,9	734:20 736:8	643:18
C	carries 612:2	1	738:24 740:19	characterizing
cables 791:14	carry 600:22	catchment 712:5	742:8 743:10	807:20
	619:20 640:15	730:18 743:6 744:18 745:19	744:12 745:20	
Calgary 636:15,	666:21 683:6		746:5 758:14	charge 704:7 732:16
18 691:1 824:8	725:8 772:2	categorical	769:22 770:1,2,4	
call 623:10	815:1	821:18	771:11 772:10,22	Charter 677:10
called 593:15	carrying 608:8	caucus 767:22	773:2,3,5,10	733:18
609:9 639:7	Carswell 677:14	caucusing 650:6	798:6,19,25	check 615:5
651:18 813:26	case 598:26 600:1	causation 645:19	799:4,10 801:8	639:23 640:10
calling 803:10	601:23 606:6	697:21 706:16	807:3 814:20,22,	659:5,7
calls 610:19	610:14,17	709:24	24 820:11,15,17,	Cherkawsky
Canada 610:5,7,	612:13,20 618:2,	caused 645:21,23	18 822:15,19	691:20
19,21 677:4,15	8 621:25 627:20	699:19 705:7	Chair's 803:25	Chicken 801:10
692:2,5,8 704:23	628:19 630:26	783:19	challenge 737:23	choice 652:7
718:2	631:15 632:22,26	causing 695:21	778:6 797:21	812:16,20
Canadian 603:8	633:20 635:7	699:3,21 707:9	challenged	choose 685:12
634:25 677:1	636:14,15 637:5,	709:21 778:12	783:20 801:7,9	715:20
680:11,13 722:13	14 638:3 639:13	caution 714:3	challenging	chose 593:21
733:18 810:19	642:22 644:14	cautious 796:8	628:8 746:26	702:24 795:12
cancel 655:24	648:17 653:20	caveat 789:6	801:21	chosen 752:22
cancellation	662:12 665:14		chance 799:6	chronology
666:3	666:24 668:4,19	central 768:14	change 643:6,11	676:19
cancelled 656:5	672:3 675:5,24	816:21	703:17,21 731:17	CIMA+ 623:2
665:23	678:5,16,25	CEO 669:18	759:21 787:2	697:3 700:19
Cantiro 609:7	680:6 684:19	CER 680:4 704:5	820:6	708:7 740:22
624:12 628:5	704:6,25 716:6 717:21 718:2	722:16 723:4	changed 590:26	741:17 751:21
624:12 628:5	721:6 729:21,25	certainty 669:12	605:10,25 642:22	752:2
•	730:3,13 733:26	686:13 790:21	644:15 684:6	circular 765:23
canvass 663:10	739:6 745:26	CERTIFICATE	697:14 760:23	
680:7	746:1 747:10	824:1	787:6	circumscribe 680:21
canvassed	751:10 753:13	certify 824:3	chaos 642:15	
786:23	755:12 765:11	cetera 629:2	748:24	circumstance
capably 822:5	769:14 777:10	791:3 819:7	characterization	711:23 761:11
capacity 755:24	779:10 789:4	chain 782:20,25	736:21	764:10 776:10
capital 645:13	793:14 794:15	783:2,6 784:15	characterization	circumstances
722:10 765:26	800:4 801:1	chair 589:2,23	s 781:12	605:10,25 639:3
	804:8,25 805:6,	639:22,26		643:7,11 644:14
		, -		
	I	I	I	I

			l	-
651:15 656:13	791:23	client 658:2	commenting	commonly
685:3 699:2,20	claims 760:21	799:7 820:13	770:23	735:10
701:9 704:24	790:25	clients 589:25	comments	commonplace
716:15 720:11	clarification	647:7 689:13	694:17 714:9	684:9
722:20 724:5	656:19	785:16 804:5	723:23 726:25	communities
726:3,24 729:20	clarified 733:6	climate 655:16	728:8 745:7	655:9 664:11
751:15 754:1,4,	791:5	cloak 672:25	749:24 750:16	741:7
16 760:25 774:6 775:2 778:21	clarify 809:11	clock 690:11	758:13 760:25	community
781:1 787:1	clarity 627:9	clocks 657:7	765:6 767:19	627:3 650:14
796:11	669:12 688:6	close 628:11	commercial	661:23 774:11
	693:3	729:10 823:4	661:19 714:3	companies
circumvent	class 671:17		785:24	591:20 619:20
702:21		closes 789:23 793:10	commercially	624:11,17 642:15
citation 678:25	classification	.,,,,,,	658:16	645:12 650:21,25
cite 718:2	629:1 631:10	closing 656:15	Commission	661:14 663:1,4,8,
cited 676:4 779:7,	791:3	688:25 693:12	603:14,15,24	20 664:2,18,22
16	clause 719:12	694:18 731:24	604:5,14,15,25,	665:6,17,21
cities 667:11	clear 597:18	732:14 740:11	26 605:4,13	670:3,16 671:24
686:24	601:21 602:17,23	772:10 790:4	639:21 642:18	672:25 673:7,15
city 591:26	614:26 624:9	closure 614:5	800:15 801:14	674:4,5 675:1,6
604:10 607:8,23	625:6 626:16,17	codes 737:12	Commission's	676:4,23 677:26
608:6,9,12,14	630:18 633:12	codified 676:6	603:19	679:17 680:16,
609:10,15 611:3,	637:18,21 638:5	coexist 661:18	Commissioner	17,20,25 681:11,
5 614:1,3,9 615:4	639:10 640:19 642:9,25 661:24	cogent 738:21	615:8 688:20,21	13 682:2,3,5,6,7,
616:22,25 617:1,	667:1 670:13	coincidentally	691:6,7	9,13 683:15,18
3,7,8,17,23,26	676:3 678:14	647:6	Commissioners	684:21 685:3,10,
618:3,6,15	682:10 685:26	collaboratively	589:24 591:5	11,15,17,22,25
636:15 637:3	686:18,26 693:20	664:19	594:11 624:8	686:7,14 693:9, 10,20 694:7,25
643:9 644:2	694:24 695:10,16		642:7 651:15	695:18 697:22
645:25 646:4,17,	696:11 699:15,17	collective 661:22 704:14	656:17 773:11	698:25 706:7,19
21,22 649:3	702:21 711:2,17		791:11 798:7	711:16 713:17
664:6 699:12	713:21 723:19	collector 626:1	813:15 822:9	714:6 717:18
701:12,17,19,22	724:13 725:6	combined 813:13	commitment	721:15 722:3
702:15,20,24	727:13,22 733:3	commenced	660:8 689:14	723:12 724:8,21
709:26 710:17 715:25 764:14,15	736:25 737:10	589:1 692:16	committed 759:8	728:20 729:3,14
715:25 764:14,15 789:17 802:6,9,	739:4 743:15	809:26	committee	733:3,22 735:17,
10 813:1 814:17	751:16 753:15	commencing	616:26 617:18	22 736:10,16
824:8	779:17,24 780:19	592:4	653:2,4,6,9,12,15	737:14 738:18,26
City's 608:2,16	784:13 785:6	comment 731:8	654:13 698:6,20	740:21 743:12
613:3 639:7	790:11 794:10,14	756:10 757:19	699:13 701:13,	744:23,26 745:13
702:18 716:4	800:3 801:16,21	764:21	18,23 702:16	747:7,21 748:7,
	806:16 808:16	commentary	703:4 710:1,17	11,13 749:7,12
civil 807:4	811:11	628:14	common 612:14	755:14 756:17,22
claim 791:7	clearer 647:3	commented	670:4 673:19	759:1 760:18
claimed 619:12	810:8	763:11	741:8	761:23 762:18,26
645:8,11 778:13				767:10 768:19
		iata Count Danoutina I		

770:11 771:4	comparison	complies 789:17	823:6	confirmed
772:1,11 774:4	768:24	comply 598:14	concludes 656:15	600:25 601:4
778:21 781:1	compelling	658:6 683:4,18	731:24 798:17	610:7 623:25
786:4,7,10,12,15	596:7 667:4	736:12		624:19 648:20
787:17 788:18	779:24		conclusion	659:10 695:18,23
789:26 790:13		complying	635:13 648:9	700:20 708:21
792:26 795:22	compensate	681:14 736:6	650:3 652:23	713:16 716:2
796:15,18,24	785:2	775:5	663:12 711:24	724:25 734:8
797:5	compensation	component	771:11 798:6	737:25 742:4,12
companies'	590:22,24 603:26	713:3 716:26	conclusions	745:2 746:9
664:26 665:8	604:1 643:2,4	components	662:16 732:23	761:19 766:23
675:17 676:9,17	739:1,9,14	712:13	758:9	768:15
710:24 711:8	767:13 768:26	comprehend	concrete 599:10	confirming
713:25 718:19	784:24,25 786:26	644:18	698:9	662:5 715:10
724:17 725:8	competitive	comprised	condition 629:1	768:3
730:9,25 731:2	739:22	701:18	682:14 700:14	
730.9,23 731.2	competitors		702:11,13 789:20	confirms 617:17,
25 734:11,14,24	663:17	compromise 785:25	conditions	26 674:16 695:12
735:24 748:10	complaints		590:14 603:15	739:18 741:4
750:6 752:18	735:25	concept 679:26	650:5 712:16	confiscation
754:22 755:19	complete 607:16	693:22 700:19	772:12 796:1	610:13
760:1,22 766:11	619:8 626:1	707:16 708:7,9,	803:25 807:4	conflate 717:10
·	670:18 695:19	11,19 716:10	conduct 600:14	conflates 716:22
company 600:12	713:22 760:8	740:23 741:17	671:2 751:10	765:23
621:15,21 632:16	766:12 824:4	751:21 753:9	763:1 775:11,15	conflating
650:11 656:1		773:21	790:4	807:16
679:23 681:21,23	completed	conception 647:5		conflict 605:26
683:26 700:4	651:17,20 674:17	concepts 719:9	conducted	606:2 668:24
709:8 727:15	689:23 705:19	733:19	660:25 721:9	687:1 702:8
734:17 739:12 761:12 774:21	completely	conceptual	725:13 751:17	804:24 805:2,5
	634:13 638:3	708:13	779:6	811:18,24,25
775:2,5,17 776:5	649:9 664:22	conceptually	conducting	
778:5,7,10	728:16 749:5	650:24	688:14 720:12	conflicts 594:10
779:26 785:2	768:23 770:16		757:24 796:6	605:20 686:25
788:9,26 789:1	771:6 791:26	concern 654:19 657:26	conducts 751:9	702:14 800:26
790:8 796:10,26	804:7,8 805:7		confidence 741:2	811:14
797:11,19 816:15	810:21	concerned	confident 822:4	conform 635:8
821:8	completing	614:24 629:16	confidential	702:9
company's	709:2	637:8 660:6	621:4 673:18	confused 716:19
675:13 735:4	complex 625:3,	797:18	738:6	confusion 764:6,
775:16	12,13 630:9	concerns 657:15		20,22
compare 820:4	729:7 754:25	674:15,25 675:4	confirm 687:9	conjunction
compared	755:5 796:4	685:26	698:24 712:7	681:18
818:24	compliance	conclude 601:12	726:8 772:12	connected 630:7
comparing	658:8 737:12,18	concluded	789:15,17	769:5
765:26	complicated	605:22 668:14	confirmation	
	758:7	684:17 704:18	614:17	connection
	130.1			751:26

consent 614:7	762:12	contents 694:23	contributions	622:10,16,26
615:4 681:21	constrained	contest 616:17	675:8	623:5,6,25,26
707:4 775:12,16,	630:5 641:21	contested 718:8	control 749:6,21	624:4 627:6
18	constraints	context 642:22	convened 763:1	628:4 629:13
consents 792:17	627:7 642:3,4	655:9 663:23	conversations	630:16 634:8
consequence	construct 602:11	664:3 677:3	594:2	635:16,18,21,22,
756:4	609:8 618:12	679:12 681:7,16		25 636:2,6,20
consequences	668:10 727:25	684:5 706:17	conversion 606:7	637:8 638:9,15
749:8,13	785:4	718:9,21 720:17	cooperate 632:17	639:3,14 642:14
*		722:11 739:8	cooperation	644:20 645:11,19
conservative	constructed	741:15 762:12	734:16	646:2 649:5,14,
654:7	611:19 612:22 614:22 642:23	774:13 762:12	coordination	17,18 651:8,9
consideration	646:18 651:4	792:11 800:21	618:5 734:16	652:11,17,19
649:8 713:10	747:5 768:12	817:5	Copies 709:12	653:11 654:25
721:8 730:12	792:13	contiguously	copy 705:21	656:12 657:22
740:9 750:6		629:26	709:19 823:3	658:5,18,23
753:22	constructing		Corp 692:11,12	664:9 665:12
considerations	617:21 700:13	continue 598:14		670:9,24 671:4
648:17 668:23	774:15 819:4	639:26 687:2	corporation	673:5 674:9
714:12 738:25	construction	694:25 710:19	692:1,4,7 803:16	680:18 683:25
740:18 748:9	591:24 598:3	767:7 788:11,20	corporations	685:20 686:13
749:18 762:17	599:10 617:15	808:19,20	642:12 730:11	689:22,23
803:4	626:1 655:15,17	continued	correct 599:25	695:15,21,26
considered 604:6	662:13 671:17	591:23 596:17	606:22 611:16	696:2 697:20
632:24 667:24	678:9,10 679:20	639:9 649:24	620:13 633:6	698:13 700:24 705:20 706:15
668:7 720:22	680:15 682:18	728:18 737:18	641:16 644:7	708:23 709:9,22,
726:26 733:12	683:16 719:2	continues 705:16	647:19 656:21	24 710:21 712:23
considers 603:16	739:24 742:20 747:1 754:12	741:8	717:19 747:16	713:6,10 714:19
712:16	819:12	contract 706:1	804:6 806:17	715:24 717:12,13
consistent		767:5 812:14	817:22	719:22 722:25
625:16 628:25	constructive	contracts 685:11	correctly 606:12	729:2,6,7 735:3
663:18 684:1	610:15,19	730:20 745:3	643:17 681:24,25	736:5 743:7,8,14,
709:4,23 714:9	consultants	752:25	779:15	25 744:2,19
718:9,21 726:25	627:14	contrary 636:3	correspondence	745:13 747:13
734:3 754:22	consultation	697:13 710:16	761:16	751:11,26 754:3,
771:8 772:8	820:13	723:17 728:4	corridor 604:11	11 755:8,10
consistently	consumers 655:8	765:10 780:17	768:2,5,17	756:19,21 759:6,
697:18 735:17	contained 590:11	783:13,16 784:22	corridors 670:22	15 765:26 771:22
737:1 746:7	592:23 620:26	790:25 794:4	766:7 768:7,9,10,	772:4 776:23
constantly	751:24	815:12	15	778:6,8,10,20
767:19	contemplated	contrast 593:20	cost 591:10,12,	779:9,21 780:22,
constitute 610:14	605:25 640:1	594:5 644:17	19,22 595:6	26 781:16
constituted	680:3	749:2	597:11 599:5	787:16,22 788:8
596:6	contended 631:4	contribute	601:8 602:16	790:17,24 797:6
constitutes 596:4	content 707:19	642:13 656:11	615:14 617:23	801:18 802:20
702:1 714:24	Content /0/.19	667:2 744:19	619:11 621:23	806:16,18 813:19
/02.1 /17.27				
1				

cost-based	695:24 699:1,3,9,	countless 675:21	critically 765:20	616:18,19,20,23
704:11 733:5	12,21 701:3,5,8,		1	618:15 619:21,22
	20,25 702:17,23	country 608:11	criticism 645:3 764:2 765:15	620:24 622:14,
cost-recovery 622:12,15 759:2	703:6 705:6,7,8	County 611:3		16,17,19 623:7,
· ·	706:12 707:10	613:7,10,11	criticisms 763:13	20 625:1,22,25
cost-sharing	709:11 710:8,26	707:4	817:8	626:5,26 627:4,
604:24 642:8	712:3 714:13	County's 613:2	criticized 643:24	11,16,23 628:23,
669:14 686:2,16	726:18 728:24,25	728:10	644:25 808:17	24 629:13,22
687:4 693:21	729:12 730:21	couple 631:1	cross 612:8 614:9	630:9 642:13
695:9,11,13	731:6 733:15,16	820:19	615:2 622:23	643:15 644:9
696:18,19,20	734:19 735:5,14,	coupled 670:19	646:2 656:3	645:20 646:4,23,
697:25 699:5,14	25 736:7,11,26	674:26	697:8 707:5	24 647:13
701:1,10 702:26	737:2 738:8	court 589:11,15	727:23,25 734:18	648:18,22 651:2,
703:1,18 704:23	739:24 743:15,22	610:7,18 640:10,	737:2 759:8	10,22,26 652:15,
705:2,10,17	744:17,24,26	13 677:15 678:5	775:10,14 776:5,	22 653:17,24
710:3 711:21,26	745:4,11 746:8	692:14,26 718:2,	18 780:1,5	654:23 655:2,13
713:7 717:23 718:24 725:7	747:5,17,24	5 822:9 824:16,	792:17 793:5	657:25 658:1,12
718:24 725:7 729:20 730:4	748:17 749:2,17	23	804:10,11 813:16	672:4,22 674:11
744:15,22 746:4	752:13,15,22,26	Court's 718:4	cross-	698:19 699:19,21
747:23 748:12,18	753:17,24 755:16	Courts 678:14	examination	706:12 708:20
762:7 763:2,21	756:1,3 760:12	730:16	595:1,12 597:25	709:5,18 710:13
772:13 801:5	769:1 770:16		599:11 600:13	712:2 723:13
810:25	772:5 778:12,16	covenants	611:10 618:22	725:2,4 729:2,10,
	779:3,11 780:2	789:18	619:17 641:1	13 731:4 733:2,6
costing 788:1	781:20 782:20,25	cover 641:16	644:25 646:3	734:1,6,9 735:11,
costs 602:9	783:1 785:21	710:21 744:24	647:15 673:1	12 738:1,19
604:20 609:6,23	786:13,16 790:22	773:16,22 779:3	674:23 683:1	743:8 748:16
616:3 617:21	797:8 804:13,14,	820:14	685:13 706:22	749:16 753:20,
618:19 619:3	16 805:4 807:26	covered 600:21	716:1,16 721:9	24,26 754:7,19
621:7 626:12,25	808:1,10 813:8,	706:4	725:5,12,16	755:4 756:1,3,6
627:11,18,23	16,18 814:4,10	create 616:6	752:10 783:22,24	757:5,12 758:23
632:17 633:4	820:10 821:10	creating 723:20	785:7 792:7	759:15,17 760:18
634:7,16,21	council 614:1	credibility	801:7 819:2	761:8,13,14
635:10 642:13	715:25	768:20	cross-examined	773:25 775:19
643:15,22 644:9,	counsel 690:3,5	credible 593:16	599:7 611:8	776:4 780:3,4
10 645:20	691:9 692:26	642:16 740:6	618:20	790:9,22 792:1,5,
647:13,22 648:4, 18,22 650:25	721:10 818:10,21	742:9 748:7	cross-examining	25 794:26
· ·	822:25	752:19 763:9	620:17 815:17	795:10,21,24,25
652:6 653:13,14,	countenance	772:18 791:10	crossed 735:20	796:16,17,23
16 654:21,23,25 655:3,5,7,22,23	686:11		crosses 611:12	797:8,13,20,26
658:9,12,17	counter 798:12	credit 675:11	612:1,6 792:14,	801:25 802:3
659:1 661:25		critical 616:16	15	805:4 813:8
662:1 665:15	counterbalance	642:17 649:7		819:2
670:7 680:13	679:16	686:26 689:4	crossing 599:3,4,	crossings 593:18
681:2 683:21	counterparty	724:6 725:23	7,23 600:5 601:2,	597:20 598:10
685:11,12	665:11,13 683:21	736:16 763:16	8,15 608:23 611:2 612:9,14	611:4 616:10
686:14,19 687:11			613:6 614:7,20	617:22,25 624:12
000.14,17 007.11			013.0 014.7,20	

