



Files : A-2016-40; A-2014-04

16 AVR. 2018

Ms. Louise Lanteigne  
700 Star Flower Avenue  
Waterloo, ON N2V 2L2

Ms. Lanteigne,

This letter is in regard to your requests made pursuant to the *Access to Information Act* (the Act) received by the National Energy Board (NEB) on 4 April 2014 and 13 July 2016, respectively, seeking access to records as follows:

*"I request all data referencing my person (Louise Lanteigne) including data generated by and collected by the National Energy Board from Sept 2011 to Dec 31, 2015. I was a delegate of the Line 9 reversal hearings and this is being done for the Public Interest."*

As the Delegated Authority for the NEB, I have reconsidered several discretionary exemptions applied in the 5 November 2014 release to you. As such, I have directed the following records to be issued to you in a revised format:

- |  |                              |
|--|------------------------------|
| - Page 34 [full disclosure]            | - Page 138 [full disclosure] |
| - Page 39 [full disclosure]            | - Page 139 [partial]         |
| - Page 125 [partial]                   | - Page 775 [partial]         |
| - Page 129 [full disclosure + blow up] | - Page 776 [full disclosure] |

With regard to public information not previously disclosed to you, this documentation is available at the following URLs:

- <https://apps.neb-one.gc.ca/REGDOCS/File/Download/834583>; and
- <https://apps.neb-one.gc.ca/REGDOCS/File/Download/834309>

If you have questions, or need more information please contact James Brunton by phone at 403-221-3292, toll-free at 1-800-899-1265 or by email at [James.Brunton@neb-one.gc.ca](mailto:James.Brunton@neb-one.gc.ca).

Yours truly,

Paula Futoransky  
Access to Information and Privacy Coordinator

Enclosure

c.c.: The Information Commissioner of Canada

Suite 210, 517 Tenth Avenue SW  
Calgary, Alberta T2R 0A8

517, Dixième Avenue S.-O., bureau 210  
Calgary (Alberta) T2R 0A8

Canada

Telephone/Téléphone : 403-292-4800  
Facsimile/Télécopieur : 403-292-5503  
[www.neb-one.gc.ca](http://www.neb-one.gc.ca)  
Telephone/Téléphone : 1-800-899-1265  
Facsimile/Télécopieur : 1-877-288-8803

-----Original Message-----

From: Nick Thomas

Sent: February 17, 2012 2:52 PM

To: DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PN

Cc: Christine Beauchemin; Darcie Harding

Subject: RE: OH-5-2011 - 12-02-17 Louisette Lanteigne - Application for Intervenor Status (A39383)

Hi Roland....

I'm trying to connect with legal on this. Darcie is en route to Banff right now. Jessica (Counsel #1 is also away), but I believe Christine (Counsel #2) is in. I'll try to get something as quick as I can today. At this point, you wouldn't be deciding on whether or not to grant intervenor status for this individual, since that topic is up for discussion as per Darcie's earlier email on a larger scale (whether to pick and choose or allow all). The focus here would be whether or not we should even consider this application since it's late. Depending on whether we allow this, I will update the summary table of Intervenor applications with the content from this one.

*s.21 advice to members/govt ops*

Thanks,

Nick Thomas

Environmental Specialist | Spécialiste de l'environnement National Energy Board | Office national de l'énergie

Telephone | Téléphone : 403-221-3289

-----Original Message-----

From: Roland George

Sent: February 17, 2012 2:40 PM

To: Secretary; DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PN; DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PWG

Subject: RE: OH-5-2011 - 12-02-17 Louisette Lanteigne - Application for Intervenor Status (A39383)

Darcie:

I'd like some advice to the panel on this late filing.

Thank you in advance.

Roland

-----Original Message-----

From: Secretary

Sent: February 17, 2012 2:20 PM

To: DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PN; DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PWG

Subject: FW: OH-5-2011 - 12-02-17 Louisette Lanteigne - Application for Intervenor Status (A39383)

OF-Fac-Oil-E101-2011-01 01

Please note that the filing was received after 12 PM. The filing will be placed in the Letters of Comment folder, please advise if the filing can be moved to the Intervenor Folder.

