# Trans Mountain Expansion Project Socio-Economic Monitoring Report - Coquihalla Hope Region April to June 2023



#### Introduction

This report presents the quarterly socio-economic monitoring results for the Coquihalla Hope Region related to construction of the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (TMEP or the Project). The monitoring approach and indicators are discussed in detail in the TMEP Socio-Economic Effects Monitoring Plan (SEEMP) approved by the Canadian Energy Regulator (CER) pursuant to CER Condition 13 (see link below). This report presents the Project-specific indicators; these are data that are directly attributable to the Project, reflect the Project's contribution to socio-economic outcomes, and help pinpoint Project actions that may require change. Please refer to Annex 1 - Socio-Economic Context, Coquihalla Hope for the regional context indicators that reflect the broader socio-economic conditions in which Project construction is occurring.

#### Socio-Economic Effects Monitoring Plan (CER Condition 13)

(the above links to the CER website where the SEEMP is filed)

For more information contact: info@transmountain.com or 1-866-514-6700

### **Project-Specific Indicators**

### **Quantitative Indicators**

| SEEMP<br>Indicator No. | Indicator  | Monthly Total |              |              | Quarterly Count | %<br>(where applicable) | Threshold<br>Triggered? | If Threshold Triggered, Action Taken   |  |
|------------------------|--|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
|                        |  |               | May-23       | Jun-23       |                 | (where applicable)      | (Y/N)                   |  |  |
| N/A                    | Total calendar days of construction site work during the reporting cycle   | 35            | 28           | 28           | 91              | N/A                     | N/A                     |  |  |
|                        | Workers on site per day (average)  | 1703          | 1995         | 1964         | 1873            | N/A                     |                         | IN A   |  |
| 1                      | Number of worker-days in field (categorized in two ways: by geographic origin, and also by Indigenous v. non-Indigenous status)  |               |              |              |                 |                         |                         |  |  |
|                        | hreshold for Action: Number of non-local/regional workers by region/spread is +/- 20% different than estimated in Worker Accommodation Strategy CER Condition 59   |               |              |              |                 |                         |                         |  |  |
|                        | Total Worker-days  | 59620         | 55866        | 54983        | 170469          | 100%                    | Y<br>(See Note 1)       | Indicator 5 (below) provides updated anticipated work force<br>number (in worker days) in this region for the next business<br>quarter. These numbers are made available through notification of<br>the online posting of this Report to municipal or regional<br>government authorities, health authorities, social services, police,<br>hotel / tourism associations and chambers of commerce. |  |
|                        | a) Worker-days, Local or Regional residents  | 8963          | 9415         | 9985         | 28363           | 17%                     |                         |  |  |
|                        | b) Worker-days, Other (workers not Local or Regional residents)  | 50657         | 46451        | 44998        | 142106          | 83%                     |                         |  |  |
|                        | c) Indigenous  | 4158          | 3829         | 5034         | 13021           | 8%                      |                         |  |  |
|                        | d) Non-Indigenous  | 55462         | 52037        | 49949        | 157448          | 92%                     |                         |  |  |
| 2                      | Number of worker-days in field (categorized by accommodation arrangements of the workers) Threshold for Action: Less than 75% of non-local/regional workers are staying in camps and qualitative feedback received about adverse issue or concern from local authority or tourism /hotel association representative. |               |              |              |                 |                         |                         |  |  |
|                        | Total Worker-days  | 59620         | 55866        | 54983        | 170469          | 100%                    | N<br>(see Note 2)       | N/A  |  |
|                        | a) Worker-days, Local or Regional resident, residing at home   | 4993          | 6442         | 6053         | 17488           | 10%                     |                         |  |  |
|                        | b) Worker-days, not Local or Regional, not staying in TMEP camps (i.e., staying in local rental, hotel)  | 46477         | 42107        | 41312        | 129896          | 76%                     |                         |  |  |
|                        | c) Worker days, not Local or Regional resident, staying in TMEP camps  | 8150          | 7317         | 7618         | 23085           | 14%                     |                         |  |  |
| 3                      | Living out allowance or related stipend  |               |              |              |                 |                         |                         |  |  |
|                        | Threshold for Action: An increase in the number of worker-days paid (indicator 3a) from the previous reportin<br>a) Number of worker-days paid   | 26592         | 44914        | 47124        | 118630          | N/A                     | or tourism /hotel (     | associations.  |  |
|                        | b) Total value (\$)  | \$ 7,383,321  |              |              | \$ 23,650,450   |                         | N<br>(see Note 3)       | N/A  |  |
| 5                      | Number of worker-days, in field - anticipated in next business quarter   | \$ 7,363,321  | \$ 8,003,505 | \$ 8,201,500 | \$ 23,030,430   | N/A                     |                         |  |  |
| 3                      | Threshold for Action: N/A - this is a forward indicator to assist stakeholders and Indigenous groups in community readiness.   |               |              |              |                 |                         |                         |  |  |
|                        | Worker days Worker onsite per day (avg)  |               |              |              |                 |                         |                         |  |  |
|                        | a) July 2023   | N/A           |              |              | 41015           | 1578                    | N/A                     | N/A  |  |
|                        | b) August 2023   |               |              |              | 40639           | 1563                    |                         |  |  |
|                        | c) September 2023  |               |              |              | 38209           | 1470                    |                         |  |  |

