

**Ontario Energy Board
EB-2025-0301**

***IN THE MATTER OF an application by Enbridge Gas Inc. for exemption
from leave to construct a natural gas pipeline and associated facilities in the
City of Port Colborne***

AFFIDAVIT OF PETER GRAHAM

I, Peter Graham, of the City of Hamilton, in the province of Ontario, MAKE OATH AND SAY:

1. I am the Consultation Supervisor of the Six Nations of the Grand River, as represented by the Elected Council (“**SNGR**”), intervenor in this proceeding, and, as such, have personal knowledge of the matters contained in this affidavit. Where I have been informed by others of information contained in this affidavit, I have indicated so, and I believe such information to be true.

2. I swear this affidavit to provide further evidence regarding consultation meetings between Enbridge Gas Inc. (“**Enbridge**”) and SNGR regarding the Port Colborne Reinforcement Project (the “**Project**”), which is not reflected in the evidence filed with the Ontario Energy Board (the “**Board**”) in respect of Enbridge’s LTC Exemption Application (the “**Application**”). This affidavit is a supplement to the existing evidentiary record, and sets out relevant context and information missing from the record currently before the Board. I verily believe that the evidence herein is necessary for the Board to have a full understanding of the consultation that has and has not occurred with respect to the Project.

Initial Notification to SNGR

3. Enbridge first notified SNGR of the Project by email to myself and Lonny Bomberry on April 22, 2025.¹ This notification included a map of proposed routes for the Project.

4. I responded the next day, informing Enbridge that the Project had substantive impacts to Aboriginal and treaty rights, particularly SNGR's harvesting rights.² In this email, I made clear that SNGR requires baseline environmental data for each of the proposed routes as a prerequisite for substantive discussions. I have continued to emphasize this need through the life of the Project.

5. Over the following months, Enbridge and SNGR exchanged preliminary correspondence.³ On May 26, 2025, SNGR entered a field monitoring agreement with Enbridge.⁴

6. On June 3, 2025, Enbridge delivered the Project Description Report to SNGR.⁵

Initial Meeting - June 10, 2025

7. On June 10, 2025, SNGR met virtually with representatives from Enbridge and Enbridge's environmental consultant, Stantec Consulting Ltd. ("**Stantec**") (the "**June Meeting**"). This was the first meeting between SNGR and Enbridge regarding the Project.

¹ Email from K. Berube to L. Bomberry dated April 22, 2025 (Application of Enbridge Gas Inc. dated November 7, 2025 [**Application**], Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachment 3.0, p. 99).

² Email from P. Graham to K. Berube dated April 23, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachment 3.1, p. 104).

³ Emails between SNGR and Enbridge Gas Inc., (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachments 3.1–3.15, pp. 104–123); Responses to Written Interrogatories of Enbridge Gas Inc. dated March 2, 2026, [**Responses**] Exhibit I, Staff-1, Attachment 2, Line-item Attachment 3.16, p. 180).

⁴ Emails between D. LaForme and K. Berube dated May 26, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachments 3.7–3.8, p. 115–116).

⁵ Email from K. Berube to L. Bomberry, dated June 3, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachment 3.15, p. 123); Project Description Report (Application, Exhibit F, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 1, Appendix B.10, pp. 310–333).

8. A crucial point raised by SNGR at this meeting was the need for on-the-ground environmental studies for each of the proposed routes prior to the selection of a preferred route. Such studies allow SNGR to understand the environmental impact of each proposed route. Desktop surveys are not enough to paint an accurate picture—on-the-ground studies of the actual route location are necessary for SNGR to assess the actual impacts of any such pipeline on the natural environment.

9. Preserving the natural environment and the diverse plant and animal species which inhabit it is a central priority of SNGR. The natural environment of SNGR's treaty territory is of vital importance to SNGR, and is essential for the exercise of SNGR members' Aboriginal and treaty rights. Developments like the Project contribute to the cumulative degradation of SNGR land for private gain, without benefit to SNGR's community, or to the natural world. The nature of this Project is such that it poses a long-term environmental risk, should the pipeline ever malfunction and cause a leak or spill. Where the pipeline is placed is therefore crucial to minimizing potential environmental issues.

10. For this reason, SNGR requires baseline environmental studies, typically in the form of an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS"), from proponents like Enbridge. This Project was no different—SNGR expressed this need in the meeting. Lauren Jones, SNGR's Wildlife and Stewardship Manager, also expressed specific studies she wished to see.

11. When Enbridge first met with SNGR, it had already selected a preferred route from the proposed routes. It told us at the meeting it chose its preferred route because it made sense from an engineering perspective.⁶ It appears to have chosen the preferred route without regard to

⁶ Meeting Notes dated June 10, 2025 (Responses, Exhibit I, SNGR-1, Attachment 1).

environmental factors, because it chose the route before environmental studies were concluded, and without performing environmental studies on the other proposed routes. This means Enbridge did not know whether the preferred route was more or less environmentally impactful than the other proposed routes.

12. Moreover, the preferred route was also chosen without considering SNGR's Indigenous perspective. This, again, is clear from the fact that Enbridge did not meet with SNGR until after the route was chosen. Despite the fact that I reached out to Enbridge the day after it put SNGR on notice of this project, SNGR was not given the opportunity to consult on the pipeline route, which is a fundamental element of the Project.

13. At the June Meeting, we told Enbridge that, for SNGR, baseline studies are a prerequisite to choosing any preferred route for the Project and that it is impossible to evaluate different routes without a full understanding of each route's impacts on the environment. Without this data, SNGR could not determine the impact of any preferred route for the Project (or of the Project itself) on its Aboriginal and treaty rights.

