

July 7, 2017

BY RESS & Courier

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
Suite 2700, 2300 Yonge Street
Toronto, Ontario
M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

**Re: Union Gas Limited (“Union”)
2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project
Board File # EB-2017-0162**

Further to the interrogatories received in the above noted matter, please find attached two copies of Union’s responses.

Sincerely,

[original signed by]

Mary Jane Patrick
Analyst, Land Services
Encl.

cc: Zora Crnojacki
Nancy Marconi

UNION GAS LIMITED

Answers to Interrogatories from Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry

1. In the Applicant's re-filed evidence, Schedule 2 entitled "Terminus Pool: Depth to Crest and Guelph Structure Map" identifies a number of wells in and near the subject storage pool. At Schedule 4, Page 7, under the heading "Assessment of Neighbouring Activities, the application identifies that:

- *There are 6 wells within 1 km of the base of the Terminus Pool.*
- *There are 3 natural gas storage reservoirs and 8 oil and gas production reservoirs.*
- *10 wells penetrate the storage zone; 8 wells are part of pool operations, 2 are abandoned.*

And further concludes:

- *Union does not expect any impact from existing operations.*

Interrogatory:

Please provide details as to the potential risks that were considered and a summary of the analysis that was conducted to lead to the above-noted conclusion.

Response:

Union Gas Limited has operated the Terminus Pool for more than forty years. Over this period of time Union has monitored the operations of the Pool and has not seen any evidence of communication with existing or abandoned wells within 1 km or any existing operations within 5 km.

In preparation for the Terminus Project, Union completed a Risk Assessment and an Assessment of Neighbouring Activities. These reports were provided to the MNR and are summarized in Schedule 5 of Union's prefiled evidence. Union utilized UGM Engineering to complete a Risk Assessment ("What if" Analysis of Hazard and Operability Issues) as described in Schedule 5. A total of 124 "What ifs" were generated and risk ranked in the following categories:

- Geological Considerations
- Existing and Abandoned Wells
- Operations Within 5 km
- New Well Drilling
- Well Completions
- Existing Storage Wells and Reservoir Considerations

- Crossover Piping
- Operations and Maintenance
- Wireline Operations
- Wellhead upgrade
- Service Rig Operations
- Wireline Logging
- Remedial Cementing
- Site Considerations

The Terminus project includes the drilling of one well and conversion of a second well. This is being completed to replace the deliverability lost as a result of the abandonment of two wells in 2016. Union is not proposing to change to the operation of the Terminus Pool as part of this project and therefore will not impact the risk profile.

UNION GAS LIMITED

Answers to Interrogatories from Board Staff

Interrogatory # 1

Ref: Evidence page 3, Lines 4-18: “Need for the Facilities” and page 6:” Proposed Facilities”

Preamble:

Union Gas indicated that the need for the proposed well and pipelines is to replace 490×10^3 m³/day deliverability lost by abandoning one Injection/Withdrawal (I/W) well and converting one I/W into an observation well as a result of Union’s Integrity Management Program.

As part of the project, Union Gas will also convert one observation well into a I/W well.

Questions:

- a) Out of the total deliverability of the Terminus Pool, what percentage of deliverability is 490×10^3 m³/day?
- b) Please confirm that the new wells will provide deliverability replacement without adding incremental deliverability to the Terminus Pool operation.
- c) Did Union Gas consider drilling a well to provide incremental deliverability in the near future, in addition to the replacement of the deliverability loss? If so, please discuss if Union Gas is planning another Terminus storage enhancement project to address this need?
- d) Which approvals does Union Gas require from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNR) for conversion of an observation well into an I/W well?

Response:

- a) 490×10^3 m³ represents 12% of the total deliverability of the Terminus Pool.
- b) Union is expecting that deliverability of the new wells in the Terminus Pool will replace the lost deliverability, and is not anticipating that there will be any significant incremental deliverability from the new wells.
- c) Union frequently evaluates the potential benefits of adding new wells to each Pool, however, Union does not have any firm plans to add incremental deliverability to the Terminus Pool by drilling additional wells in the near future.