| SEEMP<br>Indicator No.  | . Indicator  | Monthly Total        |                   | Quarterly Count      | %                    | Threshold<br>Triggered? | If Threshold Triggered, Action Taken |   |  |
|---|--|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
|   |  | Apr-23               | May-23            | Jun-23               |                      | (where applicable)      | (Y/N)                                | in meeting magered, reten reten   |  |
| 6   | Number of motor vehicle collisions or reportable incidents that involve Project vehicles on public roads during work hours or Contractor-owned vehicles during off-work hours<br>Threshold for Action: No minimum threshold. All incidents/accidents will be investigated. |                      |                   |                      |                      |                         |                                      |   |  |
|   | Total  | 0                    | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | N/A                     |                                      | N/A   |  |
|   | a) Number involving injuries   | 0                    | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | N/A                     | N/A                                  |   |  |
|   | b) Number involving fatalities   | 0                    | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
| _   | Workers transported from staging areas per day (average)   | 0                    | 0                 | 0                    | 0                    | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
| 7   | Threshold for Action: Number, when calculated as a % of total workers on site (average during the month of the count) is less than 75%.  |                      |                   |                      |                      |                         |                                      |   |  |
|   | Mid-month count  | 962                  | 1201              | 1175                 | 1113                 | N/A                     |                                      | Pipeline Contractor has worker transport strategies including<br>passenger vans and a bus to transport workers from the Ohamil<br>camp to the Popkum yard, as well as to the field. |  |
|   | End-month count  | 1097                 | 1028              | 1145                 | 1090                 | N/A                     | Y<br>(See Note 4)                    |   |  |
|   | Average  | 1029.5               | 1115              | 1160                 | 1101                 | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
| 8   | Personal vehicles in staging area per day (average)<br>Threshold for Action: Number is 10% or more of AADT values at locations nearest to staging yards and quali  | itative feedback red | eived about adver | se traffic volume is | ssues via indicators | #11 and #12.            |                                      |   |  |
|   | Mid-month count  | 757                  | 900               | 857                  | 838                  | N/A                     | N<br>(See Note 5)                    | N/A   |  |
|   | End-month count  | 778                  | 925               | 876                  | 860                  | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
|   | Average  | 768                  | 912.5             | 867                  | 849                  | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
|   | Number of times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health facility or required emergency medical transport ("Captive" workers = workers on a Project premises, i.e., in camp or on work-site)  |                      |                   |                      |                      |                         |                                      |   |  |
| 9   | Threshold for Action: Qualitative feedback from local health authority regarding capacity concerns.  |                      |                   |                      |                      |                         |                                      |   |  |
|   | a) Total number of times a worker was referred or sent to local health facilities  | 11                   | 9                 | 5                    | 25                   | N/A                     | -<br>-                               | N/A   |  |
|   | i. urgent  | 6                    | 6                 | 4                    | 16                   | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
|   | ii. non-urgent   | 5                    | 3                 | 1                    | 9                    | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
|   | iii. occupational  | 2                    | 0                 | 5                    | 7                    | N/A                     | (See Note 6)                         |   |  |
|   | iv. non-occupational   | 9                    | 9                 | 0                    | 18                   | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
|   | b) Total number of times a worker required ambulance or other emergency transport  | 2                    | 2                 | 0                    | 4                    | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
| 10  | Number of medical visits to Project on-site medical facilities   |                      |                   |                      |                      |                         |                                      |   |  |
| Threshold for Action: Number, when calculated as a percentage of average number of workers per month rises from the previous reporting cycle. |  |                      |                   |                      |                      |                         |                                      |   |  |
|   | Total  | 91                   | 75                | 52                   | 218                  | N/A                     | Y<br>(See Note 7)                    | Camp contractor has confirmed on site medical services are adequate to support Project needs.   |  |
|   | a) occupational  | 21                   | 15                | 16                   | 52                   | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
|   | b) non-occupational  | 70                   | 60                | 36                   | 166                  | N/A                     |                                      |   |  |
| 14  | Number of people affected by a notifiable disease in a work camp<br>Threshold for Action: No minimum threshold; all notifiable diseases will be reported to the local health autho.  | rity                 |                   |                      |                      |                         |                                      |   |  |
|   | Total  | 0                    | 0                 | 15                   | 15                   | N/A                     | N/A                                  | N/A   |  |