14. However, Enbridge merely forged ahead with its already-selected proposed route, and did not agree to study the other potential routes, or to complete the studies on the proposed route before taking further steps. This disregarded what SNGR had explained to Enbridge about the need to complete a full environmental assessment before it could meaningfully consult on the Project and provide a fully-informed assessment of the Project's impact on its Aboriginal rights.

15. Enbridge also took the position at this meeting—consistent with its prior communications⁷—that the Board does not require an EIS. SNGR had explained, from the outset, that SNGR’s requirements were different than the Board’s. The Board’s required environmental studies do not and cannot dictate what studies SNGR needs to be able to meaningfully consult on the Project with respect to the impacts to its Aboriginal rights. In my initial email replying to Enbridge’s notice of the Project, I said, “I appreciate OEB may not require an Environmental Impact Statement, but we do.”⁸ Despite knowing this was a requirement from the beginning, Enbridge has not performed some of the studies requested by SNGR.

16. I note that in its answers to SNGR’s interrogatories, Enbridge says “SNGR has been provided with the [Environmental Report] and supporting materials, and was provided an opportunity to identify any issues or concerns it had with same”.⁹ I disagree with this. There still have been no baseline studies performed on the other potential routes. Without those, as I have said herein, it is impossible for SNGR to be able to identify the full picture of potential issues. SNGR was not consulted with prior to the preferred route having been chosen.

17. Importantly, SNGR’s issues with Enbridge regarding consultation on this Project occurred in the context of larger consultation failures by Enbridge in the other projects. Some of those were also discussed at the parties’ June Meeting, such as the Mississauga Reinforcement Project (the “**Mississauga Project**”).

⁷ Email from K. Berube to L. Bomberry, dated April 22, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachment 3.0, p. 99).

⁸ Email from P. Graham to K. Berube, dated April 23, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachment 3.1, p.104).

⁹ Responses, Exhibit I, SNGR-1, p. 9, response to question 6(a).

18. SNGR raised this pattern of failed consultation at the June Meeting. Phil Monture, SNGR's Founding Director of Lands and Resources, made a point to inform Enbridge of SNGR's relationship with Enbridge's predecessor, Union Gas. Mr. Monture explained that SNGR and Union Gas had a positive, respectful relationship. Union Gas would meaningfully consult, collaborate with SNGR on mitigation measures, and accommodate SNGR. He directly contrasted Enbridge with its predecessor, noting that Enbridge had not done any of that.

19. I detailed these failures of communication with the Ministry of Energy and Mines (the "MEM"). In an email on June 11, 2025, I summarized Enbridge's failures at the June Meeting to MEM.¹⁰ I explained that Enbridge "wouldn't meaningfully respond to our priorities" and that I (and SNGR) viewed Enbridge as "deliberately stonewalling [SNGR]". Most notably, I informed MEM that unlike many other proponents, Enbridge did not at all move off of its position or take any steps to compromise with SNGR after our initial meeting.

Enbridge Newly Produces Notes from June Meeting

20. In its responses to SNGR's interrogatories in this matter, Enbridge attached notes taken by one of its representatives during this meeting.¹¹ These notes were not circulated to SNGR, nor filed with the OEB, prior to March 2, 2026.

21. I was very surprised to see Enbridge provide notes from the June Meeting. Enbridge had, up until its responses were filed, represented to SNGR that it did not take notes. Most notably, Enbridge represented this to SNGR at the November 25, 2025 meeting.¹²

¹⁰ Email from P. Graham to S. McCabe, dated June 11, 2025, **Exhibit 1**.

¹¹ Responses, SNGR-1, Attachment 1.

¹² Email from P. Graham to MEM, dated November 26, 2025, **Exhibit 1**.

22. That representation now appears not to be true. I do not understand why Enbridge did not tell us at the time that they had taken notes, and give them to us, seeing as Enbridge's lack of notes was a point of contention between the parties for months.

23. I do not understand why it took SNGR intervening in this Board proceeding, and asking interrogatories about the lack of notes, for Enbridge to all of a sudden produce its notes. This does not feel in keeping with the spirit of relationship-building or reconciliation, nor is it the action of a proponent who takes its delegated consultation responsibilities seriously. This has only led SNGR to lose even more trust and confidence in Enbridge.

24. Further, these notes confirm what I have been concerned about for months: that Enbridge did not accurately capture what SNGR clearly explained in the June Meeting. Enbridge's notes reflect several misunderstandings of SNGR's perspective. Among the most concerning is that the notes say SNGR stated that having baseline studies prior to route determinations to be "beneficial". That is not true. We were clear that these studies were a necessary prerequisite for any comment by SNGR.

Enbridge Delivers (Inadequate) Draft Environmental Report

25. On September 10, 2025, Stantec provided SNGR with a draft Environmental Report prepared for the Project.¹³ The next day, I replied to explain that the Environmental Report was inadequate because of a lack of baseline data.¹⁴

¹³ Email from K. Dominique to P. Graham dated September 10, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Line-item Attachment 3.24, p. 132).

¹⁴ Email from P. Graham to Stantec dated September 11, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Line-item Attachment 3.25, 3.25).

26. In SNGR's view, baseline data on the proposed routes was still necessary. I am not aware of any reason these studies could not have been performed, and Enbridge did not tell me of any. I verily believe the reason they were not performed is that Enbridge felt it would receive Board approval for the Project without them, and that they were thus not necessary, despite the fact that the failure to undertake these studies meant that SNGR could not meaningfully engage on the Project.