625:4,9,10,14 626:11 628:4,18 639:17 646:11 649:1,5 650:13 651:9 652:20 653:11,24 654:5, 8 657:23 661:15 662:26 663:9 665:23 669:4,13, 21 670:17 672:13,26 682:22 686:17 687:18 694:3 695:7,20 697:3 699:25 700:25 703:12 704:7 705:13 706:10 709:11 710:19,22 711:1, 6 723:15 728:22, 24 729:7 730:10, 18,21,24 731:6 735:18 737:10 744:20 752:21 754:7,15,23,25 755:17 758:17 761:26 769:2 779:4 780:23 794:13 796:3 803:6 805:11 812:23 Crown 612:15 CSA 598:10,14 600:15,23 650:20 682:22 683:1,4,9 735:21,26 736:6, 12 755:13 757:25 758:7 775:1,6 819:6,17 820:2 CSR(A) 692:14 824:15,22	672:12 708:13 766:2 769:13 818:17,23,26 820:4 customer 621:3 738:5 customers 745:1, 3 748:5 774:22 CWNG 634:26 635:1,8,15 810:23 CWNG's 635:4 cycle 670:11 D daily 664:17 Dal 593:26 641:13,18 666:2 damaging 774:20 dangerous 685:9 dark 791:8 date 599:12 601:22 818:15 dated 600:7 617:12 824:8 day 589:5 615:10 624:21 650:3 652:24 696:24 785:19 824:9 days 590:3 624:14,17 629:9 693:2 734:22 de 610:15,18 deal 606:16 636:20 637:4 725:3 747:19	724:26 749:26 761:1 789:25 816:7,24 dealings 756:14 763:4 deals 767:19 800:23 804:24 dealt 611:23 625:11 661:4 debate 675:16 763:3 decade 796:19 decades 697:15 737:3 762:24 774:4 December 596:14 decide 595:19 604:19 713:19 776:20 782:1 809:1 decided 596:24 633:20 714:7 726:6 decides 712:20 791:15 decision 595:15, 17,19 596:10,11, 13,25 597:2 604:12,14 605:13,22 606:10 615:24,25 629:23 630:23,24 631:3, 16 632:5 633:15, 16,23 634:18,22, 23 636:1,15,26 637:7 639:13 662:4,8,16,18 667:17 668:6,17	730:1 743:13 749:5,13 750:12 769:10 770:13 771:14,18 772:13,19 779:15,17 781:4 792:4 795:16 800:16,17,20 805:1 806:3,5 808:26 810:1,19, 20,23 811:2,8 822:12,26 823:1 decision-maker 680:17 decision-maker' s 718:7,16 decision-making 693:24,25 decisions 630:5, 19 667:23 668:1, 14 684:3,8,16 779:7,9 781:23 782:21 785:9 declined 595:19 809:1 deemed 614:1 deems 590:14 deferred 797:12 deferring 797:15 deficiencies 694:12 749:25 defined 624:23 625:4 definition 621:18	delays 655:14,21 747:3 deliberate 675:20 749:3 deliberately 720:1 deliberations 673:26 delineated 678:13 deliver 692:20 demand 655:19 demanding 616:2 demonstrate 728:13 798:3 demonstrated 631:18 656:9 663:15 demonstrates 694:9 778:26 786:7 794:1,21 denial 596:12 denied 596:11 632:23 637:15 668:2 730:6 746:4 denies 744:15 Densification 686:23 density 630:1 638:20 669:24 743:2 deny 596:21 674:8 772:13 780:25 798:14 802:17 803:16 denying 749:19
812:23		17,19 596:10,11,		
	1			Densification
· ·	1	· ·		
· ·		615:24,25 629:23	deferring 797:15	
		-		
	i i			
	de 610:15,18			674:8 772:13
' '				
curious 736:8	767:7 770:6	669:8,11 672:23	645:1 674:10	815:25
803:22	777:22 787:18	677:14,16 688:10	704:16 765:22	depart 770:18
curiously 736:25	788:16 800:26	697:25 699:25	degree 729:8	780:15
current 635:8	dealing 606:5	700:5,8 705:25 712:8 713:2	delayed 746:23	departed 622:3
663:15 664:21 667:26 668:13	625:13 662:13 675:5 684:12	712.8 713.2 714:5,7 722:22	delaying 797:2	departing 794:1
007.20 000.13	073.3 004.12	726:5,9 729:26		

departure	determination	628:16 629:16	770:24,26 771:1,	703:4,25 707:15
696:18	599:21 600:2	633:7 641:10	6 774:13 775:13	708:1,10 713:16
dependent 729:8	601:13 663:24	647:22 655:5	777:14 778:21	715:4,8,16,22
734:5 755:4	666:25 695:3	684:10 722:6	779:1 780:7	716:5,13 721:20,
756:23	713:4 717:2	727:15 729:9	781:1,26 783:5,	26 726:10 735:4
	730:7 765:1	741:11,23 743:18	21,23 785:20	740:24 741:7,22
depending	determinative	757:4 758:21,24	786:8,11,17	742:11,15,17,18,
656:24 795:25	675:19	761:11 774:11	790:5,21 791:7	20,26 743:2,3,5,
depends 713:7	determine	790:3,16,23,25	792:2 793:20	7,18 746:13,16,
deprived 677:12,	590:23 615:22	792:6 797:12	794:9 795:3	22 748:14
21	637:22 680:26	802:17 821:5	796:14 797:5,18	749:10,14,22
depth 629:1	681:2 682:25	developers	798:4,8,11,16	750:26 752:16,23
641:16 755:24	683:6 687:4	589:26 593:2,14,	802:14,22	756:23 758:17
791:2 795:26		16 608:7 619:8	811:12,16,17	763:18 772:6
Derek 824:3,15	determined	624:2,10,16	813:12,14,22	781:20 782:4,13,
derive 722:7	601:23 605:4	625:17 626:10,15	developers'	18 783:15 785:21
describe 622:9	715:1,3,14 725:19 739:2	628:1,2 629:25	689:6 737:7	786:9,13 789:26
651:14 697:9,10,	743:26 797:16	630:11 632:18	781:19 786:3,13	790:2,15 792:11
11 819:24	808:2	639:11 647:13,19	797:9,21	793:5 794:3
describes 719:2		648:3,10,20	developing	796:24 805:1
746:11	determines	649:12 650:23	607:19 792:24	806:24 812:9
	717:3 771:26 772:2	652:4,9 654:16,	813:9	814:9,16 816:25,
describing 751:8		19 655:2,5,22,23	development	26 817:1 820:23
description	detracting 762:3	656:20 658:26	607:24 608:1,2	821:2
663:19 696:3	detracts 768:19	661:17 662:10,	618:5 620:11	developments
design 641:12,15	784:13	24,26 663:2,8,17,	623:23 624:14	589:25 656:2
670:10 708:14,21	detrimental	23 664:2,7,13,18	625:11,12,21,26	668:24 672:16
795:25 819:7	631:22 662:17	665:6,14,17	627:3 628:20	684:6 691:14
designed 777:17	devalues 610:11	669:3,9 670:5,15,	629:18 631:6,8	750:10 782:23,26
desired 718:18	develop 630:3	23 671:2,5,23,26	632:4,9,24 633:1,	786:16 793:24
Desrochers	645:24 656:4	672:6,21 673:4,	5,9 637:12,18,23	794:17
625:21,26	734:18 741:3	17 674:3 675:2	638:1,4 642:4	diagonally
detail 627:9	749:4 750:12	676:10,12 687:10	643:26 644:3	622:23 631:1
671:26 711:7	790:9 792:5	688:1,4 691:16	649:25 650:14,	diameter 707:19
732:22 733:24	developability	694:15 697:14	17,25 651:21	dictate 764:13
754:8 756:21	641:23 741:19	698:1,21 702:18 703:2,3,25	652:7 654:22,23	dictated 755:12
765:19	developable	710:18 712:4	661:6,19 662:7,	dictates 764:16
detailed 600:17,	750:18	725:22 730:17,20	10,12 663:4	differ 729:13
19 628:21 700:17	developed	731:14 741:2	664:3,11,23	
707:17 708:4,21	672:20 751:22	742:19 744:14,18	666:10,12 667:2,	difference 623:4 631:25 704:12
709:1 740:23	792:24 816:25	745:19 746:15,21	8,15 668:20	716:12 816:5
751:8,17 757:7,8,	developer	747:11,19 748:2	669:19 670:18,21	
10,13,14 758:22	608:18,20,24	749:2,20 751:2	674:19 686:22	differences
760:3	609:4 618:18	753:10,11,19,23,	696:15 697:4	809:23
details 710:25	620:1,8,14	25 755:16 758:15	698:12 700:11, 15,16,23 701:2,	differently
752:24	621:10,13 624:13	760:16,21 763:5	19,21 702:7,13	660:26 717:9
			17,41 /04./,13	770:20 787:13

difficult 668:11	710:16 772:1	675:23 677:1	601:25 634:15,	distributed
670:22 671:10	795:9 796:9	680:10 683:22	19,21 636:25	814:5
684:14 711:22	809:8 811:12	684:15,18	643:5 647:11	distribution
757:9 801:12	820:8	687:21,24 697:22	687:11 695:4,8,	
difficulties	directional	720:6 728:26	14,24 699:13	743:1
663:26	771:23	735:19 742:16	712:25 713:1,13	District 633:18
		754:20 783:25	724:11 725:18,24	districts 635:5
difficulty 589:17	directions 664:6	784:1,7,12	726:15,17 727:18	disturbance
766:6	Directive 818:16,	785:23 786:20	743:12 771:20	687:18 723:13
dig 760:2	17	793:26 796:23	774:9 775:19	ditch 634:5 635:3
digs 674:17	directives 618:25	discusses 708:9	776:8 777:5,6	dividing 689:22
diligence 620:3	directly 623:18	discussing	778:15 779:5	division 662:1
624:13,18,25,26	640:18 650:10	693:13 774:3	785:24 796:19	686:19
626:22 627:10	696:21 724:26	807:10	797:26 798:1	Dixon 659:18,19
628:2 629:2,8,16	725:25 727:10	discussion	800:10 805:4	688:18 689:12,25
671:3,10 700:20	743:19 747:14		808:21 809:4,10,	691:18 694:18
709:3 750:17	784:21	669:22 674:12 734:24 757:17	15,19 810:6,9	736:9,15,23
751:1,8,18 753:4	directs 590:20	761:17 767:16	811:1	737:4 745:12
756:26 789:21	712:22 778:4	768:24 769:2	disputed 652:25	758:12 782:8
790:4 791:1,10	disadvantage	800:25	disputes 727:14	783:26 818:2,26
diluent 670:1	672:7		730:15 778:10,12	Dixon's 745:7
direct 590:14	disagree 619:14	discussions	796:23	817:24
597:11 603:16	643:23 660:5,10	593:18 594:4 673:14 724:8	disregard 728:17	
604:16 657:18	736:20 800:2	733:17 752:2	750:7 794:23	document 599:7
661:12 669:20	disagreed 725:14	768:2 775:20		documentary
674:22 699:7			disregarded 747:15	593:9
705:4,23 712:16,	disagreement 595:5 608:4	dismiss 809:16		documentation
21 717:16,20	634:16 713:14	dismissed 594:17	disregards 766:6	700:17
725:26 726:2		595:14 649:9	793:23	documents 607:9
727:2 731:17	disbelieve 655:1,	697:25 809:14	disrupt 780:17	639:7 670:2
747:24 750:8	11,16,20 821:17	dispense 733:17	disruptions	709:2
772:4 774:22	discern 718:16	756:1	747:25	dollars 643:16
775:25 779:3	disclosed 618:21	dispensed 766:3	dissatisfied	648:24 653:19
directed 616:26	disclosure	display 673:1	753:19	658:20 744:7
617:18 652:25	669:15 784:12	disposal 613:24	dissipate 698:10	745:17 755:18
664:24 679:23	discover 791:9	614:9	distinct 704:17	Dorothy 637:5
699:13 716:8	discredit 641:2	dispose 614:2	719:9,15 761:11	doubt 676:4
736:12 776:24	discretion 669:8	_	distinction	813:21
777:1,2,8 778:13	678:20	disposed 614:15	619:19	Douglas 637:5
directing 656:11		disposition 614:4		
685:20 701:23	discuss 618:16	dispositions	distinguish 674:21	downstream
713:20	693:22 694:6,14	706:5,7 739:5,23		782:23
direction 595:26	697:3,21 773:18, 19,21 780:12,25	766:2 767:13	distinguishable	dramatic 643:6
617:20 634:12		dispute 594:22	668:1 729:19,22	dramatically
645:9 653:7	discussed 667:21	595:6,10,22	810:21	642:23 644:15
658:14,22 660:6	671:6,22,26	596:2,18,22	distinguished	draw 805:3
670:13 683:18	672:5 674:22	597:5,15,17	638:3	
	I .	I	I	I .

drawings 757.7	604.15 720.0	654.16.20.664.2	emails 594:3	anda 672.16
drawings 757:7	684:15 728:9 735:19 770:25	654:16,20 664:3, 6 669:3,19,23,24,		ends 672:16
Driedger-like	735:19 770:25	26 670:1 672:13,	embark 723:20	endures 746:26
689:7		16,17,18,19	745:21	energy 603:9,13
drilling 678:9	early 629:13	684:11 699:12	embracing	604:7 617:19
drive 604:11	642:24 657:2	701:12,17,22	736:17	660:20 666:10,12
driven 701:11,12	earnings 716:18,	701:12,17,22	emerging 814:16	668:26 680:11,14
driver 736:7	25	710:17 715:25	emphasize	692:3,6,9 721:3,
759:25	earth-shattering	727:22 764:14,15	698:23	20 722:13,14
driving 721:8	636:11	806:24 813:1	emphasized	726:10 740:25
728:23 733:14	easement 706:6,	814:17	721:11	780:17 782:5,13, 18,20,24 783:6,
735:3	24 726:20 739:6	Edmonton's	employees	15 784:15 785:26
due 620:2 624:13,	775:11,15 776:19	591:26 607:8,23	593:21	794:4
18,25,26 626:22	780:6 785:3	609:10	empowers	
627:10 628:2	786:5 787:14,16,	effect 600:14	604:15 619:2	engage 634:16 682:6 715:20
629:2,8,16	22,23 788:7,10,	615:26 628:1	emptor 789:6	682:6 /15:20 719:21
633:25 671:2,10	25 816:15,16	684:23 736:23	enacted 603:5	
677:13,22 678:4	easements	757:23 765:14	685:6 702:7	engaged 668:23
679:6 689:14	676:18 740:7	816:21,23 817:1	719:6 802:9	697:3 717:1
700:20 709:3	774:5,8 775:9	effective 610:13		773:23 777:3,9
737:4 749:25	787:13,26 788:5	734:3	enactment 603:3	778:17
750:17 751:1,8,	789:18 790:6,7,	effectively	605:14	engages 764:25
18 753:4 756:26	10 791:13,18	632:18 644:8	encompassed	engaging 714:3
759:13 762:18	792:16	695:23 734:12	651:24	engineer 621:15,
789:21 790:4	east 636:18	effects 631:22	encountered	20 757:20
791:1,10 810:13	637:11 806:1,8		666:3	engineering
813:24 819:9	816:21	efficiency 742:26	encumbered	600:11,12 620:25
duly 676:9	economic 647:5	efficient 590:2	816:8	650:15 671:22
Duncanson	685:25 719:3	666:11 693:1	encumbrance	688:1 696:13
692:11 773:9,10,	721:25 722:2	721:19,26 722:3	616:12	737:22,24 738:2
12 798:19,21,24	769:10,12 783:8	742:5,12 750:21	encumbrances	757:21,25 760:3
800:13 801:2,23	economical	782:3,12,18	615:18,23 791:16	796:5,10
815:15,17,23	719:8	783:13 794:3	793:9	engineers 673:11
Duncanson's	economically	effort 702:22	end 596:26 609:7	757:20,26
799:16,22 802:11	629:25	747:20	618:3 620:8	enjoy 744:25
816:5	economics 722:9	elaborated	647:13 699:6	745:9
duty 666:21	763:10	815:23	701:24 717:8	enjoyed 748:6
dwelling 744:2	Edmonton	elected 617:8	731:11 757:9	enjoyment
dwellings 607:20	604:10 606:24	661:2	769:19,20 816:18	602:10,19 616:1
<u> </u>	607:3,4 608:6,10	Electric 603:9,13	endeavour	675:14 676:25
dysfunction 665:4	609:15 611:3	604:7 722:14	699:23	677:5,11,20
005.4	616:25 617:17	electrical 675:9,	endeavours	678:3 679:4
	618:6 629:15	13 678:10 767:10	722:5	706:8 726:20
${f E}$	638:19 639:1,2	elements 647:11	ended 608:25	794:13
	643:9 644:2	else's 731:4 737:2	651:4	ensure 598:12
earlier 642:26	645:25 646:17	Jan 5 131.4 131.2		641:14,15 708:1
668:6 681:5	649:3 653:22			