-----Original Message-----

From: E-file [mailto:secretary@neb-one.gc.ca]

Sent: February 17, 2012 2:00 PM

- Leak detection and emergency response measures – comparisons to Line 6B rupture in Michigan
- Project scoping – splitting out this Project from the larger Trailbreaker (reversal of entire Line 9 discussed a few years ago).
- Potential for oil sands crude to be transported to the east coast.
- AFN – impacts on traditional use, treaty rights and health (air quality); inadequate Crown consultation.
- AFN and OPLA – Enbridge's and the Board's environmental assessments were inadequate as it failed to consider operations post-reversal.
- OPLA and CAEPLA – in-place abandonment and historical contamination.
- Ms. Louisette Lantaigne – Impacts on local drinking water supplies.
- Several issues raised were determined to be out-of-scope or not relevant to the proceeding.

#### Conclusions

- There is a commercial need – Line 9 to Samia is currently under-utilized; no commercial opposition.
- Public consultation, including Aboriginal consultation, was appropriate, given the scale of the Project.
- The Project is not likely to cause significant adverse environmental effects.
- The Board's environmental assessment properly factored in line operation post-reversal.
- Crown Consultation – no other federal authorities acting as Crown; Board process used; opportunity for AFN to provide information/views and outline concerns.
- Enbridge has and continues to monitor and document line integrity; through its Integrity Management Program, it is able to identify and mitigate existing and future issues.
- Board imposed 15 conditions, mainly focused on pipeline integrity. Enbridge will not receive an exemption from Leave to Open.
- If and when Enbridge wants to ship different commodities, it would need to file a tariff amendment.
- It is in the public interest to approve the Project.

#### Post-Hearing Motion

- OPLA requested that the Board reopen the record to consider the US National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) synopsis and full report for Enbridge's 2010 Line 6B rupture in Michigan.
- Ruling: the Board need not hold up its decision for the Line 6B documents to be analyzed. Through the Board's compliance activities, the NTSB report will be reviewed and pertinent learnings will be applied to system-wide operations.

#### Decision

- Letter Decision to be released today (27 July 2012) – will be made into a blue book at a later time.

#### Successes / Learnings

- First time Participant Funding Program (PFP) used on a section 58 hearing:
  - PFP awarded to three intervenors and used to create quality written evidence and IRs.
- PFP process was executed in a condensed timeframe so there was minimal delay to the hearing schedule
- First time for formal implementation of Process Advisor role:
  - Many external parties expressed that they felt well supported and that the process advisor role is a great idea.
  - Helpful to internal staff to be able to direct inquiries through to one person.
- Although the application was received in August, hearing order was not issued until December – the process from start to finish took approximately 11.5 months (including extensions granted to Enbridge to respond to IRs totalling 25 days).
- Deadlines set for external parties during the hearing process were met, despite tight timelines.
- All areas of support, PWG members and Panel made the Project a priority in order to meet the condensed schedule.
- Oral statements were not provided as a participation option, which reduced the length of the oral portion of the hearing.
- Having only final oral argument and no cross examination worked well in this case, due to the highly technical issues regarding engineering and integrity.
- Security and Panel handled protester disruption at hearing well:
  - After a short recess, only intervenors and accredited media were initially permitted back in hearing room.
  - The panel accepted environmental and First Nation motions to allow people and groups, that the parties knew would not be disruptive, back into the hearing room.
  - Some media attention received.

#### Staff Involved



From: Louisa Niro  
To: Louisa Niro; Adam Lohrey; Don Heffer  
Cc: Don Heffer; Michael Benson  
Subject: Re: Regarding Line 9: Concept for the NEB to consider  
Date: January 20, 2014 10:47 AM

Very good.

Happy New Year to all!

From: Ryan Roden  
Sent: Friday, January 20, 2014 11:40 AM  
To: Louisa Niro; Adam Lohrey; Don Heffer  
Cc: Mark Hutton; Michael Benson  
Subject: RE: Regarding Line 9: Concept for the NEB to consider

Thanks Louisa, and happy new year. This just falls squarely within the scope of Michael's expertise to respond to Ms. L and advise that the record is almost devoid of any evidence which would be considered

Michael If you have any questions or how to follow up or how to handle please do not hesitate to get in touch with either Mark or myself. To Ryan

From: Louisa Niro  
Sent: January 20, 2014 11:40 AM  
To: Adam Lohrey; Don Heffer  
Cc: Ryan Roden; Mark Hutton  
Subject: RE: Regarding Line 9: Concept for the NEB to consider

Please find attached an email received today from Ms. Louisa Laroigne.