- d) No approvals from the MNRF are required for conversion of an observation well into an I/W well. Upon conversion to a I/W well Union will submit an updated Form 7 (Drilling and Completion Report) to the MNRF indicating that the Well Status (Type) of UT.13 has changed from “Observation” to a “Natural Gas Storage”.

UNION GAS LIMITED

Answers to Interrogatories from Board Staff

Interrogatory # 2

Ref: Evidence page 9, Lines 6-11: “Project Cost and Economics” and Schedule 14 “Total Estimated Well Capital Cost-Summary”

Preamble:

Union Gas estimated total capital costs for the project, including well drilling and gathering pipelines, at \$1.797 M. Union Gas did not include a Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) analysis for the project. Union Gas explained that this project is “a maintenance project” and as such will be “prorated to both the regulated and un-regulated portfolios. Union Gas also indicated that for the Terminus Pool the regulated to un-regulated split is 62.3% and 37.7% respectively.

Questions:

- a) Please provide a breakdown of capital costs for comparable well drilling and gathering pipelines projects currently in service and recently approved by the OEB.
- b) Please indicate the timing and the method for recovery of the construction costs for the project. Please discuss in relation to the regulated to unregulated storage business split indicated in the evidence.

Response:

- a) Since the Natural Gas Electricity Interface Review (“NGEIR”) decision in 2006 of the projects involving well drilling and the construction of gathering pipelines have been competed as part of Union’s unregulated storage business. The exception is the current application which is a maintenance project where the costs have been split between Unions regulated and unregulated storage business. Under the NGEIR decision Union was not required to file project costs and as such the project costs for Union recent storage projects are not on the public record. As such Union is unable to provide a summary of capital costs that were provided to the Board in recent filings.

Union can confirm that the cost estimate in the current proceeding is based on the costs incurred in the 2017 Storage Enhancement Project.

- b) The capital cost for the regulated portion of the project will form part of Union’s rebasing application in 2019. As stated in Union evidence at page 9 line 11 the capital costs will

be split between Union's regulated and unregulated store business. The split will be 62.3% regulated and 37.7% unregulated. The portion of the project costs that will be allocated to Unions regulated business is \$1,119,000.

UNION GAS LIMITED

Answers to Interrogatories from Board Staff

Interrogatory # 3

Ref: Evidence pages 10-11, “Land Matters”, Schedule 16: “Pipeline Easement”, Schedule 17: “Letter of Acknowledgment” dated April 5, 2017

Preamble:

Union Gas filed a copy of the executed Letter of Acknowledgment between Union Gas and the affected landowners. According to the Letter of Acknowledgment and Storage Lease Agreements, Union Gas has the authority to drill the well and install the pipeline at the affected property. However, Union Gas stated it would secure an easement agreement with the affected landowners in a form submitted in Schedule 16 of the Evidence.

According to section 97 of the *Ontario Energy Board Act, 1998* (OEB Act), “In an application under section 90, 91 or 92, leave to construct shall not be granted until the applicant satisfies the Board that it has offered or will offer to each owner of land affected by the approved route or location an agreement in a form approved by the Board.” Union Gas will therefore require the OEB’s approval of the form of easement agreement that it has offered or will offer to the affected landowners. Union Gas sought an approval of that form by the OEB.

Questions:

- a) Please explain why Union Gas intends to offer a new form of easement agreement for the pipelines to the affected landowners despite the fact that it has the authority to install the pipelines pursuant to the existing Storage Lease Agreements.
- b) Has the form of pipeline easement agreement, that Union Gas has offered or will offer to the landowners whose property is directly affected by the proposed pipeline, been previously approved by the OEB? If so, in which proceeding(s)?

Response:

- a) Union agrees that under the terms of the existing Storage Lease Agreement that it has the required rights to construct the pipeline. Union is offering a pipeline easement to the landowner in order to specifically identify the easement where the pipeline is located. The specific location will be referenced in the easement by way of a reference plan. The easement and reference plan will be registered on title to the landowner’s

property. By registering a specific easement on title, current and future landowners will be in a better position to identify pipeline locations. This will benefit the landowner with respect to their farming operations and enhances pipeline awareness and safety, rather than rely upon the blanket provisions within the Storage Lease Agreement.