775:1 787:17 789:22 796:11	equitable 656:13 662:1 669:14	734:19 751:26 757:14	743:4,14 749:26	excerpt 642:10 728:6
	686:16,19 687:4		750:8 754:2,14, 22 760:20	
ensures 776:3	773:21 785:20,25	estimated 621:6	762:15,20	exchange 599:17
ensuring 737:17	786:4,14	622:16 708:23	763:11,14	673:12 821:12
795:23	equity 641:7,9	738:8 752:8	765:17,18,21	exclude 719:20
entailed 633:21		estimates 623:26	766:17,16,21	excluded 720:1
634:20	ERCB 591:13 630:19,24 633:16	624:4 673:6 700:24,26 729:2,	770:13,17,24	exclusion 719:18
enter 613:6	634:21 636:20,26	6,7 756:21 797:6	771:5,13,19	exclusively 647:5
673:16 711:1	638:6 668:6	, ·	772:15,18 779:24	701:18
759:6	779:7 810:16	evaluating 733:13	781:5 783:9,18,	excuse 603:3
entered 651:19	ergo 595:10		21 784:5,10,13	651:3
709:8,14 724:12		event 660:7	796:15 797:4	execute 734:19
738:11 752:25	erroneous	689:20 740:12	798:2 801:2,4,6,	752:6 759:16
759:15	765:22	744:7 769:26	11,13 805:14,15	executed 741:1
entering 614:7	error 596:5,6	795:19	806:10 812:6	753:26
730:20	597:1 809:13	events 593:24	813:7,19,21,23	executing 710:6
enterprise 701:5	escalate 687:2	evidence 592:6,8,	815:3 820:21,26	executive 725:1
enthusiasm	ESG 714:25	9,11 593:11,12	821:4,5,7,21,23	
768:14	770:6,8 781:15	594:9,12 595:13	822:2,25	exercise 596:8
entire 681:16	esoteric 733:7	596:17 597:16	evidenced 617:2	669:7 689:1 714:3 723:20
731:23 743:25	essence 673:5,10	601:20 606:26	680:1	745:21
784:15 787:20	678:23 680:16	619:13 624:20	evidencing 743:6	
entirety 679:12	758:14 767:7	625:6,15,16 626:15 627:25,26	evident 713:12	exercised 722:20
711:10	789:11	630:8 632:7	evidentiary	exercising
entities 748:6	essentially 665:6	637:16 640:25	668:22 798:9	591:14 671:10
765:3	672:14 754:11	641:3,18 643:1	exacerbates	exhibit 592:12,
entity 658:16	793:13 800:15	647:12,18,24	672:9	16,18,20,24,26
715:9 763:24	establish 662:22	648:19 650:3	exact 698:17	593:3,5 595:16
entrance 652:1	687:6 798:11	655:1,12,17,21	710:12 758:26	599:5 600:6 603:6 604:5
environment	established	656:1,8 658:10,	examination	617:4 622:15
774:25	638:11 645:1	23 661:12,24	677:24	623:23 642:9,10
	651:5 663:26	662:15 663:15,	examine 721:24	677:8 696:3
environmental 783:11	709:9 735:17	17,22,25 666:26	Examiner's	705:22 707:16,21
	770:20 780:16	668:15 669:2,20	668:7	708:5,17,25
environmentally	781:22 794:23	670:14 674:1,16,		709:13,18 711:9,
666:12 721:19	establishes	22,24 685:26	examples 730:19 740:23 747:11	16 714:14 729:23
782:4,13 783:14	687:15 688:10	693:14 694:7,13	754:10 760:19	739:26 741:14
envision 711:22	734:11 783:4	695:2 697:5,20,	766:15	742:23 744:3
785:16	establishing	23,26 698:4,16	excavation	749:11 752:3
equal 635:22	784:14	699:10 706:26	599:9,15 600:26	766:10 768:12
equally 667:7	estate 613:24	707:3 710:15 711:26 728:12		777:19 785:14
699:18	787:7,9 789:9,12,	732:19,21,24	exception 786:2	805:19 806:5
equate 714:25	14	738:22 739:4	exceptional	exhibited 766:12,
equipment	estimate 623:7,8,	740:6 742:10	596:7	20
633:26	9,10,14 654:7	7 10.0 7 12.10		

exhibiting	expedient 718:15	explored 619:17,	774:22	factor 642:6
733:20	expended 747:19	18	faced 664:8	649:4 720:9
Exhibits 752:9	expenditures	exposed 634:4	facie 596:5,6	739:3 750:22
760:14	632:19	783:6	597:1	factored 626:12,
exist 618:26	expense 628:22	express 666:18	facilitate 650:13	22 750:11
628:10,12 661:18	674:6 760:4	719:19	670:17 678:10	factors 663:11
680:2 751:5		expressed 610:2	686:21 695:7	667:17 715:11
760:26	expenses 746:7	670:4 686:1	737:9	756:4 796:1
existed 602:3	expensive 747:6	748:26 764:6,22	facilitating 639:6	facts 594:14
611:7 679:15	experience	expresses 719:9	669:13 693:1	660:16 693:18
768:7 778:24	627:2,4,16 647:9	_		705:12 724:11
805:15,16 806:12	654:10 665:20	expressing 686:8	facilities 697:7	796:22 798:1
existence 605:11	674:15 750:9	801:19 817:14	722:1 783:10	factual 594:10
626:20 641:21	759:14	expressly 592:12	791:17	663:23 794:7,24
707:24 741:18,20	experienced	606:15 607:7	facility 604:16,23	factually 638:3
751:24 752:20	787:4	616:26 619:2	708:22 722:18,	793:26
754:2	experiences	639:6 666:16	24,26	
existing 598:6,7,	629:6 747:3	719:24	facing 672:14	failed 711:17
11 612:21 615:18	755:9	expropriate	fact 596:21	730:3,5 798:8
632:11,13 637:10	expert 640:21	679:1,16	599:14,22 601:14	failing 596:3
650:18 682:19,22	746:9 767:23	expropriation	602:2 609:17	796:15 797:14
683:5 686:25	772:17 805:18	610:16,18 679:6,	610:1,7 611:1	fails 648:15
706:12 707:1,2,	817:9	22 733:19	619:13 624:3	714:15
14 708:2,11,12,	expertise 647:9	extend 701:14	625:24 636:6	fair 590:1 597:17
16,20,22 722:4,	experts 763:9	819:18	645:6 648:15	598:21,24,25
18,24,26 723:22	experts' 714:23	extending 598:6	649:23 654:11	601:12 614:26
734:1 740:25	explain 626:20	extension 820:9	669:26 670:19 672:14 675:2	625:8 643:4,20
750:4,10 751:18	729:7,10 753:1	extensive 597:23	676:8,10 677:6	656:13 658:10
766:1 767:13	explained 729:5	668:26	681:16 684:3	687:4 731:1
774:3,12,14	733:22,24 735:1,	extent 671:20	704:1,15 705:18	739:10,20 740:3, 8 764:3 765:15
777:10 780:2	8 740:1 741:20	683:13 689:1	706:2 707:6,11	788:18 803:12
793:2,23 794:16	748:18 750:8,17	external 601:1	715:2,3,15 726:8	
797:24 798:3	751:2,16 754:26	627:14	730:17 735:16	fairly 733:21
811:19 819:13,15	755:3 756:6,20,	extraction 678:8	736:11 739:12	800:20
expand 661:9	26 759:3,12		745:9 750:3	fairness 748:9
expanding 592:3	763:23 782:24	extraordinary	753:18 755:20	749:18 763:4
811:20	783:6 791:3	591:7 638:7	759:24 760:5	faith 621:11,14,
expect 639:13	795:21 796:3	extremely	761:15 764:7,9,	19 624:3 673:5
731:5 734:21	806:20	666:22 671:10	24 765:6 769:11	false 647:25
735:5 758:21	explains 707:13	673:19	771:24 790:4	806:10
expectation	708:11 741:9	eyes 700:16	801:15,20 803:5,	familiarity
658:3,5	765:21 784:11	791:16	19 805:7 807:12	766:20
expected 627:23	explanation		810:4,22 812:15	far-reaching
653:24 784:16	622:3 674:24	\mathbf{F}	822:1	685:9
821:15	764:18		facto 610:15,18	farmland 643:8
		face 701:2 746:21		668:11 816:21
	1	ı	1	1

Fash 655:4	692:20,22 693:6	610:3 611:2,3	26 820:16,18	foremost 609:14
703:15	704:20 709:15	613:4,13,16	Fitch's 660:15	foreseen 643:25
Fash's 655:12,20	713:2 723:8	615:12 618:10	706:21 726:4	forever 636:4
father's 816:5	728:4 731:8	633:11 643:19	740:11 763:13	643:21 818:8
father-in-law	732:11 773:9,12	675:15,18 676:3,	764:2 765:9,14	form 615:3
815:20	775:22 777:23	15 706:14 727:4	fix 699:23	679:15 687:17
father-in-law's	798:26 799:12	728:11,21 733:4,	fixed 657:6	700:18 739:9
815:19 816:6	820:12	9 770:19 789:7	690:11	772:19 778:25
	finally 593:4	792:10 793:14,17	Fjeldheim	788:2 795:9
favour 592:2 749:19 806:25	614:19 637:4	794:1,7 812:25	648:19,26 649:4	formed 716:7
	655:26 694:14	813:2 815:9	653:4,5 698:5	formula 669:14
favoured 780:14	698:4 725:19	first-time 655:8	804:9	686:16 687:4
favours 645:20	726:11 766:5	firsthand 593:17,	Fjeldheim's	formulation
647:6	770:5 773:23 811:26	22 594:7 724:7	656:1	714:23 762:11
features 697:8		firstly 632:22	flaw 610:26	forum 701:16
751:4 792:14,21	financial 645:13	636:1 641:5	flawed 730:14	703:19 785:15
February 603:7	681:14 685:16,21 730:9 783:25	657:24 805:18	762:9	797:25
fee 739:9,14,15	784:2,6,12	806:6 809:25	flaws 694:12	forward 590:4
740:3 775:9		fit 630:3	749:24	666:9 689:4
787:12,15 788:1,	financing 655:21,23	fit-for-service	flowed 747:17	724:18 746:10
7,18	find 628:8 636:21	600:11		754:12 771:5
fee-simple	638:24 728:14	Fitch 589:22,23	focus 714:18	804:6 822:11
614:12 816:14	729:23 783:2	639:22,25 640:4,	focused 714:11	found 665:26
feel 822:4	785:9,25 786:17	16 656:18,21,23	770:6 803:5	666:5 679:24
felt 753:3 812:8	finding 637:1	657:9,14,21	folks 594:1,2	736:8 745:14
fibreoptic 791:14	684:22 795:20	659:9,13 660:12	follow 710:20	782:9 785:13
field 662:25	findings 697:24	667:21 668:5,19 669:23 671:6,22	735:17 738:18	787:23 808:23
fields 763:9	718:1,4	673:3,8,21	follow-up	foundational
figure 645:18	finds 807:23	675:24 677:1	761:17,18	706:15
746:1,2		680:4,10 681:19	foolish 624:3	four-lane 606:8
figured 598:16	fine 690:9 727:3 770:4	682:15 683:22	Foothills 633:18	608:12
figures 755:8		684:18,25 689:5	810:19,23	fourth 694:1
file 617:1	finish 640:6,17	691:14 694:18	Footnote 785:13	700:10 773:21
filed 592:8	first-in-right	715:26 720:6	for-profit 701:5	fraction 643:13
594:15,16 596:9	602:18 609:26 610:3 613:14	724:6 725:5	722:6 771:3	frame 666:9
667:22 695:13	615:12 643:19	727:12 728:1	803:16	762:2
761:20	665:1 676:3,15	736:15 740:14	force 684:23	framework
filings 670:2	706:15 727:4	757:18,22 758:11 763:15 764:6,20,	818:17	711:6 723:21
694:23	733:5,9 770:19	22 765:6 769:17,	forced 671:4	frankly 624:1
final 589:20,22	789:7 792:10	22 777:24,26	682:5	669:5 685:10
590:5 593:6	793:15,17 794:2,	778:23 779:14,16	forces 696:14	767:20
599:21 600:2	8 812:25 813:2	791:23 792:8	forcing 616:3	freedom 677:19
601:5 659:18,21,	815:9	798:25 799:4,12,	foregoing 717:19	Freedoms
23 660:14	first-in-time	13 814:20,21,23,	824:4	733:19
	602:18 609:25			

frequent 669:21	fulsome 668:21	631:23 639:11	22	651:6,12 652:10,
frequently	function 779:18	720:26 721:17	government-	12 655:2 656:20
593:23 662:12	functions 666:21	733:1 771:9	sanctioned	663:23 691:16
664:8 706:16	fundamental	814:16	679:10	694:15 703:2
fresh 658:11	648:15 660:17	generally 671:15	Govier 589:5	704:1,2,14
799:19	661:5 677:18	673:20 747:17	691:1	725:22 746:15
friend 594:26	733:20 762:23,25	762:21 815:26	gracious 732:17	753:23 755:16
648:7 660:12	767:4 789:8	generated	grammatically	770:24,26 771:6
668:5 675:24	815:5	738:15 756:22	819:24	795:3 798:16
679:8 696:9	fundamentally	gentlemen		802:14,17
726:13 727:19	616:15 667:26	618:20	grant 662:18	811:12,17 813:12
728:4,17,26	668:13 725:22	Gerein 593:26	663:12 667:20	grouped 719:10
729:16,26 740:11	funded 675:10	607:21 619:15	678:7,20 685:17 706:7 729:20	groups 703:5,25
757:17 777:24		641:19 644:1	780:20	704:4
783:26 800:5,6,	furnish 756:17	659:9 742:2		grow 629:26
13 805:11 810:12	furnished 752:5	752:10 754:8	granted 650:13	630:6 661:9
815:12 821:18	furtherance	812:6 820:26	679:17,22 680:22 693:6 694:11	growing 667:10
friend's 731:12	661:10 662:11	821:5	747:23 748:12,19	growth 591:25
794:10 820:3	664:4	get-out-of-jail	804:25	605:19 606:3,9,
friends 591:4	future 602:7	644:8		24 607:3,8 608:4,
594:21 630:14	628:16 631:20	get-out-of-jail-	granting 614:7, 11 636:10 662:19	9 609:9 637:13
638:13 652:18	633:9 643:22	free 730:23 817:6	685:8 784:8	638:26 639:6,15
660:7 693:16	644:2 662:26	give 645:8 649:20		644:3 645:23
694:18 769:17	685:22 766:7	653:6 658:2	grasp 714:15	650:14,26 661:10
773:15 776:11	769:12 793:4,24	688:19 757:13	gravel 806:9	670:21 727:21
781:10 786:23	816:26	798:22 822:16,17	great 675:15	728:1,2,5 811:20
800:13 802:25		giving 680:19	686:3 732:21	guarantee 677:9
809:12 810:22	G	795:17 797:5	747:19 770:6	guess 640:8 805:6
811:3 813:3	•	glass 814:24	822:12	guidance 663:10
817:8,26 822:10	gain 741:23		greater 654:20	669:6 687:1,16
front 652:16	786:10	goal 609:8	grossly 686:2	730:2 769:21
fuel 664:17	gained 799:8	goals 669:17	799:2	779:21
full 607:19	gap 626:3	743:2	ground 687:18	guide 758:2
672:26 700:11,12	gas 631:16 634:26	good 589:2,4,23	723:13 766:9	guided 718:1
717:6 739:9,15	639:9 649:25	659:19 667:14	813:22	guise 764:26
740:2 749:15	668:9 673:20	682:7 692:23	grounded 697:16	guise 704.20
750:4 752:24,26	677:26 685:23	732:12 759:23	grounds 596:7	
774:5 786:5	707:18 810:19	769:22 788:15 790:23	719:26	H
787:21 788:21	gas-distribution		group 589:26	half 592:10 595:1
789:1 790:7	754:18	govern 683:14	593:2,14,16	596:15 623:7,15
796:4 819:18	gave 593:25	governing	608:24 609:7	624:25 625:1
fully 629:12	644:17 741:1	677:25 711:6	610:8,17 619:8	635:9,25 640:7
661:15 725:19	772:24	Government	624:10 625:17,20	643:15 769:24
735:5 751:22	gears 619:6	610:10 613:23	626:15 628:1	799:14
758:17 778:7	general 618:4	614:14 675:26	639:11 647:13,19	
		702:4,5 804:20,	649:13 650:23	

	ı	1	I	1
Halifax 610:8	762:8 771:19	held 623:22 718:5	holder 616:4	654:2,9,12 655:8,
Hall 589:5 691:1	777:14 779:24	739:19 740:8	holding 812:9	18,19,25 661:19
Hamdan 691:12	781:11,13,18	764:20	Hollands 637:15	667:8,10 743:11
hand 591:24,26	785:18 786:24	henceforth	668:4	764:13 781:16
641:8 642:1,2	789:4 790:3,26	638:14	Hollands' 637:6	806:24 814:17
649:25 803:14	792:9 793:15	Henday 604:11		hub 670:1
	795:4 796:13	hesitant 745:20	home 655:7	huge 805:6
hands 640:9	802:13 811:2,16		715:21 746:6	811:18
Hansard 603:3	812:16 815:3	high 626:3	747:18 789:19,21	human 774:24
605:14,16,24	817:24 818:5	627:13 639:15	homebuyer	
happened 594:11	821:9	687:23	743:20	hundred 612:12
608:22 652:2	hearing 589:5,	high-grade	homebuyers	713:23 814:4
797:13 810:10	13,17,24 590:2,4	806:9	655:3,8 715:19	hundreds 653:18
happening 638:4	591:5 592:8,25	high-level 628:21	743:16,23 744:8	Hydro 603:9,12
684:7	593:3,12 594:11,	higher 653:15	789:19 814:12	604:7 722:14
happy 656:16	13 596:26 597:3,	700:25	homeowners	hydrocarbons
694:20,21 732:2	4,6,13,14 600:5	higher-volume	647:14,23 648:5	667:6
hard 644:18	602:25 606:19	774:14	813:18 814:12	hyperbole
660:2	609:18 617:6,9	highest 638:20	homes 654:25	801:10
	624:8 640:26	669:24	715:16,17 742:20	hyperbolic
harm 685:21	642:6 647:8		743:13 746:11,24	801:21
782:17 783:8,19	650:4 651:14	highlight 732:23	747:2,15 764:11	
Harrison 677:14	652:24 660:21,	highlighted	813:9,19	hypothetical 820:24
he'll 694:14	24,25 661:1	670:14 672:13	homesite 668:11	820:24
health 685:26	668:20 669:2	748:9	honour 590:2	
774:24	671:8 675:17	highly 630:5		I
hear 693:16	681:5 688:15	800:18,21,22	hopes 669:11	
694:22 725:11	691:6,7 693:1	highway 598:5,7	horse 600:1	i.e. 594:10
731:20 777:23	696:24 712:1	819:2,5,10,12,14,	607:7,9,14,22,24	idea 704:6 719:9,
790:13 822:6,23	713:17 750:2	19	608:5 639:1	15 790:23
heard 592:9	753:10 755:18	Hill 655:9 700:18	644:1 648:22	ideal 664:17
593:26 594:20	768:3 771:13	707:11 709:8	649:1 653:21	identical 603:11
595:7 619:15	773:11 781:12,13	715:26 740:26	654:3 655:9	672:15 680:8
624:9 634:22	785:18 792:12	743:6,13 744:14	700:18 707:11	800:24
641:13 642:14	795:3,5,13 798:6	Hills 600:1 607:7,	709:8 715:26	identified 597:7
647:18 658:23	807:24 809:26	9,14,22,24 608:5	740:26 743:6,13	606:12 607:7
675:17 681:26	813:15 815:5	639:1 644:1	744:3,14 809:19	703:11 753:15
684:5 687:19	822:5,11,24	648:22 649:1	813:17	identify 722:15
693:15 694:5,17	823:3,4	653:21 654:3	hour 595:1 640:1,	
695:16 696:21	hearings 660:22	744:3 813:17	7 656:24 690:2,6,	ignore 800:14,17
697:8,10,11,21	heart 698:24	historically	9 769:24 799:14	803:19
700:3 703:8,15,	Heartland 604:8	627:17 674:9	house 744:10,11	ignores 664:22
21 705:16 709:5	heavily 749:19	history 660:13	745:16,17 789:15	730:16 765:26
714:17 723:17,25	HEEA 680:6	hold 665:2	houses 747:5	769:11
724:2 726:1	723:4	676:23	764:16	ignoring 807:12
728:8 730:25	, 23. 1	070.23	housing 645:24	808:15
731:2 734:4,14			648:18 649:5,26	
	1	1	1	1