I am not sure if it requires any answer.

Louisa

From: Louisa Laroigne [mailto:louisal@outlook.com]  
Sent: January 20, 2014 10:40 AM  
To: Louisa Niro  
Subject: Regarding Line 9: Concept for the NEB to consider

Hello Ms. Niro

Wasn't sure where to send this to but it is in regards to the Enbridge Line hearing process for which I was a delegate.

A groundbreaking ruling has just taken place in Texas regarding the term Common Carrier in regards to the Keystone XL pipeline. The Texas Supreme Court ruled in favour of land owner Julia Trigg Crawford, ordering TransCanada to submit information by Feb. 6 as the justices weigh arguments to hear the case regarding eminent domain issues.

At the heart of Crawford's case is the ability of TransCanada, a foreign corporation, to use eminent domain under the state's "common carrier" clause since their pipeline transports 90 percent Canadian Tar Sands and 10 percent North Dakota oil. There is no on ramp for Texas of therefore violating the definition of a common carrier under Texas law.

<http://ecowatch.com/2013/12/19/landowner-uses-transcanada-keystone-xl-eminent-domain-case/>

As a delegate at the Enbridge Line 9 hearings, I am aware that Enbridge ADMITS Line 9 is a "COMMON CARRIER" Pipeline system. Here's a document I found online quickly just to support this point that states the following:

"Enbridge owns and operates Line 9, a common carrier pipeline system regulated under the NEB Act."

<http://www.enbridge.com/DeliveringEnergy/Shipping~/media/~/www/Site%20Documents/Delivering%20Energy/Shipping/Appendix%201%20-%20Competitive%20to%20En%20Settlement%20the%20CSTS%20.pdf>

Line 9 as designed, was never intended to ship oil from the US to Canada, but at the National Energy Board, the Ontario Minister of Energy made it public that Line 9 may be used to ship US oil to CANADA via Line 9 from the Wessover Pumping station owned by Enbridge. If this is the case and the majority of the oil is planned to be US BASED, it would no longer be a "Common Carrier". If the major volumes of oil shipped in Line 9 is not intended to be Canadian, the term COMMON CARRIER is legally inappropriate in the eyes of the law. The policies that allows it to function are no longer subject to the same rules since the majority of oil flowing it it would be FOREIGN.

The application to reverse the flow of Line 9 to move US oil to Irvine in Montreal would hit the same legal snag as the Keystone XL right now. I believe it would be beneficial to investigate what changes may happen should Line 9 lose its "Common Carrier" status and to clarify the function of the pipe to determine exactly where this oil is coming from before the NEB allows a decision on this matter.

Yours in good faith,

Louisa Laroigne  
700 Star Flower Ave.  
Waterloo Ont  
N2V 2L2

s.21(1)(a)

s.21(1)(b)

s.23

To: Bob Lantz  
From: Luc L'Amour  
Subject: RE: Meeting with the Honourable Lucie Robitaille, Minister of the Environment - 02/02/2019  
Date: February 12, 2019 at 2:14 PM

Re: 020219-02

From: Luc L'Amour  
Sent: February 12, 2019 2:14 PM  
To: Bob Lantz  
Cc: Luc L'Amour; Bob Lantz; Lucie Robitaille  
Subject: RE: Meeting with the Honourable Lucie Robitaille, Minister of the Environment - 02/02/2019

Hi Bob,

Following the project which would be for the main water supply, I think for the short and long term that the security is clear.

Best regards,

Luc

Luc

Luc

From: Luc L'Amour  
Sent: February 12, 2019 2:14 PM  
To: Bob Lantz  
Cc: Luc L'Amour; Bob Lantz  
Subject: RE: Meeting with the Honourable Lucie Robitaille, Minister of the Environment - 02/02/2019

Hi

I am about to start the meeting with the

Project and follow

Luc

From: Luc L'Amour  
Sent: February 12, 2019 2:14 PM  
To: Bob Lantz  
Cc: Luc L'Amour; Bob Lantz  
Subject: RE: Meeting with the Honourable Lucie Robitaille, Minister of the Environment - 02/02/2019