27. Enbridge did not, in my view and experience as the person at SNGR primarily responsible for consultation on this Project, approach its consultation with SNGR with seriousness, honesty, integrity, or any intent to compromise or meaningfully engage. In my experience with Enbridge on this Project, it appeared to have approached consultation with SNGR as a box-checking exercise, with the primary goal being Board approval, rather than actual consultation, dialogue and engagement. As mentioned above, this is in contrast to SNGR's relationship with Enbridge's predecessor in the area, Union Gas.

October 9, 2025 Meeting: Continued Failure to Take Seriously SNGR's Concerns

28. As a consequence of Enbridge's pattern of failed consultation on the Project and the Mississauga Project, SNGR sought the Crown's intervention.

29. On October 9, 2025, SNGR, Enbridge, and MEM met virtually (the "**October Meeting**") to discuss consultation on the Project and the Mississauga Project. This meeting was emblematic of Enbridge's deficient consultation.

30. A transcript of this meeting was attached to Enbridge's written interrogatories.¹⁵ It appears to have been automatically generated by the virtual meeting software.¹⁶

31. At the October Meeting, we told Enbridge that it failed to take seriously SNGR's need for baseline studies prior to route selection. We further told Enbridge that, in SNGR's view, it was not engaging in even minimal consultation. Enbridge maintained its refusal to conduct an EIS on the proposed routes the basis of regulatory standards, taking the position that one was not necessary.

32. SNGR responded to this position by telling Enbridge that duty to consult and regulatory requirements are distinct, saying: "this is duty to consult, you know, this isn't about ensuring Enbridge is meeting municipal, provincial, federal requirements. This is, you know, to get down to, you know, potential impacts to Aboriginal and treaty rights."¹⁷

33. At this meeting, even after SNGR's statement, it did not appear that Enbridge appreciated the distinction between regulatory requirements and SNGR's requirements. At this time, Enbridge had been largely unresponsive to SNGR's community needs and perspectives.

34. As another defence to Enbridge's lack of studies, Enbridge said the Project was primarily being built on an existing road allowance. In Enbridge's view, this was already disturbed land, such that further disruption would not be a major cause of concern.

¹⁵ Responses, SNGR-1, Attachment 2.

¹⁶ See for example Responses, SNGR-1, Attachment 2, at pp. 8–9, where a block of text is attributed to Tayler Hill, but some part of it was said by me, not Ms. Hill. I cannot recall which, but this error is reflected in the transcript at p. 9, where Lauren Whitwham replies to me, despite my speaking not being reflected.

¹⁷ Responses, SNGR-1, Attachment 2, p. 8.

35. This is not the case. At this meeting, Mr. Monture explained that the Project's location on an existing road allowance did not ameliorate SNGR's concerns, as building in road allowances does not address (among other things):

- (a) That constructing the Project would disturb potential SNGR burial areas;
- (b) That Enbridge would be profiting off a past wrong, that wrong being the initial construction of the road allowances on SNGR land; and
- (c) The cumulative effects of continued disturbance.

36. Enbridge's narrow focus only on the fact that the pipeline is proposed to be on the road allowance disregards the bigger, historical picture necessary to understand SNGR's position, and necessary to truly engage with the Project's impacts on SNGR's Aboriginal rights and interests.

37. I note that Enbridge's responses to SNGR's interrogatories state that "cumulative effects assessment under the OEB framework is focused on the incremental contribution of the Project in combination with other reasonably foreseeable activities. With respect to historical projects, those projects were subject to their respective regulatory and consultation processes in place at the time".¹⁸ Respectfully, this is too narrow of a view of cumulative effects from a duty to consult perspective. The duty to consult and accommodate must take into account cumulative effects on the natural environment and Aboriginal and treaty rights from past developments.

38. Before the October Meeting concluded, Enbridge took the (shocking) position that the June Meeting did not count,¹⁹ and that no response to SNGR's concerns was forthcoming, because it

¹⁸ Responses, Exhibit I, SNGR-1, p. 10, response to question 6(c).

¹⁹ Email from P. Graham to K. Berube, October 16, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachment 3.26, p. 134).

was a verbal meeting. Specifically, Enbridge said that Enbridge did not follow-up on SNGR's concerns because it never received them in writing.²⁰

39. SNGR explained to Enbridge that they are a primarily oral people and that the requirement for SNGR to articulate its concerns in writing, when it had already done so orally (and Enbridge was capable of reducing the discussion to writing), was inappropriate.

40. Another major issue discussed at this meeting was Enbridge's attempt to consult with SNGR through SNGR's field monitors. SNGR told Enbridge that such monitors are not authorized to engage in consultation, and that only SNGR's Consultation and Accommodation Process ("CAP") Team is permitted to do so. The Field Monitors' role is strictly limited to observing field studies. They cannot carry out consultation on behalf of SNGR.

41. Despite being aware of this lack of authority, Enbridge tried to deputize SNGR's monitors and directly engage in consultation with them, over SNGR's objection.

CAP Team Requires a Structured Consultation Process, Enbridge Proceeds With Application Without Notice to SNGR

42. Due to the above failures of consultation on the Project and others, the CAP Team decided that a structured consultation process with Enbridge was required going forward.²¹ In light of Enbridge's dismissal of SNGR's verbal requests, the CAP Team viewed consultation based on the *status quo* as impossible.²² I informed Enbridge of this conclusion by email on October 16, 2025.²³

²⁰ Responses, SNGR-1, Attachment 2, p. 7.

²¹ Email from P. Graham to K. Berube dated October 16, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachment 3.26, p. 134).

²² Email from P. Graham to K. Berube dated October 16, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachment 3.26, p. 134).

²³ Email from P. Graham to K. Berube dated October 16, 2025 (Application, Exhibit H, Tab 1, Schedule 1, Attachment 6, Line-item Attachment 3.26, p. 134).