II(B) 711:8	633:3,5 635:26	include 592:26	incredibly 647:4	755:21 762:24
illogical 746:6	648:16 660:18	602:16 605:10	incur 749:2	763:3 771:9
769:3	663:23 664:22	650:19 670:6		772:9 780:17
	666:8 667:7	797:7	incurred 655:22	791:12
illusion 678:2	714:15 725:21	included 599:8	769:1	industry's
imagine 611:25	775:8 778:22	653:11 654:8	indefinitely	698:12
impact 628:17	788:4	686:4 700:24,26	783:7 801:5,19	inefficient 747:1
629:17 641:23	importantly	768:23 795:1	independence	
642:8,15 643:13	636:6 751:25	includes 592:16	766:13 768:20	inequality 665:4
644:10 648:17	impose 705:6	593:6 669:14	independent	672:8
685:16 715:11	778:20	702:10 707:23	766:17 767:23	inequitable
741:21 742:15,25		including 615:19	772:17 817:9,21	700:2 701:4,7
743:12 745:12,	imposed 616:22 635:19 642:4	617:15 652:10	indeterminate	inequity 700:6
13,15 748:20		664:23 665:23	632:12 783:7	inferior 718:13
758:23 784:16	imposing 780:26	666:15 669:10	801:5,18	740:16
813:5,9	impossible	673:15 675:20	indication	inferring 719:26
impacted 663:21	613:19 629:11	676:17 677:4,26	607:23 722:22	information
741:19 746:23	649:19 668:12	679:3 686:9	724:20 739:18	592:15 605:11
impacts 685:9	670:23 671:1	700:4 707:18,25	755:9	620:24,26 621:3,
686:1 721:2,6,7	impression	743:1 751:18,25	indicative 660:9	22 622:10 623:13
722:9 743:11,23	806:17	772:16 775:9	673:13 679:2	624:17 628:4,9,
783:11 788:24	improper	779:19 780:3	761:6	26 649:18
794:3	595:13,14	incompatible	indicia 681:13	658:15,24 669:15
impartial 817:22	725:10,16 808:18	637:23	indistinguishabl	670:9,26 671:12,
impasse 634:8	809:21	inconsistent	e 793:2	14,15,18,20
impeached	improperly	615:15 616:5	individual 609:3	673:4,17 675:1
813:20	797:6	793:18	628:15 648:10	684:19 687:8,20,
impeded 637:12	improvements	incorporate	677:20	24,26 700:24
impeding 749:9	635:6	632:3	individually	704:26 707:18,24
imperative	improving 598:4	incorporated	661:5	708:4 729:2,8
662:22	in-scope 705:13	631:24 707:15	individuals	734:5 737:26
implements	inaccurate	741:12 742:6,18	670:5 677:11	738:3,5,15
775:3	725:10,16 808:18	incorrect 595:13	758:6	751:24 752:1,5 753:5 756:18,21
implication	809:21	644:12 714:21	industrial 631:8	757:3 758:15,22
602:17,23	inadequate	762:10,11 765:19		760:11 761:1,4,
· ·	797:1 798:4	increase 607:5,9	637:13	10,12 766:22
implications	inappropriate	648:23 649:6	industries 662:2	791:1,4,9 797:1
616:7 788:5	756:9 778:2	653:26 813:19	667:2 686:20 697:19	802:19 805:21
implied 719:18	inappropriately			informs 741:10
imply 803:18	766:7	increased 655:5	industry 650:18,	infrastructure
import 696:9	incidental	increases 747:5	26 661:6,8 675:9	606:3 661:21
importance	666:20	increasing 756:2	684:2 696:15	662:14 664:10,15
650:8 661:5,7		increasingly	697:6,18 700:7 701:20 703:5,7,	668:26 670:20
724:22	incidentally 763:6	665:16 684:13	25 709:4 710:19	674:4,6 675:6,13
important 617:5	/03.0	incredible	722:9 724:23	678:11 686:25
622:20 632:21		643:11	731:1 748:22	706:13 708:3,16
			/51.1 / TO.22	
	I	I	I	I

715:4,7 722:25	instruments	26 608:3,6 613:3,	12,14 809:9,17	705:14
731:5 737:3	767:14	5,24 614:3,10,15	811:10 817:5	intervene 714:1
740:25 763:25	insufficient	616:2,3,4 617:26	822:12	intervening
782:22 792:13,	637:16 668:15	619:5 636:23	interested 660:9	769:6
14,15,16,18,20	740:16	637:1 639:6,8,21	interesting	
793:3 811:19	insulate 814:9	640:19,23 641:6	621:25 745:14	intervention
inherent 662:9		642:19 644:13	822:11	753:22
664:20 687:5	integral 664:11	645:1,9,17,20	interestingly	introduce 782:19
747:12	integration	646:25 647:5,11	604:9	introduced
inherently 645:5	741:6	648:16 649:7		696:24
initial 741:4	integrity 598:22	650:1 654:13	interests 615:21	intrusion 679:11
744:1	600:12,14,22	656:10,14 661:13	685:21 720:11,	invest 782:21
initiate 682:18	619:15 620:4,19	662:2,9,20,23	17,22 748:5 765:24 767:11	investigation
	621:26 630:10	663:25 664:14,	795:17 803:9,11,	670:10
initiates 674:11	674:17 708:2	20,23 666:7,14,	15,17,20 804:17	investment
initiating 618:25	774:20 775:4	25 667:3,5,7,16,	806:22 814:15	722:10
714:10	795:23 796:7 818:4	18 668:22 669:16	interfered	investor 642:11
initiation 598:3		677:22 679:25	602:21 726:24	686:4
injurious 787:20	intend 673:9	680:19 681:1 686:17,20 687:5		investors 686:9
input 737:15	680:7	688:11 693:23	interference	
746:7	intended 676:18	694:10 700:8	678:3	inviolable 610:5
inquire 620:3,12	682:1 685:2	704:2,4,12,13,16	interim 600:6,21	invited 761:17
721:24	719:21 778:9	712:18,21 713:4,	601:4 623:12	invoiced 711:3
inquiries 624:11	784:23 820:19	8,19,26 714:11,	internally 688:2	743:19
629:5	intending 806:19	20,24,26 715:1,6,	interpret 681:24	involve 754:17
inquiry 763:2	intends 615:23	12,14,18,24	718:8 777:15	involved 593:19
insight 718:10	intent 600:20	716:6,10,13,15,	793:22	635:23 636:16
inspect 623:12	718:17 793:18	18,21,24 717:2,4,	interpretation	645:5 663:3
_	794:19	9,14,15,20,22	664:26 680:1,20	700:2 710:1
inspected 599:14	intention 603:5	718:23 719:15,	681:7,9 684:25	748:2 759:24
inspection 599:9	610:2 694:22	21,24 720:1,15,	689:2,8 714:8,21	778:15 779:9
601:1 708:22	732:20	24 722:1 725:26	717:19 718:12, 14,20,22,26	involvement
760:4 789:20	intentional	726:2 727:1,10	719:19 736:17	744:13
instability	675:20	728:6 730:14	737:5 762:5,10	involves 808:9
747:26	intents 675:19	733:13 738:14	771:17 777:18	involving 725:2
installation	interaction	745:7 753:22	780:8,13 818:3,7	779:21 785:24
708:15,23	708:9	762:6,8,12,17 763:10,21,23	interpretations	irrelevant
instance 761:13	interactions	764:1,5 765:1,8,	780:15	761:24,26 762:1
771:25	663:7,19,20	23 770:8 771:26	interpreted	768:1 769:4
instances 611:23	664:1 670:16,19	773:20 776:1,21	682:4	770:6 771:7
775:13	672:15	781:3,9,13,14,15,		804:23 805:8
Institute 669:19	interest 590:18	21,24 783:16	interrupt 639:22	809:21 810:3
751:1	591:18 592:1	784:19 786:26	intersection	IRS 761:16,23
instrument	596:1 597:10	787:1 803:2,4	599:16 601:21	isolation 721:17
702:7	603:21 604:19	806:26 807:13,	622:23 651:17 667:13 696:6	issuance 779:9
	605:5,8 607:25,	22,25 808:3,5,8,	0:07.13 090:0	

issue 596:19,23 602:7 618:13,16
619:7 624:5 625:9 638:14
640:19,21 643:2
657:18 658:8
669:3,4,21 681:4 686:17,26 703:11
706:2 713:20
717:23 718:11
723:9 725:17,23 726:6 730:9
754:25 755:4,11
762:1 764:4,10
765:6 766:4 772:1,3 774:17
781:6 794:25
809:25 811:6,20
812:23 813:11 816:4 818:1
823:1
issued 594:18
595:15 596:12 617:3 663:10
678:16 702:12
704:23 708:8
719:23 800:9 805:21 806:3
808:23 810:25
811:2 818:14
issues 597:6
657:22 660:17 661:4 663:7
666:3 672:15
684:8,13 693:18
703:18 705:12 732:24 746:16
784:24 822:5
items 737:13
iterative 729:5 734:15
J
January 594:17

January 594:17 708:8

job 808:8 joint 593:4 608:24 651:5,18 652:13 711:8 812:18 judicially 678:23

jurisdiction 634:17 680:11 702:2 769:15 780:21,23 781:6 784:21,26 785:5, 12 786:19

jurisdictions 770:7

jurisprudence 677:17

justification 705:9 794:24

justify 798:9 justifying 596:7 JV 608:25.26

609:4,6 651:4,18 652:3,5,10 705:20,26 710:12

K

kev 609:22 641:3,

kettle 803:10

5 693:13,17 695:1 699:22 704:20 705:11 706:2 732:23 750:6 773:16 789:3 **Keyera** 593:20 615:7.11.13 621:25 622:3 624:20 625:2 636:9 672:4 674:17 677:7 692:11,12 694:8 697:11 700:4 733:4 747:21 749:1 772:24

773:7,13 778:3 798:14 799:17,22 810:14

Keyera's 674:23 773:17 777:18,25 779:25 780:8,13 782:15 783:9,18, 25 784:1,6,12 785:14

kind 636:10 716:20 801:12 804:17 817:13

kinds 677:6 knew 626:23 790:16 810:4,6

knowing 748:13 knowingly 747:11 797:15

knowledge

593:17,22 594:7, 8 676:11 700:11, 12 724:7 749:15, 21 750:4 752:24 766:13 790:7

L

lack 619:8 622:5,

7,9 624:6,7,10

626:6 655:12 670:6,8,18 700:1 710:4 729:1 756:15 761:7 766:12.20 780:21 794:6 802:13.22 lacks 764:17 land 605:19,26 608:14 609:8 611:4,5 612:1,3, 7,15,16 613:20 614:16 615:5,16 616:2 624:14 628:15.19 631:10 637:11 639:7.18 641:24 644:15 646:3,4,6 662:7,

9,10,24,26 663:2, 8 664:2,7,23 667:2.15 670:15 671:2,5,13 672:6, 21 676:5,7,10,21 678:6 679:1,3,16 684:10 687:10 704:3,7 709:8 721:3 727:6 733:7 738:24 739:1,15,23 741:12 742:16 746:13 749:4 750:13,21,23 751:10,19 757:6 766:25 769:7 775:10 784:25,26 785:9,11 786:26 788:2,8,10,11,14, 15,20,21,23,24 789:2,19 790:1,5, 15 791:15 792:4 793:6 801:25 803:6 804:26 805:25 806:2 811:24,25 816:25,26 817:1 821:3

landowner 643:3 668:8 720:7,14 721:2,6,14 739:11 740:15 768:25 784:24 785:3 787:18 788:10,13,16,19, 24

landowners

637:9 679:3 720:11 lands 627:22 671:3 700:11,22 708:26 709:3 720:22 733:11 741:2,3,20 749:15 750:1,3 751:17,23 752:23 753:18 758:19,25 760:13 766:3 768:17 769:8 791:13 806:8 812:24,26 813:1

landscape 792:19 793:3

language 666:18 678:4

large 789:26 790:1,22

largely 607:1 759:13

larger 716:24 719:12 774:14

lastly 762:15 802:11

late 642:24 761:1, 5 768:25

law 613:18 644:12 662:17 677:1,13,23 678:4 679:7 680:6 719:7

733:19 767:5 773:22 780:11,16 781:5 784:10

786:22 789:3 794:23 798:13 809:13 810:18

815:6,10,11 **laws** 615:16

lawyer 745:21,22 789:15 813:26

lawyers 822:4 layouts 654:6

lays 650:10 **lead** 644:20

648:23 655:21 672:10 696:21 741:24 807:7

leading 732:16 **leads** 606:17 615:7 655:14

lease 614:5,11

Total Since Sinc
--

maintenance	675:7 741:3	market-based	MD 633:20	731:25 732:13,
619:19 620:4	749:5 758:5	766:8	634:10 635:18	18,26 734:20
797:7,12,16	765:12 770:13	markets 645:13	810:19,23	736:9 738:24
· ·	796:8 797:1	739:23	meaning 603:1	740:19 742:8
major 632:19	802:15 803:13		604:6 718:17	743:10 744:12
638:20 669:4,25 670:21	809:13 810:1	Marquis 607:15,		745:20 746:5
	malign 771:8	16,24 608:5,25,	773:20 784:19 807:10	757:26 758:14
majority 639:17		26 609:4,6		763:20 770:26
734:12 761:4,22	man-made	623:20 651:4,18,	meaningful	772:10 802:17
make 602:14,25	792:14	22 652:3,5,10,13	719:11 813:20	mention 730:3,5
630:14,17 657:18	management	705:20,26 707:22	meaningless	· ·
658:2 669:8	621:2 738:4	709:18 710:12	602:25 684:22	mentioned
680:16 682:13	mandate 645:10	759:14,17 812:17	799:24	657:16 698:16
704:5 705:3,4,6,	666:8,14 680:22	821:2	means 602:5	711:19 713:12
25 715:6 716:23	721:17 769:15	Martin 660:1	648:13 661:22	723:18 728:12
726:5 737:5	773:19,24	Martyshuk	672:21 683:19	745:16 746:15
742:4,11 758:2	780:11,18 781:8	668:8	742:5 767:9	753:10 756:5
763:21,26 776:14	782:1 784:18	material 605:11	776:17,25 777:7	770:24
777:12 779:13	786:1,19 794:5	671:16 719:6	781:13,14 783:11	mere 676:8
781:4,23 785:8	798:12	795:26	784:2 787:19,25	Meridian 606:7
789:21 792:3	mandated	materially	789:11 792:12	608:11,22 611:6
793:7 795:9,16	591:25 664:12	642:15 779:18	794:6 799:25	612:20 613:18
797:11 810:8	666:10		804:4 815:8	615:2 616:23
816:3,11 817:23	manner 610:6	materials 622:21	meant 654:15	617:22,24 622:24
819:21 822:26	663:5 686:23	630:15,21 636:9	719:6 764:7	641:14 696:1
makes 619:3	688:15 718:9	640:26 694:26	measured 643:14	705:15,18 708:7
629:11 642:17	723:6 741:1	700:21 747:4		710:14 806:1,11
671:1,9 683:12		795:25	measures 729:12	merit 685:10
750:21 757:9,15	manufacture	math 648:24	775:3	merits 763:2
794:14 814:13	695:8	745:21,23 813:26	mechanism	
817:21	map 624:1	matter 613:18	689:22 784:23	message 609:22
Makholm 640:22	805:22,23	632:2 634:7	meet 598:9	met 736:2
642:21 644:17	mapping 707:25	645:5 650:12	600:22 629:26	methodology
645:4,26 647:4,8,	maps 622:21	652:24 659:24	655:19 682:21,26	597:23
10 648:15 649:10	March 599:13	698:24 699:26	683:8 711:17	metres 633:22
697:21 700:5	622:14 691:3	714:1 716:24	735:21,26 797:14	metro 638:19,21
703:24 715:10	752:4 824:9	721:25 764:25	meeting 725:2	669:23,25
716:16 739:17	margins 720:20	771:7 781:4	meets 678:17	metropolitan
763:7,14,16,22		matters 593:23	770:1	607:3
764:4,7,8,19,21,	mark 771:12	738:26 763:3	Melcor 609:6	
23,24 765:4,7,15	markedly 817:2	766:13,14 770:7		Meysami 691:5
803:12	market 643:20	822:21	member 661:6	MG 652:12
Makholm's	648:10 655:25	Mattson 625:11	703:9	MGA 702:15
645:17	739:10,20 740:3	639:2	members 589:26	Midstream
	746:10 764:8,12,		593:13 627:26	692:2,5,8
making 638:8	13,16,17 774:5	max 769:26	652:9 659:20	million 607:5
663:24 666:25	786:5 787:21	Mcnaughtan	669:22 692:24	623:9,18 643:15,
667:17 673:26	788:18 815:26	691:7	703:4 715:7,15	023.3,10 043.13,
			1	1

16 653:26 656:3	misunderstandi	778:23 779:14	756:14 765:16	11,12 769:21
658:20 709:10	ng 733:20	783:26 791:23	much-needed	770:3,5 773:1,15
752:8 755:19	mitigate 753:14	793:16 794:11	667:10 669:12	776:11 781:10
millions 653:18		805:10 811:11	Mueller 678:25	802:26 805:12
mind 693:14	mitigation 624:23 625:1,4,	Morrison		813:6,26 814:13
695:2 699:23	13 775:3	640:20,25 641:2	multiple 653:10 747:18 778:14	820:21 821:7,9,
704:21 799:20	MJ 652:12	642:17 643:1,11,		18
mindful 659:5		17,23,24 644:6,	multitude 755:23	Naffin's 812:21
772:24	MLC 608:24	26 645:4,7	756:4	815:2
mineral 721:20	625:20 651:6,12 652:10,12 666:2	704:18 714:26	municipal	narrow 647:4
782:5		716:22 762:16,21	612:16 613:23	664:26
minimize 750:3	modern 804:19	765:20 766:5,12,	614:13 633:17 635:4 661:10	natural 634:25
759:4	modification	16,20,23 767:9,	662:11,14 664:5,	640:2 756:3
	770:21 819:13	22 768:2,15,23	12 675:24,26	810:19
minister 590:13, 20,26	Modifications	769:9 781:14,26	702:4,5 740:20	nature 597:8,17
,	819:9	785:1,6,16	746:22 804:20,22	731:23 745:2
minister's	modify 775:25	787:11,15 788:6 793:12 813:13	municipalities	753:16 754:15
590:16	791:17	815:3,4,12	661:8 675:25	755:5 756:18
minor 774:14	moment 650:6	816:12,19 817:3,	municipality	760:9 788:5
minute 822:16	689:12 698:16	9,11,18	610:8 681:21	791:8,20
minutes 640:8	706:20 744:9	Morrison's	702:7 746:17	navigate 684:14
657:8 769:18,23,	moments 709:25	592:17 593:1,6	municipally	NDAS 673:16
26 770:4 778:18	820:12	641:3 740:9,13	664:24	Neal 618:4
780:12 799:8	Monday 697:12	762:20 763:11	musings 740:9	necessarily
822:17	779:25 782:17	765:17,18,21,25		605:9 741:21
minutes' 657:2	795:22	767:3 768:1,14,	Myers 594:26 690:9 692:4,21,	763:26 820:23,25
772:23	money 816:3,11	20 770:5,13,17	22,23 732:4,16	necessity 651:25
misapprehend	Montana 678:25	784:20,22 787:26	733:6 735:9	683:19
725:22	months 624:15	motion 721:24	742:16 751:15	needed 607:24
misapprehensio	625:19,23 630:11	761:20	762:8,14 763:15	634:6 652:6
n 728:18	moot 652:18	motivation	770:24 773:15	670:13,17 674:18
mischaracterize	morning 589:2,4,	703:24 771:1	776:11 779:15	678:1 724:13
d 728:7	23 590:5 659:19	motivations	781:10 782:8	784:25 798:5
misconstrue	677:2 681:20	693:20	800:14 802:25	812:19
777:16	689:7 693:15	motives 748:4	804:18 805:14	nefarious 810:11
misconstrued	696:9 705:16	move 664:15	806:14 807:10,19	negative 641:22
804:8	714:17 716:2	666:9 679:23	808:17 811:6,26	741:21 742:15
misguided 616:8	720:6 721:11	705:11 711:5	Myers' 803:22	788:23 794:2
missed 689:9	723:18,26	740:17 749:23		negatively
801:26	726:13,19	moved 740:12	N	741:19 746:23
misses 791:26	727:12,19 728:5	moving 631:19		negligible 627:19
missing 816:7	729:17,26 731:18	634:23 663:4	Naffin 692:1	negotiate 737:14
misspelled	735:9 736:8 740:14 745:8	738:24 740:18	693:11 694:6,11	negotiated 634:8
798:20	758:13 763:14	743:10 748:8	717:24,25 723:24	negotiating
7,70.20	766:4 777:24	753:23 754:11	731:11 732:1,10,	negonanng
	700.1777.27			
	I	l	1	1