Hi

Hi

On: February 12, 2019 1:14 PM  
Re: 020219-02

Hi Lucie L'Amour, I am about to start the meeting with the

Project and follow

Luc

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

Hi

**From:** [Luis Llamas](#)  
**To:** [Luis Llamas](#)  
**Subject:** [Environmental Assessment \(EA\) for the proposed expansion of the TransCanada pipeline from Alberta to Ontario](#)  
**Date:** [Friday, February 20, 2015 9:31 AM](#)

No objection

**From:** Luis Llamas  
**Sent:** February 20, 2015 9:31 AM  
**To:** Ryan Tucker  
**Subject:** RE: Reply from the Honourable Laura Agyi, Minister of the Environment - 100-177628

Hi Ryan -

I'm thinking the proper action would be for Michael to contact Llamas, then let her let the city and remind her that the request is closed.

Any objections?

Cheers,  
Luis

**From:** Luis Llamas  
**Sent:** February 20, 2015 9:31 AM  
**To:** Ryan Tucker  
**Subject:** RE: Reply from the Honourable Laura Agyi, Minister of the Environment - 100-177628

Luis

I received this email from Llamas regarding:

Project EA status

Luis

**From:** Luis Llamas  
**Sent:** February 20, 2015 9:31 AM  
**To:** Ryan Tucker  
**Subject:** RE: Reply from the Honourable Laura Agyi, Minister of the Environment - 100-177628

On Thursday, February 19, 2015 1:44 PM, Luis Llamas <[luis.lla@transcanada.ca](#)> wrote:

It is Llamas Llamas, contact with Llamas on 100-177628 regarding: 100-177628

In the attachment is a letter from Prime Minister of Environment Canada, regarding an email I sent to her on October 23rd 2013. She asked me to help the Llamas with their decision on Line 3.

Here is the email she asked me to reply to her for your reference.

Thank You, Luis

Luis

**From:** Luis Llamas  
**Sent:** February 20, 2015 9:31 AM  
**To:** Ryan Tucker  
**Subject:** RE: Reply from the Honourable Laura Agyi, Minister of the Environment - 100-177628

Hi Everyone

I want to give thanks to the National Energy Board, to the Federal and Provincial officials who are now taking a deeper look at the EA data regarding Enbridge Line 3. It is a blessing that we have the chance to review this matter again in light of the recent testimony at the National Energy Board.

In light of data presented at the NEB hearing, there are further concerns I would like to relay.

During the NEB hearing, concerns were raised about the possibility of an oil spill in proximity to the Pickering Nuclear Station and the risk of oil making its way into the area of the water intake. We need systems in place to prevent such risks.

There is the need to craft localized pipeline rupture responses for municipalities along line 3 including the disclosure by municipalities to Enbridge on the location of storm water sewers, well intake zones and other risks along the route.

April data regarding seismic risks of Eastern Canada indicates that Cruth River Nuclear Power Station is built in an area of high seismic activity. We should encourage a review of the system to address these risks and make sure systems are in place to prevent accidents.

The Proposed Lake Huron Deep Repository is in proximity to Kand Mahone systems and Earthquake Risks as well.

It is confirmed by TransCanada that blumen links.

Moreover, Enbridge worked for 33 years with Environment Canada before he quit in 2008. He tested different kinds of data in the 1950s and found that they "all sank in freshwater." But the research was abandoned before it could be implemented.

The US Geological Survey confirms Fracking causes Earthquakes

Here is information and maps showing where companies intend to extract shale deposits in Ontario using Fracking. Note it is in proximity to Line 3 pipeline.

The need is there for Municipal, Provincial and Federal Levels to secure the use of standardized units of measurements and test times and methods to ensure the quality and clarity of Environmental Assessments used for planning processes. The other engineering firms use

**From:** Adrian Luhowy  
**To:** Michael Benson; Mark Watton; Ryan Bodler; Zoe Pfeiffer  
**Subject:** RE: Question about Line 9 ruling and Leave to Open  
**Date:** March 13, 2014 3:58:47 PM

---

She's mixing some stuff up. Those LTO bullets she found are appropriate for many cases but not all and they are not mandatory, nor sufficient, in some cases. The conditions are more project-specific than the generic stuff she's found.

