Trans Mountain Expansion Project

Socio-Economic Monitoring Report - Greater Edmonton Region July to September 2023



Introduction

This report presents the quarterly socio-economic monitoring results for the Greater Edmonton 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 Indicators, Greater Edmonton Region 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 Indicator No.	Indicator	Monthly Total			Quarterly Count	% (where applicable)	Threshold Triggered?	If Threshold Triggered, Action Taken	
		Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23			(Y/N)		
N/A	Total calendar days of construction site work during the reporting cycle	20	23	12	55	N/A		N/A	
	Workers on site per day (average)	66	67	43	62	N/A		19/5	
1	Number of worker-days in field (categorized in two ways: by geographic origin, and also by Indigenous v. non-Indigenous status)								
_	Threshold 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	1322	1547	521	3390	100%		Indicator 5 (below) provides updated anticipated work force number (in worker days) in this region for the next business quarter. These numbers are made available through notification of the online posting of this Report to municipal or regional government authorities, health authorities, social services, police, hotel / tourism associations and chambers of commerce.	
	a) Worker-days, Local or Regional residents	950	1217	392	2559	75%			
	b) Worker-days, Other (workers not Local or Regional residents)	372	330	129	831	25%	Y (See Note 1)		
	c) Indigenous	142	131	64	337	10%			
	d) Non-Indigenous	1180	1416	457	3053	90%			
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 feed.	back received abo	ut adverse issue or	concern from loca	l authority or touris	m /hotel associ	ation representat	tive.	
	Total Worker-days	1322	1547	521	3390	100%	N (See Note 2)	N/A	
	a) Worker-days, Local or Regional resident, residing at home	948	1217	387	2552	75%			
	b) Worker-days, not Local or Regional, not staying in TMEP camps (i.e., staying in local rental, hotel)	374	330	134	838	25%			
	c) Worker days, not Local or Regional resident, staying in TMEP camps	0	0	0	0	0%			
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	a cyclo and any a	ualitativa foodback	raceiued about as	duarea issuas fram la	ocal authorities	or tourism /hoto	l accaciations	
					388		or tourism /moter	N/A	
	a) Number of worker-days paid	186	130	72	300	N/A	N (See Note 3)		
	b) Total value (\$)	\$ 27,680	\$ 20,800	\$ 6,880	\$ 55,360	N/A			
5	Number of worker-days, in field - anticipated in next business quarter Threshold for Action: N/A - this is a forward indicator to assist stakeholders and Indigenous groups in commu	nity readiness.							
					Worker days	Workers onsite per day (avg)			
	a) October 2023	N/A			N/A - scopes complete	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	b) November 2023				N/A - scopes complete	N/A			
	c) December 2023				N/A - scopes complete	N/A			

SEEMP Indicator No.	. Indicator	Monthly Total		Quarterly Count	%	Threshold Triggered?	If Threshold Triggered, Action Taken	
		Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23		(where applicable)	(Y/N)	
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 Threshold for Action: No minimum threshold. All incidents/accidents will be investigated.							
	Total	0	0	0	o	N/A	N/A	N/A
	a) Number involving injuries	0	0	0	0	N/A		
	b) Number involving fatalities	0	0	0	0	N/A		
7	Workers transported from staging areas per day (average) Threshold for Action: Number, when calculated as a % of total workers on site (average during the month of	the count) is less t	han 75%.					
	Mid-month count	35	38	61	45	N/A	Y (See Note 4)	The majority of TMEP workers in this region were at the Edmonton Terminal. Contractor confirmed there is a staging area with arranged transport to site for direct hires. Contractors also bring their own vehicles to site.
	End-month count	39	29	2	23	N/A		
	Average	37	34	32	34	N/A		
8	Personal vehicles in staging area per day (average) Threshold for Action: Number is 10% or more of AADT values at locations nearest to staging yards and quality	tative feedback rei	reived about adver	se traffic valume is	ssues via indicators £	#11 and #12		
	Mid-month count	31	38	8	26	N/A		
	End-month count	35	29	0	21	N/A	N (See Note 5)	N/A
	Average	33	34	4	24	N/A		
9	Number of times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health facility or required emergency mathematical transfer of times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health facility or required emergency mathematical transfer of times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health facility or required emergency mathematical transfer or times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health facility or required emergency mathematical transfer or times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health facility or required emergency mathematical transfer or times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health facility or required emergency mathematical transfer or times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health facility or required emergency mathematical transfer or times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health facility or required emergency mathematical transfer or times a "captive" Project worker was referred to a local health authority regarding capacity concerns.	edical transport ("Captive" workers	= workers on a Pr	oject premises, i.e.,	, in camp or on	work-site)	
	a) Total number of times a worker was referred or sent to local health facilities	1	0	0	1	N/A		N/A
	i. urgent	0	0	0	0	N/A		
	ii. non-urgent	1	0	0	1	N/A	N (See Note 6)	
	iii. occupational	1	0	0	1	N/A		
	iv. non-occupational	0	0	0	0	N/A		
	b) Total number of times a worker required ambulance or other emergency transport	0	0	0	0	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 ris.	es from the previo	us reporting cycle.					
	Total	1	0	0	1	N/A	N (See Note 7)	N/A
	a) occupational	1	0	0	1	N/A		
	b) non-occupational	0	0	0	0	N/A		
14	Number of people affected by a notifiable disease in a work camp Threshold for Action: No minimum threshold; all notifiable diseases will be reported to the local health author	rity						
	Total	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A

Qualitative Indicators

SEEMP Indicator No.	Indicator	Threshold Triggered? Y/N	If Threshold Triggered, Action Taken				
4	ualitative feedback about Project use of local/regional commercial accommodation (e.g., hotels, motels, campgrounds) hreshold for Action: Qualitative feedback received about adverse issues from local authorities, tourism/hotel associations or hotels used by Contractor.						
	None	N	N/A				
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.						
	None	N	N/A				
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.						
	None						
13	ualitative 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 feedback line data, and the review of stakeholder and Indigenous 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 June 25, 2023 September 30, 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.
- For the threshold analysis for Indicator 1, the estimate of non-local/regional workers estimated in the WAS finished in August 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 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 distinct 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.
- 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 ti meframe.
- 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 a decrease in the number of worker-days paid for indicator 3a from the previous reporting cycle (quarterly total) and no adverse feedback was received from local authorities or tourism/hotel associations; therefore, the thr eshold has not been triggered.
- 4. For Indicator 7, the average workers transported from staging areas per day (34) is approximately 55% of the average workers on site per day (62); therefore, the threshold has been triggered.
- 5. For Indicator 8, no feedback was received about adverse traffic volumes; 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 thre shold 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 (a verage over quarter) (1.6%), is lower than the previous reporting cycle (2.0%); therefore, the threshold has not been triggered.