663:8 670:16 672:26 negotiation 821:14 negotiations 593:19 661:14 662:25 664:8 665:22 672:11 687:21 neighbourhood 607:13,14,15,17, 18 641:12 650:14 652:1 654:6 700:19 707:22 740:22 741:16 746:24 751:21 neighbourhoods 654:21 neighbouring 774:24 NERA 640:22 645:8 739:17 763:6 765:18,20 NERA's 765:17 net 641:22 network 668:26 neutral 819:25 newly 690:11 696:17 770:14 news 769:22 Nicholas 625:20	northern 655:16 nose 623:22 812:9 note 634:13 660:19 680:7 711:12 778:22 783:18 784:19 noted 637:18 638:17 676:9 687:13 738:11 755:15 778:23 782:8 801:6 notes 632:7,15 768:10 824:6 notice 592:19,23 594:19 597:7 676:18 725:20 726:6 795:17 808:23 noticed 724:16 notion 714:25 728:10 747:13 756:1 notions 748:8 notwithstanding 648:2 739:12 786:9 November 594:16,19 595:15 596:12 714:10 818:12,14,20	numerous 713:17 730:19 nutshell 654:18 O oath 784:3,14 801:4 obiter 730:1 779:16 object 821:16 objection 648:7 725:11 objections 683:24 685:24 723:2 objective 662:3 707:26 781:19 objectives 664:5 701:14 703:20 obligated 618:12 682:7 736:10 obligates 735:19 obligation 616:21,22 635:11 682:12,24 683:3 735:23 736:1,26 obligations 737:16 797:14 observing 589:13	occurred 724:8 783:11 occurrence 741:8 occurring 643:26 670:21 760:7 occurs 787:20 offer 614:25 622:2 789:20 offering 820:24 office 614:16 officers 593:21 official 589:12 692:14 824:16,23 oil 639:9 649:24 673:20 677:25 685:23 767:10 Olive 739:17 763:7 Olive's 715:12 763:14 one's 815:9,10 one-page 702:25 one-sided 664:8 673:14 one-size-fits-all 756:7 796:6 ongoing 708:1 onus 615:17 681:10,23 683:17	608:16 661:20 682:11 708:2 737:18 806:23 operational 621:1 738:3 operator 602:9 612:5 621:17 629:8 634:25 674:10 678:17 682:24 683:6,23 736:26 758:21 760:2,8 799:25, 26 807:5 operator's 602:10 operators 602:5 629:2,10 649:19 655:13 658:25 661:18 662:24 664:13 671:9 683:4 735:12 740:2 755:22 763:5 767:10 771:2 800:4 804:3 opine 737:9 opinion 590:16 603:19 614:26 632:12 644:22 712:18 768:21 801:15,19,22 813:23 817:12,
746:24 751:21 neighbourhoods 654:21 neighbouring 774:24 NERA 640:22 645:8 739:17 763:6 765:18,20 NERA's 765:17 net 641:22 network 668:26 neutral 819:25 newly 690:11 696:17 770:14	594:19 597:7 676:18 725:20 726:6 795:17 808:23 noticed 724:16 notion 714:25 728:10 747:13 756:1 notions 748:8 notwithstanding 648:2 739:12 786:9 November 594:16,19 595:15 596:12 714:10	683:24 685:24 723:2 objective 662:3 707:26 781:19 objectives 664:5 701:14 703:20 obligated 618:12 682:7 736:10 obligates 735:19 obligation 616:21,22 635:11 682:12,24 683:3 735:23 736:1,26 obligations 737:16 797:14	oil 639:9 649:24 673:20 677:25 685:23 767:10 Olive 739:17 763:7 Olive's 715:12 763:14 one's 815:9,10 one-page 702:25 one-sided 664:8 673:14 one-size-fits-all 756:7 796:6 ongoing 708:1 onus 615:17	operators 602:5 629:2,10 649:19 655:13 658:25 661:18 662:24 664:13 671:9 683:4 735:12 740:2 755:22 763:5 767:10 771:2 800:4 804:3 opine 737:9 opinion 590:16 603:19 614:26 632:12 644:22 712:18 768:21 801:15,19,22

oral 592:9 593:11	719:3,7 721:19,	671:11 693:3	paid 597:12	796:7 798:17
Orchards 625:10	25 722:2 749:9	697:1 711:19	600:18 619:15	803:24 813:12,13
639:2 665:26	782:3,12,18	over-the-top	620:15 623:22	815:18 822:24
674:16	783:14 794:3	801:22	627:22 642:3	Panel's 712:6
Orchards'	orders 662:19	overhaul 723:21	643:12,20 651:22	717:9 739:3
674:19	678:8,22 685:8	overlap 786:24	674:3 705:19,26	743:12 771:14
order 590:22	694:9 696:18	_	712:4,26 737:1	772:19
591:19 594:24	706:8 710:3	overlooks 726:7	739:11,14,21	panels 593:13
596:19 601:26	717:23 718:24	overnight 734:22	740:16 743:17	paragraph
602:8,15,16	729:20 740:7	override 726:21	766:1 767:14	595:25 604:13,25
603:24 619:3	744:15 747:23	727:7	768:24 774:4	605:13,22 615:7
636:6 639:14,16	748:12,19 754:4	oversight 758:8	777:5 786:5	647:16 677:7,16
642:8 650:5	762:7 776:14,25	overstated 645:3	787:22 788:13	678:24 718:5
651:8,9,21 652:5	ordinarily 751:9	686:2 745:14	789:1	721:18 729:24
656:4,10 657:18,	ordinary 681:8	overstatement	panel 595:2	785:13 808:25
22 658:4,5,7,8	753:12	645:16	596:20 602:25	809:7
662:25 667:9			607:2 627:26	
673:17 678:20	organization 669:20 703:16	overtop 598:13	628:1 637:21,24	paragraphs 718:3 800:18
680:12 685:17	724:19	overturn 762:22	640:6 650:4	
686:2 689:22		767:4 770:18	653:4 657:15,17,	parallel 604:11
698:10 704:23	organizations	overview 693:17	19 658:22	622:22 636:23
705:17 706:5,24	758:10	705:11	659:20,25 660:3	parcel 612:3
710:2 711:21,26	organized 693:1,	owned 608:13,14	662:15 673:2,25	746:13 750:12
712:14,23 713:1,	11	611:4,5 675:25	683:2 685:14	751:10
9,20 717:4	original 595:4,17	803:6	686:21 688:13,16	parcels 613:20
719:16,22 722:8,	623:8 635:17,19,	owner 604:17,23	692:24 694:21	641:24 742:4
17,24 726:21	21,23 695:13	614:8 631:14	695:1 696:23	pardon 734:25
739:7 740:4	696:19 702:26	636:2 721:12	711:14,23 712:12	736:18 739:13
744:23 746:4	725:7 726:16	722:24 723:1	713:18 717:3,14	742:24 748:21
748:1 752:15	740:15 768:25	769:7 775:10	718:1 724:17	754:7 765:5,16
763:21 771:23	809:23,26	owners 735:20	725:6 731:25	Park 815:19
772:3 775:26	originally 594:15	774:24	732:13,18,24,26	816:6,8
776:23 777:1,6,	623:1 660:26	ownership	734:20 736:9	part 590:15,21
10,12 779:9,12	outcome 661:13	787:12,15 788:1,	738:24 740:19	602:22 603:17
792:5 796:9	718:18 724:22	787.12,13 788.1,	742:8 743:10	609:22 620:2
800:8 801:6,17	outcomes 628:17	,	744:12,15 745:20	651:7 652:16
810:25,26	outline 693:19		746:5,20 747:16	655:13 660:23
811:21,23 812:8		P	748:3 750:7,15	672:16 679:21
ordered 591:12	outlined 709:15	(22.0	754:7 755:7,15,	699:16 733:21
630:17 645:12	714:8 718:20	pace 632:8	16 756:1 758:14	747:12 756:16
652:19,21 683:24	719:1 740:13	pages 647:16	762:19 764:18	761:25 762:2
743:14 745:14	776:12	673:23 696:7	765:7,12,13	792:19 795:7
779:11	outright 739:16	707:16,21 708:6	770:12,18 771:16	797:9,19 802:12
ordering 771:24	788:14	734:26 742:24	772:10,11,18	815:15
orderly 631:5	outset 591:3	745:6 766:10	780:19 781:22	partially 634:4
661:20 666:11	649:14,21 659:25	781:17 783:3	785:15 787:25	796:25
001.20 000.11	660:18 666:8	791:6 824:4	794:16 795:6	7,50.25
	I	I	l	1

participants 823:2	776:4,6,7,15,18	payable 590:24 604:1	615:1 618:9,14	810:5
	778:11 787:8 792:17 812:11		619:12,18 620:17	Pembina/plains/
participate		paying 604:20	622:11,19,21	secure 690:5
661:3 702:24	passage 673:21,	620:9 645:20	623:1,4,13,17,20	pending 631:26
720:14 747:20	22 718:4 779:16	681:23 711:3	626:21 630:14	people 664:16
795:12,18	passed 590:10	745:17 788:7,21	633:6,13 634:14	759:22 813:22
participated	647:14,23 648:5	payment 590:22	636:8 638:10	people's 735:11,
594:4 698:1	655:3 743:16,22	603:25 712:23	640:21,25 641:8 642:2,9 643:24	13
participation	744:8 747:14	759:1,5 776:23	644:7 646:1,24	per-unit 648:23
711:15 748:4	763:8 813:18	800:10	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	654:25
770:25 822:23	814:12	pays 633:7 697:7	656:3,9,11 658:6, 11,14 690:3	
parties 620:24	past 592:9 627:17	699:1,18 735:3	692:1,4,7,19	percent 612:13
621:5 634:5,9	629:6 631:25	736:26	693:4,8 695:5,17	648:21 652:6
636:19 641:7	653:13 657:7	PDF 592:16,18,	696:4,26 697:9	654:1 665:12
645:6 659:8	693:2 822:23	21,24 593:1,7	698:25 699:7	712:2,5 735:14
663:1 669:16,17	patience 822:22	595:16 617:4	701:9,25 702:16,	744:16,24
672:10 673:15	pause 634:13	656:6 696:6,16	22 705:14 706:5,	745:17,25 746:3
687:6,9,15	pay 600:8 602:9	698:15 703:14	23 707:8 708:10,	753:14 772:5
688:12 695:14	606:21 609:5	704:19 705:22	23 707.8 708.10,	814:3,4
703:20 715:20	618:26 620:14	707:16 713:23,24	713:9,14,21	percentage
723:15 724:13	621:24 632:16	734:2,7,10,26	716:7 717:5,11,	658:20,21 806:20
738:1,7 757:24	633:4,8 635:5,9	735:7,15 737:20	16 720:21 724:6,	807:7,8
759:24 764:26	636:5 642:8	738:10,16 739:26	18 726:19 727:24	percentages
767:11 769:5	643:21 644:9	740:5 741:14,25	728:11,20 729:4	814:1
775:9,14 778:14	648:21 652:5	742:23,24 743:20	730:22 732:14	Perfect 690:10
780:1 785:25	656:3 658:19	744:4,21 745:5	733:10,24 735:1,	perfectly 731:22
792:26 795:11	659:1 665:12	746:14,18 748:25	3,5 737:14	753:8
800:10 803:14	671:23 675:3	749:11 750:13,25	738:12 739:5,8,	perform 699:7
823:2	683:11,19 688:2	751:7,13 752:3,	19 740:8 741:18	711:4 780:6
partners 767:8	695:20 698:21	16 753:7 754:13,	745:9 748:20	performed
parts 639:18	701:20 702:17	21 755:1,6	750:4 751:25	698:18 710:7
731:21	704:11 705:25	756:11 757:16	752:3 753:13,17	726:12
party 591:8	709:22 722:4	759:11,20	755:10 756:15,16	
604:21 609:21,23	724:15 728:24	766:10,18,19	757:10 761:2,3,8	period 624:13,18,
618:19,26 635:25	730:10,18,21,24	767:2,16,26	766:1,24 768:4,7,	26 628:2,9 629:3,
636:4 661:14	731:6 733:5,15	768:6,13,18	11,26 772:15	8,17 816:20
665:12 675:12,21	735:5 736:11	769:16 770:10	799:18 802:5,24	periphery 604:9
689:19 699:1,2,	737:22 740:2	805:24 806:5	803:10,14,19	638:26 639:15
21 700:2 705:4,6	745:10 759:22,26	Pembina 590:7	805:9 808:19	643:8 668:25
706:10,11 709:21	770:22 779:10,11	591:5,17 592:22	809:12 810:14	686:24 811:13
727:15 728:23	780:21 786:12,26	593:5,20 594:2,6,	Pembina's	821:2
731:4 734:6,17	787:19 788:18	9,21 595:8 596:9,	602:18 613:5	permissible
735:6 736:6	793:24 794:17	16 597:20,26	616:18 636:3	614:10
737:1 759:7	803:26 804:3	600:4,9,12,18,25	643:18 698:19	permit 678:16
760:5 761:12	814:4 818:4	601:4,7,22	708:18 752:1	702:13 743:18
764:1 772:7		606:19 609:18	756:25 761:15	804:25
		610:23,26 613:13		

permits 775:24	pipeline 590:7,8,	9 679:9,14,17,18,	745:13 747:7,13,	810:26 813:8,16
permittee	11,16,21,25	23,24 680:9,12,	20 748:7,10,13,	816:9,14,17,22,
603:16,18	591:9,20 594:25	16,17,19,24,25	16,22 749:7,12,	23 817:2,24
perpetuity	595:21 596:1	681:1,6,10,11,13,	16 750:5,19	818:4,11,12,13,
644:8,11	597:9 598:1,6,8,	17,18,19,20,23	751:6,12 752:1,	19,22 819:2,4,6,
,	13,14 599:9,13	682:1,2,3,4,6,9,	14,18,21 753:20	8,15 821:8,13
person 616:1 735:3 786:25	601:1 602:5,7,8,	13,15,19,20,23,	754:22 755:12,	pipeline's 629:1
	12 603:4,22	24,25,26 683:3,5,	14,17,19,21,22	791:2
personal 593:22	604:3 606:12,15	6,7,14,15,16,17,	756:17,22	pipelines 591:18,
594:7	610:1 611:12,19,	23,25,26 684:21,	758:21,23 759:1,	23 598:11 606:6
persons 591:15	25 612:5,6 614:8,	26 685:3,10,15,	16 760:1,2,3,6,8,	609:12 612:22
603:26	19,20,22 615:19	21,22,24 686:7,	18,22 761:8,12,	615:1 616:7
perspective	616:9,11 617:21,	14,17,25 687:9,	13,23 762:11,18,	619:20 622:22
659:11 671:21	25 619:2,4	12,14 688:8	24,26 763:3,5	626:21,24 627:1,
717:14 746:19	621:17 623:16,18	689:18,20 692:1,	766:11,25 767:9	17 629:17 631:23
773:17 775:7	624:11,17 627:23	4,7 693:10,20,26	768:1,6,15,16,19	632:3 638:20
persuade 808:7	628:4,7,23,24	694:3,7,25 696:1,	770:11,16,21	641:11,21 642:5,
pertaining	629:22 630:10,	5,14 697:18,22	771:2,4,9,17,24	23 643:14
668:22 687:18	12,20,25,26	698:12,25 699:1,	772:1,11 773:19	644:10,21 646:2
	631:4,14,19,21	20,25 700:3,7	774:4,12,19,21,	650:19 656:10
pertains 669:8	632:13 633:8,19	701:3,26 703:7,	22 775:2,4,5,9,	658:4 661:21
674:15 676:16	634:1,4,6,12,21,	11 705:17 706:7,	10,12,15,16,17,	662:6 666:15
678:22	25 635:5,7,16,19	18 707:10,14,17	23,24,25,26	667:14 669:25
pertinent 669:15	636:2,16,21,25	708:2,4,12,18,20,	776:2,3,5,7,9,14,	670:12 671:1,13,
petroleum	637:2,6,10,22,24	24 709:11,17,22	16,17,19 777:16	25 672:15,19,20
664:16	638:9,25 639:17	710:13,24 711:6,	778:5,7,10,13,19,	674:2 676:1
philosophy	641:16 642:13	8,16 712:11,17	20,24 779:4,10,	679:13 681:11
621:1 738:4	643:22 645:12	713:5,16,25	23,26 780:2,4,6,	682:11,13 687:26
phone 804:20	646:11,13 648:18	714:6 716:13	9,22 781:1,10	688:3 698:19
phrases 719:12	649:18 650:7,10,	717:18,26 718:19	782:9,22 784:23	700:12,14,22
-	13,17,21,25	719:17 720:3	785:2,4 786:4,7,	702:3 705:14
physical 601:1	651:2 653:1,10	721:15,22 722:1,	10,11,15 787:12,	706:2 707:5,8,13,
717:11 776:20,26	655:2,13 656:3	3,9 723:3,11,12,	14,17,21,26	24 708:11 713:9,
777:2,8 778:4,11,	658:25 661:8,14,	19 724:17,23	788:5,8,9,12,17,	15 716:9,14
12,13 779:5	17,26 662:24	725:2,8 726:22	22,25 789:1	717:6,12,17
797:19,26	663:1,3,7,8,20	727:8,15 728:20	790:6,8,13,14,19	722:4 727:24,26
pick 629:18	664:2,9,13,17,22,	729:3 730:9,25	791:12 792:1,26	728:12,21
picked 615:9	25 665:6,8,17,20,	731:2 732:19,21	793:1,19,22	729:10,15 730:24
piece 715:4 749:4	23 666:17,18,24	733:1,2,3,15,22,	794:14,18,20	737:19 739:2
816:13,20	667:1,6,25 668:9,	25 734:1,11,14,	795:22,24,26	740:25 741:6,18,
pieces 664:15	26 669:4,13,21	17,18,24 735:5,	796:9,15,17,21,	21,22 742:11,14,
-	670:3,7,16,17,20	12,16,18,20,22,24	26 797:3,5,7,11,	17,25 743:8,26
pin 802:21	671:5,9,24 672:3,	736:4,14,16,18,	15,19,23 799:23,	746:12 748:15
pipe 623:12	12,22,25,26	19,26 737:11,14,	25,26 800:4	749:9,16 750:5,
681:18 774:20	673:7,15 674:3,5,	16 738:17,19,26	802:2 804:2,12,	11 751:19,25
795:26 796:11	9,10,21 675:1,6,	740:2,20,21	15,16 805:4,5,10	753:17 754:20
804:2 819:16,25	17 676:4,8,13,17,	741:10 743:11	806:23 807:5,6,	755:11,23 759:8
	22 677:26 678:1,	744:17,23,26	22,25 809:3,8	155.11,25 157.0
		<u> </u>		