She should look at the Act for what a s.47 is:

<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/N-7/page-21.html#h-32>

**"(2) Leave may be granted by the Board under this section if the Board is satisfied that the pipeline may safely be opened for transmission."**

So a company is required to show that the line is "safe" to be opened for transmission. Those bullets she found refer to a common type of project the Board deals with (new pipelines), but they aren't project-specific.

1. I've got to refresh my memory by looking at the documents.
2. Enbridge would like to know that, too. They may ultimately have to do hydro tests, and the plan for those would have to be accepted by the Board.
3. They can ask.
4. They're on Livelink (similar to the hearing documents, though a different but connected directory). The condition-compliance stuff shows up in the same directory.
5. Typically, no, unless it's required in a condition.
6. Most conditions require that proof be provided that the condition's been achieved. The Board assesses that proof. The exact response by the Board depends on the wording in the condition. Conditions that require "Board approval" before they're achieved will get a letter from the Board to the Company (with a copy on the public record) regarding the Board's approval/disapproval of the submission.
7. Some conditions require written proof be submitted. See response to #4.
8. If a condition is not met then the company can't move to the "next stage". Some conditions require the condition be satisfied before "construction" or before "operation" or before "something". That "something" can't be done until the condition is satisfied.
9. We are.
10. If someone feels a condition has not been met, they can bring that to the attention of the Board. There's no funding available for that, as far as I'm aware.

I'm not sure how to word this so I hope everyone else weighs in. It appears she may want to be a reviewer of all the condition-submissions (or have someone of her choosing do that), and provide her own assessment of them to the Board.

I did experience one project where a few interested persons/groups submitted an affidavit and photograph indicating that a company hadn't met a condition. It was a photograph of an empty field and an assertion by the person who photographed the empty field that it was, indeed, an



empty field but that it should have been a tank-farm-under-construction. We asked the company to respond. The company responded, and we assessed both submissions, and the Board sent a letter confirming the condition had been satisfied. (as near as we could figure the photographer was in the wrong place)

---

**From:** Michael Benson  
**Sent:** March 13, 2014 2:25 PM  
**To:** Mark Watton; Ryan Rodier; Adrian Lohow; Zoe Pfeiffer  
**Subject:** FW: Question about Line 9 ruling and Leave to Open

Hello,

I have received an email inquiry from Ms. Lanteigne. I would appreciate hearing your thoughts on a potential response.

Michael

---

**From:** Louise Lanteigne [mailto:butterflyblueu@rogers.com] s.19(t)  
**Sent:** March 13, 2014 1:46 PM  
**To:** Michael Benson; [REDACTED]@liberal.ola.org; [REDACTED]@ndp.on.ca; justin.trudeau@parl.gc.ca; Elizabeth.May@parl.gc.ca; thomas.mulcair@parl.gc.ca; stephane.dion@parl.gc.ca; linda.duncan@parl.gc.ca; [REDACTED]@liberal.ola.org; [REDACTED]@thestar.ca; [REDACTED]@therecord.com; [REDACTED]@liberal.ola.org; pm@pm.gc.ca; Leona.Aglukkaq@parl.gc.ca; [REDACTED]@on.ndp.ca  
**Subject:** Question about Line 9 ruling and Leave to Open

Hello Mr. Benson

It's delegate Louise Lanteigne of the Line 9 hearing. I read through the ruling and I'm trying to better understand what it means. The NEB ruling mandates a new application is needed for the Leave to Open process, that a request to bypass this was denied. I went to the NEB website and it sets the following conditions to secure Leave to Open such as

- confirmation that the test pressure did not fall below 97.5 percent of the minimum strength test pressure; and
- details regarding any unsuccessful pressure tests, including the cause of the test failure.
- a statement that hydrostatic testing was completed and found acceptable;

In light of this I have the following questions.