- b) The form of easement was approved by the Board as part of the Panhandle Reinforcement Project EB-2016-0186.

UNION GAS LIMITED

Answers to Interrogatories from Board Staff

Interrogatory #4

Ref: Evidence Schedule 19, Email by the Ministry of Energy to Union Gas, dated February 23, 2017; Schedule 20: *Indigenous Consultation Report, Terminus Well Drilling Project*

Preamble:

The 2016 edition of the *OEB Environmental Guidelines for the Location, Construction and Operation of Hydrocarbon Pipelines and Facilities in Ontario* (OEB Environmental Guidelines) sets out new streamlined procedures and protocols for Indigenous consultation and the duty to consult on natural gas pipeline and storage projects that are subject to the OEB's approval. Union Gas is required to adhere to these procedures and protocols and to file the required documentation with the OEB as part of its evidence in support of its application.

In accordance with the OEB Environmental Guidelines, Union Gas' evidence includes an *Indigenous Consultation Report, Terminus Well Drilling Project*. Union Gas also filed a copy of the e-mail/letter from the Ministry of Energy in which it is advised to "...proceed as you have in the past for well applications". To date, Union Gas has not filed any other documentation it received from the Ministry of Energy related to the Duty to Consult (for example, a determination as to whether the Duty to Consult has been triggered by the Project and an assessment of Indigenous consultation activities undertaken by Union Gas).

Questions:

- a) Please comment on the email letter from the Ministry of Energy found in Schedule 19 and indicate whether that letter is a formal delegation to Union Gas of the procedural aspects of the Duty to Consult?
- b) What other documents (related to the Duty to Consult delegation and environmental assessment) does Union Gas anticipate the Ministry of Energy will issue to Union Gas in accordance with the OEB Guidelines?
- c) What is the expected timing of Union Gas filing these documents with the OEB?
- d) Please provide an update on the Indigenous consultation undertaken since the application was filed. Identify any concerns raised in the consultation and describe how Union Gas is planning to address the concerns raised by First Nations and Metis communities affected by the proposed project.

Response:

- a) b) c) The Ministry of Energy has submitted to Union a letter stating that no Duty to Consult has been triggered as a result of this project. The letter dated June 22, 2017 is attached as Schedule 1.
- d) 1) Caldwell First Nation: A second email notification, dated March 16, 2017 to Chief Hillier was forwarded to confirm if consultation or any further information was required. Chief Hillier responded with no issues or concerns and asked to be notified if monitors are required for archeological surveys on the project. Union will follow up and will notify when monitors are required.
- 2) Walpole Island First Nation: A second email notification, dated March 16, 2017, to Chief Miskokomon, Dr. Jacobs, Consultation Manager and Janet Macbeth, Project Review Coordinator, was forwarded to confirm if consultation or any further information was required. No issues or concerns have been forwarded regarding this project.
- 3) Aamjiwnaang First Nation: A second email notification, dated March 16, 2017 to Chief Rodgers and Sharilyn Johnston, Environmental Coordinator, was forwarded to confirm if consultation or any further information was required. Chief Rodgers confirmed that Sharilyn Johnston would respond if she had any concerns. No issues or concerns have been forwarded regarding this project.
- 4) Chippewa's of the Thames First Nation: A second email notification, dated March 16, 2017 to Chief White-eye and Kelly Riley, Consultation Manager, was forwarded to confirm if consultation or any further information was required. No response or issues brought forward.
- 5) Kettle & Stony Point First Nation: A second email notification, dated March 16, 2017 to Chief Bressette and Lorraine George, CAO, was forwarded to confirm if consultation or any further information was required. Valerie George, Consultation Coordinator, contacted Union by email on May 26, 2017 and requested a meeting. Union responded on May 31st with a voice message to set up a meeting. No response received by June 25, 2017 so an email was forwarded to Ms. George requesting a meeting. Union is waiting for a response to move ahead with any consultation that is requested. Based on our meeting of March 13, 2017 Union expects this will be an update meeting and will address any issues or concerns if they arise.

