OTTAWA LIGHT COMMISSION RAIL TRANSIT D'ENQUÊTE SUR LE RÉSEAU DE TRAIN LÉGER SUR RAIL D'OTTA TRAIN LÉGER SUR RAIL D'OTTAWA

Public Hearing

Audience publique

Commissioner / Commissaire

The Honourable / L'honorable C. William Hourigan

VOLUME 10

Held at: Tenue à:

Ian Scott Building 100 Thomas More Private Second Floor Courtroom Ottawa, Ontario K1N 1E3

Friday, June 24, 2022

Immeuble Ian Scott 100, Thomas More Private Salle de cours au 2e étage Ottawa, Ontario K1N 1E3

Vendredi, le 24 juin 2022

INTERNATIONAL REPORTING INC.

http://www.transcription.tc (800)899-0006

II Appearances / Comparutions

Falguni Debnath Executive Director / Directrice Générale Christine Mainville Co-lead Counsel / Avocate principale

Kate McGrann Co-lead Counsel / Avocate principale

John Adair Co-lead Counsel / Avocat principal

Chris Grisdale

Commission Counsel / Avocat de la Commission

Mark Coombes

Commission Counsel / Avocat de la Commission

Carly Peddle

Commission Counsel / Avocate de la Commission

Commission Counsel / Avocate de la Commission

Emily Young Commission Counsel / Avocate de la Commission

Peter Wardle The City of Ottawa

Betsy Segal

Catherine Gleason-Mercier

Jesse Gardner

John McLuckie Amalgamated Transit Union 279

Jaime Lefebvre

Michael Valo Alstom Transport Canada Inc.

Charles Powell

Lena Wang

Jacob McClelland

Sarit Batner Ontario Infrastructure and Lands Corporation (IO)

Julie Parla

Morgan Watkins Solomon McKenzie

III Appearances / Comparutions

Kyle Lambert

Morrison Hershfield

Jeremiah Kopp

Heather MacKay

Jeffrey Claydon

Adam Mortimer

The Province of Ontario

Michael Varantsidis

Gary Gibbs Kim Gillham Rideau Transit Group – EJV (Engineering Joint Venture)

Jennifer McAleer

Peter Mantas Maria Braker Thales Canada Inc.

David Jeanes

Transport Action Canada

Linda Rothstein

RTG (Rideau Transit Group General Partnership)

Gordon Capern

+

Michael Fenrick

OLRTC (Ottawa Light Rail Transit Group General

Jean-Claude Killey

Partnership)

Kartiga Thavaraj

-

Jesse Wright

RTM (Rideau Transit Maintenance General Partnership)

Mannu Chowdhury

Michael O'Brien

STV

James Doris

IV Table of Content / Table des matières

	PAGE
MR. MATTHEW SLADE, Affirmed	1
Examination in-Chief by Ms. Christine Mainville	1
Cross-Examination by Mr. Peter Wardle	82
Cross-Examination by Mr. Michael Valo	110
Cross-Examination by Ms. Jennifer McAleer	130
Cross-Examination by Mr. John McLuckie	131
Cross-Examination by Mr. Jean-Claude Killey	136
MR. YANG LIU, Sworn	145
Examination in-Chief by Ms. Carly Peddle	146
Cross-Examination by Ms. Sharon Vogel	176
Cross-Examination by Mr. Manu Chowdhury	199
Cross-Examination by Ms. David Jeanes	210

V Exhibit List / Liste des pièces

NO	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
136	COW0523321 – Mitigation Schedule – Sinkhole Event – 20 December 2016	8
137	COW0158931 – Trial Running Procedures – 16 August 2019	37
138	RTC00885419.0001 – RE: RTG Executive Committee Meeting – 24 June 2019	55
139	RTG00332043 – Sustantial Completion Notice – 26 July 2019	61
140	RTG00400436.0001 – RE: Revenue Service Requirement for Q4, 2019 – 31 July 2019	63
141	RTG00151032 – Revenue Service Availability Term Sheet	71
142	COW0435176 – RAMP Final Report to Program Management Team – 17 July 2019	77
143	RTG00332043.0002 – Substantial Completion Agreement	95
144	COW0468165 – Letter – RTM Readiness and OLRTC Warranty Support – 24 July 2019	103
145	RTG00429222.0001 – Minutes RTG Board Meeting No. 33 - 25 July 2019	107
146	COMH0000025 – Re: CCTV troubleshooting	111
147	ALS0056191 – Email Alstom 14 June 2019 Infra – What we can do	113
148	ALS0014029 – Letter re: Support Maintenance Activities prior to Handover – 28 March 2019	114
149	PRR00000182 – Email Trackwork – 24 September 2020	119
150	PRR00000182.0004 – RTM Letter Trackwork Warranty Claim – 23 September 2020	121
151	PRR0000119 – RTM – Alstom Amended and Restated Maintenance Subcontract – 2 October 2019	123
152	COMH0000023 – Email Switch Heater Inspection – 8 November 2018	127
153	AGG0000129 – Ottawa Light Rail System – IC Report on RSA – 31 August 2019	141

VI Exhibit List / Liste des pièces

No	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
154	COW0534279 – Letter Green Wheels for Service – 22 December 2021	189
155	ALS0013631 – Powerpoint Alstom QMS: OCS Maintenance Closing meeting: Discussion of Draft Audio Findings – 12 June 2020	191
156	COW0593599 – Alstom Letter to Mayor Jim Watson and Councillor Hubley – 24 September 2021	193
157	COM0010116 – Report Ottawa LRT Independent Review Report – April 2022	198
158	ALS0018035 – Alstom Incident Report – LRV 1119 Mainline Derailment – 27 October 2021	200
159	RTC00079996.0003.0002 – OTT LRT Axle Spline Connection Report – 30 June 2021	202

1	Ottawa, Ontario
2	Upon commencing on Friday, June 24, 2022, at 9:00 a.m.
3	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. The hearing is now resumed.
4	The Honourable Justice Hourigan is presiding.
5	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Good morning. Welcome to Day
6	10 of the hearings. Today's first witness is Matthew Slade of OLRTC/RTM. Mr. Slade,
7	are you there?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I am.
9	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Okay.
LO	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Good morning.
l1	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Good morning. You're going to be
L2	asked some questions today by counsel. Before we do that, though, we need to either
L3	have you swear an oath to tell the truth or affirm solemnly to tell the truth. What is your
L4	preference?
L5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Affirm, please.
L6	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Hang on.
L7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Affirmed
L8	THE REGISTRAR: The witness has been sworn in.
L9	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Thank you. Mr. Slade,
20	the first lawyer to examine you will be from the Commission, Ms. Mainville. Go ahead,
21	Ms. Mainville.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
23	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Good morning, Mr. Slade.
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Good morning.
26	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Let's start with your employment
27	currently is with EllisDon, correct?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you are the rail director of
2	systems and infrastructure there, looking after Ellis' all of EllisDon's transit projects in
3	Canada, correct?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you held a few positions
6	on the Ottawa LRT project beginning in late 2017, right?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I joined the project formally in 2018, yes.
8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: 2018, yes, and I'll just enumerate
9	the positions briefly, if you can then let me know if I've got it right? You first worked for
10	OLRT Constructors
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: correct? And you were involved,
13	as you just pointed out, first informally to assist with revising the schedule to mitigate
14	delay on the project, correct?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
16	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that was in 2017 before your
17	or beginning at the end of 2017 before your formal involvement in 2018?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. It was in the winter of 2017, right at
19	the end of the year.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And am I right that you
21	became formally involved in April 2018 as assistant director and systems director for
22	OLRTC?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you then became project
25	director replacing Rupert Holloway when he left in July 2019?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then you led the project,
28	then, for OLRTC through RSA and revenue service, correct?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you were also chair of the trial
3	running team during that time period?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And later in 2020, so about a
6	year after revenue service when RTG was asked to prepare a remediation plan, you
7	became an advisor to RTM?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And, currently, you are an alternate
10	board member for RTM, Rideau Transit Maintenance, right?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And in terms of your
13	background, you're not an engineer, but you are trained as a building surveyor in the
14	U.K., which you've explained is close to engineering?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It is.
16	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you've worked all of
17	your career in transit, including significant work in the railway industry, right?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. All my work has been in the
19	transit industry.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you've previously
21	worked for Alstom?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I have.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Now, going to your first role
24	on the project, it was, am I right, to rework the schedule after the May 2018 RSA date
25	was missed?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And am I right that your
28	instructions were effectively to determine the earliest possible completion date?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, what you do as a first step
3	is you proceed to what and correct me if I'm wrong, but what may be the usual or
4	regular analysis that you would conduct using sophisticated scheduling tools available
5	to you, right?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that analysis gets you
8	somewhere around a 90 per cent probability of meeting, as you recalled it when you
9	were interviewed, a March 2019 RSA date. Do you recall that?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I do.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. So, is that right, that you first
12	performed this analysis, and the probability it gives you is a March 2019 RSA date?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then you, from there,
15	looked at mitigation measures and ways to accelerate the schedule, right?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And one aspect of that is
18	that you're not including the contingency and risk that you would normally include?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And am I right that in sort of
21	accelerating the schedule, if you will, that also allows you to maintain a certain amount
22	of pressure on everyone who is working on the project to get things done?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And do you recall where you
25	land after your incorporation of these mitigation measures and removing the
26	contingency, where you land in terms of the proposed RSA date that you put forward?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Originally, it was an October date. I can't
28	remember the exact date in October, but it was an October 2018 date.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: October 2018. And do you recall
2	whether it was you or someone else who came up with an August 2018 date?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I mean, we I can't recall. When we run
4	those probability models on the schedules, it obviously, the earlier the date is, the
5	lower the probability is of achieving it, but the probability may have had an August date
6	in it, but the percentage would have been low.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And, ultimately, though, your
8	recollection, I believe, was that the Board, the OLRTC Board or executive committee
9	made a decision about the date that would be targeted, right?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And was that October 2018, to your
12	recollection?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I believe so.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you've explained that
15	subsequent to that, the City was brought into the conversation about the schedule,
16	right?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you had indicated in your
19	interview with Commission that the risks were the schedule risks were identified for
20	the City and the critical path was laid out for them?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Now, were you involved or present
23	for these discussions?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so, who would those
26	have been with at that time about the schedule and what the target date was to be
27	following the missed May 2018 RSA date?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I obviously can't remember everybody

1	that was in the room, but the most senior person I suspect was John Manconi and
2	Steve Cripps. I can't remember if John was in the room, but Steve Cripps certainly was
3	and we had a lot of conversations, not just you know, in the buildup of that meeting
4	with Mr. Cripps.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And would they have known
6	about the probability analysis
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: and the various probabilities?
9	Yes? And so, they knew this proposed schedule was without or with little contingency?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And OLRTC had proposed,
12	as you said, an October date; do you recall that the City wanted – or asked for a
13	November date instead, November 2 nd ?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Do you know why?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Their assertion was that we wouldn't
17	achieve the October date.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But they believed the November
19	date was realistic?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Am I right that, as you previously
22	informed the Commission, you did not believe even the November date to be realistic;

correct?