43. SNGR and Enbridge scheduled a meeting to establish this process on November 25, 2025 (the “**November Meeting**”). This meeting took place in-person, as-scheduled. At the November Meeting, Enbridge told SNGR that it did not take notes at the June Meeting. As discussed above, this statement turned out to be false.

44. Some progress was made at this meeting, and SNGR left the meeting believing that Enbridge was finally engaging in good faith, and that meaningful consultation could finally begin.

45. However, SNGR subsequently learned that Enbridge commenced this Application on November 7, 2025, prior to the November Meeting.²⁴ Enbridge did not tell SNGR at the meeting that it had commenced this Application. SNGR learning that Enbridge had already submitted its Application (which is contingent on consultation having been appropriately carried out) has further eroded SNGR’s trust in Enbridge and has significantly set back the relationship.

46. Enbridge’s decision to commence this Application prematurely, when true consultation was only just beginning, and in the middle of active discussions with SNGR, forced SNGR’s hand. Intervening in the Application has become the only way for SNGR to require Enbridge to hear its concerns. Given Enbridge’s approach to consultation on the Project, SNGR does not have confidence that if the Application is granted, Enbridge will engage with SNGR in good faith on a go-forward basis. Its actions to date are those of a proponent who is engaged in consultation only to the extent needed to obtain project approval.

47. Enbridge’s decision to commence this Application when it did has only increased the time and expense SNGR has needed to expend. Among other things, Enbridge’s Application was

²⁴ Letter from R. Murray to S. Hill dated December 2, 2025 (filed with the OEB as Notice_EGI_LtC Exemption_Port Colborne Project_SNGR_20251202).

incomplete and left out key documents. SNGR was required to correct the Indigenous Consultation Record attached to Enbridge's Application (which was incomplete).

AFFIRMED by Peter Graham of the City of Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, before me at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, on Tuesday, March 18, 2026 in accordance with O. Reg. 431/20, Administering Oath or Declaration Remotely.

}

Aidan C. Testa

A Commissioner, etc., Province of Ontario,
while a Student-at-Law.
Expires November 6, 2028
(or as may be)

AIDAN CAMERON TESTA



PETER GRAHAM

This is Exhibit “1” referred to in the Affidavit of Peter Graham affirmed by Peter Graham of the City of Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, before me at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, on Tuesday March 18, 2026, in accordance with O. Reg. 431/20, Administering Oath or Declaration Remotely.

Aidan C. Testa

A Commissioner, etc., Province of Ontario,
while a Student-at-Law.
Expires November 6, 2028
(or as may be)

AIDAN CAMERON TESTA

[REDACTED]

From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Sent: November 26, 2025 2:18 PM
To: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

Thank you for providing us with this update. Good to hear it was a productive meeting.

I'm sure we'll be in touch again soon on Port Colborne.

Enjoy the rest of your week!

Thank you,
Shannon

From: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: November 26, 2025 2:14 PM
To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Good afternoon Shannon,

We had a productive meeting with Enbridge yesterday. They've finally admitted to not taking notes at that June meeting.

While a lot of work is still required for Port Collborne, we told Enbridge we'd 'sign-off' on this phase of the Mississauga Reinforcement if the company agreed to our 10-1 tree replacement ratio, which it did. Accordingly, we have no objections to the file moving forward.

Thank you,

Peter

From: Peter Graham
Sent: September 17, 2025 3:27 PM
To: 'McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM)' <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Shannon,

Yes, the below is an accurate summary of our meeting.

Thank you, Peter

From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Sent: September 17, 2025 1:47 PM
To: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

Thank you for the follow-up discussion about the Mississauga Reinforcement project yesterday. We appreciate your time.

Below is a summary of the key issues discussed and next steps. Please let us know if we inadvertently mischaracterized anything.

- Six Nations continues to have unresolved issues with the Mississauga Reinforcement project, which includes:
 - o Concerns about baseline studies, routing and lack of information to be able to determine and assess impacts to rights
 - o Concerns that there has been a lack responsiveness and willingness from Enbridge to address Six Nations' concerns
 - o Enbridge's interrogatory response dated August 21, 2025 indicate that "*As of August 11, 2025, SNGR representatives have not identified any outstanding concerns. Enbridge Gas will continue to engage with SNGR about the Project*". Six Nations does not agree with that statement.
- We also note your concern/interest in ensuring that Enbridge is aware that feedback/ input from field/environmental monitors does not replace or constitute formal feedback into the consultation process. Consultations should take place with Six Nations' Land Use and Consultation Unit.
- We also note that that Six Nations is seeing similar concerns on other Enbridge projects, including Port Colborne and Cedar Springs.

Next steps:

- Chloe has already reached out to Dawn Russell at your office to determine some potential times that work for Six Nations, the Ministry and Enbridge to meet and discuss outstanding issues for the Mississauga Reinforcement project. A meeting to be scheduled as soon as possible.

Thanks again and we will be in touch soon.

Sincerely,
Shannon & Chloe

From: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: September 16, 2025 9:56 AM
To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

dawnrussell@sixnations.ca

From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Sent: September 16, 2025 8:53 AM
To: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Good morning Peter,

Thanks for the call last week. After we chatted, our team met with Enbridge to discuss several matters, including the Mississauga Reinforcement project. If you're free at 9:30 today, I can give you a quick update on that discussion. Or if another day works better, please let me know.

Thanks!
Shannon

From: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: September 16, 2025 8:46 AM
To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Shannon,

I don't remember, but am assuming today's 9:30 hold was issued in case last week's time didn't work out. Please confirm.