Due to the long standing consultation practice that Union has with Indigenous people Union does not anticipate any issues to be brought forward. Union will continue to engage with the First Nations and will address any concerns that may arise during construction.

Ministry of Energy

77 Grenville Street
6th Floor
Toronto ON M7A 2C1

Tel: (416) 314-2599

Ministère de l'Énergie

77 rue Grenville
6^e étage
Toronto ON M7A 2C1

Tél: (416) 314-2599



Indigenous Energy Policy

VIA EMAIL

June 22, 2017

Ken McCorkle
Manager, First Nations and Métis Affairs
Union Gas Limited
50 Keil Drive North
Chatham, ON N7M 5M1

Re: 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Drilling Project

Dear Mr. McCorkle:

Thank you for your letter dated April 10, 2017, providing an Environmental Protection Plan and an Indigenous Consultation Report for the 2017 Terminus Well Replacement project.

I understand that Union Gas Ltd. is proposing to drill a new well to maintain the deliverability of the Terminus Storage Pool in the Township of St Clair in Lambton County. The project will include drilling a new well, and install new NPS 12 inch pipeline to connect the new well to the existing gathering system.

Based on the information Union Gas Ltd. has provided to date, the Ministry is of the view that the project will not result in any appreciable adverse impact on the established or asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights of any First Nation or Métis communities. Should new project information become available that indicates a potential to impact Aboriginal and treaty rights (e.g. the result of the archeological assessment) I request that you notify the Ministry as appropriate.

Given that the Ministry has determined, based on currently available information that no duty to consult has been triggered it will not be necessary for the Ministry to provide a letter of opinion regarding the sufficiency of consultation.

Also, I recommend that Union Gas Ltd. continue to maintain a record of its interactions with Indigenous communities about the project it has engaged on an interests-basis. In the event that an Indigenous community provides Union Gas with information indicating

a potential adverse impact of this project on its Aboriginal or treaty rights, I request that you notify the Ministry as appropriate.

If you have any questions about this letter or require any additional information please contact Anne-Laure Bouvier, Senior Advisor by phone at 416-212-6704 or by email anne-laure.bouvier@ontario.ca

Sincerely,



Shannon McCabe
A/Manager
Indigenous Energy Policy

UNION GAS LIMITED

Answers to Interrogatories from Board Staff

Interrogatory # 5

Ref: Evidence page 9, Lines 19-23 “Environmental Matters”; Schedule 15, “2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project: Environmental Protection Plan”

An Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) was prepared by Union Gas to meet the intent of the OEB Environmental Guidelines. The EPP covers both the proposed well and the pipeline. The EPP was provided to members of the Ontario Pipeline Coordinating Committee (OPCC) on April 10, 2017 for review and comments. To date, no comments from the OPCC review are included in the evidence.

Question:

Please file a summary and updates of comments and concerns received from the public consultation and the OPCC review, as well as Union Gas’ responses and planned actions to mitigate each of the issues and address each of the concerns.

Response:

Attached as Schedule 1 is a summary as well as the actual comments received as part of the OPCC review.

OPCC Review Summary**2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project**