23

24

25

26

27

your interview, if you recall, was that it could be achieved in a utopian world?

MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.

MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It was probably unrealistic, yes.

MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. The way you described it in

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: All the stars would have to align.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. All the starts would have to
3	align which rarely happens on a project like this; correct?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so my question is why would
6	the October 2018 date be put forward if it was unrealistic really?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That was a desire from all parties to
8	oversee – get the project to the end date as quickly as possible.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you indicated the City
10	was aware that this was a stretch target?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay.
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: At the time we were projecting, you
14	know, over a year in advance as to what was going to happen and schedules are
15	reviewed on a monthly basis for that very reason, because, you know, what you know
16	now and what you know in a year's time is very, very different.
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And if the dates that – and
18	the schedule that OLRTC was putting forward was not realistically achievable and
19	OLRTC was still producing the schedule, was there not a concern that that may impact
20	the relationship of trust between the parties, between OLRTC, RTG and the City?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, because the City were involved; at
22	the time I didn't see trust or distrust being an issue at the time.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And the result of the
24	scheduling work, aside from not having any contingency, is that both the construction
25	work and the testing and commissioning work becomes out of sequence; correct?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, I'm not sure I'm understanding.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But when you – I'm going back to
28	when you were preparing the schedule.

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Right.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And one thing you did was remove
3	the contingency that you would normally allow for?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And am I right, that the other piece
6	of it, or one other piece of it, is that you – the sequency of the work has to change; so
7	both in respect to the construction, but also testing and commissioning?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And a lot of things are happening
10	at the same time effectively; correct?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And another aspect of accelerating
13	the schedule is that there is far less time provided for to run the trains ahead of RSA;
14	correct?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I wouldn't necessarily say that.
16	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: We'll just look at one of the earlier
17	schedules; if we could look at COW0523321. So this is, of course, before your time,
18	because I want to look at what the schedule was earlier on. But if you see this as
19	December 2016, and if we go – well, first of all, let's go down a little bit just to see that
20	it's - the next page, or sorry, a bit further. We'll see just the top of the schedule. So this
21	is OLRTC's master schedule
22	EXHIBIT No 136:
23	COW0523321 – Mitigation Schedule – Sinkhole Event – 20
24	December 2016
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:at that time. And if we go to
27	page 94; it's a fairly lengthy document, right? Because there's a lot to schedule over
28	the course of a project like this?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Oh yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then if we go to page
3	94 towards the bottom, here you have the trial running period and do you see there for
4	pre-trial running on the phone-in line, what's originally provided for, at least at this time
5	in 2016, is almost three months of pre-trial running; correct?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that was significantly
8	compressed ultimately; right?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think – so I haven't seen this before,
10	but I think the fact that this line item says "pre-trial running, full main line" and then I
11	assume the other schedule you're going to show me is the one that will probably show
12	pre-trial running being, you know, a number of days rather than a number of months. I
13	don't necessarily – I can't confirm that the two activities are the same activity.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. How so?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So this is, you know, the full main line
16	and there was – we were operating – in the other schedule, we were operating on the
17	full main line for probably more than three months. So it – I mean I can't, you know,
18	agree with whether it's the same level of activity. This might be more than one activity
19	rolled in together.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay.
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: You know, without reviewing every
22	single line item given all the activity codes and understanding; I mean on the face value
23	it looks like it, but I don't know that it necessarily is.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. But am I right that the trains
25	were only running on the full main line I think closer to the summer of 2019?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, they were running on the full main
27	line from late summer, early fall of 2018.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. So then – then am I right

1	that if – running more than one train at the same time on the full main line I think
2	occurred more towards the summer of 2019?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, I don't agree with that statement
4	either.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: That's not your recollection? Okay.
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think we were running multiple vehicles
7	of single cars rather than a double – rather than a train. We were running more than
8	ten, a dozen trains on the full alignment in the fall of 2018.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: That's your recollection? Okay.
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And just so we have it, for
12	trial running at this point in time, what's been allotted is just short of one month
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: to do that? Okay.
15	We can take this down, thank you. Did you have any concerns in
16	terms of the schedule that you ultimately produced with some direction, I take it, from
17	the Board and perhaps others, did you have concerns from the perspective of the
18	reliability of the system that OLRTC would be producing at the end of the day, in terms
19	of how the activities, the various activities were to be performed and the time allotted for
20	these activities, the construction and manufacturing, but also the testing and
21	commissioning in trial running?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, I didn't have any concerns
23	regarding reliability at that time.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you believe it could be
25	done and produce a reliable system based on the way these activities were sequenced
26	and the time – even though they were accelerated as well?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Now, once formally involved on the

1	project you began attending RAMPM meetings, "Rail Activation Management Program
2	Meetings"?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that was with OC Transpo, the
5	City and some of their consultants; right?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: In addition to RTG and RTM who
8	had representatives there?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And the meetings would cover – I
11	think you explained everything from training, testing and commissioning, media, vehicle
12	performance and maintenance; right?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And those meetings
15	increased in frequency over time; right? They were monthly and then they came to be
16	weekly meetings?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And Mr. Manconi and Michael
19	Morgan, am I right, chaired the meetings?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Alstom representatives also began
22	attending at a point in time, correct?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, towards the very end.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you indicated in your
25	interview with the Commission that there was a huge thirst for knowledge from the City,
26	at least at that point in time?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But you also described that the City

1	had a distinct lack of trust
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: for Project Co. Can you explain
4	that?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think it was I mean, when I said that,
6	and, you know, thinking back to when I was sat in those meetings and in that room,
7	the level of challenge in the questioning, just the feeling was that we were not being
8	trusted with what we were saying and what we were doing.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Did you have any sense of
10	where that came from, that lack of trust?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, not really. No.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And am I right that, as
13	you've described it, the City that when OLRTC or RTG would propose something,
14	your perception was the City was defensive or didn't believe that these things were
15	being proposed for the good of the project?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yeah, there was, I would say, a high
17	level of skepticism as to why OLRTC would be proposing anything other than for the
18	benefit of themselves. It wasn't it didn't ever come across that it was being perceived
19	as being best for the whole project, which is the approach that certainly I was taking at
20	the time.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: You mean you were proposing
22	things for the good of the project?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yeah. It wasn't for the benefit of the
24	contractor, so we were in it together, as far as I was concerned, and the best thing to do
25	was to have the best outcome for everyone, and if there were proposals or suggestions
26	that could improve that, then they were to be you know, that was the environment to
27	table them at, but they were rarely, if ever, received with good reception.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And was one of these

Т	proposals a soft or progressive opening?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, this was this possibility or
4	option was raised with the City?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And when was that? Do you recall?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, I'm aware that there was one done a
8	the sort of at the end of 2018, but I raised it again in late spring, early summer of
9	2019, and that's the one that was it was my proposal that I brought. I never got an
10	opportunity to actually make the proposal, because it was shut down so vehemently in
11	the room.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. So, let's just start with the
13	first time. Were you present for that one? You said around the end of 2018?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And who was that discussed with, if
16	you recall?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Everybody that was in the RAMP room
18	at the time. So, John Manconi, Michael Morgan, the City's advisors from STV, Peter
19	Lauch from RTG, Claude Jacob from RTM, and a whole host of other staff from the City
20	teams, either from OC Transpo or from City of Ottawa.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, was this a suggestion
22	emanating from OLRTC?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And what kind of progressive
25	or soft opening was being proposed at that time?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, at that stage, we were suggesting
27	that it might be of benefit to all parties if we had what we I would classify it as a partial
28	opening rather than a soft opening. We had essentially a large part of the east end of

- the alignment at a level of maturity of testing commissioning so that if there had been an
- 2 appetite to do it, we could have potentially opened, I suspect, between Blair and
- 3 University of Ottawa, and run a shortened part of the railway that would give, you know,
- 4 every party involved, RTM, the City, OC Transpo and the public, an opportunity to start
- 5 using the system, albeit a reduced system, which would obviously provide benefits to --
- 6 what we perceived at the time, benefits to all parties, but it was not seen in that regard
- 7 from the City.
- 8 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, it was shut down, effectively, at
- 9 that point?
- 10 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE**: Yes.
- 11 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And was that partial opening raised
- primarily because of the issues resulting from the sinkhole and the alignment not -- or
- being delayed, the entire alignment being delayed?
- 14 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
- 15 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: But you, as you've just explained,
- saw additional benefits in terms of getting people started on -- getting accustomed to
- the line and the system?
- 18 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE**: Yes.
- 19 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then you referenced
- another occasion when a partial or progressive opening was raised in the spring of
- 21 2019?
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. So, that I would regard as -- what I
- was going to propose would have been what I would call a soft launch rather than a
- partial opening. So, it would have been the entire alignment, and it would have been
- what we would call a reduced service, not necessarily reduce the number of trains, but
- 26 reduce the hours of service.
- So, I've opened a number of other railways elsewhere before I
- came to Canada, and I've always done a soft launch, even with very established

- agencies such as London Underground, where we would have a soft opening, and we
- would operate still a time tabled service, but we would start later than 4:00 a.m. You
- know, we would start -- if a normal day would start at 4:00 a.m., we would start at, say,
- 4 8:00 a.m., and miss a portion of the morning peak, and we would close -- instead of
- running all the way up to midnight or 1:00 a.m., we could close at, say, 9:00 p.m. or 8:00
- 6 p.m., such that the system gets used but by a reduced ridership, so relieving a bit of
- 7 pressure, but it would also increase the time for OLRTC and RTM to undertake the
- 8 closure of deficiencies and to ensure all of the infrastructure and the vehicles were
- 9 having an increased period of maintenance because of the hours and the reduced
- hours of operation. So, that was what was the approach that I was hoping to be able to
- present to the RAMP room at the time.
- MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, you're the one who raised this
- personally at that time?
- 14 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
- MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And who did you recommend that
- 16 to?
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, everybody that was in the room,
- but it was directed to John Manconi as the chair of the room.
- 19 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: Do you recall when you were
- interviewed, you weren't sure if it was during a RAMP meeting, you just recalled it being
- in the RAMP room?
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
- MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, would it have been to the
- entire team or just to Mr. Manconi?
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It was certainly -- whether it was the --
- you're correct. I don't know whether it was a RAMP meeting. We had most of our
- 27 meetings in that room, known as the RAMP room, which is in OC Transpo's offices.
- 28 Certainly, there was a number of people in there. It wasn't just John and myself, but I