766:8 768:4,11	701:9,26 702:17,	773:16,18 804:26	723:8 725:21,23	634:14,24 636:3
769:12 774:3,5,6,	23 705:23 706:6	planned 608:1	726:23 727:8	643:18 645:17
17 775:14 779:3	709:9 713:9,14,	631:7 654:5	728:4,19 731:15	649:22 650:22
784:25 789:10	21 716:7 717:16	768:12	740:17 758:5,10	651:7 652:3,8,9
791:8 792:3,6,24	720:21 724:6,18	planning 607:8	766:5 790:12	664:21 665:9
793:4,24 794:12,	728:21 729:4	628:21 639:7	791:22,26 792:2	676:22 683:12,26
17 795:23	730:22 732:14	662:11 664:5	797:10 799:7	684:20 696:17,26
805:15,16 806:12	733:10,24 737:14	702:6 709:1	800:23 801:3,13,	697:2 699:15
811:19 820:22	739:7,19 740:8	740:18,20,26	20,26 802:1,4,10	721:13 732:19
821:3	745:9 748:20	741:13 742:2,6	810:24 814:2,13	733:21 740:13,15
place 628:21	749:1 752:2	743:1 768:15	815:23 817:25	770:15 784:8
669:1 682:12	753:13 755:11	785:9,12	818:9,18 819:21	800:3 804:5
706:3 733:15	756:14,16 759:5,	plans 591:26	820:11 821:6	807:20 810:5
745:3	15,18 761:2,3,9	609:10 620:4	pointed 635:3	817:17
placement	768:26 772:15	630:2 631:6,20,	646:3,12 679:8	positions 642:1
768:16	799:19 802:5,24	26 637:18,21	684:25 779:15	693:4 694:14,26
places 672:6	803:11,14,19	638:1,4 661:10	781:11	747:22 812:4
681:10,23 683:3,	805:9 808:19	708:10 709:1,3	points 632:21	positive 662:4
17 774:19	809:12 810:4,14	742:18 749:22	635:26 641:3,5	669:11 682:12
plain 714:24	Plains' 610:26	750:12 751:24	693:13 695:1	717:2
716:23 736:23	613:5,13 616:17	758:17 786:9	698:23 720:25	possess 749:21
776:13	618:9,14 619:12	797:21	727:3 773:16	possibility
	633:6 643:18	plausible 718:13	774:2 778:1	602:14
Plains 590:8	696:1 698:18	_	797:10 803:13	
591:4,17 592:22	705:14,17 706:23	play 660:17	811:3 814:7	possibly 644:13
593:5,20 594:2,5,	707:8 708:11,12	720:24 803:5	820:19	760:8
9,21 595:7 596:9,	710:13 717:5,11	806:22	policies 618:25	pot 803:10
16 597:20,26	726:20 727:24	playing 662:25	policy 635:4	potential 627:5,7
598:19 599:1,3,4,	728:11 734:8	pleased 659:20	696:23 701:13	628:23 650:5
12,15 600:4 601:22 602:18	739:5 741:18	773:12	781:25	671:4 672:12
606:19 609:18	750:4 751:25	pleasure 590:3	political 701:14	701:3 721:7
610:23 615:1	753:17 759:12	PM 690:14	703:20 710:16	741:11 746:16
619:18 622:11,	761:15 766:1,24	692:16		749:16 753:16
14,17,22,26	768:4,7,11	point 589:17	poorly 787:8	potentially 674:7
623:5,16 626:21	Plains/pembina/	592:3 602:4	population	687:17 769:7
630:14 633:14	secure 673:2	606:26 609:2	607:4,10 608:9	power 596:8
634:14 636:3,8	683:2 685:14	610:20 611:9	661:9	614:1,2 648:10
638:10 640:21,25	plan 607:4,12,13,	616:16 618:23	Porco 692:14	665:4 672:9
641:8 642:2,11	14,15,22 631:22	630:13,16 633:3	824:3,22	679:16,22 681:1
643:24 644:7	637:19 653:22,23	641:26 642:17,25	portion 592:4	764:8,13,17
646:1,24 651:2,	654:4 700:18,19	643:5,6 651:12	701:8,25 702:17	791:13
20 652:2 656:9,	707:11,13,20,22	656:24 657:1	779:3 786:12	powerful 678:2
11 658:6,11,14	708:7,9,11,19	686:24 689:6	portions 593:9	practically
690:3 692:2,5,8,	715:26 719:13	695:4,22 699:22	617:15 764:15	603:10 629:24
19 693:5,9 695:5,	740:22,23	700:10 701:10	position 602:24	776:2 799:24
17 696:26 697:9	741:16,17 748:17	704:20 714:15	615:14 617:7	practice 621:8
698:25 699:7	751:20,21	721:11 722:12	631:2,14 633:6,7	practice 021.0
	I	1	I	1

622-2 4 626-4	nuodiatah:1:4	nuogontationa	(75.15.19.676.0	nuocativa (20.22
622:2,4 636:4 660:20,23 675:8	predictability 657:17 670:6	presentations 686:5	675:15,18 676:2,	proactive 629:22
684:2 697:6,10,	688:7		4,5,6,15 697:21 706:14,15 709:24	problem 626:6
12,14 699:17		presented 632:7	727:4,5 733:5,9,	636:26 672:23
709:4 710:11,19,	predictable	666:26 771:13	23 770:19 786:25	problematic
20 731:1,3,7	663:5 686:22	presenting 590:4	787:11 789:6,8,	742:3,11 774:21
738:9,19,21	prefer 594:12	pressed 646:16	11 790:2 791:21,	problems 631:10
759:12 760:22	813:21 820:26	pressing 638:26	22,23 792:9,10,	procedural
761:22 770:20	821:4	pressure 645:24	12 793:15,17,23	594:14 660:13
772:9 779:26	preference 640:5	707:19	794:2,8 801:24	procedurally
780:5	preferred 708:20	presume 777:26	812:25 813:2	778:2 795:8,15
practices 735:17	prejudicial	presumed 719:5	815:10,11	821:25
815:6	701:7	presumption	principled	proceed 651:21
pre-november	preliminaries	684:24 719:3	650:23	695:20 748:14
819:8	589:18	pretty 790:23	principles 681:9	749:14 797:3
precedence	premature		697:17 704:10	799:9,11
729:16 810:18	632:24 637:25	prevails 702:6,13	706:18 727:7,9	proceeded
precedent 616:6	638:2 668:4	prevalence	762:23,25 767:5	687:21 812:13
636:11 639:14	684:18	672:20	773:22 780:12,16	proceeding
654:15 662:23	prematurely	prevent 796:9	781:3 786:21	625:10 656:8
683:23 685:9	783:10	previous 668:1	789:8 794:23	660:10,14 661:3,
686:15,21 687:7	premise 613:14	750:19 818:12	798:13 815:6	4,7,13 662:5
688:11 724:4	709:20 786:18	previously 605:1	prior 592:8 598:3	663:3,14,18,26
731:13,18,20	premised 605:9	640:2 751:20	616:1,4 628:20	666:26 667:15,
783:4,9 784:14	prepare 589:11	788:25	640:26 671:3	23,26 674:14,16
798:12	600:19	price 627:21	729:18 758:24	675:16,22 681:26
precedent-	prepared 632:16	655:6,10 740:2	790:4 793:8	684:5 686:1,6,8
setting 784:9	633:4 699:11	743:13 744:10	priorities 703:13	687:15,22 693:5,
precedents 638:6	709:2 740:17	746:11,24 747:2	733:8	7,19 694:8,13,16,
precisely 645:10	784:6	764:11 766:8	priority 607:7	24 695:3 697:1 698:2,17 699:16
•	preparing 719:5	769:10,12 816:1	615:20	701:15 702:24
preclude 631:11 702:15	prescribe 603:26	prices 648:23	private 611:26	703:6 705:1,12
	-	655:19,25 743:11	612:3,7 637:9	706:19 710:15
predated 790:14	presence 700:12 741:10 742:25	746:6 764:14	645:6 701:5	711:13,16,18
predecessor	741:10 742:25	813:9	704:13,14 714:1,	712:7 713:13
630:13 641:10	749:15	pricing 750:22	3 715:20,21	714:11,19 717:7,
796:20		prima 596:5,6	716:18 755:22	10 720:15,16,18,
predecessors	present 631:4 659:21 693:6	597:1	763:4 764:25,26	20 722:12 724:2,
667:24 678:7	717:25 729:21	primarily 642:20	765:2,23 769:5	5,21,22 728:13
679:14 684:17	746:12 747:10	682:5 813:6	771:2 775:19	730:5,19 731:13,
779:12	773:12 774:16	primary 728:19	803:2,9,11,13,15,	16 732:20,25
predecessors'	777:10 816:26	principal 626:9	17,20 811:10 814:15	739:4 742:10
766:24	presentation	642:21 800:25		743:5 744:6
predicated	642:11 688:25	principle 609:26	privately 803:6	746:10 747:20,22
613:14	3.2.11 000.25	610:4 615:12,15	privileges 733:12	748:3 749:25
		616:5,9 665:1		754:26 755:11
	1	1	1	1

756.0 750.25	757.10 20 750.1	774.94 700.11 16	protests 642.14	612:17 702:12
756:9 759:25 760:14 761:5,24	757:19,20 758:1, 4,10	774:24 780:11,16 784:26 786:22	protests 642:14	
760:14 761:3,24	1	784:26 786:22	provide 603:25	provision 590:25
762:2,0,13,20,22	professionalism	15,17 793:7,9	620:22,23 621:5,	683:9 718:8,22
769:11,13	688:14	794:23 798:13	22,26 640:22	719:8 721:5
770:14,26 771:7,	profile 634:3	815:10,11,19,21	658:14 666:11	723:8 747:4
14 772:16 773:25	profit 720:19	816:4,6,8,10,13,	667:10 669:12	800:23,26
774:3,10 775:21	728:2 741:4	16	676:18,19 677:3	provisions
782:1 783:25	749:5		693:17 694:1	603:10 680:1,5
784:1,5,11 786:4	profitable	proponent	721:18 722:21	702:15,22 719:10
794:8 795:9,14	730:11	646:21	732:13 737:26	720:4 721:16
796:18,24 798:3	profits 745:10	propose 731:9	738:7 740:23	722:13,16,23
804:23 805:17	748:6	proposed 605:6,8	749:23 753:13	723:5
		624:14 629:17	758:22 773:24	proviso 607:26
proceedings	programs 671:20	631:12 632:9	782:3 784:23	proximity
589:1 690:14	prohibitive	634:3 635:2	798:8	625:19 665:21
691:1 692:16	743:9	661:15 676:20	provided 601:5	666:4 729:11
801:13,16 823:6	project 655:24	683:5 708:13	620:18 622:10	748:15 754:24
824:5	656:5 665:25	757:5,12 760:5	623:6 628:25	760:6 776:4
proceeds 732:3	746:23 747:5,6	786:3 794:18	637:16 640:20	780:6 793:25
process 624:22	763:25,26 790:2	proposing	648:8 650:6	public 590:18
669:13 673:26	792:21	797:19	662:24 663:22	591:18 592:1,25
677:13,22 678:4	projected 607:4,	proposition	666:16 667:14	593:3 596:1
679:6 688:6	9 637:13	613:23 665:7	668:21 669:2	597:10 603:20
693:1,24,25	projects 663:4,21	788:3	670:5 673:6,10	604:18 605:5,7
699:24,26 700:5,	686:22	proprietary	678:17 695:20	607:25,26 608:3,
20 709:5 710:5	promised 771:11	620:26 673:18	696:4 698:3	5,13,14 609:8
723:10,19,22	_	738:2	707:4 708:4	611:6,13,20
729:5 734:15,22	proper 590:14 603:16 680:21		710:7 724:3	612:1 613:3,19
739:9 741:13	681:7 712:13	prospective	729:2,9 737:8	616:10,13 617:25
742:7 750:17	743:1 771:16	715:17,19	738:21 741:26	619:4 621:15,21
751:2 755:3	777:17 795:17	prosperity	750:16 753:5	636:22 637:1
756:24,25 757:2	818:3	685:22	754:1,8 756:22	639:5,8,20
759:25 761:8		protect 630:10	757:3 761:2,6	640:19,23 641:6
767:15 789:24	properly 615:22	650:16 696:13	803:24	642:19 644:13
791:18 796:26	682:3,11 702:18	708:16 775:4,25	providers 675:11	645:1,9,17,19
processes 733:25	705:13 716:7	776:7 804:15,16	providing 622:4	646:6,18,25
734:3,5,8,11	763:22	807:6	702:25 749:23	647:5,11 648:16
735:25	properties	protected 796:12	774:2 797:1	649:4,7,26
processing	661:19 815:25	protecting	province 591:10,	654:12 656:10,13
624:24 655:13	property 610:5,	790:18	15 638:23	662:2,9,20,23
produced 740:6	11,13,21 615:17,	protection 650:7	639:12,19 648:11	663:25 664:19,23
product 707:19	21,24 631:11	674:21 708:19,24	702:3 723:19	666:7,14,25
782:24	637:11 649:6	protective	731:1,19 737:3	667:2,5,7,13,14,
	676:23 677:1,4,5,	729:12	748:21 767:12	16,18 668:22
products 664:16	9,11,20 678:2,4,6		795:11 824:8	669:16 671:21
professional	679:4,11 739:16	protest 651:23	provincial	679:24 680:18
621:14,20	767:5 773:22		F	681:1 686:9,17,
	1	I	1	1

20 687:5 688:11
693:23 694:10
700:8 704:12,16
712:18,21 713:4,
8,19,26 714:11,
20,24,25 715:1,2,
4,5,6,8,12,14,15,
18,24 716:6,10,
13,14,21,24
717:2,4,9,13,15,
20,22 718:23
719:15,21,24
720:1 721:26
725:26 726:2
727:1,10 728:6
730:13 733:13
739:7 753:21
762:5,8,12,17 763:10,17,19,20,
23,24,26 764:5,
26 765:8,22,24
770:8 771:25
773:20 775:26
776:21 781:3,8,
13,14,15,21,23,25
783:16 784:19
791:24,25 792:2
801:25 803:4,7
806:2,4,22,26
807:13,22,25
808:2,5,8,12,14
809:9,17 817:5
publicly 670:2
pull 730:1 804:19
pump 747:7
purchase 700:22
715:16 741:2
749:4 750:12
752:23 789:20
790:15 791:15
792:4
purchased
676:10 700:10,16 701:2 708:26
739:16 742:16
750:3 751:16,23
757:6 758:19,24

760:12
purchaser
615:16,22,26
747:18 816:2
purchasers
715:17 747:15
purchasing
615:21 700:15
746:13 751:9
753:18
pure 797:8
purely 748:4
purport 665:2
purported
759:21 760:25
purportedly
762:16 766:17
767:23
purpose 602:2
603:2 604:6
605:15 684:4
689:3,5,11
706:18 718:10,21 722:5 727:12
755:24 800:25
807:11
purposes 605:16
610:20 675:19
679:2 693:7
720:8,26 788:21,
22 790:1 793:6
pursuant 591:3
618:11 633:18
652:26 660:19
664:5 675:25
676:23 679:18

680:13,24 701:21

705:20 706:1

712:26 738:13

752:25 777:6

pursue 654:14

703:16 710:3

pursued 715:8

728:3 764:1

pursuing 703:20

803:2,9,11,15,17, 20 814:15 **put** 669:1 673:24 674:13 685:3 686:5 705:8 717:9 724:18 725:14 741:23 746:9 757:26 761:22 770:19 771:5 795:24 800:20 803:23 804:6 808:5 809:20 812:10 821:9 Q **Oualico** 589:25 591:6,14,20 592:6.11 593:9.

14,15 594:10,12, 14 595:2,4 596:20 597:19 599:1 600:1,8,18 601:5,7,20 602:24 606:20, 21,23,25 607:18 608:6,15,17,20, 23 609:1,4,6,11, 13,15,19,20,24 611:5 616:20,21, 24,26 617:13,18 618:8,10,14 619:7 620:19,22 623:6,21 624:9 626:15 627:9,20, 26 630:15 638:5, 8.11.13 639:10

640:20 641:7 642:1,2 643:1 644:6 645:20,21, 23 646:1,4 647:12,18 649:12

650:4,22 652:4,9, 25 653:3,20 654:14 655:2

656:7,16,19

662:19,20 663:2 666:2 667:20 668:18 669:7,10 672:14,17 685:8, 18 689:6 691:14 694:9 695:5,20 696:11,19,23 698:20 699:11 700:10,17 701:11,20,23 702:21 703:9 704:24 705:1,16 706:9,10 708:26 709:7.14.21 710:1,5,8,10,18 711:12,13,17,19, 24.25 712:1.10 714:15 715:23 716:11,19 717:24 718:25 720:5,7, 13,15,25 721:11, 16 722:6,12,15, 21 723:6,25 724:1,3,9,12,14, 26 725:6,21 726:13,17,19 727:19,22 728:2, 3,22 729:21 730:17 731:12, 14,17 733:13 736:7 737:7,22 738:11,21 740:6, 12,14 741:1 742:1,16 743:24 744:16,25 745:15 746:11,26 747:3 748:2 749:12 750:2,7,9 751:9, 16,22 752:4,6,19 753:9,15,19,24 754:1,9,16 756:15,17 758:14,20 760:10,12,16 761:2,16,20

762:6 764:7,12,

658:13,15,16,18,

21 659:15

16,17 765:24 767:22,25 769:1 772:4,7 777:20 779:1,7 780:7 781:18 783:4,20 785:19 790:5 793:13,15,20 794:8 795:1,15 798:7,10 800:3 801:9 802:1,5,13, 16 803:2,6,9,14, 16,24 805:20 806:14 807:12 809:22 811:7,12, 15 812:1,7,15 813:1,13 814:3,7, 8,14,15 815:17 **Qualico's** 589:20

590:5 591:2,16

592:14,18,21,25

593:4,25 595:11

596:21 603:7

604:4 606:26

613:16 615:14

616:18 617:4

618:1,13 626:22

636:10 641:10 646:2 650:3 651:24 652:16 659:11 661:1,16 663:13 669:11 684:11 693:21 694:12 695:7,11, 19,23 696:21 697:25 699:5 700:26 703:1,18 705:10 707:7 708:10 709:10,16 713:7,15 714:18, 23 715:16,17,21 716:24 720:17. 19,23 721:7,10

728:21 731:23

738:20 742:15

7,22,24 747:15

744:15,22 746:3,

748:11 749:6,19,

24,26 750:11,16	679:4 706:8	594:20 595:18	744:12 746:8	recent 653:14
752:7,12 753:23	726:20 794:12	598:2,20 599:18	817:16	668:14 700:26
756:14 762:5	quo 753:20	601:11,17	realm 714:4	recently 610:7
768:21 770:14	quotation 605:24	603:13,23	reason 592:1	664:1
772:13 773:23	_	604:14,25	616:19 642:21	recitation 660:16
776:10 778:22	quote 595:16	605:18,23 610:9		
780:20,25 781:2	611:9 618:3	611:11,17 612:18	654:26 655:11,	reckoning
782:11,17 783:19	678:24	613:1,25 614:14,	16,20,26 670:13	769:17
784:8 795:7		21 615:13	684:7 705:2	recoating 708:14
798:14 802:6	R	617:10,11 619:25	756:2 758:26	recognize 731:25
809:14 811:10		620:21 626:10,19	760:4 778:6	recognized
	railway 819:10,	628:6 629:4,20	801:9 802:12	677:18 696:9
qualified 757:25	13,14,20	631:3,17 632:6	806:21,25 810:3	
758:6	raise 591:3	633:24 634:26	812:7 821:16	recognizes
quantitative	645:13 811:3	635:14 637:20	reasonable	662:8,23 669:16
649:16,17,20		638:18 641:19	620:1,11 657:7	686:16 687:5
quantity 672:12	raised 618:16		658:16 659:1	688:11
quarter 631:1	641:14,15 681:4	646:5,19 647:17	673:7 683:16	recognizing
707:20 805:26	701:16 703:18	648:8 651:13	685:4 735:26	675:12 774:26
	804:18	653:5,8 673:25	758:20 760:2	recollection
question 593:18	ran 630:26	677:16 679:12	reasonableness	763:22
594:10 598:18	range 648:25	681:7,17 682:16	665:14 670:24	recommend
611:7 613:9	755:16,20	696:11 698:7	755:10	789:16
620:5,20 639:20	ranges 755:18	703:10,26 707:26		
648:14 652:17		716:17 718:3,6	reasons 716:23	recommendatio
657:14,15 659:3,	Rapid 605:19	719:4 721:23	717:24 745:22	n 795:20
14 667:19 673:3	rapidly 811:20	735:9 736:9	770:11 771:24	recommended
688:20,22 712:9	rate 647:8 764:21	737:25 739:21	778:19 780:24	785:8
714:20 717:7,14	765:1	741:5,9 748:19	782:15 785:22	reconsider
718:14 803:25	rate-regulated	749:7 750:17	786:19 798:14	596:10,13
806:8 813:5	644:21	751:3 753:2	rebroadcasting	reconsideration
questioning		754:9 757:1	589:14	592:20,23 594:19
725:10 755:15	ratepayers	759:3,13 767:6	rebuilding	·
questions 593:24	779:20	782:2 790:12	664:14	595:15 596:8,10,
615:9 656:17,26	rational 719:13	800:19,20 808:26	recall 594:26	11,13,25 597:2,8
657:3,20 670:12	rationale 738:22	819:1,3,10,11	597:25 599:5,8	660:21,24,25
685:25 688:16	759:23	readily 671:19,21	606:18 611:8	662:17 693:19
694:21 725:12,14	re-evaluate	720:18 791:4	622:11 815:16	712:6 720:12
747:9 750:15	601:19	reading 776:13		725:20 726:7
761:22,25 766:21	re-evaluated		receive 629:7	808:23,26
767:23 781:25	767:20	ready 589:21	738:14 796:18	reconvene
783:23 785:7		695:18 713:22	823:3	690:12
798:18,23 822:20	reach 604:23	731:26 773:8	received 594:3	record 589:9
·	775:17	799:5 823:2	643:3 723:14	593:8,9 597:18
quick 822:16	reached 636:19	real 784:3 787:6,	733:26 734:6	640:19 652:25
quickly 637:4	689:21	9 789:9,12,14	receives 604:26	656:19 668:22
quiet 602:10,19	reaching 686:24	805:13	receiving 675:7	674:14 686:6
616:1 675:14	read 590:12,19	reality 598:26	receiving 0/3./	694:24 698:17,21
676:25 677:5	370.12,17	684:20 685:19		706:26 710:10,15
	I	I	I	I