AGENCY	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Ontario Energy Board via Lillian Ing, Case Administrator	<p>1. Phone conversation on April 12th, 2017</p> <p>Requested an electronic version of the Environmental Protection Plan and letter to Zora Crnojacki.</p>	<p>1. Subsequent email with Environmental Protection Plan and letter to Zora Crnojacki attached.</p>
County of Lambton via Matt Deline, Public Works Manager	<p>1. Email dated May 5, 2017</p> <p>The County had no concerns with the Environmental Protection Plan.</p> <p>Inquired as to whether Union Gas has taken measures to implement any best management practices of a Clean Equipment Protocol as it pertains to invasive plant species.</p> <p>Provided a link with a Best Management Practices Webinar (pdf) for the Clean Equipment Protocol: Inspecting and cleaning equipment for the purposes of invasive species prevention.</p> <p>2. Email dated May 9, 2017</p> <p>Thank you email with no other concerns.</p>	<p>1. Email dated May 8, 2017</p> <p>Thanked the County for their review of the Environmental Protection Plan and information regarding the Clean Equipment Protocol.</p> <p>Stated Union Gas's commitment to best management practices of the Clean Equipment Protocol and attached the document adhered to on recent Union Gas projects (same protocol as referenced by the County):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clean Equipment Protocol for Industry: Inspecting and cleaning equipment for the purposes of invasive species prevention (2013). Prepared by the Peterborough Stewardship Council and the Ontario Invasive Plant Council.
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport via Joseph Muller, Heritage Planner	<p>1. Email with attached letter to Zora Crnojacki, Ontario Energy Board, (cc: to Union Gas) dated May 11, 2017</p> <p>The Ministry stated that Union Gas is required to determine the project's potential impact on cultural heritage resources (archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes) as per the OEB's Environmental Guidelines (2016).</p> <p>The Ministry outlined Union Gas's commitments made in the Environmental Protection Plan to meet the OEB requirement described above and requested continued circulation on the project.</p>	<p>1. Email from Zora Crnojacki, Ontario Energy Board, (cc: to Union Gas) dated May 11, 2017</p> <p>Thank you/acknowledgement email with no other comments.</p>

Tomek, Evan

From: Tomek, Evan
Sent: April-12-17 3:08 PM
To: 'boardsec@oeb.ca'
Subject: 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project
Attachments: 2017_Terminus_EPP_022317.pdf; UGL_Terminus_EPP_Notice_OEB.pdf

Hi Lillian,

As discussed, please see the attached Environmental Protection Plan prepared for the 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project and the corresponding letter addressed to Zora.

Thanks,

Evan Tomek, BES

Environmental Planner *on behalf of*
Union Gas Limited | An Enbridge Company
745 Richmond Street | Chatham, ON N7M 5J5
Tel: 519.436.2460 ext 5236904
Cell: 226.229.9598
email: etomek@uniongas.com



Tomek, Evan

From: Matt Deline <Matt.Deline@county-lambton.on.ca>
Sent: May-09-17 8:21 AM
To: Tomek, Evan
Subject: RE: 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project

Great. Thanks Evan.

Thanks,
Matt

Tomek, Evan

From: Tomek, Evan
Sent: May-08-17 9:16 AM
To: 'Matt Deline'
Subject: RE: 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project
Attachments: Clean_Equipment_Protocol_for_Industry.pdf

Hi Matt,

Thank you for your review of the EPP and information regarding the Clean Equipment Protocol.

Union Gas is committed to preventing the spread of invasive species through best management practices of the Clean Equipment Protocol. We have used the attached Protocol as a guide on recent projects. I will file the content you attached to supplement this information.

Please let me know if you have any questions and I'll be happy to answer.

Thanks,

Evan Tomek, BES

Environmental Planner *on behalf of*
Union Gas Limited | An Enbridge Company
745 Richmond Street | Chatham, ON N7M 5J5
Tel: 519.436.2460 ext 5236904
Cell: 226.229.9598
email: etomek@uniongas.com



From: Matt Deline [<mailto:Matt.Deline@county-lambton.on.ca>]
Sent: May-05-17 4:32 PM
To: Tomek, Evan
Subject: 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project

Hi Evan

The County of Lambton recently received the Environmental Protection Plan for the 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project. There are no concerns with the proposed EPP, but has Union Gas taken measures to implement any best management practice of a Clean Equipment Protocol? When working in areas with potential invasive species, such as Phragmites, wild parsnip and giant hogweed, inspecting and cleaning equipment can significantly minimize the spread of such species. There are a variety of [documents](#) that have been developed to provided land managers with proper tools for accurately identifying and effectively controlling invasive plants.

If you would like to discuss further please feel free to contact this office.