1	can't remember precisely if it was a RAMP meeting or not.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so, what was the
3	response that was received to this proposal?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Oh, it was another flat refusal, and, in
5	fact, we didn't even really get an opportunity to even air the level of detail that I just
6	presented to you just there. It was you know, we've you've raised this before, and it
7	was rejected then, and it was just shut down firmly. It wasn't even I wasn't given five
8	minutes of the floor to have a conversation. And it wasn't that I had a you know, had
9	it all mapped out or had a formal proposal. I was expecting at that time for an
10	opportunity to go away and work with some of the individuals from OC Transpo and
11	from the City's consultants to flesh it out, to see whether or not it would have benefit or
12	would be of something of interest.
13	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. But you were not sorry?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: But it never got to that stage.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. You were not asked for
16	details or a plan?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you had described the
19	response as being so badly received that it wasn't raised again?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And am I right that your impression
22	was that the impression was as though Project Co. was trying to take advantage or
23	were going to benefit in some way from this? Yes?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you recalled at least one of the
26	City's advisors being supportive of the idea?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, Tom Prendergast from STV.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And what do you recall him

AD MATTHEW OLARS THAT A 18 THAT A
MR. MATTHEW SLADE : That he I think at the time, he was
trying to agree that it was something we should discuss, and he was supportive that a
soft launch would be a wise thing to do. But, again, it never got any further than that.
MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And am I right that your view
is that even if you have sufficient time to run the vehicles and fully burn in the system
ahead of revenue service, you would still recommend or advise for a soft start because
well, perhaps you can explain that. Am I right that that's your view?
MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. I would never contemplate opening
a rail system without a soft opening.
MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And why is that?
MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Just because there are so many moving
parts and so many unknowns and, you know, you can test and test, but until the system
is actually being used, you don't know how it's going to behave or react or respond.
And as I know, others have probably talked about it, and there's it's a phrase that I
know people in this day and age, we shouldn't use. There is quite often early failures
what we refer to as infant mortality, on certain systems. It's quite common on electronic
components of all sorts, not just railways, and the best thing to do is to have a soft
launch.
I think it's I mean, for me, it's built I've built it into everything
I've done, because ever since I've worked in the industry, all the jobs I've worked on,
there's been something that's been incorporated into it. So, for me, it's I regard it as
best practice.
MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And am I right that here,
there was neither a soft start or a progressive opening, nor really sufficient time to fully
burn in the system prior to it being launched?
MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, I'd like to sorry, "burn." So, a lot of

these terms have very specific meanings, and maybe different meanings to different

28

- people. So, when we talked about "burn in," we talk -- that's specifically about vehicles
- 2 and about the number of kilometres that they cover before going into service. This
- particular contract did not have a burn in requirement, but we would have -- well, we did.
- 4 We far exceeded what would be I would regard as a normal burning with the number of
- 5 kilometres on these vehicles.
- So, yeah, burn in and soft opening, two very different, distinctive
- things. Same as some of the other terms that we use. Bedding in period is more akin
- 8 to reliability growth period.
- 9 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: Right.
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: And that, again, is separate from a soft
- 11 launch.
- MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so -- right. And so, perhaps
- what I should have said is there was no -- not a full bedding in period before the launch.
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: There was an opportunity for one, but it
- wasn't taken.
- MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: What do you mean an opportunity
- 17 for one?
- 18 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, the contract with -- for the delivery of
- the project, as you're aware, had a revenue service availability date, and the date of
- revenue service was completely in the gift of the City, and, therefore, you could have
- 21 had any time frame between revenue service availability and revenue service
- commencing. So, that period, whatever that period was, would be your bedding in or
- 23 your reliability growth period.
- MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. So, between RSA and the
- 25 actual launch of the service to the public is when ---
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
- MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: --- you would have foreseen some
- 28 bedding in period to be ---

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Now, you've spoken about
3	the pressure to get to RSA on all sides, really, that basically everyone had the same
4	goal?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, let's start with the pressure
7	from your own organization. You've described, first, the financial pressure on OLRTC at
8	the time as being significant?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, it was.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Do you recall there were a lot of
11	what I think have been called cash calls to the partners to bring the project to
12	completion?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, there were.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then there were
15	liquidated damages and penalties being incurred for the delay?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, every day.
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. And you've mentioned that
18	you had pressure from your Board to achieve milestones because there were financial
19	payments linked to them.
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: I just want to clarify. Is that only in
22	respect of substantial completion and RSA or other milestones as well?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Those were the only two milestones that
24	I really felt any pressure from.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you were not on the
26	Board or at the executive level, but from where you stood, would this financial impact
27	have been greater than what may have been anticipated or planned for?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Yes?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: How so and why is that?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, I think again, like, I wasn't there
5	at the time. Obviously, we talked well, you mentioned the sinkhole, which was a
6	significant event for everyone on the project and added a considerable amount of time
7	to the schedule. Nobody could have foreseen that. And so, the financial pressures that
8	came as a result of the delay were not foreseen either.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But is it not the case that complex
10	projects like this one are often late?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So but to your mind, this was out
13	of the ordinary?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. When I think when you refer to
15	complex projects being late, that is true, and a number of projects I've worked on have
16	been beyond their original planned date, but there is obviously mechanisms in contracts
17	to provide what's called an "extension of time," and extension of time gives you relief
18	and helps and assists with those penalties.
19	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, in your experience, there's
20	often that type of extension granted?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And am I right there was not
23	in this case, to your knowledge?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: In terms of the pressure on the City
26	side to get to RSA, how would you describe that?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I would describe it quite simply as very
28	political.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And what was your basis for
2	that perception?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think the level of attention from the
4	media and the politicians was quite immense, not something I had experienced before
5	to this extent, and it was it was clear from meetings with councillors and the City staff
6	that the pressure was far greater than I've seen on other projects, and that was driven
7	predominantly by the City staff and the councillors and the various meetings that were -
8	we were able to watch publicly, such as Transit Commission, and FEDCO, et cetera.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Did you have any sense of
10	what informed that pressure, that desire to get to RSA in a
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: You know, I came to the project quite
12	late, but it was clear from, you know, reading news articles, and reading media, and
13	watching what was going on that several people had been very vocal about the delivery
14	of the project and the schedule, and had made promises on it being, you know, finished
15	and in service by a particular date. So, those pressures, I think, came from that.
16	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: When you say certain people, are
17	you referencing the Mayor's Office or otherwise?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. No, the Mayor's Office.
19	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: The mayor specifically?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And am I right to say,
22	though, that this, from the City's perspective, was not at any cost, right? Because they
23	initially refused OLRTC's first application for substantial completion?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But as you describe it, in the
26	summer of 2019, the pressure was very significant?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so as a result, am I

1	right, that it was understood by all that OLRTC was going to proceed to trial running as
2	soon as substantial completion was met, even if the trains were not running reliably?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That was the plan. That was always the
4	plan.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that's because once you
6	achieved substantial completion you could, at least on paper, start trial running; right?
7	That was the next step.
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And trial running is – we've heard a
10	bit about it, but it's operating the system to a timetable that replicates how the system
11	would operate in revenue service; right, and making daily service but without
12	passengers?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And is it correct that the City made
15	an announcement when substantial completion was certified?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: They made an announcement, sorry?
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: That they announced substantial
18	completion had been certified?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: You recall that? Okay.
21	And you said once that happened everyone got their calendar out
22	and predicted when the railway was going to open?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so the decision to go straight
25	to trial running is a decision that OLRTC makes; correct?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But it's fair to say the City was on
28	board with that plan; right?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I mean trial running involved a
2	number of stake-holders and everybody had to be on board; I mean it was OLRTC's, I
3	would say "request". It was in our schedule to almost immediately, but I guess with the
4	trial running being – participated in by a number of parties, then we could have had a
5	discussion and potentially delayed it, but there wasn't any appetite at that time to delay
6	anything.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay.
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: And pre-trial running, as we've seen on
9	this schedule, that's typically essentially practiced for trial running; right?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But without any pass/fail criteria;
12	you're just running the full system to make sure you're ready for trial running?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, it's the "mock exam" for want of a
14	better phrase.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And in this case it was a matter of
16	a few days; might it have been a couple of days even?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so you – do you recall
19	indicating during your interview that come the time for trial running, I think when I asked
20	you if the trains were ready for trial running you indicated that on paper the trains were
21	ready for trial running but their reliability was quite a way short of where you were
22	hoping they would be at that point?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so what were the issues that -
25	I mean I take it there were quite – the issues were varied across the different vehicle
26	systems; correct, at that point in time?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Do you recall some off the top of

1	your head?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: We were having – I'll be general, we
3	were having brake issues, door issues and auxiliary power supply issues.
4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay.
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: There was probably more though
6	certainly.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Traction power issues?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yeah.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you, as we've mentioned,
LO	chaired the trial running review team; right?
l1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I'll say, yes, yes.
L2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Along with Will Allman?
L3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
L4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Who was also with OLRTC?
L5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
L6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that's because trial running is
L7	effectively an OLRTC production; right? It's part of your obligation under the project
L8	agreement and the last time to RSA?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And Mr. Allman had recently been
21	brought in from SNC to help with the project close-out; right?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And he was pretty new to the
24	project and you recall indicating that that's precisely why you decided to bring him on to
25	the trial running team?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And explain that reasoning?
0.0	MR MATTHEW SLADE: I wanted to have someone who was in