Thank you, Peter

From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Sent: September 4, 2025 1:26 PM
To: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Thanks, Peter. 9:30 it is. I'll send out an invite.
Speak soon,
Shannon

From: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: September 4, 2025 1:25 PM
To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Shannon,

Yes, please send an invite for 9:30 on the 10th. I have a 10 o'clock, but we should have plenty of time. I'm somewhat cynical generally, but still surprised to hear Enbridge is claiming no outstanding concerns.

Thank you, Peter

From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Sent: September 4, 2025 1:19 PM
To: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

Agree – summer went by way too quickly!

Thanks for letting me know that concerns are still outstanding. Enbridge filed its interrogatory responses with the Ontario Energy Board on August 21, and in that document, it states the following: *“As of August 11, 2025, SNGR representatives have not identified any outstanding concerns. Enbridge Gas will continue to engage with SNGR about the Project.”*

I think a short call would be helpful as a next step. And then you can determine if a subsequent meeting with your consultation team should be arranged with ministry staff. Would 9:30am on Wed Sep 10 work for you?

Thank you!
Shannon

From: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: August 29, 2025 12:57 PM
To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Shannon,

I share the common sentiment that this summer is ending too soon!

I haven't heard anything from Enbridge about this project since the last meeting I reported on, so our concerns are still outstanding.

Depending on what you have in mind, we can have a one-to-one phone call (I'm free before 10 most days and other times can be arranged) or a more formal meeting with the consultation team.

Thank you, Peter

From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (MEM) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>

Sent: August 28, 2025 5:02 PM

To: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>

Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (MEM) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>

Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

I hope you're doing well, and I hope you are having a great summer!

I am following up about the Mississauga Reinforcement project proposed by Enbridge. I wanted to check in on the status of the concerns that Six Nations had raised about the project, including concerns about environmental reports as well as concerns about potential impacts to plant and animal species of importance to Six Nations, concerns about tree removal and routing, among others.

On Aug 21, Enbridge filed its Interrogatory Responses in response to questions from Ontario Energy Board staff about the project. The response includes updates on its engagements with First Nations, including Six Nations. All of the project materials filed with the OEB about the project can be found here, including Enbridge's Aug 21 responses: [Content Manager WebDrawer - Search Results](#).

I see from Enbridge's updates, that capacity funding was provided to support Six Nations' participation in the consultation process for the project. It's been a while since we've connected and I wanted to check in with you for any updates on your consultations with Enbridge to date and to understand if there continues to be outstanding concerns.

Please let us know and we'd be happy to schedule a chat to discuss further. Enbridge has filed its leave to construct application with the OEB and I anticipate that the OEB will be making a decision on the project in the near future.

Thank you very much,
Shannon

Shannon McCabe (she/her)
Manager, Strategic Indigenous Initiatives
Ministry of Energy and Mines

Ontario 



From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (ENERGY)

Sent: June 16, 2025 5:43 PM

To: 'Peter Graham' <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (ENERGY) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

Thank you for your email, and my apologies for the delay in responding. We appreciate you providing us with an update after your meeting with Enbridge about the Mississauga Reinforcement project. As you're aware, the Ministry has a role in reviewing the proponent's consultation records and providing a letter of opinion on the adequacy of the consultation process to date. At this time, we note that you have outstanding concerns that have not been resolved or mitigated through the consultation process.

Do you have further meetings planned with Enbridge? Or has Enbridge committed to further considering your requests? We'd be happy to schedule a call with you so we can discuss in more detail, and we would be pleased to raise these issues with Enbridge directly as well.

Thank you again. Best regards,
Shannon

From: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 9:41 AM
To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (ENERGY) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (ENERGY) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Shannon,

We had our meeting with Enbridge yesterday.

They will not consider doing proper baseline studies prior to preferred route selection. They're asking us "What standard is the community looking for?... What meets community needs?", while simultaneously not realizing that having adequate baseline environmental studies prior to route selection is a path towards fulfilling those standards and needs.

Lauren Jones, our wildlife and stewardship manager, outlined why such information is needed from an Indigenous perspective and noted particular environmental study components she'd like to see. Lauren was taken aback when Enbridge asked us to select our preferred Port Colbourne route after she had outlined why baseline information was a prerequisite.

Phil Monture, our founding director, spoke about the positive and respectful relationship SNGR had with Union Gas before Enbridge took over that company's assets. He noted meaningful dialogue, deep collaboration on mitigation measures, and accommodations for rights impacts. Enbridge, he observed, hasn't done any of that.

While Enbridge repeatedly expressed its willingness to utilize our plant and animal lists, it wouldn't meaningfully respond to our priorities.

One problem may be that the Enbridge employees at the table didn't have the authority to agree to anything beyond a sprinkling of cultural sensitivity. They couldn't even reveal the name of the "industrial customer" prompting the Port Colbourne work as they didn't have express permission from higher ups.

Going into the meeting, I was planning on offering a variety of suggestions to get us past the environmental studies logjam, such as asking for a lower-level environmental memo, or waiving the request for Mississauga in exchange for the company agreeing to have an EIS prior to preferred route selection for newer projects like Port Colborne. Similar compromises have worked with other proponents in the past. But the company was completely closed to deviating from the OEB minimum requirements, so offering concessions would have been tantamount to negotiating with myself.

It's not unusual to have company and local government employees we've never previously met with insist on sticking to minimum requirements, but they usually move off that once an initial meeting has been held. As we've had several prior meetings with Enbridge and some of its representatives at the meeting, and the company can't realistically claim to be unfamiliar with the duty to consult, I believe Enbridge is deliberately stonewalling us. Consequently, the meeting did not move the needle on the grossly inadequate consultation to date.

