

EXHIBIT C - ROUTING AND ENVIRONMENTAL

C.1.1 ROUTE SELECTION

1. The selected route presents the least potential for adverse environmental and socio-economic impacts.
2. The route evaluation was supported by a review of available background information, desktop studies, environmental, and socio-economic field surveys, consultation with regulators and other stakeholders, and constructability reviews.
3. The route selection process was supported by a review of available background information, including requests to several agencies and stakeholders to assist with identifying environmental features, constraints, the potential for presences of Species at Risk (SAR) and their habitat. The results of this data collection are visually summarized within the Existing Conditions Figures within Appendix C of the ER **Error! Reference source not found.**(Appendix 1) The Preferred Route was circulated to agencies and stakeholders for review, no comments were received.
4. Alternate construction methods were considered for the East Sixteen Mile Creek crossing:
 - a. Open cut crossing was less desirable than HDD as it would require physical disturbance to the watercourse and vegetation clearing on and adjacent to the watercourse banks. Additionally, there would be potential disturbance and impacts to aquatic SAR within the watercourse. HDD avoids impacts to Trafalgar Road, a regional arterial roadway. An open cut crossing would result in additional disturbance to the property and residence immediately east of the watercourse associated with construction equipment access requirements, construction techniques and engineering requirements.
 - b. An alternative HDD entry pit location was considered between Trafalgar Road and East Sixteen Mile Creek. This alternative would impact the residence and property immediately east of East Sixteen Mile Creek due to construction equipment access requirements, construction techniques and engineering requirements.
5. HDD reduces potential environmental impacts, locating the HDD entry pit east of Trafalgar Road eliminates socio-economic impacts to the residence west of Trafalgar Road.
6. The Preferred Route may be subject to minor adjustments as the Project progresses through detail design, supplemental studies (including environmental studies) and site-specific requests from landowners and agencies. As identified in Section 3.6 of the ER (Appendix 1) the following key inputs will be considered in the detailed design:

- The applicable fish timing window guidelines for any in-water works will be followed, as required by the MNDMNR (formerly MNRF).
- A permit under O. Reg 162/06 will be required from Conservation Halton (CH) and necessary design modifications will be incorporated.

In general, this detailed design exercise will seek to avoid sensitive natural features to the extent practicable while considering utilities and infrastructure.

C.1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT SUMMARY

1. The ER fulfills the requirements of the OEB's Environmental Guidelines for the Location, Construction, and Operation of Hydrocarbon Pipelines and Facilities in Ontario, 7th Edition (2016). The ER is a component of the LTC application for the Project.

The ER describes the actions taken to identify an environmentally preferred route and to outline various environmental mitigation and protection measures for the construction and operation of the Project. The ER has three main phases:

- Phase 1 – Identification of Project Study Area and Preferred Route

This phase defined the study area, determined routing parameters and routing objectives, and identified environmental and socio-economic opportunities and constraints. This information and criteria were then used to evaluate potential alignments through a detailed review of available literature, mapping, and digital data, as well as engineering factors and constructability. The product of this phase was the determination of the Preferred Route.

- Phase 2 – Gather Information and Consultation

During this phase environmental and socio-economic background data relevant to the study area was confirmed and further supported through information requests to several agencies and stakeholders to assist with identifying environmental features, constraints, the potential for presence of Species at Risk (SAR) and their habitat. This data was used to develop mitigation and protective measures based on predicted effects and potential impacts.

Feedback on the Project was also sought through the issuance of public notices and targeted letters to agencies, municipal representatives, Indigenous communities, landowners, and other stakeholders.

- Phase 3- Environmental Report

During this phase potential environmental and socio-economic impacts and cumulative effects that would result from the Project were identified and mitigation and protection measures to reduce these impacts were determined. Mitigation and protection measures included the identification of supplemental studies, monitoring and contingency plans to be prepared and implemented.

C.1.3 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION PLAN

1. A Project specific Environmental Protection Plan (EPP) along with several management and contingency plans will be developed through the detailed design process, prior to construction. The EPP will outline the required environmental protection measures and commitments to avoid or reduce potential effects on the environment as a result of the Project. The EPP builds on the mitigation measures monitoring and contingency plans identified within the ER. It will provide the overarching structure upon which environmental management will be completed during construction by identifying environmental requirements, compliance procedures, roles and responsibilities, training procedures, inspection and reporting structures, and other processes and procedures for environmental management.
2. The EPP is a dynamic document that will be progressively developed as the Project moves through the design, permitting, and construction phases.
3. The EPP will include several Project specific management plans that will be topic specific to provide clear and transparent guidance regarding permit approval terms and conditions, other regulatory requirements, and commitments made as part of the ER.