Thanks,

Matt Deline, P.Eng.
Manager, Public Works
County of Lambton
519-845-0809 x5370

DISCLAIMER:

If you are not the intended recipient of this transmission, you are hereby notified that any disclosure or other action taken in reliance on its contents is strictly prohibited. Please delete the information from your system and notify the sender immediately. If you receive this email in error contact the County of Lambton at 519-845-0801 extension 5405 or email itsupport@county-lambton.on.ca.



please don't print this e-mail unless you really need to.

Tomek, Evan

From: Zora Crnojacki <Zora.Crnojacki@oeb.ca>
Sent: May-11-17 4:19 PM
To: 'Muller, Joseph (MTCS)'
Cc: Tomek, Evan
Subject: RE: Union Gas 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project

Hello Mr. Muller:
Thank you very much.

Zora Crnojacki
Project Advisor
| Applications | Supply and Infrastructure |



P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge Street
Toronto ON M4P 1E4
416-440-8104
zora.crnojacki@oeb.ca

From: Muller, Joseph (MTCS) [<mailto:Joseph.Muller@ontario.ca>]
Sent: May-11-17 1:48 PM
To: Zora Crnojacki
Cc: etomek@uniongas.com
Subject: Union Gas 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project

Hello Zora Crnojacki:

Please find attached our comments from the Heritage Program Unit at the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport on the above project, and contact me if you have any questions or would like to discuss the file. Thank-you for your assistance,

Joe

Joseph Muller, RPP, MCIP

Heritage Planner
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Culture Division | Programs and Services Branch | Heritage Program Unit

401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto, Ontario M7A 0A7

Tel. 416.314.7145 | Fax. 416.212.1802

This electronic transmission, including any accompanying attachments, may contain information that is confidential, privileged and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law, and is intended only for the

recipient(s) named above. Any distribution, review, dissemination or copying of the contents of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient(s) is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and permanently delete the copy you have received.

Ce message, transmis par courriel, y compris tout fichier joint, peut contenir des renseignements qui sont confidentiels, qui sont protégés par le secret professionnel ou qui ne peuvent être divulgués aux termes des lois applicables et s'adressent exclusivement au(x) destinataire(s) indiqué(s) ci-dessus. La distribution, la diffusion, l'examen ou la reproduction du contenu du courriel par une autre personne que le(s) destinataire(s) voulu(s) sont strictement interdits. Si vous recevez ce message par erreur, veuillez le supprimer définitivement et en aviser l'expéditeur immédiatement par retour du courriel.

**Ministry of Tourism,
Culture and Sport**

Heritage Program Unit
Programs and Services Branch
401 Bay Street, Suite 1700
Toronto ON M7A 0A7
Tel: 416 314 7145
Fax: 416 212 1802

**Ministère du Tourisme,
de la Culture et du Sport**

Unité des programmes patrimoine
Direction des programmes et des services
401, rue Bay, Bureau 1700
Toronto ON M7A 0A7
Tél: 416 314 7145
Téléc: 416 212 1802



May 11, 2017 (EMAIL ONLY)

Zora Crnojacki
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street, Suite 2601
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4
E: Zora.Crnojacki@ontarioenergyboard.ca

RE: MTCS file #: 0006528
Proponent: Union Gas
Subject: Environmental Protection Plan (EPP)
Union Gas 2017 Terminus Well Replacement Project
Location: St. Clair Township, County of Lambton, Ontario

Dear Zora Crnojacki:

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) has been provided with the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) for the above project. MTCS's interest in this project relates to its mandate of conserving Ontario's cultural heritage, which includes:

- Archaeological resources, including land-based and marine;
- Built heritage resources, including bridges and monuments; and,
- Cultural heritage landscapes.

Under the Ontario Energy Board "Environmental Guidelines for the Location, Construction and Operation of Hydrocarbon Pipelines and Facilities in Ontario" (2016), the proponent is required to determine a project's potential impact on cultural heritage resources. While some cultural heritage resources may have already been formally identified, others may be identified through screening and evaluation. Aboriginal communities may have knowledge that can contribute to the identification of cultural heritage resources, and we suggest that any engagement with Aboriginal communities includes a discussion about known or potential cultural heritage resources that are of value to these communities. Municipal Heritage Committees, historical societies and other local heritage organizations may also have knowledge that contributes to the identification of cultural heritage resources.