Thank you, Peter

From: Peter Graham
Sent: May 29, 2025 9:09 AM
To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (ENERGY) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (ENERGY) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Shannon,

I'm indeed well and hope you can say the same.

We're meeting with Enbridge on June 10th to discuss the two projects. I'll update you after the meeting.

Re the field work, it's environmental rather than archaeology. But our archaeology supervisor, who manages all paid SNGR fieldwork, will be sending a person, as she does with most close-by opportunities. My concern is they're mixing typical monitoring work with more formal duty to consult as monitors wouldn't be very familiar with the overall project, Elected Council's opinions, documents, etc. No need to reach out to Enbridge. Just noting to ensure OEB is aware of the constraints of that process on the small chance it becomes an issue because a monitor said, or didn't say, something.

Thank you, Peter

From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (ENERGY) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Sent: May 28, 2025 5:16 PM
To: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>
Cc: Lazakis, Chloe (ENERGY) <Chloe.Lazakis@ontario.ca>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

Good to hear from you. I hope you are well.

Your email is timely and my apologies for the delay in following up with you about the Mississauga Reinforcement project. Thank you again for sharing your concerns about the project. Please know that your concerns were relayed to Enbridge at our unit's regular meeting with them. Enbridge acknowledged Six Nations' ongoing issues and interests, and did acknowledge their long delay in responding to your initial ask for environmental reports. Enbridge recently advised us that they've filed the application for the project with the Ontario Energy Board. Enbridge has also shared their Indigenous consultation records with our Ministry for review. We are currently reviewing.

As you may know, the Ministry has a role in reviewing the proponent's consultation records and providing its opinion on the adequacy of the proponent's consultation efforts. Based on the records, Six Nations continues to have concerns that haven't been addressed and that a meeting is in the process of being planned between Six Nations and Enbridge. Has a meeting been scheduled yet? If a meeting takes place, we are interested in knowing how that goes and any outcomes. We want to assist with ensuring that your concerns have been adequately addressed ahead of decisions being made on the project.

And also thank you for flagging your concerns about the Port Colborne project. I'm wondering if there is a way that Enbridge could support Six Nations' early involvement in the archaeology work, but in a way that suits your needs? If you have any suggestions, let us know and we can share that with Enbridge.

Please keep us posted on the upcoming meeting with Enbridge, if it takes place, and if there is any other information you'd like to share, including about the Port Colborne project, we'd be happy to schedule a call. I've copied my colleague, Chloe Lazakis, who is working with me on this file.

Thanks very much and talk soon,

Shannon

Shannon McCabe (she/her)
Manager, Strategic Indigenous Initiatives
Ministry of Energy and Mines



From: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: Friday, May 23, 2025 3:42 PM
To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (ENERGY) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Hi Shannon,

Please update me on this file.

I'm particularly concerned because Enbridge is pursuing a similar project in a much more environmentally sensitive area (Port Colborne line). I've requested a meeting with Enbridge, but to date, the company is repeating the same mantra they've used for this one, that OEB doesn't require an EIS, as if that precludes a detailed natural environmental study and abrogates the duty to consult. The company is making noises about adopting SNGR perspectives in the ESR, but that's insufficient when comprehensive baseline data is needed.

Thank you, Peter

PS: A lesser concern is an invite I just received for a Port Colborne line area field visit. Enbridge says: "this is a new process we are introducing in response to requests to have earlier engagement on projects. Participation in these

surveys offers an important opportunity to share knowledge related to treaty rights and traditional land use. Early participation and input will help ensure that community rights, values, and perspectives are meaningfully reflected in the assessment of potential route options.”

Sounds good, but I’m also leery, and am alerting you because the company may later argue we were given this opportunity and declined, so inadequate consultation is on us instead of them. I have meetings scheduled throughout the concerned day next week and will not attend. Even with more advance notice, I can’t justify the amount of time required. We could potentially send a field monitor, but that person would not have authority to participate in the way Enbridge is envisioning. While I appreciate Enbridge responding to complaints about inadequate consultation, an arbitrary plan which doesn’t suit our needs is not the way forward.

From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (ENERGY) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>

Sent: April 4, 2025 4:29 PM

To: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>

Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

Thank you so much for this detailed outline of SNGR’s concerns. This is very much appreciated. As mentioned, we are meeting with Enbridge next week and will relay the concerns. I’ll follow up with you soon.

Wishing you a lovely weekend,
Shannon

From: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>

Sent: Friday, April 4, 2025 10:41 AM

To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (ENERGY) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>

Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Good morning Shannon,

According to the report’s consultation log, the only First Nation comment submitted since the study formally commenced last summer was from SNGR, summarized as “A SNGR representative emailed the Enbridge Gas representative to advise that they would like to be provided with any environmental study or anything relevant to the Project. The SNGR representative advised that they do not have enough information to determine impacts to their Aboriginal and treaty rights.”

That continues to be SNGR’s position upon reviewing the report. Per correspondence forwarded to you earlier, we have been awaiting natural environmental reports prior to commenting, and have only recently learned that key documents to understanding potential impacts to Aboriginal and treaty rights, like a Environmental Impact Study and Arborist report, have not been prepared. Such studies are required for SNGR to uncover potential impacts to Aboriginal and treaty rights.

The report asserts “The data available at the current stage of the environmental study is appropriate for predicting effects and potential impacts and recommending mitigation and protective measures.” We are of the strong opinion it is not. The report is only concerned with SAR (and to a much lesser extent SOCC) species. There is no attentiveness to plants important to Six Nation members (we have a list which we can circulate with restrictions) and scant information for animals deemed particularly valuable for harvesting (despite an assertion that incidental wildlife were recorded, there is no such record included in the report). Despite the focus on SAR, the study fails

them as well, with a woefully inadequate single-day windshield study. After reading the report, potential impacts to aquatic species remain a mystery.