	1			
713:13 728:13,14	referred 601:6	region 627:2	Regulator's	relating 666:3
730:19 738:17	609:19,20 630:21	630:6 638:19	592:15 634:17	670:3 721:25
739:4 742:10	668:5,17 669:26	654:17 669:23	782:6 808:8	relation 658:8
743:4 751:16	673:21 678:5	672:13	822:12	746:21 751:18
754:14 760:10,	679:26 713:1	regional 607:3	regulators	806:3 809:22
15,20,24 761:18,	766:16 777:7	610:8	715:19	relationship
19 778:26 786:7	779:14 801:2	register 611:13	regulatory 662:6	665:5,16 672:9
793:26 794:20	805:12 808:25	613:21	663:9 669:6	779:20
795:19 802:16	811:26 815:18	registered	677:25 680:2	relative 642:1
805:17 806:11	819:1 820:21	614:16 615:20	686:26 694:2	
recording 589:14	821:7	616:12	697:17 706:16	release 774:23
recourse 665:25	referring 592:13		711:6 737:18	relevance 762:3
689:19 723:15	597:26 673:22	registration	779:17 782:6	779:22
776:19 797:21,24	681:15,16 764:9,	676:9,11,17	797:14	relevant 675:1
798:3,4	10,11,19,23,24	registrations	reimburse	697:16 724:10
recover 655:5	765:5 812:23	676:16	759:18	725:19 727:10
744:26 745:4	refers 605:14	registry 793:7		730:12 751:4
821:10,14,20	reflect 679:15	regular 622:2	reimbursed	758:19 800:11,
	719:12	regulate 610:10	712:3	18,21,22
recovers 655:6			reimbursement	reliability 622:9
recovery 599:5	reflected 665:8	regulated 758:3,	744:25 745:18	729:1
695:26 696:2	714:4 736:13	6	reinforce 646:11	reliable 624:4
705:20 709:9	reflective 706:13	regulating 765:2	reinforcing	772:18
759:6,16	739:22	779:19	646:2	
rectify 756:12	reflects 755:20	regulation 610:6,	reiterate 772:15	relied 687:10
REDA 712:9	refrain 589:14	12 621:17 720:26		721:16
720:8,25 721:1,	refusal 759:26	764:22 765:2	reiterating	relief 667:20
18 782:2	761:3	regulations	609:22	686:12 705:9
reduce 627:21		618:24 628:12	rejected 647:7	712:9 715:23
	refuse 647:10	678:19 682:8	683:13	720:19 724:4
reduction 655:18	678:20	737:12	relate 714:12	749:20 786:3
refer 604:12	refused 759:18	regulator 591:1	732:24 766:22	795:1,6,14
613:22 633:15	761:24	594:18 597:7	769:5 800:8	798:10,15
636:14 659:22	regard 592:11	603:9 617:19	related 598:4	relies 592:6,12
693:9 733:8	600:4 622:6,9,19	619:3 638:24	605:14 621:1	720:5 765:21
reference 590:26	623:20 632:20	642:19 645:9	624:5 664:9	relieve 632:18
671:7 715:2,3,15	643:6,10 656:7	652:16,26 657:22	666:4 685:25	relocate 590:15
745:8	658:1 695:25	658:4,13 660:20,	695:24,26 719:9	591:9 602:8
referenced	696:10,25 702:4	21,26 665:25	738:3 739:1	603:17 604:17
709:24 719:25	717:22 719:4	666:9,24 667:19	761:12 792:9	605:1 637:1,24
728:1 729:17	721:14 722:14	668:2 680:11,14	relates 605:3	638:2 668:9
735:9 755:17	755:26 759:13	683:13 688:8,10	693:23 694:3	relocated 636:26
761:18 766:14	760:22 762:26	704:22 713:26	699:19 723:9	
789:5	764:3 765:15	714:2 722:13	731:11 748:5	662:6 689:20
references	812:17,21	801:14 808:13	806:6 807:13	768:5
753:24 795:4	regime 694:2	809:25 810:15,16	811:13	relocating
, 55.27 / JJ.T		811:13 822:9	011.13	636:21 722:26
		011.13 022.7		790:18
		1		1

relocation	reminder 589:6	722:22	715:23 717:24	759:9 760:10,11
590:17,21 603:20	remote 639:18	reporter 640:11,	718:25 746:3	776:6,26 779:5
604:21 605:6,9	remotely 730:12	13 692:14	747:23 748:18	780:22 787:17
619:4 630:25	removal 637:6	824:16,23	749:19 762:7	796:11 797:20
632:25 636:16	741:24	reporters	798:10,15	802:6,8 807:14
637:8,17 641:17		589:11,15 692:26	requesting 591:6	819:16
675:10 679:24	remove 641:17	822:9	604:22 634:11	requirement
680:12,18,26	removed 634:7	reporting 783:26	636:5 669:7	598:12 646:10,
681:2 683:25	685:4	784:2	706:10 723:15	12,13 681:15
685:21 687:12	render 668:10	reports 618:17,	724:4 734:6	requirements
719:16 722:17	684:21	21 640:21,23	requests 596:9,	598:10 600:23
727:17 780:3	rendered 634:22	672:1 685:15	11 653:10,14,17	650:20 662:12
807:14	736:19	686:4 745:8	723:13,14 725:4	678:18 682:21
relocations	repair 619:19	765:20 766:15,23	734:9 754:24	683:1,4,9 687:8
605:17 661:15,26	repeat 660:14	768:1 784:6	756:26 761:1,4,	701:24 712:10
671:5 776:16	673:9,24 694:22	represent 715:18	10 796:16,17	727:5,9 735:24,
reluctance	711:10 762:13	728:18 744:1	797:2 798:14	26 736:2 754:19
674:26	773:14 803:8		802:15,18,20	773:25 775:1,6
rely 592:14 624:2	repeatedly	representative	805:22	794:26 795:10,
627:13 633:11	609:18,20 766:16	698:5	require 596:2	12,21 819:7
664:16 676:12	repeating 595:8	representatives	602:8 614:5	820:2
694:25 753:4	596:26	659:26 701:19	635:4 690:6	requires 595:24
755:8 767:12		724:19	729:11 759:1	646:17 681:20
768:1 770:12	replaced 674:7 818:11	represented	774:13 780:15	713:3 734:16
relying 592:18,		684:11	796:4 809:10	770:21 775:15
21,24 593:2,10,	replacement 675:5	representing	required 591:24	780:4 809:6
12 681:6 706:19		591:4 670:5	598:24 599:2	819:14
800:12 813:6	replacements	represents	600:15,22 601:21	requiring 674:8
remain 641:4	650:18	650:23 696:17	608:8 609:9,12	701:20 702:16
650:21	reply 592:21	719:14,26 730:14	617:13 618:12	754:24 793:23
remains 598:26	593:4 603:7	740:2	619:22 621:16	requisite 667:19
787:18	604:4 659:6	reputations	624:24 625:5	rescinded
remarkably	667:24 749:6	758:2	628:18,24 638:25	818:13,16
663:18	768:9 777:20,26	request 592:15	648:21 650:16	reserved 822:13
remarks 693:12	798:26 799:12,21	596:12 619:21,23	656:2 666:15	residential 631:8
694:19 731:12,24	report 592:17	625:22 638:2	667:9 670:10	659:22 691:18,20
732:14 733:7	593:1,6 622:5	711:20,25 724:1	671:4,23 675:3 681:12 688:1	716:12 744:2
740:12 765:12	642:10 644:25	730:4 733:26	689:23 696:13	774:11,13 786:16
780:25	645:26 646:10	759:5 796:26	703:7 708:15	residents 607:20
remedied 663:9	668:7 708:7	797:13 805:21	713:22 723:12	resile 812:11
remedy 602:26	739:17 740:13	806:15,18	724:14 727:25	
662:6 689:18	741:4,9 742:22 744:1 763:6	requested 597:8	729:5 735:25	resist 821:24
785:5 800:1	765:17,18,21,25	654:13 662:19,20	736:10 739:8	resolve 669:5
remember	767:24 768:10	667:20 685:8,17	747:13 748:16	727:14,17 771:21
622:20 623:8		686:12 704:13	751:26 752:6,13	resolved 634:9
641:9 821:12	reported 684:3	706:8 710:4	756:19 757:11	730:15
U+1.7 041.14				
	1	1	1	1

758:19 760:1 761:7 766:11 767:21 769:3 771:3,9,15 respectfully 679:20 680:20 683:12 685:19 responsibility 7758:6 responsibility 650:10 681:14 699:11 709:10,16 718:16 737:17 752:7,14,26 770:15 804:10,12 results 620:25 655:17 738:1 results 620:25 655:17 738:1 15,16 616:18,19, 20,23 618:9,10, 13,14,15 633:11 665:1 676:23 677:4,9,10 678:3, 6,13,18,21 679:3, 698:8,10 702:17

	I	ı	1	1
706:22,25 707:1,	813:7,23 820:22,	rush 814:22	scope 599:8	13,19,20 631:3,
2,5,7,9 715:2	24 821:6	Ruth 719:1	600:9,14,17,19	15 632:5 633:18,
727:25 728:10,11	Romanesky's	717.1	621:6 629:12	23 634:12,24
735:20 741:24	648:24 741:4		673:6 693:18	635:13 637:6
758:17 763:17,	room 590:4	S	695:25 701:14	638:9 652:14
18,19 774:18	656:25	sacrosanct	710:7,26 734:18	653:1 654:11
791:24 801:25		610:21,22	737:11 738:7	666:18,23 667:25
803:7 804:11	roughly 623:3		753:16 756:19	668:3,16 675:26
805:11,12,13,14,	routine 665:21	safe 591:23 639:9	757:4,8 760:9	676:13 678:13
16 806:9,11	666:4	649:24 661:20	769:13 776:16	679:9,14 680:5,8,
819:3,4,5,10,12,	routinely 678:7	664:11 666:11	797:7,22	13,24 681:5,9,19,
14,19	routing 740:18,	667:5 682:10,14	scopes 729:6	22 682:15 683:3,
road's 696:12	20 766:25 768:2	721:19 737:18 780:22 782:3,12	season 747:1	11,16 684:4,21,
roadmap 771:16	769:11	783:14 806:23	seasons 655:15	22,26 687:9
roads 591:24	Rowe 624:12		seat 593:21	689:3,6,11,18
613:19,25	625:18 628:5	safely 664:14		693:25 701:26
646:18,19 648:25	RPR 824:15	797:15	seated 589:3	702:5,11 707:20
649:2,3 664:10	rubber 678:23	safety 774:24	657:13 690:4	708:8 711:7,8
674:18 675:25	rule 638:11,22	salability 641:24	692:18 724:17	712:8,10,12
698:14 700:13	639:12 719:18	sale 614:4 655:6,7	732:9 773:6	713:3 714:8,22
701:21 721:12	735:2,3 736:10,	746:11 789:23	seating 724:7	716:26 717:19,26
774:14,15,16	23 780:21 811:7	793:11	second-in-right	718:20,26 719:14
804:14	819:8 820:5	saled 788:14	675:21	720:3,8,25 721:1,
roadway 606:8		sales 790:5	second-in-time	22 722:18 723:3,
608:16 616:13,14	rulemaking 666:23 687:13	salient 764:4	609:21,23 618:9,	4,10 726:9,22
662:26 792:2			18 665:11 697:7	727:8,13 736:18 761:21 762:10
roadways 616:10	rules 598:1	sanctioned	698:26 699:18	771:17 773:18
617:16 618:13	646:13 660:20,	664:25 763:18	706:11,24 707:7	775:23,24 776:2,
675:24 791:25	22,23 679:20	Sander 773:12	727:14 728:23	9,13,22 777:4,15,
roadwork	681:6,10,18,25	satisfactory	731:4 733:14	17,18 778:17,19,
598:13 681:12	682:1,8,12,15,25 683:14,17 684:24	659:10	734:17 735:2,6	23,26 779:23
804:1 807:5	687:17 688:8	satisfied 637:17	737:1	780:8,9,14,23
	723:11,21 735:19	717:8 787:18	secondary	781:9 782:2,9
Robinson 615:8	736:4,14 761:22	satisfies 712:10	633:21 770:21	784:22 793:18,22
688:20,21,23	802:9 817:24	satisfy 658:17,26	secrecy 672:25	794:14,20,21
689:24 691:6	818:11,13,14,19,	711:24 735:23	section 590:11,	796:21 797:22
robust 709:3	22,24,25	767:8	19,25 591:1,3,11,	799:23 800:1,7,
role 678:21	ruling 638:14	saved 677:22	12 594:24 596:20	24 804:18,22,23
680:21 779:19		SCC 610:9 718:3	598:1 601:26	805:7,25,26
785:23,26	run 701:24		602:1,2,3,13,15,	807:11 817:23
Romanesky	791:13 798:12	schedule 589:19	22,25 603:1,6,11,	818:3,7,18,24
607:25 618:17,23	running 612:2	621:7 738:9	12,22 604:3,6,15	819:1,9,22 820:1
626:10 632:2	774:17 790:6	scheme 677:25	605:2,7,15,26	sections 631:1
646:8 648:20	814:18	679:13 680:23	606:11,14,15	666:17 676:7
716:2 728:5,7	runs 611:26	718:11	609:26 610:3	702:3
741:20,26 742:3,	790:16	school 626:2,3	613:23 614:6,13,	
12,22 743:15,26			19 619:1 630:12,	

secure 593:5	sensitive 782:25	14 642:14 644:20	sight 816:19	730:1 742:9
640:22 692:3,6,9,		645:12 649:14,17		747:16,17 752:19
20 693:3,5 694:8	separate 769:5	650:24 651:8,9	signal 633:12	758:16 776:3
697:9 700:4	sequencing	652:17,19 657:23	766:8	802:15 804:9,21
724:18 733:4	719:11	658:5,15,18	signalling 769:12	806:10 807:21
747:21 772:17	serve 664:19	670:7 673:4	signals 769:10	818:9 820:4
790:9	served 662:2	680:18 685:20	signed 618:4	single 630:16
seek 591:18	664:23 686:20	714:19 715:24	752:11 812:1,2,7,	647:21 700:3
617:19 665:24	Services 692:3,6,	743:14 745:13	15,18	704:21 724:3
676:12 686:18	9	773:21 778:20	significant	725:2
689:19 705:17	Session 691:3	779:21 780:26	621:16 650:26	
737:15	set 595:24 596:4	785:20 786:14	654:24 655:23	singular 714:18
seeking 638:9	607:1 630:1	801:18 806:16,18	662:2 663:26	sir 612:19 613:2
661:9,25 662:8	636:10 639:14	sheds 603:4	668:21 670:20	627:20 646:20
686:13,15 687:24	654:15 660:13,	shield 602:13	671:7 672:7	sit 803:21
696:19 704:24	23,26 667:12		700:6 716:12	situation 601:19
720:19 761:20	668:19 674:1	shift 703:6	745:10 747:3,25	606:13,14 612:4
774:11 775:13,14	676:20 695:26	760:17	748:23,24 749:20	682:17 787:4
779:2 780:1,5	710:6 711:7	shifting 701:8	755:22 784:16	situations 629:11
783:5 785:20	735:21 744:10	shippers 685:12	798:11	639:15 747:10
797:6 798:11	764:11 766:22	745:3 821:11,15,	similar 603:10,22	760:25
811:13,21 812:11	777:17 778:3	16,20,22	604:2 606:11	sixth 704:20
seeks 686:19	782:15 809:5	short 601:20	631:13 632:1	size 671:16
688:6 719:7	sets 660:21	617:5,10 655:15	661:14 666:3	745:23 755:24
738:20 776:4,18	707:25 723:11	753:3 762:17	671:19 680:1	skill 824:7
793:5	744:9 746:11	772:25	704:25 729:20	
sees 619:8	setting 752:7	shorthand 824:5,	767:11	skipped 820:20
	severe 605:19	6	similarly 620:17	skipping 612:26
segue 775:22		shortly 654:22	655:11 676:22	slab 599:10
self-interest	severely 680:21	674:17	680:10 702:11	708:24
768:22	sewer 754:17	should-the-	717:21 761:19	slabs 698:9
self-interested	791:14	costs-be-shared	777:4 781:18	slightly 799:1
731:23	share 619:16	807:17	797:4 803:20	slowly 589:16
self-servingly	636:3 646:1	shoulder 722:25	simple 624:22	small 820:19
595:8	658:25 659:2	show 595:3	625:1 727:8	smaller 704:7
sell 816:3,10	673:17 675:1		733:21 739:10,	
selling 614:11	683:21,24 746:3	shown 629:10	14,15 740:3	so-called 618:8
send 617:9	shared 591:19	shows 710:10	754:23 755:4	soil 796:1
769:10	649:23 652:11	738:17 760:10	775:10 787:12,15	sold 787:5
senior 593:21	671:24 672:1,2	shut-in 782:26	788:1,7,18 796:4	788:14,25 815:20
724:19 725:1	687:8 688:4	sic 606:7 812:17	simply 591:14	sole 772:7
sense 625:12	sharing 591:10,	side 612:7 637:11	616:10 624:1	solely 707:9
683:12 705:3,4,6	12,22 602:16	810:14 817:17	629:18,21 633:10	722:4 735:13
737:6 757:15	615:14 617:20,24	822:10	637:26 660:8	772:6
819:25 821:26	630:17 634:9	sides 822:6	672:21 679:9	solid 771:16
017.23 021.20	636:7,20 637:8		685:19 705:8	
	638:10,15 639:3,		715:6,20,25	

sophisticated	spend 590:3	607:3 628:5	18,23 702:16	structuring
710:18 722:6	_	629:19 631:2,15,	703:4 710:1,17	759:22
753:11 789:25	spent 594:26	18 632:5 633:23	1	
	711:4	635:1,13 637:20	step 788:4	Sturgeon 611:2
sort 631:13 689:7	spill 774:23	645:26 646:10	steps 749:3	728:10
727:18 811:2	split 664:9 807:1	655:4 661:11	sterilized 637:10	subdivision
815:23	spoke 665:19	669:20 672:7	stood 711:25	617:12 618:5,10
sorting 781:25	689:5	677:16 716:16	stop 660:2	631:20 743:17
sorts 750:20	spoken 607:2	751:11 767:5	story 686:8,10	802:8 804:26
sought 621:22	spread 650:16	770:8 777:20		subdivisions
632:25 668:9	814:10	statement 648:6	straightforward 771:15	631:24
694:9 705:9	Sprott 594:6	672:8 737:11		subject 610:6
712:9 763:21	601:10,17 621:12	806:7	stranded 783:10	613:26 657:24
795:14	673:2,10 709:6		stream 589:15	677:5,12 679:5
sour 707:18	735:1,8 737:10	statements 725:6	streamed 589:7	688:16 700:11
source 598:12	745:1 748:17	748:10	street 599:6	707:25 708:26
sources 791:5	757:23 758:5,12	states 598:1	606:7 608:11,22	720:22 733:11
South 636:18	Sprott's 757:19	603:13,23	611:6 612:20	735:22 739:2
672:18	_	614:14,20,21	613:18 615:2	741:19 742:14,20
	staff 589:24	615:13 719:4	616:23 617:22,24	744:17,18,19
southeast 805:26	659:20 691:10,	720:26 736:4 819:3	622:24 636:18	750:3 751:23
806:6	11,12 692:26		641:14 672:4	752:21,23 753:18
Southwest 639:2	stage 629:14	stating 618:25	696:2 705:15,18	754:18,20 766:3
speak 589:16	676:20 705:12	754:9	708:7 710:14	768:11,17 769:1,
608:19 703:22	713:10 743:17,18	status 651:2	731:3 735:10	8 771:7 798:18
732:19 733:1	756:23 757:2	670:11 671:25	806:1,11	812:24,25,26
782:26	761:5 791:2	688:3 707:18	strenuous 685:24	subjective
speaking 629:24	stamp 678:23	753:20	stress 774:19	755:13
speaks 732:22	758:1	statute 681:24	stresses 795:24	submission
specific 628:17	stand 748:11	statutes 603:8	stretch 805:7	593:14 594:8
639:3 657:23	standard 608:12	680:2,3 719:2	strip 788:8	595:11 597:18
676:12 710:25	625:5,7,14 780:4	722:16	_	602:4 603:7
723:14,24 754:14	standards 635:8	statutory 591:26	strong 681:12	604:4 615:8
760:11,19 796:22	735:21 737:13	609:10 676:13	786:2	621:18 632:21
797:25,26	stands 728:2	678:2 679:2,10,	strongly 667:12	633:13 635:26
specifically	Stantec 640:20	13,20 680:22	679:21 802:16,18	639:16 641:3
627:21 695:12	start 623:22	681:7,9 684:25	820:7	643:17 647:3 649:7 655:1
708:9 723:11	692:25 693:12	689:2,8 702:21	structure 607:12,	662:3 677:8
726:8,17 754:6	774:1 799:16	718:11 719:19	13,14,15,22	681:22 695:10
766:22	started 607:18	721:16 722:15,23	637:19 653:22	700:1,9 701:8,16
specifications	724:1 812:23	723:8 735:22	654:3 698:8,10	700:1,9 701:8,10
755:25		800:23 804:26	700:18,19	713:18,25 718:19
speculation	starting 611:10 612:23 705:22	staying 599:4	707:11,22 715:26	720:13 722:2
766:26 797:8		steering 616:26	740:22 741:16 744:13 751:20,21	729:23 733:2
798:2	state 603:6	617:18 653:1,3,6,		734:21 735:24
	stated 590:12,19	9 698:6,20	structures	738:22 742:9
	604:4,14,25	699:12 701:12,	819:17	