1 the room and managing the process who was – I'm going to say, use the word, "divorced" from everything that had gone on before and was not party to the pressures 2 and issues and everything else that had been happening and was not, I guess, involved 3 in any of the relationships that were in the room, et cetera. He was – whilst he was an 4 OLRT employee he was relatively independent in terms of everything that had been 5 going on in the build-up to that, and I wanted someone to be able to be responsible for 6 7 compiling the score sheets and everything else, being the secretary at the meeting for 8 want of a better term. And making sure that if there were going to be any discussions or 9 debates in the room, that there was someone, other than myself, that could steer the conversation such that it didn't have the look or feel that I was trying to persuade 10 anyone one way or the other, not that that was like a plan that was ever expected, but I 11 just wanted, you know, someone else to have control or the secretary of the meeting 12 role basically. 13 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Someone who I think as you 14 15 described it previously, didn't have baggage with the City and with RTM? 16 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Was this to address the trust issue 17 that you've described? 18 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Partly, yes. 19 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. 20 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: And you began working on planning for 21 22 trial running with the City consultant named Russell Davies; correct? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 23 24 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so that was about working on what the requirements for trial running would be? 25 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 26 27 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:** You indicated in your interview that there were several versions of the trial running procedure before the one you wrote with 28

1	Will Allman?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But am I right that you, at that point
4	in time when you start working on this trial running procedure, you're not aware, or you
5	were not aware of a version of the requirements that was devised in 2017 and agreed to
6	by all parties called the "RFI0266"?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I was not aware of that at the time.
8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Because that predated you?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so when you spoke in your
11	interview of working off an original document that you said contained some errors and
12	didn't achieve what it needed to, you were not referring to the RFI?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. So there was some earlier
15	version of the - what ultimately became the trial running procedure that you came up
16	with?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And let's bring that up, the work
19	product you – well, that flowed from your work with Mr. Davies but that you and Mr.
20	Allman ultimately prepared; it's OTT0377178.
21	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Please repeat the number.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Yes, sorry. OTT0377178.
23	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Stand by.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: I'm sorry, it could be 3177178.
25	Yeah, I think it's 3177178, OTT. Thank you.
26	This is the trial running test procedure you devised; correct, Mr.
27	Slade?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It looks like it, yes.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you see it says "Prepared by
2	Matthew Slade and Will Allman"?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And if we scroll down just a little bit
5	we have the date of the document; this is the final Rev-2 dated July 31st, 2019; right?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Which is just about the time trial
8	running started?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And if we go to page three, just at
11	the bottom of the page, yes, where you have definitions. So this is the definition, am I
12	right, from schedule 15.1 of the project agreement of what trial running is; correct?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And it says:
15	"A 12 consecutive day period that may commence upon the
16	successful completion of testing and commissioning."
17	And it indicates:
18	"Upon successful completion of trial running the integrated system
19	will be ready for revenue service"?
20	Right?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So that's the starting point for what
23	trial running is about.
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then if we go to page 5, we
26	have here the objectives to be achieved. And am I right that those are taken directly
27	from Schedule 14 of the PA, project agreement?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Yes? And we see, for instance, the
2	second bullet point that the objective is, amongst others:
3	"To exercise and confirm the operating reliability of
4	the system and subsystems."
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay? And it indicates that:
7	"(Note: The basic design requirements and safety
8	and security requirements will have been verified
9	through the testing and commissioning program prior
10	to this stage of Trial Running)"
11	Right?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
13	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so safety and the functioning of
14	the system, that's covered during testing and commissioning in the various tests that
15	are done there, but trial running is really to demonstrate reliability, that's the point.
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So not just reliability, operability.
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Operability, okay. But part of it is
18	confirming reliability?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then we have more
21	about the scope of trial running that I won't take you through, but if we go to page 7, and
22	you see just beneath that chart, it indicates:
23	"Over the course of the 12 day trial, achievement of
24	the following goals will be verified to the satisfaction of
25	the Independent Certifier"
26	And that's taken directly from section 1.5(e) of Schedule 14?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then if we jump to page 9, we

have here at the bottom of the page, where it describes the trial running process, that 1 the IC, so the independent certifier again, will provide -- oh, sorry; on my page it's at the 2 bottom but here on yours it's at the top of page 10, I believe, if we go down. Yeah. So 3 the number 4, subpoint 4: 4 "The IC will provide final classification for the previous 5 day as one of the following:" 6 And then it explains, "Pass, Repeat, and Re-start". 7 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 8 9 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, for a pass, performance has to be demonstrated for all evaluation criteria. 10 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 11 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then we move on to the next 12 day. A repeat is, you'll have the performance in one or more criteria not having been 13 met, or not having the passing requirement, that'll be a repeat day. 14 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 15 16 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And a restart or a failure occurs when you have serious safety issues requiring restarting the trial running at Day 1. 17 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 18 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:** And so just pausing there, because 19 there was a restart, you'll recall, at the start of trial running around Day 3? 20 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 21 22 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so was that linked to a safety issue? 23 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't believe so. 24 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: It doesn't indicate that there were 25 any safety issues, but I take it, then, that the performance was just so poor that it was 26 27 considered that you needed to restart? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.

28

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And at number 7 here,
2	subpoint 7, we have:
3	"Should a situation arise when one or more of the
4	eighteen pass criteria is not considered a pass, the
5	Trial Running Review Team will assess the conditions
6	that led to the fail and will make a determination. Any
7	fails within a pass day will be justified and recorded
8	on the scorecard and verified by the Independent
9	Certifier."
LO	And so am I right that this explains why and we'll come to some
l1	of the scorecards in a bit, that explains why you may have a failed criteria or a failure on
L2	some of the criteria, but overall the day will be a pass?
L3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Right.
L4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so there is some level of
L5	discretion even if some of the, as it says here, 18 criteria are not met. Depending on
L6	what led to the failure, a note might be made to explain why the trial running review
L7	team might consider it to, nevertheless, not warrant a repeat day or a restart day?
L8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
L9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then just at the very end
20	of the subpoint number 8, it says:
21	"The 12 'pass' scorecards signed by the IC is the
22	validation for Trial Running."
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so trial running could not be
25	validated, am I right, by the IC unless there had unless there were 12 passes on the
26	scorecards, 12 daily passes?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
Ω	MS CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay And Liust want to point out a

1	little bit lower in the category of "Exclusions," a little bit lower on the page. Thank you.
2	You have exclusions here, and this is from availability calculations,
3	so the availability of the trains, right?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yeah. It might not have been just the
5	trains.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. But one example it gives is
7	where there's an event outside of OLRTC's control that reduces availability?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, for instance, the first bullet
10	is:
11	"Any 'Non Project Co. Cause' as defined in Schedule
12	20 of the Project Agreement."
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so that could be something just
15	totally outside of your control, like a fire emergency or some other
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. If there'd been a road traffic
17	accident or if a power outage like we had recently in Ottawa; if there'd been a hydro
18	outage that prevented that shut the railway for a number of hours, then that would be
19	a non-Project Co. cause.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: That wouldn't cause that wouldn't
21	count.
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And trial running was to be,
24	as we've seen pursuant to the project agreement, 12 days in a row with a passing
25	grade; correct?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And such that it would take
28	however long it took to get those 12 passing days, right?

Τ	WIR. WIATTHEW SLADE. 1 es. Tillean, il could take 12 takes, il
2	could take six months, or whatever, right?
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. And that was generally
4	accepted, that that was the way it was to be interpreted? When I say, "That was the
5	way," that amongst at least all of the trial running team but amongst the various entities
6	involved; correct?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And as you explained in your
9	interview, am I right that you, in this trial running procedure, purposely had the metrics
10	match the reliability targets that RTM would be held to following revenue service?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so I haven't taken you to it but
13	this trial running procedure provides for an AVKR, which we had defined yesterday, an
14	aggregate vehicle kilometre availability ratio,
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
16	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: of 98 percent, right?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that is and, sorry; that's the
19	12-day average has to be 98 percent, I believe.
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that aligns with what RTM
22	would be held to following revenue service, pursuant to the project agreement; correct?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you explained that that was to
25	protect that was done purposely to protect RTM against penalties that it would incur if
26	those targets were not met?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It was. I mean, it made complete sense
28	to set the pass criteria, the criteria by which we would be measured over the next 30

1	years of the concession.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. It's only logical to have it
3	match what you're going to be held to during service.
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you indicated you didn't want
6	to go into service with something that was going to fall short of the reliability targets,
7	right?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: We were trying to avoid that, yes.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Yeah. Otherwise you're setting
10	yourself up, or you're setting RTM up to fail, basically.
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And why, in July 2019, when you
13	know there are some reliability challenges with the trains and the system, and everyone
14	is eager to make RSA, why still, then, would you have set those metrics at the level you
15	set them at?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry; can you repeat that?
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Well, I'm just wondering, because
18	we've talked about how there was everybody was eager to get to RSA
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: and to get trial running complete
21	right?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you know that the trains may
24	be ready for trial running on paper, but there are reliability issues.
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, I'm just wondering why you,
27	nevertheless, maintained those criteria at that point in time?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Because that's what we were going to be

measured to. I also -- you know, everybody was under pressure, and, again, the way of 1 ensuring that any of the issues that we had were being closed out was to keep that 2 pressure on, and this was another form of that pressure. 3 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And we can bring this 4 document down. Thank you. Trial running doesn't start off so well, correct? 5 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. 6 7 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: You have to pause, and then, as we 8 said, restart? 9 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then there were some ups and 10 downs, right? 11 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 12 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But by that time, everyone was 13 banking on a particular RSA date, correct? 14 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE**: Well, the RSA date was a targeted date, 15 16 but I -- I don't know that we were banking on it. MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. I believe you indicated in 17 your interview that everybody was working towards a particular RSA date, and by 18 "everyone," I include the City. 19 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 20 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. And that, eventually, it 21 22 became clear that the way things were going, that date would not be met? 23 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It was at risk, yes. 24 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Which was not good for either OLRTC or the City? 25 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. 26 27 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: And so, the metrics that you had

