



Joel Denomy
Technical Manager
Regulatory Applications
Regulatory Affairs

tel 416 495 5676
EGregulatoryproceedings@enbridge.com

Enbridge Gas Distribution
500 Consumers Road
North York, Ontario M2J 1P8
Canada

VIA Email, RESS and Courier

August 20, 2019

Ms. Nancy Marconi
Manager of Supply and Infrastructure
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street, Suite 2700
Toronto, Ontario, M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Marconi:

**Re: Enbridge Gas Inc. (Enbridge Gas)
Ontario Energy Board (Board) File No.: EB-2018-0096
Liberty Village Project – Post - Construction Interim Monitoring Report –
Reply Submission**

On August 01, 2019, the Board issued a letter for the above noted proceeding requesting that Enbridge Gas provide a written reply to OEB staff's questions no later than August 20, 2019.

Accordingly, please find enclosed Enbridge Gas's reply.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions.

Yours truly,

(Original Signed)

Joel Denomy
Technical Manager

1. With reference to page six of the Report, Enbridge Gas states that, “Contaminant concentrations that exceeded the MECP Table 3 Site Condition Standards included zinc and PAHs [benzo(b)fluoranthene and benzo(a)pyrene].” (emphasis added)
 - a. Please provide a complete list of contaminants whose concentrations exceeded MECP Table 3.
 - b. Please explain why the Report did not include the full list of contaminants whose concentrations exceeded MECP Table 3.
-

Response:

- a. The complete list of contaminants whose concentrations exceeded MECP Table 3 are:
 - Zinc;
 - Benzo(b)fluoranthene; and
 - Benzo(a)pyrene.

The referenced sentence should be revised to state: “Contaminant concentrations that exceeded the MECP Table 3 Site Condition Standards are zinc and PAHs [benzo(b)fluoranthene and benzo(a)pyrene].”

- b. Please see the response to a. above.

2. With reference to page seven of the Report, Enbridge Gas states that permanent restoration of the tie-in on King Street west of Jefferson Avenue is planned for July 2019, pending receipt of a noise exemption permit from the City of Toronto. The “Action” for this work is described as “None required”.
 - a. Would it be more accurate to describe the action for this work as “Obtain permit and complete restoration”?
 - b. Please provide an update on the status of the permit and the restoration work.
-

Response:

- a. Yes, it would be more accurate to describe the action for this work as “Obtain permit and complete restoration”.
- b. The permit for noise exemption was denied by the City of Toronto on June 27th, 2019. Enbridge Gas contacted the City of Toronto Work Zone Coordinator to notify them that the permit was denied and asked for suggestions on an alternative schedule to complete the work. The Work Zone Coordinator advised that working hours from Monday to Friday are from 10:00am to 3:00pm and that work could not be completed on weekends due to planned events in the area. The Work Zone Coordinator advised Enbridge Gas that a weekend permit in October from Friday night until Monday morning may be a possibility. Enbridge Gas will continue to work with the City of Toronto to secure working time to complete the final restoration of King Street West.

3. With reference to Appendix D of the Report for November 20, 2018 (page 23), Enbridge Gas states that it was advised that the “project must have a paid duty officer on site.” The table entry suggests that, although paid duty officers were ordered, there was not one on site.
 - a. Please confirm that no work that required a paid duty officer was completed without an officer being on site.
 - b. If work that required a paid duty officer was completed without an officer being on site, please explain what Enbridge Gas did to address the non-compliance; what will Enbridge Gas do to prevent a similar occurrence in the future?
-

Response:

- a. and b. To the extent possible Enbridge Gas follows the information and guidance provided in the Ontario Traffic Manual Book 7 (“OTM Book 7”). OTM Book 7 provides for a uniform approach in the design and application of traffic control devices for roadway construction in Ontario. OTM Book 7 covers a broad range of traffic scenarios. OTM Book 7 allows for discretion and field experience in determining what is safe for road way construction. In some cases, the judgment of the traffic practitioner may lead to meeting or exceeding the guidelines and in other case it may not be possible or sound to meet the guidelines. OTM Book 7 recognizes that in certain cases the guidelines may not be followed yet the design and use of traffic control devices may be safe. In this case, it wasn’t possible to use a paid duty officer at all times for the Project. Certain tasks were completed without a paid duty officer on site. Enbridge Gas was unable to reschedule these tasks. The tasks were completed due to other works contingent on the tasks and in order to maintain the schedule and costs for the Project. In the absence of a paid duty officer Enbridge Gas used a combination of third party traffic control specialists and resources on site in order to protect the public and the workers.

Enbridge Gas would note that it makes every attempt to secure paid duty officers well in advance of when they are required. On many occasions Enbridge Gas receives confirmation from Toronto Police Services that a paid duty officer will be on site only to find out on the day the officer is required that the officer has cancelled or the officer does not show up on site at all. This is a recurring issue that has occurred on many projects, not just the Liberty Village Project. When this occurs Enbridge Gas will attempt to reschedule the work so that a paid duty officer can be present. If a paid duty office is requested and confirmed but then is not available and work cannot be rescheduled, Enbridge Gas will use resources onsite and/or hire a third party traffic control specialist to support the work and assist in managing traffic and ensure both the public and workers are safe.

4. With reference to Appendix D of the Report for November 30, 2018 (page 23), the “Resolution” entry is incomplete. Please provide the complete entry.
-

Response:

The Uber driver was upset that Enbridge Gas was performing traffic control using a single lane on East Liberty Street and allowing traffic through at intervals (east bound or west bound). The flag person had stopped traffic momentarily and the Uber driver started shouting obscenities at the flag person. The Uber driver eventually drove through the lane despite being instructed not to do so. The driver proceeded to drop off passengers. This was a concern as the Uber driver could have hit someone or caused an accident. The foreman on site took photos/videos of the incident and informed the Enbridge Gas inspector on site. No complaints were received from Uber or from the Uber driver and no subsequent developments have occurred related to the incident.