The report says the preferred route “is not anticipated to impact trees” and “Although the PPR appears to intersect more environmental features than the Alternative Routes, the impacts are not significant and can be mitigated during construction.” Yet correspondence with Stantec rejects my interpretation of the above as meaning “zero impacts” on trees. And without substantive natural environmental investigation, potential impacts cannot be detected or mitigated. Why does the PPR only ‘appear’ to intersect more environmental features than other routes? The report strongly suggests it does. Surely proper natural environmental studies will put any debate to rest. The route evaluation on p. 79 suggests a staggering amount of potential natural environmental impacts for the PFR vs. any of the alternatives.

Consultation with SNGR on the PPR was not possible because – as Enbridge should be aware - we’ve been waiting for natural environmental studies to establish a baseline for our opinion and comments. Yet the report says “As no comments were received that would cause a change in the PPR, it was confirmed as the PR”. The report emphasizes “Indigenous community participation is essential to the Project” and “Enbridge Gas will continue to meaningfully engage with affected Indigenous peoples”, yet the correspondence log suggests that hasn’t been the case and First Nations had zero input.

The report discusses cumulative effects, but again, we found any assertions lacking without baseline information having been obtained. Enbridge says the purpose of this proposed project is “In part to support existing Enbridge Gas customers transitioning from other fuel sources to natural gas.” What other fuel sources are they transitioning from? Is the switch to natural gas more or less environmentally-friendly than the status quo? The report appears to consider construction activities as the only potential factor impacting air quality.

Alarming, the report concedes “the process followed may not satisfy the ‘duty to consult’ component from an Indigenous community’s perspective. To demonstrate that we respect this view, we will use the term ‘engagement’ throughout the remainder of this Report when we refer to seeking input from Indigenous peoples.” I submit that meaningful consultation, rather than switching to the term engagement, is a much more appropriate and respectful way to address the issue.

Thank you, Peter

From: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (ENERGY) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>

Sent: March 28, 2025 12:17 PM

To: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>

Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

Thank you for reaching out! I’m doing well, thanks. Hope you are too.

I really appreciate you raising these concerns with us. I’ll be sure to raise it with my team here. This is something we will certainly discuss with Enbridge as well.

Our ministry – recently renamed to the Ministry of Energy and Mines - has a role in the Ontario Energy Board’s hydrocarbon process, where we have a role in delegating the procedural aspects of consultation to proponents, reviewing the proponent’s consultation efforts, and providing an opinion on the sufficiency of consultation that the OEB considers in its decision making. It’s helpful for us to hear concerns and issues directly from First Nations, so thanks for contacting us.

Would it be helpful if we scheduled a call so that we can better understand the issues? Perhaps we can find some time next week?

In addition to raising concerns with us directly, you may also be interested in becoming an intervenor in the OEB's future hearing process for the project. It's another option for raising concerns and to have comments "on the record" so to speak. The OEB reimburses for certain costs as well. You can find more information here: <https://www.oeb.ca/stakeholder-engagement/intervenor-information>

Best regards,
Shannon

Shannon McCabe (she/her)
Manager
Strategic Indigenous Initiatives
Ministry of Energy and Electrification



From: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2025 10:16 AM
To: McCabe, Shannon (She/Her) (ENERGY) <Shannon.McCabe@ontario.ca>
Subject: FW: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION -- EXTERNAL E-MAIL - Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender.

Good morning Shannon,

I hope you're keeping well.

Enbridge responded to my below email via a new email string, noting you were their OEB contact for this file.

I first requested to see natural environmental studies last summer, and am frustrated I'm only now being told they don't exist and will not be conducted as part of its impending application. That situation, along with persistent problems with the reliability of Enbridge, has prompted me to write.

I'd like to better understand OEB's process for Enbridge's proposal, especially what the timelines are looking like. Enbridge wanted comments last month. I had been waiting to receive the natural environmental studies before inserting the project into our work queue. Had I known basic natural environmental studies would not be conducted at this stage, I would have requested some last summer. We will want enhanced environmental studies – EIS and arborist specifically - for the company's preferred alternative.

A key part of our job is determining potential impacts to Aboriginal and treaty rights, seeking avoidance or mitigation where negative impacts are identified, negotiating enhanced mitigation measures beyond existing commitments, etc. So obtaining a baseline cannot wait until after this approval process. Further, my experience with Environmental Assessments and similar applications, tells me proponents cannot be relied on to consult with us after receiving their initial approval. Even where there's a clear commitment to consult with us on detailed design, I estimate it fails to happen around 90% of the time.

Enbridge is great, vs. the average proponent we work with, for its willingness to provide consultation dollars, but well below average for most other things. Despite several past meetings (not regarding this project) where we emphasized the need to study animals important to Six Nation members, they've only done the basic SAR and habitat checklists.

The below string is not the summary of my efforts to receive usable environmental information, as Enbridge usually issues standalone emails in response instead of hitting reply. I'm pasting below my January 7th email immediately below as another example of us trying to get basic info, which was only answered on March 24th.

Thank you, Peter

Jan 7-"Good morning Kevin,

On July 9, 2024, we indicated that an environmental study was required for us to make an informed assessment of potential rights impacts, but the Environmental Report sent to us yesterday is the only such information we've received. On July 18, 2024, we requested this project be discussed in a meeting but, to the best of my recollection, that never occurred.

At this stage, I'm concerned about the 42-day comment window (It's not possible to carefully read the report and engage in consultation within the allotted time) and lack of information about the natural environment (the Report occasionally refers to fieldwork, but evidence of it is few and far between).