carefully crafted, that we just went through, end up changing, right?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, explain to us how that
3	came about.
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, I can't remember the exact day, but
5	we were in, I was going to say, in the middle of trial running. We were in the process,
6	and we had had a we hadn't scored the day yet. It was shortly before the meeting,
7	which was generally held at 2:00 in the afternoon, and we were all at the maintenance
8	facility at Belfast where most of us were co-located.
9	And shortly before the meeting started — a number of us were in
10	the room — I got myself and Peter Lauch were asked to step out of the room to have
11	a conversation with Mr. Troy Charter from OC Transpo, and Mr. Charter said that Mr.
12	Manconi wanted to have a conversation with us regarding the criteria for trial running
13	later that day.
14	So, we went back into the room. We undertook the scoring for the
15	day, and I think later that afternoon or very early the next morning, we went and had a
16	meeting with Mr. Manconi down at I think it was probably in the RAMP room again
17	down at the OC Transpo offices at St. Laurent.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. And I should have perhaps
19	made this clear before, but the trial running review team did not include Mr. Manconi,
20	correct?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: This was a team that had
23	representatives of RTM, RTG, OC Transpo, the city, and OLRTC as well as the
24	independent certifier, right?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: And the maintainer as well, yes.
26	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: The maintainer, yes, RTM. But not
27	Alstom?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, the City is represented
2	there, and we did, indeed, speak with Mr. Holder yesterday. He was a member of the
3	trial running review team, right?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, he was.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And Mr. Charter as well
6	was?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, the City and OC Transpo are
9	there, but Mr. Manconi is not one of the members of the trial running review team, but
10	you're told he would like a meeting; is that do I have that right?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct, yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so, go on in terms of
13	what conversation ends up taking place.
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, Peter and I met with John, and I'm
15	pretty sure Troy was there. I think Michael Morgan was there as well. And at that point,
16	I was presented or we were presented with the RFI that you mentioned earlier, and that
17	was the first time in which I had seen it, and it was suggested that if OLRTC presented
18	that RFI back to the City at that point, the City would accept its contents and would
19	agree to change the timetable.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And this was an agreement
21	that had come about about what the requirements for trial running would be back in
22	2017, correct?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you said if, did you say,
25	OLRTC or RTG submitted it, the City would accept it?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think I said OLRTC, because we owned
27	the document, you know, the trial running document that you put on the screen earlier
28	that I authored co-authored. So, the way obviously, the way the contractual

documents flow is OLRTC will produce the documents, submit them to RTG for RTG to 1 formally submit to the City. 2 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. And you indicated during 3 your interview that it was to come from our RTG for audit purposes? 4 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 5 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: And so, what did you mean by that? 6 7 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, that was a phrase that was used by 8 the City at the time, was that whatever we were doing had to be auditable. 9 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, in terms of following the process that -- yes? 10 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 11 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, on paper, it shouldn't come 12 from the City, was that the idea? 13 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know whether it was where it 14 15 came from. It was just that whatever we were doing had to be formally documented and 16 be auditable. The whole process. MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Got it. 17 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Irrespective of who wrote what. I mean, 18 the original author of that RFI was the City. 19 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so, is that what OLRTC 20 and RTG proceed to do? 21 22 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 23 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And I'll take you to this letter, 24 if you can identify it, COW 0158931. --- EXHIBIT NO. 137: 25 COW0158931 – Trial Running Procedures – 16 August 2019 26 27 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Do you see this letter? And it's addressed to Michael Morgan, who was a director at that time of the O-Train 28

1	construction office, right?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And if we go at the bottom just to
4	see if you recognize it, it's a letter, as you say, sent by RTG, so signed by Mr. Lauch.
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But if you go a bit lower, you're
7	copied on the letter?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I am.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. So, do you recall having
10	seen this letter?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so, maybe this assists
13	with the date. If we go back to the top, it's dated August 16th, 2019.
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, would that be the date the
16	criteria changed, or the next day?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It probably changed that day.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And what's indicated here, if
19	we go to the third paragraph of the letter, which effectively is the point of the letter, it
20	indicates, "Subject to agreement by the trial running review team, the test criteria used
21	as part of trial running test procedure" that's your REV 2 procedure, correct, that
22	we've seen?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: "will be set to reflect the targets
25	agreed to in the above mentioned RFI," right?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And if we go to the or look at the
28	first paragraph, that explains this RFI that was agreed to in 2017?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And it indicates in the second
3	sentence, "RFI 0266 confirmed an agreement between all parties on an average daily
4	AVKR of 96 per cent or higher over 9 of 12 days evaluated over a 12-day moving
5	window of passing days," right?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, those were two of the main
8	changes, correct, or two of the main differences between the RFI and the document, the
9	trial running procedure you had written, which was that AVKR was going to go from 98
10	per cent to 96 per cent, right?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And it would be an average
13	evaluated over the highest of 9 of 12 days?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: As opposed to a full 12 days?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then at paragraph 2 of the
18	letter, I think there's some effort to set out a rationale for this. So, if we look at that, it
19	says,
20	"While Schedule 20, Appendix V of the project agreement,
21	provides specific performance targets as a threshold before
22	financial deduction factors are implemented, these target
23	numbers will be adjusted in service to remove all non-Project
24	Co. causes, and are therefore not a true reflection of the
25	passenger experience."
26	So, it's suggesting that the criteria should be lower because, in
27	reality, after revenue service, you may have non-Project Co. causes that could affect
28	availability; right?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But am I right that this was it was
3	accounted for in your trial running procedure, these non-Project Co. causes as we've
4	seen, yeah?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then the second sentence
7	says,
8	"Further, some of the ad hoc failure management
9	scenarios over some of the trial running days
10	invariably affects the average AVKR rendering
11	specific targets impractical on those dates." (As read)
12	Right?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But these ad hoc failures or
15	scenarios also could be accounted for under your trial running procedure; right?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then the other change that
18	occurs, if we look at the last paragraph on this page,
19	"Further to the trial running team monitoring
20	undertaken to date, we've now completed five days of
21	testing that demonstrate an ability to operate with a
22	maximum number of vehicles in service when
23	required." (As read)
24	And that's the 15 vehicles, right, that you've demonstrated
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
26	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: could be used could be
27	operated at once? And then it's indicated,
28	"Five days of testing was completed, including

1	maximum service capacity on August 9 th , 12 th and
2	13 th , and weekend capacity on August 10 th and 11.
3	We plan to proceed to a subsequent phase of testing
4	where we provide a service that matches or exceeds
5	the expected passenger volumes during the launch
6	period. This plan requires 13 vehicles during the
7	morning peak and 13 vehicles during the afternoon
8	peak and will be measured against RFIO266 targets."
9	(As read)
10	So that's the other changes that instead of running 15 vehicles
11	during the morning peak hour, you'll proceed to run 13; right?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Right. Correct.
13	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And am I right that this reduction in
14	the number of vehicles to be run was because you were struggling with running 15
15	vehicles together; right?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, and as it says here in this letter
17	that, you know, we there were you know, 13 was far more achievable than 15.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: M'hm. Right. Am I right that at this
19	time it was not known that the reduction from 15 to 13 would also be applied to revenue
20	service? So you didn't yet know that during revenue service, you would be effectively
21	permitted to run 13 as opposed to 15?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't think we did at the time. We I
23	don't know whether it was us or or certainly RTG received a service change
24	notification, I think it was after it was after this date, correct. The
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right.
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: service commencement to 13 tracks.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. So the expectation, at least
28	on your end, was still that you would have to make 15 trains run once passengers were

1	actually on board; right?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But you were no longer being held
4	to that during trial running?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And this reduction in the number of
7	vehicles also meant reducing, of course, the number of kilometres that had to be met;
8	right? It had to be proportionate to the number of vehicles you're running?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you explained
11	previously that you and Mr. Allman did an exercise to see what percentage you got in
12	terms of AVKR, I take it, if you only ran 13 instead of 15?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I believe so.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that was to see whether you
15	would pass by running fewer trains. Okay.
16	And so effectively, these changes made it easier to complete trial
17	running; fair?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Fair, yes.
19	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so I wonder what happened
20	then to the goal that you had initially of protecting what I think you call your sister
21	organization, RTM?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, that goal was gone.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And why is that? It became more
24	important to reach RSA?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Certainly, it was achieving RSA was
26	important for all parties, as we discussed earlier, you know, as I hope everyone can
27	appreciate that the pressure when you're going through these trial running days, and
28	days are not going so well, that the level of pressure increases and the there was a

1	desire to not miss another RSA date.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. And I think you candidly
3	explained during your interview that the penalties that might be incurred by the
4	maintenance people during revenue service, at the end of the day, no longer weighed
5	as much in the balance when you were looking at potentially further delay and the
6	impact that that had on OLRTC?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And it was understood, correct, Mr.
9	Slade, that this change increased the chances that there would be performance or
10	reliability issues at RSA after RSA I should say?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: You indicated it was done with the
13	full understanding of the implications, correct, and that's also on the City's end?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And am I right that there were still
16	or there were several events a day that needed attending to; right? That were arising
17	during the trial running period?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, can you say that again?
19	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Yes. There were events, or failure
20	events, or that were taking place during trial running every day?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so was it known that it would
23	be difficult to make the requisite number of trains available every day?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It was a daily struggle, yes.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. We can take this down, and
26	we'll just look at some of the score cards. If we go to COW 0270758? And you've
27	alluded to this, Mr. Slade, but the way the trial running function is the trial running review
28	team, there was a morning team and an afternoon team; right?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And maybe you could just explain
3	briefly what each role the respective roles were for those teams?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Certainly. So the morning team was,
5	again, made up of representatives of all of the participant organizations. And the
6	morning team's responsibility was to gather and analyze all of the data from the
7	previous day. The amount of data that was being measured and gathered was
8	significant, and they were processing that, reviewing it, and then presenting to the trial
9	running review team in the afternoon, which met at two p.m. They were presenting that
10	data after it had been processed such that the trial running review team could then
11	make an assessment on pass or fail on each of the different metrics.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. And so you were on the
13	afternoon team; correct?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that was sort of the senior level
16	team you would say?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: The representatives of the morning
19	team meeting, they were from the same organizations and entities, right, but different
20	people?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so you would receive a
23	recommendation on the various criteria, a pass/fail recommendation; correct?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Along with some of the data that
26	they had analyzed?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. Substantiation from the data.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. Okay. And then but they

1	wouldn't provide a recommendation for the overall day in
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: terms of pass/fail?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: That was up to the trial the
6	afternoon trial running review team?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And what the afternoon
9	team did was go through this these score cards that I'll take you to, right, and assess
10	each category, and then come to a determination on the full day?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so if we could go to day
13	I think it's around page 22. They're not paginated on the document, but it's August
14	14 th . Yes. Okay. So this is well, first of all, trial running began on July 29 th , 2019;
15	right?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then we explained that there
18	was a restart, but here we're quite a ways through, about midway through; right, August
19	14 th ?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And what we see here is that's a
22	repeat day; right?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: At the top right corner is the overall
25	result for the day; right?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then I take it it's at least in part
28	because you've got a failure on the operational category, including the trial time and the