1. Is the Leave To Open application applicable to only to Line phase B or is it required to review the totality of Line 9 from Sarnia to Westover?
2. How is the scope of the test area determined and by whom? Is the criteria defined in a policy or is it based on discretionary powers?
3. Does Enbridge have the procedural ability to request a limited the scope of these tests?
4. Can the public at any point view the findings of the pressure tests both successful and



**From:** [Christine Beauchemin](#)  
**To:** [Sonia Stauch](#)  
**Subject:** FW: OH-5-2011 - 12-02-17 Louise Lanteigne - Application for Intervenor Status (A39383)  
**Date:** February 17, 2012 3:43:44 PM

---

s.21(1)(a)

s.21(1)(b)

s.23

Christine Beauchemin  
Legal Counsel - Avocate  
Phone: (403) 292-6489  
Fax: (403) 299-2710  
Email: [christine.beauchemin@neb-one.gc.ca](mailto:christine.beauchemin@neb-one.gc.ca)

-----Original Message-----

s.21(1)(a)

From: Christine Beauchemin

s.21(1)(b)

Sent: February 17, 2012 3:17 PM

s.23

To: Nick Thomas; DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PN; DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PWG

Cc: Darcie Harding; Christine Beauchemin

Subject: RE: OH-5-2011 - 12-02-17 Louise Lanteigne - Application for Intervenor Status (A39383)

Re: Later intervention request of Lanteigne



Thank you.

Christine Beauchemin  
Legal Counsel - Avocate  
Phone: (403) 292-6489  
Fax: (403) 299-2710  
Email: [christine.beauchemin@neb-one.gc.ca](mailto:christine.beauchemin@neb-one.gc.ca)

-----Original Message-----

From: Nick Thomas

Sent: February 17, 2012 2:52 PM

A0009374\_1-000775

To: DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PN  
Cc: Christine Beauchemin; Darcie Harding  
Subject: RE: OH-5-2011 - 12-02-17 Louissette Lanteigne - Application for Intervenor Status (A39383)

Hi Roland....

I'm trying to connect with legal on this. Darcie is en route to Banff right now. Jessica (Counsel #1 is also away), but I believe Christine (Counsel #2) is in. I'll try to get something as quick as I can today. At this point, you wouldn't be deciding on whether or not to grant intervenor status for this individual, since that topic is up for discussion as per Darcie's earlier email on a larger scale (whether to pick and choose or allow all). The focus here would be whether or not we should even consider this application since it's late. Depending on whether we allow this, I will update the summary table of Intervenor applications with the content from this one.

Thanks,

Nick Thomas  
Environmental Specialist | Spécialiste de l'environnement National Energy Board | Office national de l'énergie  
Telephone | Téléphone : 403-221-3289

-----Original Message-----

From: Roland George  
Sent: February 17, 2012 2:40 PM  
To: Secretary; DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PN; DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PWG  
Subject: RE: OH-5-2011 - 12-02-17 Louissette Lanteigne - Application for Intervenor Status (A39383)

Darcie:

I'd like some advice to the panel on this late filing.

Thank you in advance.

Roland

-----Original Message-----

From: Secretary  
Sent: February 17, 2012 2:20 PM  
To: DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PN; DL Enbridge Line 9 Reversal PWG  
Subject: FW: OH-5-2011 - 12-02-17 Louissette Lanteigne - Application for Intervenor Status (A39383)

OF-Fac-Oil-E101-2011-01 01

Please note that the filing was received after 12 PM. The filing will be placed in the Letters of Comment folder, please advise if the filing can be moved to the Intervenor Folder.

-----Original Message-----

From: E-file [mailto:secretary@neb-one.gc.ca]  
Sent: February 17, 2012 2:00 PM  
Subject: 12-02-17 Louissette Lanteigne - Application for Intervenor Status (A39383)

La version française suit le texte anglais.

The National Energy Board acknowledges the receipt of filing A39383.

This filing can be viewed at:  
<http://www.neb-one.gc.ca/fetch.asp?language=E&ID=A39383>

**Purolator**

**Purolator Express 10:30AM**

**FROM/DE**

National Energy Board  
517, 10th Avenue SW  
Suite 210, Mailroom, 2nd Floor  
CALGARY, AB  
T2R 0A8  
403-299-3162

**TO/À**

MS. LOUISETTE LANTEIGNE  
MICHAEL DE SOUZA  
700 STAR FLOWER AVENUE  
WATERLOO, ON  
N2V 2L2

587-896-5147



DATE: 16 APR 2018  
PIECES: 1 of 1  
WEIGHT/POIDS: 3 LB

**YYZ 67**

**EXP 10:30**

**OSNR**



**PUROLATOR PIN: 331382720620**

Purolator's published terms and conditions of service apply - see www.purolator.com  
Les Modalités et conditions de service publiées de Purolator s'appliquent - voir www.purolator.com

**Purolator**