## Qualitative Indicators

| SEEMP<br>Indicator No. |  | Threshold<br>Triggered? Y/N   | If Threshold Triggered, Action Taken   |   |     |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------|--|---|--|---|-----|--|--|--|--|
| 4                      | ualitative feedback about Project use of local/regional commercial accommodation (e.g., hotels, motels, campgrounds) reshold for Action: Qualitative feedback received about adverse issues from local authorities, tourism/hotel associations or hotels used by Contractor. |   |  |   |     |  |  |  |  |
|                        | None   | lone  |  |   |     |  |  |  |  |
| 11                     | Number and types of calls/complaints received through TMEP feedback line (about construction-related social impacts) Threshold for Action: There is no threshold for action as all grievances will be responded to.  |   |  |   |     |  |  |  |  |
|                        | Month<br>Apr-23  | Number, originating from the region<br>Total: 4<br>% Indigenous: 0<br>% Non-Indigenous: 100   | Traffic/Driving - residents concern<br>about vehicle speeding on<br>Birchtrees Drive, Hunter Creek<br>Road and Acacia Drive; resident<br>concern about use of engine   | Trans Mountain will continue to follow up on any<br>traffic-related concerns. Contractors have a Traffic<br>Management Plan that addresses public protection<br>measures, access roads/routes to the construction<br>site and Traffic Control Plans for each work zone<br>which consider potential impacts with mitigation.<br>Trans Mountain follows with the contractor to  |     |  |  |  |  |
|                        |  | alleged impact to venice from<br>automated flagger arm; Hope<br>resident concern about a<br>contractor's truck erratic driving;<br>damage to car as a result of debris<br>on the roadway. | nains woontain to way and the contraction of the ensure traffic-related requirements are being met.<br>Each complaint is examined in order to provide<br>additional information and/or appropriate follow-<br>up. For example, in the case of erratic driving, the<br>contractor's driver was identified and their driving<br>privileges were revoked. In the instance of the<br>debris on the road, the contractor is dealing with<br>the complainant to assess compensation. | N/A   | N/A |  |  |  |  |
|                        | Мау-23   | Total: 5<br>% Indigenous: 0<br>% Non-Indigenous: 100  | Sensory disturbance - Hope<br>residents complained of cracks in<br>foundation and drywall due to<br>Project-related vibration; dust in   | Trans Mountain will follow up on dust, noise and<br>vibration complaints to confirm their relation to<br>Project activity. Trans Mountain is working to<br>ensure compliance with bylaws and requirements.<br>Trans Mountain will work with stakeholders to<br>resolve and address such complaints where<br>practical. Regarding the dust in the Kawkawa Lake<br>Road area and on Elder Road, the sweeper will<br>monitor the area closely and have more sweepers<br>deployed throughout the day. |     |  |  |  |  |
|                        | Jun-23   | Total: 5<br>% Indigenous: 0<br>% Non-Indigenous: 100  | the Kawkawa Lake Road area and<br>on Elder Road; Project-related day<br>and night noise in Hope; overnight<br>noise at the Mountain Road<br>Retreat.   |   |     |  |  |  |  |