The report claims "Input on the PPR was sought through consultation" but that's not true with respect to SNGR for the above-noted reasons. If given the opportunity, we would not have supported the chosen alternative, which has the largest potential impact to Aboriginal and treaty rights..."

From: Peter Graham
Sent: March 24, 2025 2:40 PM
To: Kevin Berube <kevin.berube@enbridge.com>
Subject: RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Kevin,

Please provide me with Enbridge's OEB contact for this file. I'm concerned it's taken the better part of a year for me to be told that no substantive natural environment studies have been completed.

Thank you, Peter

From: Kevin Berube <kevin.berube@enbridge.com>
Sent: March 24, 2025 12:44 PM
To: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

I reached out to Stantec regarding your request below. This is what I received from them:

[We have not completed any environmental studies apart from the windshield survey and desktop review which is typical at this stage of the ER. Arch stage 1 and a Cultural Heritage Screening Checklist have also been completed.](#)

Let me know if you have any questions or need anything from me.

Thanks,
Kevin

From: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2025 3:01 PM
To: Kevin Berube <kevin.berube@enbridge.com>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION! EXTERNAL SENDER

Were you expecting this email? TAKE A CLOSER LOOK. Is the sender legitimate?
DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you are 100% sure that the email is safe.

Hi Kevin,

Thank you for forwarding Stantec's response.

I'm looking for natural environmental studies, which may include arborist and hydro studies. The main natural environmental document - variously called a environmental impact study, sub-watershed study or natural environmental study - is the most important for my purposes.

Best, Peter

From: Kevin Berube <kevin.berube@enbridge.com>
Sent: March 11, 2025 12:45 PM
To: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Hi Peter,

I reached out to Stantec to see if they have information to respond to your queries below. I have a response from Stantec to the second query:

We are not saying that there would be "zero" impacts to trees. The project would be subject to municipal tree by-law permitting, and through that process tree protection set-backs and/or mitigation would be identified, and/or compensation provided to the municipality for replacement. The level of impact would determine the mitigation, and location of the running line in relation to the trees would determine the level of impact. With the absence of running line detail, we can't really be more specific. That would be evaluated in the future through a tree inventory and permitting.

With respect the standalone study, are you referring to the archaeological assessment? If so, I can contact the PM to see what has been completed and forward you that information.

Thanks Peter,
Kevin

From: Peter Graham <L RCS@sixnations.ca>
Sent: Tuesday, February 11, 2025 8:32 AM
To: Kelly, Dominique <dominique.kelly@stantec.com>
Cc: Kevin Berube <kevin.berube@enbridge.com>; MississaugaReinforcementEA <MississaugaReinforcementEA@stantec.com>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

CAUTION! EXTERNAL SENDER

Were you expecting this email? TAKE A CLOSER LOOK. Is the sender legitimate?
DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you are 100% sure that the email is safe.

Good morning Dominique,

Thanks for getting in touch. I have two outstanding questions I hope you can help me with.

We always start with natural environmental studies to determine potential rights impacts. Is there no standalone study for this project?

And per p. 80, "...a third of the PPR is adjacent to wooded areas, however construction will be limited to the road allowance and is not anticipated to impact trees. Although the PPR appears to intersect more environmental features than the Alternative Routes, the impacts are not significant and can be mitigated during construction." We'd like to see evidence illustrating the zero impact to trees and lack of any other significant impact.

Best, Peter

From: Kelly, Dominique <Dominique.Kelly@stantec.com>
Sent: January 28, 2025 11:21 AM
To: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>; Lonny Bomberry <lonnybomberry@sixnations.ca>
Cc: Kevin Berube <kevin.berube@enbridge.com>; MississaugaReinforcementEA <MississaugaReinforcementEA@stantec.com>
Subject: [External] RE: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Good morning Peter and Lonny,

I just wanted to send out a friendly reminder that we are hoping for your comments on the Mississauga Reinforcement ER by **February 17, 2025**. Please let me know if you need any assistance accessing the Report. I will be sending out a 2-week reminder next week and a 1-week reminder the following week.

Kind regards,

Dominique Kelly BA (Hon.) - (she/her)
Environmental Planner – Assessment & Permitting

Mobile: (613) 453-0626
Dominique.kelly@stantec.com

Stantec
300 - 1331 Clyde Avenue
Ottawa ON K2C 3G4



From: Kevin Berube <kevin.berube@enbridge.com>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2025 11:52 AM
To: Peter Graham <LRCS@sixnations.ca>; Lonny Bomberry <lonnybomberry@sixnations.ca>

Cc: Kelly, Dominique <Dominique.Kelly@stantec.com>

Subject: Mississauga Reinforcement ER

Boozhoo Peter and Lonny,

I hope you had a restful holiday season.

I'm reaching out to let you know that the Mississauga Reinforcement Environmental Report is now available for viewing. Dominique Kelly from Stantec will send you a link to the ER. I've cc'ed Dominique on this email. The 42 day window for comments starts today and runs through to February 17, 2025. If you have trouble accessing the ER or have any questions about the ER let Dominique or me know.

Meegwetch,

Kevin Berube

Sr. Advisor, Community and Indigenous Engagement, Eastern Region

Public Affairs, Communications and Sustainability
500 Consumers Road
North York, ON
M2J 1P8

Cell: 416 666 6759



Caution: This email originated from outside of Stantec. Please take extra precaution.

Attention: Ce courriel provient de l'extérieur de Stantec. Veuillez prendre des précautions supplémentaires.

Atención: Este correo electrónico proviene de fuera de Stantec. Por favor, tome precauciones adicionales.