1	headway?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay.
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: And also during – or on the
5	maintenance practices?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: It's just at the bottom there.
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It's on the bottom, yes.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay.
10	And so you have a repeat day on the 14th and then if we go to the
11	next page the same thing occurs on the 15 th , in terms of a repeat?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
13	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so you have those two
14	days that are not going well before we get to the 16 th which is, as you've explained, the
15	day the criteria changes?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right? So that's effectively, would
18	you say – what prompts this, is you're having challenges at that point in time; right?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so we go to the 16 th . Thank
21	you. And now – that day is now a pass?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And everybody signs off; right?
24	think you've explained in your interview how there was a consensus, there had to be a
25	consensus; correct, every day?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Every day there was a consensus; we
27	wouldn't leave the room until there was. But we were never in the room for long period
28	of time; the consensus was achieved very quickly.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. You indicated – you didn't
2	see or witness any significant disputes as you explained in the afternoon meetings;
3	right?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, the meetings went very smoothly.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you have at the bottom of the
6	page, we see, for instance, everybody signing off on any given day; right?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Then if we go to August 19th, so
9	about three pages later. I just want to see whether this is one example of, for instance,
10	the travel time being a fail, and that being one of the requirements; right?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But the overall day being a pass?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And if – we see under
15	"maintenance delivery", the maintenance practices also failed but the day's a pass;
16	right?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so if you – and we touched on
19	that in terms of the trial running procured, that there would be notes typically that
20	needed to be made to explain why
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: that would be done? And so at
23	the bottom of the page there are some notes. And what you have there: "Maintenance
24	Practices due to an occurrence processes and procedures are being adjusted".
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Do you recall what that was in
27	reference to?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, I do not.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: It's not very detailed, but there was
2	
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, looking at now, you know,
4	obviously I was never expecting it to appear like this, but I – yes, it should be a more
5	fulsome note.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then the same for
7	number four, is:
8	"The travel time not considered to impact the overall result for the
9	day due to only one trip being affected by a GIDS activation."
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And do you recall what that
12	means?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So "GIDS" is an acronym for "guideway
14	intrusion detection system" which is a system that is at all the stations and at the tunnel
15	portals; essentially it's a sensor that senses if anybody has – anybody or anything has
16	encroached on the guideway and it safely brings the trains to a stop such that there's no
17	risk to the personnel operator. And there was obviously a GIDS activation on this day
18	that delayed one of the trains partially. And I'm assume, and it is an assumption, that
19	this was a genuine GIDS activation rather than a false GIDS activation for it to be
20	accounted as not to have an impact.
21	Now the way the GIDS work, it could have been a false positive; it
22	could have been, you know – we've had a lot of storms recently. If you have a windy
23	day there's a carrier bag or litter blowing around in the air, it would trigger the GIDS, so I
24	can't recall what actually happened on this day, but we obviously had a conversation
25	and agreed that whatever triggered the GIDS and affected the passage of that one train,
26	that it was one of those non-project co events and that it wouldn't be counted in, you
27	know, under the terms of the project agreement.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. If we go to the last – and,

T	again, there would have been a consensus on those, right, on those exclusions?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. And actually those notes were
3	drafted and agreed in the meeting room with all of the participants. So the language
4	that was used – first, I apologize that it's not very fulsome; it was crafted by all of those
5	people that have signed their names. We agreed what the language would be for those
6	notes on that page.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And if we go to the last day,
8	August 22 nd , right here, that was the last day of trial running; right?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And, again, that was a pass even
11	though the headway was not met?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
13	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And if we'd go to the note, the
14	number two one says "RFIO266 – morning peak above minimum availability of 88 per
15	cent."
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
17	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And I think that's – am I right, that
18	that's because the minimum daily AVKR of 90 per cent becomes 88 per cent for peak
19	service; right?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And just so we have it, at the very
22	last page of this document is a tally of the days that ultimately end up counting for the
23	12 days of trial running; so after the restart – and there are a few days, I should point
24	out at the beginning in July and the first couple of days of August, that are not reflected
25	here. But after the restart you basically have counted there the days 1 through 12 that
26	end up counting towards trial running; right?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And in the middle of that are the

1	two repeats that we indicate – that we brought up that lead to the change in criteria as
2	of the 16 th ?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And we see the 12 day AVKR
5	average which, I take it, would be the 9 out of 12; it ends up being 96.9 per cent?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so had the criteria
8	remained 98 per cent that wouldn't have passed; right?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. Well, we can assume; I mean
10	we might have had 12 perfect days, but I doubt it.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Well, presumably the change in the
12	criteria wouldn't have affected the performance of the vehicles?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's very true.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And we see after August 16 th the
15	AVKR averages, the percentage there in the column 92 per cent, 96 per cent, and
16	that's, as we've pointed out, now with fewer vehicles and fewer kilometres to be run;
17	right?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
19	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: We can take this down. I just have
20	a couple of questions, Mr. Commissioner, before we can take a break.
21	So, am I right, Mr. Slade, that there were several failures under
22	maintenance practices; right?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And what were those challenges,
25	to your recollection?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: We had a number of, if I recall correctly,
27	it's a long time ago; part of it was around the vehicles being ready for launch in the
28	morning, so in the very early hours of the morning, so between 3:00 o'clock and 4:00

- o'clock in the morning. There's a requirement to demonstrate that those vehicles are
- 2 ready for service which involves providing documentation from RTM to the City that
- presents the vehicles as being ready for service. And if I recall correctly, quite often the
- 4 paperwork was late under the terms of what was supposed to be done. I think the
- 5 paperwork was due to be in the hands of the City an hour before trains were launched,
- and quite often it was scramble what papers were being presented at the time while the
- 7 train was sitting and waiting to be launched on the main line.
 - We also had an issue with how work orders were being managed or closed in a timely fashion in accordance with the project agreement for the
- 10 maintenance work.

8

- 11 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And in terms of closing the
- work orders, do I understand though that there was an issue with the work orders a
- number of them or the struggles with them being compounded by the wind, which the
- 14 City was going about initiating them?
- 15 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So that the volume of work orders that
- were being introduced to us, I would say, excessive and probably not representative of
- what was expected of the system. And we also had a situation where some work
- orders were being raised for items that were on the minor deficiency list and, therefore,
- shouldn't have been treated as work orders at all.
- So, there was -- and some of that was being filtered out through the
- 21 morning -- part of what the morning sessions were doing for the trial running team.
- They were going through those work orders. But at the same time, and I know you've
- seen it, the minor deficiencies list which at the time obviously had a huge number of
- deficiencies on it, all of them minor, but someone was having to go through the work
- orders that had been raised overnight and correlate those against the deficiencies.
- And, obviously, when you've got different individuals, because
- they're shift work, typing things into work orders and then interpreting that and
- understanding whether it correlates across to a minor deficiency or not was a huge task.

1	And so, there were instances where there were work orders raised that were, in fact
2	or shouldn't, in fact, have been work orders.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right, but
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It was just the volume of work was just
5	of processing that data overnight, you know, the maintenance hours are very, very
6	short, and it was far more than anyone had ever expected it to be.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. And just so we're clear,
8	that's because the minor deficiencies list is agreed upon at the time of substantial
9	completion, right?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, there had been agreed upon
12	minor deficiencies at that point in time, and what you're saying is work orders were
13	being entered, as I understand it, by City representatives?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: For items that were on the minor
16	deficiencies list, and so, effectively, shouldn't have been shouldn't have counted,
17	right?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
19	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Because they had been agreed
20	upon as deficiencies?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
22	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. But am I right, though, that
23	at the end of the day, what you could tell from the maintenance performance during tria
24	running was that the teams were not well drilled to their processes and procedures, I
25	think you explained?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, that's a very fair reflection of the
27	situation.
28	MS CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And there were

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Everybody was new to their job at that
2	point.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. Right. Okay. And so, there
4	were issues also with the response time to events?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. Work orders get categorized under
6	the project agreement as to what their response time and rectification time are, and
7	some of that was unclear, again, partly through how they were prioritized or entered by
8	the person or persons entering them, and also how they were interpreted by the people
9	reading them.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And last question before the
11	break, the score cards we went through, they were considered confidential, right?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
13	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: The trial running score cards.
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: In fact, am I right that, aside from
16	the pass/fail outcome, what happened in that trial running review team was deemed to
17	be confidential?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. From the outset, the general
19	agreement and understanding was what was discussed and recorded in the trial running
20	review team meetings and in that meeting room stayed in that meeting room until the
21	end of trial running. At the time, there was a situation where information, detailed
22	information about the project was getting leaked into the media, and the media had
23	information that was not in the public domain, and there was a very conscious decision
24	that we didn't we collectively, the City, OLRTC, RTG, all parties, didn't want these
25	score cards getting out into the public domain until trial running had completed.
26	And so, we took the decision long before the process started that
27	we would the people in the room would know what was going on each day, and the
28	seniors, be it Board members and executives, would be told if it was a pass or a fail, but

they would not get to see the detail of the score card or the content of the score card 1 until after trial running was completed. 2 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: So, even senior management, your 3 CEO ---4 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. I mean, my CEO asked me, 5 and I flatly refused, but I would tell him if it was a pass or a fail. The same with Board 6 members at ExCo from RTG and OLRTC, none of them received those score cards. 7 8 Some of them probably hadn't seen them until this inquiry started. 9 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: And your expectation was that that would be the case on the City side as well? Mr. Manconi or others wouldn't seen them? 10 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. 11 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And, again, you said there were 12 concerns about leak. What was the concern about that information getting out? 13 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, because any information, but 14 15 obviously, this was -- this information was -- at the time, the political pressure and the 16 media pressure was, I guess, peaking, and you know, there had been a very public announcement about RSA, and, you know, there were media statements about the 12 17 days starting, and how each was going to go, and Mr. Manconi had made a public 18 statement, I can't remember if it was at FEDCO or at Transit Commission, saying that 19 the media would not be told what the score would be on a day-to-day basis, and they 20 would found out at the end of the 12 days. But he had already set those ground rules 21 22 publicly. And so, it was very important that we ensured that everything stayed within the 23 project. 24 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Thank you. I think we'll take the morning break, Mr. Commissioner. 25 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN**: That's fine. We'll take the break. 26 27 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Thank you. So, we'll be back in 15 minutes, Mr. Slade. 28