| 12 | Qualitative feedback themes about community concerns and experienced social effects   |   |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
|----|---|---|---|-----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|    | Threshold for Action: Adverse socio-economic issue or concern from an appropriate government authority or service provider or community organization.   |   |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
|    | Theme   | Impact Overview   | Trans Mountain Response   | Threshold<br>Triggered? Y/N | If Threshold Triggered, Action Taken   |  |  |  |
|    | Sensory Disturbance<br>(Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation)   | Safety fencing visual disturbance to business<br>billboards | Trans Mountain will continue to follow up on visual complaints related to the Project.<br>The mesh fencing is safety related. | Y                           | Trans Mountain is working directly with the community leadership<br>to assess and address the business impact. |  |  |  |
| 13 | Qualitative feedback themes about effects on the quality and abundance of traditional harvesting resources, or ability of Indigenous people to harvest resources, within the Project footprint  |   |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
|    | hreshold for Action: Qualitative from Indigenous group leader/administrator regarding reports of adverse effects on quality and abundance of traditional harvesting resources, or ability of Indigenous people to harvest their resources or access cultural sites, within the Project footprint. |   |   |                             |  |  |  |  |
|    | None  |   |   | N                           | N/A  |  |  |  |

#### Methodology and Notes

- Information in this report was collected through internal sources including labour and incident data from Contractors, TMEP f eedback line data, and the review of stakeholder and Aboriginal engagement records. Data reflects activity related to TMEP construction only.

- A worker-day is defined as 10 hours of work, by a construction Contractor on-site or in an on-site office.

- The monthly data cut-off is typically the last Saturday of each month; this reporting cycle was March 26, 2023 - June 24, 2023.

- Thresholds are internally assessed on a monthly basis and are considered triggered if a threshold is exceeded for any given month within each quarterly reporting cycle.

- The threshold analysis of Indicator 1 utilizes the estimate of non-local/regional workers estimated in the Worker Accommodation Strategy (WAS) CER Condition 59, based on the corresponding month of construction in an ordered manner. For example, Month 1 predicted in the WAS is compared to Month 1 actual.

- Indicator 11 tallies feedback line calls/queries related to actual socio-economic impact topics related to TMEP construction activity. Socio-economic topics include: access limitations; road closures; business impacts; pressure on housing/accommodations; burden on infrastructure/services; sensory disturbance; traffic and driving; worker conduct; traditional use and cultural sites.

- Employment and business opportunity and training indicators are monitored and reported through separate processes, as per dis tinct CER Conditions (CER Condition 107 - Aboriginal, Local and Regional Employment and Business Opportunity Monitoring Reports; and CER Condition 58 - Training and Education Monitoring Reports).

- Individual numbers may be rounded to allow for totals to add up.

- For the threshold analysis for Indicator 1, the estimate of non-local/regional workers estimated in the WAS finished in May 2020. While calculations comparing indicator 1 to the estimated workforce in the original WAS are no longer possible due the longer construction timeline, Trans Mountain continues to respond like the threshold for action has been triggered and share forward workforce estimates.

- Indicator 5 includes active Construction contractors only.

- Data may be subject to revisions based on updates from Contractors or ongoing quality reviews.

#### Quantitative Threshold Analysis Notes:

1. For Indicator 1, data is not available. Construction workforce continues beyond Worker Accommodation Strategy predicted timeframe.

2. For Indicator 2, no adverse feedback was received from local authorities or tourism/hotel associations; therefore, the threshold has not been triggered.

3. For Indicator 3, there was an increase in the number of worker-days paid for indicator 3a from the previous reporting cycle (quarterly total) but no adverse feedback was received from local authorities or tourism/hotel associations; therefore, the th reshold has not been triggered.

4. For Indicator 7, the average workers transported from staging areas per day (1101) is approximately 59% of the average workers on site per day (1873); therefore, the threshold has been triggered.

5. For Indicator 8, the personal vehicles in the staging area per day (average) was less than 10 % of the AADT values at locations nearest to staging yards; therefore, the threshold has not been triggered.

6. For Indicator 9, no feedback was received from the local health authority regarding capacity concerns; therefore, the threshold has not been triggered.

7. For Indicator 10, the total as a percentage of average number of workers per month reflected as workers on site per day (average over quarter) (11.6%), is higher than the previous reporting cycle (6.4%); therefore, the threshold has been triggered.