Archaeological Resources

As noted on page 33 of the [OEB Environmental Guidelines](#) (2016): "The preliminary assessment of the heritage potential in the study area must be carried out, prior to the selection of a preferred alternative." A commitment is made on page 10 of the EPP that an archaeological assessment (AA) will be undertaken: this should be by an archaeologist licenced under the *OHA*, who is responsible for submitting the report directly to MTCS for review. MTCS archaeological sites data are available at archaeology@ontario.ca.

Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes

A commitment is made on page 10 of the EPP that a determination will be made whether the project may result in impacts to built heritage and/or cultural heritage landscapes. The MTCS [Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes](#) should be completed by the proponent to help determine whether the project may impact cultural heritage resources. The Clerks for the County of Lambton and St. Clair Township can provide information on property registered or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Municipal Heritage Planners can also provide information that will assist the proponent in completing the checklist.

If potential or known heritage resources exist, MTCS recommends that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), prepared by a qualified consultant, should be completed to assess potential project impacts. Our Ministry's [*Info Sheet #5: Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans*](#) outlines the scope of HIAs. If undertaken, the HIA should be provided to MTCS and the local municipalities for review, and made available to local organizations or individuals who have expressed interest in review.

Environmental Assessment Reporting

All technical heritage studies and their recommendations are to be addressed and incorporated into the projects report, and provided to MTCS before commencement of work on-site. When screening has identified no known or potential cultural heritage resources, or no impacts to these resources, the completed checklists and supporting documentation should be included in the project report or file.

MTCS requests continued circulation on this project: please contact me for any questions or clarification.

Sincerely,

Joseph Muller, RPP/MCIP
Heritage Planner
Joseph.Muller@Ontario.ca

Copied to: Evan Tomek, Environmental Planner, Union Gas Limited

It is the sole responsibility of proponents to ensure that any information and documentation submitted as part of their project report or file is accurate. MTCS makes no representation or warranty as to the completeness, accuracy or quality of the any checklists, reports or supporting documentation submitted as part of the reporting process, and in no way shall MTCS be liable for any harm, damages, costs, expenses, losses, claims or actions that may result if any checklists, reports or supporting documents are discovered to be inaccurate, incomplete, misleading or fraudulent.

Please notify MTCS if archaeological resources are impacted by project work. All activities impacting archaeological resources must cease immediately, and a licensed archaeologist is required to carry out an archaeological assessment in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act and the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.

If human remains are encountered, all activities must cease immediately and the local police as well as the Cemeteries Regulation Unit of the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services must be contacted. In situations where human remains are associated with archaeological resources, MTCS should also be notified to ensure that the site is not subject to unlicensed alterations which would be a contravention of the Ontario Heritage Act.

UNION GAS LIMITED

Answers to Interrogatories from Board Staff

Interrogatory #6

Ref: Application EB-2017-0162, page 1, paragraph 2

Union Gas applied for leave to construct facilities under section 90(1) of the OEB Act. If Union Gas does not agree to any of the draft conditions of approval noted below, please identify the specific conditions that Union Gas disagrees with and explain why.

For conditions in respect of which Union Gas would like to recommend minor changes, please provide the proposed changes.

Response:

Union can accept all of the proposed conditions of approval in relation to pipeline construction.

UNION GAS LIMITED

Answers to Interrogatories from Board Staff

Interrogatory #7

Ref: Application EB-2017-0162, page 1, paragraph 1

Preamble:

Union applied for well drilling licences under section 40(1) of the OEB Act. Should the OEB find the applications in the public interest it would issue a favourable report to the Minister of Natural Resources and Forestry recommending issuance of a well licence and certain conditions.

Question:

Please comment on the following conditions of approval proposed by OEB staff.
Please note that these conditions are draft and subject to additions or changes.

Response:

Union can accept all of the proposed conditions of approval in relation to well drilling.