1	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. The Commission will recess
2	for 15 minutes.
3	Upon recessing at 10:34 a.m.
4	Upon resuming at 10:53 a.m.
5	THE REGISTRAR: The hearing has resumed.
6	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Please proceed.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Thank you. Hi, Mr. Slade.
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Hello.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. I'm going to take you to an
LO	email that you received on June 24th, 2019, mapping out what, at that point in time, was
l1	devised as the plan, I think, for RSA and revenue service. So, RTC 00885419.0001. I'll
L2	say that again. It's a long number. RTC 00885419.0001.
L3	EXHIBIT NO. 138:
L4	RTC00885419.0001 – RE: RTG Executive Committee
L5	Meeting – 24 June 2019
L6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. So, this is an email, you'll
L7	see, from Peter Lauch and you are amongst the list of recipients, do you see?
L8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
L9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And it's dated I think we
20	see the top right corner, as I said, June 24 th , 2019, and it's being sent to ExCo, which I
21	understand to be RTG's executive committee, right?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Right.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Just based on the subject line.
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay. The recipients are not all I don'
25	believe are all RTG executive committee members.
26	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Some of them were?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Some of them were, and some of them
οQ	were executive committee members for OLRTC

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Got it. Okay. So, it's being sent to
2	both, effectively, or members of both, at least.
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Members of both.
4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And Mr. Lauch indicates that
5	the City wants, and RTG, an executive committee called this Friday, right?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: First line? Okay. And then when
8	he says, "Matt and I met with John Manconi and team today," do you know if that's in
9	reference to you?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I assume so. I don't think we had any
11	other Matthews on the project at the time.
12	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Got it. So, you would have met, it
13	appears, with John Manconi and his team "today to map out some key dates," right?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: "Steve Kanellakos and John
16	Manconi will want to hear from ExCo that we are all aligned"?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then it says "the dates are,"
19	and I'll go through some of them with you. So, how do those dates come about, if you
20	recall that meeting or the surrounding circumstances?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, I don't specifically remember the
22	meeting, and so, it's hard for me to say anything, really. I think I mean, the dates are
23	there, and I can't recall whether they were proposed by us or proposed by the City.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. That was going to be my
25	question, if they came from the City or you, and you don't recall.
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Some of them would have come from us,
27	certainly, because some of them, the City so, for instance, the third one there, July
28	8 th , Thales safety certificate for software in hand and upgraded, et cetera. So, that

_	would have come from us as they were our subcontractor.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay.
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: But I think these were probably worked
4	out collectively as to, you know, what the final few weeks of the project would look like,
5	trying to map out the final steps.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And what you have there is
7	July 9 th would be the plan for when RTG would submit a new substantial completion
8	application and commit to a revenue service availability date of August 16 th ?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
LO	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, this is before any trial
l1	running takes place, right?
L2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
L3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And it effectively, at least as a plan,
L4	boxes you in in terms of trial running, and how long that would go on for?
L5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: As the word is tentative, but it does. And
L6	I think, for me, the more telling one is the one before July 10 th where the City publicized
L7	the RSA date.
L8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Correct, and I was going to ask you
L9	about that. So, FEDCO meeting, and the plan is that you'll submit or RTG will submit
20	the new substantial completion application on the 9 th , and on the 10 th , in relation to a
21	FEDCO meeting, the City will publicize the RSA date, right?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's what that says, yes.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And to be clear, that's not the
24	revenue service date, not the launch, but the
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
26	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: revenue service availability date
27	that Project Co. meets? And, again, that's before trial running, so to your point, making
Ω	that public would create some pressure, right, and box you in on that?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. By publicizing that, they are, I'm
2	going to say, predicting when trial running will both start with the July 13 th date, but also,
3	they are predicting it will be complete by the 16 th of August.
4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. Exactly. And so and here,
5	the tentative date for it to start was July 13 th ?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then, again, August
8	16 th , revenue service availability date.
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And beneath that, it says, "13 July
11	for trial running start is earliest date. OLRTC and RTM may want to use the week of
12	15 th July for practice runs and to make sure RTM is ready to take on the revenue
13	service support role," right?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, there was, at least at that time
16	in June, some thought that you might take a week to do practice runs before trial
17	running?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
19	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that didn't happen, right?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry?
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: That did not occur?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Not a week.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Not a week, yeah. Okay. And then
24	the next line is, "Committing to the date is important to the City as they need to book
25	drivers/schedules by 17th July for the three weeks of parallel bus/LRT service that will
26	start second week of September, which is linked to a 16 August RSA date," right?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, at that point in time, the

expectation, or from what I take, the City's plan is to have four weeks between RSA and 1 revenue service, right? To the extent that you have service starting the second week of 2 September and RSA being scheduled for August 16th? I guess that could be 3 somewhere between three and four weeks. 4 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yeah, I -- yes. 5 6 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. 7 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, I had -- I don't -- I'm just reading 8 this email again for, you know, the first time since whenever it was sent. 9 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. MR. MATTHEW SLADE: "Three weeks of parallel bus/LRT service 10 that will start the second week of September." Okay. 11 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Had that been your understanding 12 in terms of what the City's plan was in respect of the time that they would have as 13 between the RSA date and the start of public service? 14 15 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That wasn't my understanding, but ---16 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:** What was your understanding, sir? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, I think I said it when we had our 17 previous conversation. I think my understanding was that I understand it might be out of 18 date order, but my understanding was that Mr. Manconi, and I can't remember when, 19 whether it was at that July 10th FEDCO meeting or whether it was a different one, he 20 had been -- he had publicly stated they need 4 weeks after RSA to get ready for 21 22 revenue service. So I was always expecting that to be a minimum because I talked 23 about earlier about betting in and what have you. I know it was in their gift, but even 24 four weeks, I would have thought would have been short. And I know also, although it came -- I'm pretty sure it came after 25 this email, there was the letter that we discussed earlier where the City changed the 26 27 service level where we would be starting with 13 trains, which said the City intended to

start revenue service in Q4 of 2019.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. And I'll take you to that letter
2	in a minute. But what did you understand needed to be done within that period of time
3	between RSA and revenue service, or what were the City's intentions, to the extent you
4	knew?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I didn't know at that time. I think at the
6	time of this email in June, I probably wasn't aware. As we were going through trial
7	running, or maybe it was even at the end of trial running, I understood that they were
8	going to be carrying on with running a I'm going to call it a simulated service because
9	there wouldn't be passengers on board, and they would be finalizing some
10	familiarization, I'll call it, with emergency services, whether that first responders, police,
11	fire, paramedics, et cetera, and they would be training continuing to train their staff,
12	and training and coaching what they referred to as their red-vest ambassadors, who
13	were the people that would be on the ground, at the stations, at the time of service
14	commencement to interact with the public, because the stations are actually unmanned.
15	They always plan to be unmanned, but the City had a plan to have staff there in the
16	short term of revenue service to help people familiarize themselves with how to get in
17	and out of the station, some of the stations along and have different access routes in
18	and out, depending on where you want to go to when you surface or when you leave
19	the station.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. So you expected at least
21	that they would be taking the time to familiarize everybody with the system and getting
22	ready for a public launch; right?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And public launch being, of course,
25	a City decision, not anything that Project Co. has anything to do with?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And this timeline that we've just
28	looked at in this email, that wasn't met; right?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, wasn't met, no.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Was not, yes, sorry. But was there
3	subsequently another similar plan with revised dates to your recollection?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't recall. I would be I would
5	expect there to have been, but I honestly cannot recall.
6	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay.
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: You were once I guess once trial
8	running had started or thereabouts, you know, from July, or not long after this, OLRTC
9	and RTT, all the parties were meeting on a more frequent basis. And when I say more
10	frequent, it was probably more than weekly. Sometimes we would meet two or three
11	times a week. To go through a schedule of this nature, we talked about the RAMP
12	meetings and, you know, we would go through their ready-for-rail steps. I don't know
13	what you call them, but their ready-for-rail steps, and they would have dates and things
14	in. So we would monitor this, the City would monitor it, and we would have input to it
15	from here on in, I guess.
16	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And, for instance, so here
17	we had July 9 th as the date on which RTG would submit its new substantial completion
18	application. Do you recall that was actually done on July 26 th ?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I believe so.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And the City I believe accepted the
21	same day. If we could take this document down and pull up RTG00332043? I'll say it
22	again, RTG00332043.
23	EXHIBIT No. 139:
24	RTG00332043 – Sustantial Completion Notice – 26 July
25	2019
26	And this is just the cover email, but indicating Mr. Morgan from
27	the City sorry, indicating to Ms. Monica Sechiari, who was the independent certifier,
28	and Mr. Lauch that,

1	"As detailed in an independent letter, the City's
2	opinion is that RTG has satisfied the conditions for
3	issuance of the substantial completion certificate."
4	(As read)
5	Right? So this was on July 26th, we see from the top; right?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And I just want to know, he
8	indicates,
9	"Separately, we agree that the substantial completion
10	certificate can be issued in advance of the minor
11	deficiency list." (As read)
12	And do I take it from that that the minor deficiency list hadn't yet
13	quite been finalized or
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, the minor deficiency list, as I know
15	you now, is a very long document and was I'm going to use the word fluid, because as
16	fast as things were being added, we were also closing things out. But I think I'm not a
17	hundred percent certain, but I think the reason it was probably a little bit afterwards is
18	because one of the components of the minor deficiency list is actually pricing the work
19	that's on it. And because there are well, there are contractual reasons for that, and I
20	think and obviously that has to be signed off and agreed by the independent certifier.
21	And that minor deficiency list covered both fixed infrastructure and vehicles as well,
22	which I know you're aware of.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: M'hm.
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I suspect it was just the fact that there
25	was still you know, it was a very fluid document. We were working every single day to
26	try and reduce the number of items on it, and obviously, adjust prices and
27	accordingly, and make sure that, I guess at the point in time, it gets frozen and agreed.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so despite substantial

completion not being applied for on July 9th as the previous email indicated, but instead 1 on July 26th, am I right, and I'll just take you to a document if you don't recall, but that 2 this -- at this time, the City is still -- or there's still a timeline that's being -- that the City is 3 still looking to, which is the same RSA date of August 16th ---4 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** I believe that was the case, yes. 5 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Yes? Okay. So and let's just go to 6 a letter, RTG00400436.0001. 7 8 --- EXHIBIT No. 140: 9 RTG00400436.0001 – RE: Revenue Service Requirement for Q4, 2019 – 31 July 2019 10 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:** So this is a letter dated July 31st, 11 2019. And if we go to the bottom, it's from Mr. Morgan, writing to RTG, and you'll see 12 there back towards the top that the anticipated RSA date is, in the City's mind, still 13 August 16th, 2019; right? 14 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 15 16 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so even though, as we've seen, substantial completion was only achieved later July -- not later than this, than 17 August 16th, but later than had originally been planned on July 26th? 18 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 19 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so that leaves still less time for 20 the trial running period; right, in terms of what -- in comparison to the original email --21 22 the email we saw where the plan had been laid out? 23 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, but I think it's important to 24 understand that RSA date did not constrain trial running. MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. 25 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Or it shouldn't have. 26 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Well, it did only to the extent that, 27 as we've seen, the criteria changed because ---28

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: you could see the everybody
3	could see the clock ticking; right?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And you've I take it this is the
6	letter you were referencing earlier where you said the City indicated its intention to
7	commence revenue service in early Q4.
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right? Of 2019?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so, you recalled that being your
12	expectation, and Q4 being October onwards, right?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's what I understand that to mean,
14	yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so, at that time, on July
16	31st, 2019, while the City appears to still be targeting an August 16th RSA date, it looks
17	as though it has at least considered pushing back the commencement of service from
18	the second week of September that was referred to in the earlier email to Q4, so
19	October, right?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That was how I interpreted that, yes.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: To have a month in between as
22	previously planned, or at least as you understood was planned, right?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. The four weeks that had previously
24	been publicly mentioned.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And yet, I think, as we know,
26	after this letter, and despite the fact that RSA was only notice of RSA was sent on
27	August 30 th , 2019, the City commenced service on September 14 th , 2019?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.