746 20 740 6	700 12 700 2	h (71 17	002 12 006 14	704 0 700 15
746:20 749:6	780:13 788:2	substance 671:17	802:12 806:14	704:8 709:15
750:6 751:14	797:24 798:7	substantial	suggesting	740:7 768:16
752:19 753:8	804:21 812:26	638:26	643:25 726:23	795:20 798:9 820:7
755:7,20,26 756:10 758:20	813:3	substantially	768:4 788:6	
760:1 761:7	submits 596:20	653:15 778:24	811:9	supported
766:11 767:21	601:20 602:24	substantive	suggestion	627:25 697:26
769:3 771:4,10,	638:5 644:7	592:4 640:18	675:18 706:21	698:5 703:2
15 777:12,19,20	656:7 662:15	671:14	726:4 731:11	719:1 784:10
779:8 785:14	663:14 667:25 677:24 685:7	substantively	737:21 740:7	supporting
791:26 793:16		591:1	741:17 742:1	649:16 684:11
795:8 796:8	687:3	subsurface	770:17 786:3	supportive 618:1
800:17 803:23	submitted	804:14	suggestions	supports 617:1
809:11 817:23	597:14 609:24,25	suburban 655:9	737:8 784:22	630:8 661:16
820:3 821:23	637:12 694:7	success 713:6	suggests 605:24	662:16 663:12
submissions	806:14 822:25		718:23 720:7	675:3 680:6
589:22 592:19,	submitting	successfully 631:24 762:24	736:24 749:7	693:4
22,25 593:2,4	634:10 807:21		750:7 766:7	Supreme 610:7,
596:18 604:13	subsection	succinctly	820:7	18 677:15 678:5
638:12 640:18	590:12,19	661:11	suitability	718:1,5
659:18 667:22	595:21,24,25	Suffice 660:15	671:25 688:3	surely 808:9
668:17 688:17	596:4 601:26	sufficient 756:18	Sullivan 719:4	surface 678:13,
692:21,22 693:8,	603:23,25 604:2	762:14	Sullivan's 719:1	18,21 679:18
15 694:23 697:23	614:13,15 660:19	suggest 652:19	summarize	706:4 739:5,23
711:11 714:16,17	712:15,20,25	679:21 699:4	592:5 687:23	749:9 754:12
720:5 721:10	717:1,7 719:23, 25 720:2 727:11	716:1 724:9,20	738:17 749:18	766:2 767:13
723:17,25 726:1		727:13 728:16	summarized	774:18 788:11,20
728:18 729:19	735:18 736:3,14 776:14,22,24,26	730:2,7 731:22	634:24 703:24	804:13 807:5
732:11 762:13	777:2,4,6,9,11,13	737:5 746:6	712:14	surfaces 650:15
773:9,15,24	778:5,9 800:6,7,9	752:20 761:26	summary 694:1	696:12
777:14,24,25	807:13,17,23	763:8 765:10	1	surprise 703:1
778:3 782:16	808:5,6,15 809:2,	767:18 772:23	sums 731:22	surprised 751:11
794:11 795:4	6,7	786:11 788:17	Sundre 630:25	752:20
799:12,17,22	subsequent	792:8 803:17	637:14,26 810:18	surprises 751:15
802:12,25 803:3	816:2	805:3 806:10	superior 718:22	_
812:21 815:2,24	subsequently	813:20 817:20 820:24	supervisor 618:4	surprising 704:3
817:25 822:1,3	615:20 710:2		supplemental	surrounding
submit 606:22	759:17	suggested 591:21	592:15 805:21	644:15 651:16
636:9 642:6		644:20 676:19	supplier 747:4	survey 789:16
644:12 693:20	subsidiary 709:8	686:3 687:7	supply 655:18,	surveyed 612:25
706:25 711:17	subsidize 771:2	714:26 716:2 725:9,17 726:13,	19,25	suspend 712:7
717:18 719:14 721:15 738:26	786:15	15,19 727:19	support 592:6	sustainable
740:21 747:8	subsidizing	728:4 730:22	600:6,21 601:4,5	608:2 716:4
748:7 749:12	722:5	736:9 754:5	617:3 637:16	switch 619:6
762:18,26 768:19	subsidy 753:14	756:16 760:17	668:15 669:10	synonym 817:12
770:12 772:11	subsisting 706:4	769:9 799:24	683:26 702:25	Symonym 017.12
770.12 772.11				

technical 678:18 testified 607:21 **system** 663:15 710:12 711:12 734:23 738:11 676:5 727:5 737:13 624:12,15,21,22 719:20 770:8 739:11,24 747:19 775:1 811:3 625:18,21 629:15 781:15 799:21 751:23 752:11 systemic 663:6 641:19 644:1 812:17 817:14 753:6 758:16.18 687:19,25 techniques 743:1 648:26 649:4 762:1 767:1,20 **things** 599:8 telephones systems 676:16 651:12 671:18 768:11 769:18 604:16 660:6 804:19 673:18 698:6 772:21 774:6 666:9,20 715:6 **Telford** 611:8 \mathbf{T} 784:3 820:22 786:6 787:1,3,19, 742:4 750:11,20, 614:25 618:17,22 821:1 22 788:23 796:19 22 774:13 791:2, 626:9 632:2 **Table** 708:5 799:1,2,15 **testify** 619:15 13 804:1 815:15 646:7 697:10 **TAG** 656:2 810:13 814:18,20 641:13 802:14 thinking 641:9, 740:1 742:13 take-it-or-leave-815:26 817:14 **testimonv** 626:18 26 746:9 764:12 it 665:7 timeline 625:5.7. 632:16 638:17 **thinks** 787:12 805:18 806:13 takes 625:1 781:7 14 723:12 644:17 665:18 813:7,24 third-party 785:17 796:26 670:4 682:3,9 timelines 670:7 **Telford's** 768:9 600:11 675:10 816:15 687:19 695:16,22 671:7 687:7 791:12 792:15,21 **telling** 686:7 688:7 696:5,10,25 **taking** 595:1 765:7 813:15 **thirty** 619:24 698:2 703:23 610:15.19 628:21 timeliness 624:7, temptation **thought** 616:16 710:24 714:16 680:3 740:15 10 658:7 802:13, 812:16 821:9 821:24 752:14 810:12 715:1 728:7 22 ten 703:12 707:13 thoughts 650:12 729:4 740:1 812:3,4 817:17, timely 628:25 772:23 742:23 754:5 **thousand** 648:23 18 663:5 669:15 766:15 767:3 **tend** 816:1 744:7 745:16 talk 606:18 617:6 686:23 688:7 770:6 782:16 **tendered** 762:16 thousand-dollar-619:6 624:5,7 times 619:13 784:20 801:3 640:24 645:15 **a-house** 745:25 tenets 789:3 644:19 713:17 811:17 821:1 649:11 762:4 746.2 789:5 term 675:21 799:6 817:13 text 718:9,21 thousands 715:18 781:8,9 **timing** 626:8 736:13 **talked** 600:5,9 653:18 725:3 792:12 632:8 **textbook** 674:10 601:3 609:17 796:17 terminated **Tingle** 659:26 624:6 800:6 thanking 590:1 three-minute 710:2 title 611:14 692:25 **talking** 595:17 771:12 terms 590:13 613:20 614:12,18 606:10 654:9 the-sky-will-fall **throw** 793:14 603:15 627:5 615:18 616:12,13 733:7 775:20 801:11 794:7 650:5 684:6 671:13 676:9 792:1 805:26 theme 802:26 686:12 689:8 **thrown** 744:6 789:15 791:25 tantamount 707:4 712:15 804:4 **themes** 670:4 816:14 680:19 684:23 724:13 729:16 803:1 Thursday 724:16 **titled** 613:19.24 targets 630:1 730:23 738:13 **theory** 602:19 614:20 819:2,9 **Tie** 678:25 744:9 747:25 task 712:6 718:7 **thereof** 677:13, titles 614:16 time 589:16 757:4,18 762:5 781:24 21 615:5,16 676:5,7 624:24 625:2 764:21 765:8 tasked 666:24 727:6 733:8 **thicker** 698:9 628:13 630:4 774:7 775:8 667:16 680:26 793:6 632:14 637:25 819:16 803:25 807:3 783:17 639:23 644:4 today 589:18 thickness 671:16 **terrible** 745:23 tax 743:19 652:15 653:9 590:25 598:26 796:1 test 595:23 596:4 655:17 690:7 599:15,20 601:13 teams 724:25 **thing** 606:17 809:5 693:10 701:22 610:20 643:14,26 645:2,7 704:9 707:6 726:15 659:21 717:25

transcript transparency 723:23 731:10,26 655:3 715:16 716:8 735:4 589:10,12 598:20 619:7,9 622:6,8 786:21 787:7 730:6 744:16 752:23 757:10 599:18 600:16,24 624:6 626:7 802:21 790:22 760:3

undertaken	units 655:18	683:20 696:12		view 606:12
664:4	719:12	upgrading	\mathbf{V}	627:5 657:19
undertaking	universal 773:25	608:10 632:11,		689:6 701:13
758:7 759:9	794:26 795:10,20	13,17 633:4,25	vague 760:21,24	714:6 730:14
763:24	unknown 758:23	662:13 674:4	valid 706:1,4	741:3 748:26
undertakings	unnecessary	774:14 819:15	752:25	749:4 762:21
664:20	771:23	upholding	validity 767:12	765:9 772:16 800:11 801:20
underway 633:2	unprecedented	699:17	validly 610:10	815:4 818:2
668:20	705:2	upset 723:22	values 787:2	820:6
undeveloped	unpredictable	738:20	variable 697:15	
643:7	697:16	upsets 700:5	variation 756:3	viewed 721:17 777:22
undoubtedly	unproductive	Upshall 618:4		
652:19	673:14	upstream 782:22	variations	viewers 589:13
unequivocal	unreasonable	upwards 734:9	772:12	views 755:13
715:10	725:1 797:2,6	_	variety 753:11	767:3
unequivocally	802:15,21	urban 604:9	vary 662:18	violate 704:10
770:7	unreasonably	606:2,9,24 637:13 638:26	712:7 746:7,8	706:9 781:2
unexpected	776:18 799:26	639:15 644:3	755:23	violating 684:2
616:3	800:4	645:23 650:26	vast 734:12	virtually 680:8
	unreliable	668:25 669:19	vault 633:25,26	684:21 800:24
unexpectedly 745:4	649:19	686:23 740:23	634:1,6	virtue 612:9
		741:6 750:26	Vavilov 718:2	736:11 764:1
unfair 664:9	unscheduled	811:13,20 821:2	vehemently	vision 608:2,8
700:2 701:4,7 737:21 758:12	772:25	urge 642:18	619:14	716:4
787:8 791:19	unsubstantiated	801:16 815:13	venture 608:25	vital 661:20
795:8,15 817:10	697:13	821:4,11	651:5,18 812:18	664:15
	unsupported	urged 680:16	Ventures 652:13	voice 756:12
unfairly 807:20	740:9 755:8	800:14	verbatim 800:19	Voltarix 668:1
unfairness	unsurprising			
788:26	704:9	urgency 629:9	verifiable 754:2	Volume 696:6,
unfettered	unusual 591:7	useless 684:22	version 590:10	698:15 703:14
794:12	638:8 724:2	736:20	595:2 602:3	704:19 713:23 715:13 716:25
unfinished 626:4	822:2	user 697:7 704:11	603:4 684:26	734:2,7,10,25
unified 665:8	unwilling 673:16	733:5,14 770:21	810:13 818:12,	735:7,15 737:1
unimpeached	up-front 759:1,5,	usurp 702:2	13,16,17,23,26	738:10,16 740:
641:4	22	utilities 603:14	819:9 820:4,5	741:24 742:23
uninformed	upgrade 633:8,	604:5 661:21	versus 619:21	743:20 744:20
768:23	21 674:24 681:11	739:7 767:10	vested 661:12	745:5 746:14,1
unintentionally	682:26 735:20	779:19,22 800:15	664:14	748:25 750:13,
624:19 625:16	upgraded 598:9,	801:14 806:2,4	veto 680:20 776:3	751:7,13 752:1
unique 729:13	15 674:5,7,18	utility 604:10	794:13 799:25	753:7 754:13,2
756:7 791:11	682:21 683:8	676:2 779:20	viability 783:8	755:1,5 756:11
821:25	707:7,8	utmost 650:8	vicinity 774:12	757:15 759:11,2
unit 649:5 654:2,	upgrades 650:15,		video 589:6,9	766:18 767:1,1
9 744:3	18 674:2 675:3			25 768:5,17

15.16 812:19

686:15,20 687:7

813:23

688:10

20 669:22

657:5 731:7

776:20 778:13

764:16 815:21,22

779:5 797:19

787:10

757:22

713:17

19,25 593:2

615:8 619:1

596:17 604:13

630:14,21 636:9

777:18,25 778:3

640:26 642:26

697:23 711:9

779:8 782:15

785:14 793:16

714:24 803:18

Y

596:14 603:8

725:4 734:9

21 809:4 811:9,

729:18.22

822:1.3

808:24

769:15 770:9 well-established 597:26 599:11 626:7 634:15.19. 684:1 697:6 606:19 609:18 20 635:23 638:25 voluntarily 699:24 709:4 619:12,17 620:18 651:16.20 652:5. 699:8 705:5 workable 662:23 710:11 730:26 622:12 624:9 11.15 656:12 710:20 723:1 738:18 772:8 625:17 695:17,23 657:18 664:4,9, 728:3 752:22 798:13 815:6 697:8 700:4 18,24 665:9,12, voluntary 728:3 working 654:19, 703:22 710:25 15 670:10 673:6 well-informed 749:3 724:7 725:13 674:8 681:3 593:17 works 626:16 729:4 730:26 683:5,6,11 689:4, well-served \mathbf{W} 731:2 734:15,24 23 694:4 695:6, 687:16 742:1 761:9 19,21,25,26 well-tested waited 625:22 772:17 779:26 696:3 698:18 734:12 **world** 664:17 waiting 625:24 790:3,26 792:6 699:7,10,19 West 589:26 630:11 777:26 810:12 811:17 705:19,23,26 691:14 worry 621:19,20 **walked** 689:7 813:12,14 821:8, 709:17,22,23 **Western** 634:25 800:16 13 710:7.26 711:4 712:21,22,24 **Westren** 661:11 witnesses' worse 787:6 **wall** 671:16 713:20,22 714:12 667:12 672:7 795:26 819:16 696:10 714:16 worth 673:25 716:8.10.21 790:11 Wonderful **Walton** 623:3 717:3,5,11,12,13, whatnot 814:1 659:12 627:22 641:11 **Wow** 648:12 21 721:12 723:1 742:17 769:7 whatsoever wondering 689:9 wrapping 651:1 724:13,15 725:9, 754:8 **wanted** 633:20 **wonders** 804:19 **writing** 618:23 18,24,26 726:2, 769:18 808:16 **Wheaton** 691:11 word 674:23 12,16 727:2,16, **wanting** 730:23 wherewithal 806:15 807:16 written 592:7,11, 17,20,23 729:6, 730:10 warranted 817:7,11,20 12 733:2,6 632:14 **whim** 755:13 wording 602:2 734:12,19 735:23 warranting 604:2 680:8 737:9,11 738:6,8, whomever 609:7 20 743:25 747:14 753:22 782:9 820:6 **wide** 700:16 751:26 752:6,8, words 630:9 waste 810:13 753:11 791:16 14 753:20 754:3, 652:2 660:24 water 754:17 **widely** 706:13 19,24 755:12 700:16 719:11,19 814:24 widen 636:24 756:19 757:8,11, 736:20 757:23 waterlines widening 598:5 13,21 758:1,3 765:14 766:26 791:14 633:21 636:17.22 759:9,17 760:6,7, 808:19 819:22 website 589:8 637:2 682:19 10,11,18 770:21, work 595:9,22 week 592:10 width 819:18 22 771:21,22 wrong 662:17 596:18,23 597:6, 771:19 779:26 772:2,4 775:11, willingly 701:6 11,22 598:23 15 776:4,6,24,26 weeks 624:15.25 willingness 599:2,8,15,22 777:2,8 778:4,7, 625:8 822:23 725:8 wrote 645:26 600:2.9.14.17.18. 11,12 780:6,22 weigh 695:2 19,21 601:8,14, **WSP** 594:1 windfall 674:11 786:8 787:10 749:18 21.24 606:20.25 **Windsor** 815:19 790:8 791:18 weight 762:19 608:8,26 609:11, 816:6,8 796:10 797:3,7, 774:18 14,16,19 619:9, **wishing** 759:7 12,16,22,26 19,21 620:9 well-defined **year** 590:9 witnesses 593:15 802:19 804:15 621:4,6,15,20 774:26 807:6,14 808:7, 594:12 595:7

622:7 623:12

years 590:7,8 591:10 607:6,11 630:11 643:3,4, 20,25 644:4 669:1 674:7 706:3 769:6 778:25 780:10 794:22 816:18 yesterday 697:12 \mathbf{Z} **Z662** 598:10,14 600:15,23 682:22 683:1,4 735:21, 26 736:6,12 755:13 757:25 758:7 775:1 819:6,17 820:2