C.1.4 ARCHAEOLOGY ASSESSMENT

1. A Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA) was completed to evaluate the archaeological potential of the Preferred Route. The AA was completed in accordance with the MHSTCI's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. The Stage 1 AA included a background review of current land use, historic and modern mapping, past settlement history for the area and a consideration of topographic and physiographic features, soils, and drainage. A site visit was also conducted on November 19, 2020, to document the current conditions of the area.
2. The Stage 1 AA concluded that the majority of the study area has archaeological potential and that further stages of AA's be completed (e.g. Stage 2) in accordance with MHSTCI's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologist* to provide for the assessment and mitigation of identified archaeological resources, if any are found.
3. The Stage 1 AA Report (prepared by Timmins Martelle under PIF# P324-0571-2020) was submitted to MHSTCI on January 7, 2021 and entered into the Ontario Public Register on January 20, 2021. The Stage 1 AA found that further archaeological work would be required. The Huron-Wendat, Six Nations, MCFN, and HDI were involved in the Stage 1 assessment and had an opportunity to review the report prior to MHSTCI submission. There were no edits of the report requested by any of the Indigenous communities. The Stage 1 AA can be found in Appendix E of the ER (Appendix 1).
4. The Stage 2 AA Report (prepared by Timmins Martelle under PIF# P324-0576-2020) was submitted to MHSTCI on July 16, 2021 and entered into the Ontario Public Register on July 16, 2021. The Stage 2 AA found that no further work is recommended. The Huron-Wendat, Six Nations, MCFN, and HDI were involved in the Stage 2 assessment and had an opportunity to review the report prior to MHSTCI submission. There were no edits of the report requested by any of the Indigenous communities. The Stage 2 AA can be found in Appendix E of the ER (Appendix 1).
5. The Huron-Wendat, Six Nations, MCFN and HDI participated in the Stage 2 AA field program.

C.1.5 CORRESPONDENCE RELATED TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

A summary of key correspondence with MHSTCI and Indigenous communities related to archaeological resources is provided in Table C.1.5-1. Additional information on consultation is included in Appendix B of the ER (Appendix 1).

Table C.1.5-1: Archaeological Resource Correspondence

Date	Party	Description	Comment
August 12, 2020	Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council (HCCC)	Notice of Commencement	Sun-Canadian provided Notice of Commencement
August 12, 2020	Huron Wendat Nation (HWN)	Notice of Commencement	Sun-Canadian provided Notice of Commencement
August 12, 2020	Mississauga of the Credit First Nation (MCFN)	Notice of Commencement	Sun-Canadian provided Notice of Commencement
August 12, 2020	Six Nations of the Grand River (SNGR) Elected Council	Notice of Commencement	Sun-Canadian provided Notice of Commencement
August 21, 2020	MHSTCI	Notice of Commencement	Sun-Canadian provided Notice of Commencement
September 8, 2020	MHSTCI	Response to Notice of Commencement	MHSTCI provided a response to the Notice of Commencement outlining MHSTCI interests and processes as it relates to archaeological resources, including the completion of archaeological assessments
September 9, 2020	HWN	Virtual Meeting	Discussed inclusion of community members in archaeological assessments
September 22, 2020	SNGR	Virtual Meeting	Discussed inclusion of community members in archaeological assessments
October 5, 2020	MCFN	Virtual Meeting	Discussed inclusion of community members in archaeological assessments
November 13, 2020	HDI	Email	Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants (TMHC) reached out to HDI concerning the project and participation in the Stage 1 archaeological assessment
November 13, 2020	HWN	Email	TMHC reached out to HWN concerning the project and participation in the Stage 1 archaeological assessment
November 13, 2020	SNGR	Email	TMHC reached out to SNGR concerning the project and participation in the Stage 1 archaeological assessment
November 13, 2020	MCFN	Email	TMHC reached out to MCFN concerning the project and participation in the Stage 1 archaeological assessment
December 8, 2020	HDI	Email	TMHC provided HDI a copy of the draft Stage 1 report for review

December 8, 2020	HWN	Email	TMHC provided HWN a copy of the draft Stage 1 report for review
December 8, 2020	SNGR	Email	TMHC provided SNGR a copy of the draft Stage 1 report for review
December 8, 2020	MCFN	Email	TMHC provided MCFN a copy of the draft Stage 1 report for review
December 15, 2020	SNGR	Email	SNGR confirmed there were no requested edits to the Stage 1 report
December 29, 2020	HWN	Email	HWN confirmed there were no requested edits to the Stage 1 report
January 6, 2021	HDI	Phone call	HDI provided TMHC verbal confirmation that there are no additional comments following their review of the Stage 1 report
January 6, 2021	MCFN	Email	MCFN confirmed there were no requested edits to the Stage 1 report
May 5, 2021	HDI	Email	TMHC reached out to HDI concerning the project and participation in the Stage 2 archaeological assessment
May 5, 2021	HWN	Email	TMHC reached out to HWN concerning the project and participation in the Stage 2 archaeological assessment
May 5, 2021	SNGR	Email	TMHC reached out to SNGR concerning the project and participation in the Stage 2 archaeological assessment
May 5, 2021	MCFN	Email	TMHC reached out to MCFN concerning the project and participation in the Stage 2 archaeological assessment
May 31, June 3 and 4, 2021	HDI	In field discussion	Discussions between TMHC field director and HDI representative about the fieldwork, findings and recommendations. No concerns were raised.
May 31, June 3 and 4, 2021	SNGR	In field discussion	Discussions between TMHC field director and SNGR representative about the fieldwork, findings and recommendations. No concerns were raised.
May 31, June 3 and 4, 2021	HWN	In field discussion	Discussions between TMHC field director and HWN representative about the fieldwork, findings and recommendations. No concerns were raised.
June 18, 2021	HDI	Email	TMHC provided HDI a copy of the draft Stage 2 report for review
June 18, 2021	HWN	Email	TMHC provided HWN a copy of the draft Stage 2 report for review
June 18, 2021	SNGR	Email	TMHC provided SNGR a copy of the draft Stage 2 report for review
June 18, 2021	MCFN	Email	TMHC provided MCFN a copy of the draft Stage 2 report for review
June 27, 2021	SNGR	Email	SNGR confirmed there were no requested edits to the Stage 2 report
June 28, 2021	MCFN	Email	MCFN confirmed there were no requested edits to the Stage 2 report

July 13, 2021	HDI	Phone call	HDI provided TMHC verbal confirmation that there are no additional comments following their review of the Stage 2 report
---------------	-----	------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------