T	WIS. CHRISTINE WAINVILLE. 30, HOLIH Q4, HIGHL!
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: September 14th not being in Q4?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Do you know why the City made
6	that decision, that change?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, and no. I think we talked about it
8	before. It was a surprise. I used the word "shock," and when they announced
9	September the 14 th , Peter Lauch and I were there personally, and it was a shock. We
10	were not expecting that at all. So, I mean, it was in their gift to make it whatever day
11	they wanted it to be, so but I had always had an expectation that it would be a
12	minimum of four whatever date RSA was, whatever date, you know, that it would be
13	four weeks afterwards.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And you explained the
15	circumstances to me previously for how you learned about this, but can you just walk us
16	through?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Certainly. So, we had got to the end of
18	trial running successfully, based on the change criteria, and Mr. Manconi and via the
19	Mayor's Office, as well, asked RTG and OLRTC if we could provide a I'm going to call
20	it a celebratory train ride for councilors, City staff, dignitaries, from one end of the line to
21	the other end of the line, culminating in a I'm going to call it a meeting, but a gathering
22	at City Hall, which we did.
23	So, the City arranged a lot of staffing coordination with RTG and
24	OLRTC. We met at City Hall. We got on a bus, you know, one of the City OC Transpo
25	buses. We got driven to a train station. We boarded a train. We went all the way along
26	the alignment. The media were onboard. And we then went to City Hall where the
27	Mayor, Mr. Manconi, Transit Commission Chair Hubley, and some other people made
28	well, the Mayor made the announcement in City Hall that they would be opening on the

1	14 th of September, and that was the first we heard of it.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And your recollection, at least at the
3	time of your interview, was that this was around August 30 th that this would have taken
4	place?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think that was the date, from memory. I
6	mean, it's in the media. It's easy to find the date. There's photographs of everybody
7	onboard the train, and there's the photograph when the City asked us to give the Mayor
8	or asked Peter to give the Mayor a key in recognition of revenue service availability
9	being achieved.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And I just want to take you to
11	a letter well, the notice of RSA which was sent on August 30th, 2019. COW0159308
12	So, you'll see this being the revenue service availability notice sent
13	to Mr. Morgan on August 30 th ?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And just at the end, it does
16	reference a September 14 th , 2019, revenue service date, if we go to the third page?
17	All right. Here, "We trust that the" this is Mr. Lauch writing this
18	letter, "We trust that the above satisfies the requirements for revenue service
19	availability, and we look forward to the official launch of the Confederation Line on
20	Saturday, September 14 th , 2019."
21	So, do I take it from your evidence that this date was that Mr.
22	Lauch would have learned about this date on the same day as well?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. That was my understanding.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Because he, at least,
25	appears to know, by the time he sends this letter, that that's the public launch date.
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, that was this letter might have
27	been sent after that announcement.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And is it accurate to say that

T	OLK TO was not consulted about the public launch date?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
3	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Was RTG, to your knowledge?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And do you have any
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't think so, but I don't know.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Similarly, do you have any
8	knowledge of whether Alstom was consulted?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think the first time we all knew about it
10	was when the Mayor made that announcement and it hit the news that day.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And we can bring this down,
12	thank you.
13	How were the trains running during the two what effectively
14	became, I think, a two-week period between RSA and revenue service, right?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
16	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: How were the trains running during
17	that period of time?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think they were improving. I think there
19	were still issues, but I think they were improving.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Do you recall in your interview
21	indicating there were good days and bad days?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that's fair? And you, in fact,
24	indicated that was putting it politely?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. I think when they were bad days,
26	they were very bad, and when they were good, they were, you know, very good. There
27	was not often an in-between, I think is the best way to describe it. It was either great or
28	it was bad.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. It was apparent, though, that
2	there would be reliability issues going into service, right?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And did it continue to be apparent
5	that maintenance was not fully ready?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: In my opinion, yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And do you have anything to
8	say about an assertion that there may not have been clarity from RTG on the state of
9	the system to the City?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I'm not sure I understand the question.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, if one of the I believe it was
12	Parsons a witness from Parsons indicated that they were not sure there was clarity
13	from RTG about the state of the system going into revenue service or RSA. From your
14	perspective, what was the level of transparency, if you will, or clarity about the state of
15	the system for the City?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think it was 100 per cent clear. I think
17	what everyone needs to remember is that the well, it depends on whether you're
18	differentiating the City from OC Transpo. OC Transpo, part of the City, are operating
19	the trains, i.e., they're providing all the drivers, light rail operators, electric rail operators.
20	They're providing all the control room staff and all the team and leadership team that
21	manage all of that. So, they're all heavily involved.
22	And the City, as well, all the way up the chain, is also aware. And
23	we we were meeting probably daily. If we weren't meeting daily, we were certainly
24	exchanging correspondence and phone calls daily. Everyone was acutely aware of the
25	situation that was evolving on a daily basis.
26	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: From your perspective
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No one was hiding anything. It was plain
28	to see. The media could see it. Everyone could see it. Everyone could see when

SLADE

1 trains were stationary, stuck, not moving, whatever, or when, you know, there was -- it was highly visible, you know. Yeah, I don't really know what else to say. I don't think --2 no one was hiding anything, and I don't think it was possible to hide anything. 3 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: In terms of maintenance 4 preparedness, is it your view that the City and/or OC Transpo had visibility into the lack 5 6 of maintenance preparedness? 7 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think the City and OC Transpo had 8 visibility of everything, yes. 9 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Their consultants and the City were -- we 10 shared the same building. They were there onsite. There was -- we were having daily 11 meetings. I don't think there was any -- like I said, they were -- everyone was 12 participating in those meetings; everyone was represented and everybody knew what 13 was happening. 14 15 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:** Do you believe the operators were 16 ready to address incidents on the line when revenue started? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't think so; I'd like to make a 17 clarification when we say "operators". 18 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: M'hm. 19 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** So you have – I can just mention, so 20 you have – they call themselves "EROs", "electric rail operators", which are the train 21 22 drivers and then you have control room operators who are actually in the main control 23 room operating the control system and operating the wider system. 24 I think they were, much like we have the bathtub curve that we've talked about with regards to reliability, you also have the reverse of that; you have a 25 learning curve; so the resources that were in those roles. And they were all relatively 26 27 new to the job and to the system and I think there was a steep learning curve, and I think it's at that point that we went into service. I think we were still quite a way down 28

1

the beginning of that learning curve.

MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that had an impact in terms of 2 the time needed to resolve issues after the start service; right? 3 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I think the lack of familiarity with 4 the system compounded some of the issues that we had that were reliability. 5 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Because eventually over time that 6 7 response time improved quite significantly; correct? 8 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** Yes. And I – you know, even this week 9 we are still seeing similar reliability issues on certain components that we saw in 2019, but in 2019 it would have an impact on the service that would affect it for tens of 10 minutes, if not hours. And when they impact it now this week, you either don't notice 11 the impact at all or its less than ten minutes, quite often less than five minutes. And I 12 think that is a reflection of the fact that everybody has learned how the system works 13 and how to react to different situations. 14 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So both on the maintenance side 15 16 and the operational side; correct? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. All parties. 17 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:** All parties, okay. 18 Were OLRTC, or to your knowledge RTG, consulted about when 19 the parallel bus service should be cut off? 20 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No. 21 22 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:** Okay. Did anyone provide any 23 input to your recollection on that? 24 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I'm fairly certain – again, whether it was a RAMPM meeting or not, it was certainly in the RAMPM room. I'm fairly sure we had a 25 discussion about whether or not it was sensible to – I'm going to the use phrase "turn 26 27 them off" – turn all the buses off in one go rather than do it gradually. You know, we talked about a soft launch for the trains. There was a conversation about whether 28

1	turning the buses off all in one goal was a wise decision or whether or not that should
2	have been progressive. I certainly remember that conversation. But the City's decision
3	was to turn them all off in one go.
4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Of the second application
5	for substantial completion
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: am I right that some of the items
8	that had been deemed critical for RSA in respect of that application, so critical to be
9	completed prior to RSA, I understand some of those made it to the term sheet; correct?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I believe so.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And the term sheet being the
12	agreement that was entered into between the City and RTG to achieve RSA despite
13	certain requirements of the project agreement not having been met; right?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So those were not completed prior
16	to RSA or indeed prior to revenue service; is that your understanding?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And if we could bring up the term
19	sheet just for a moment, that's RTG00151032. You would have been familiar with those
20	even though RTG signs it; correct?
21	EXHIBIT No. 141:
22	RTG00151032 – Revenue Service Availability Term Sheet
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And I just want to go to a couple of
25	items with you. If we go to the second page, first we see the agreement that ultimately
26	is achieved for RTG to be permitted to achieve revenue service availability with 13
27	double-car trains available for use during morning peak period service as opposed to
28	15?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And then "completion of trial
3	running", the third row there:
4	"RTG will be permitted to successfully complete trial running when
5	it achieves a target availability of 96 per cent on nine out of 12 days
6	compared to 98 per cent as set out in RTG's test procedure dated
7	May 25 th , 2017, as agreed upon in RFI2066 dated May 11 th , 2017."
8	Right?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And so the fact that this was
11	included in the term sheet, is that a reflection of the fact that it was considered a
12	requirement, basically that the trial running procedure that had been agreed to, agreed
13	to, was effectively incorporated as a requirement that then had to be addressed in this
14	term sheet?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's my understanding.
16	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And just following up on that, from
17	your perspective would the City have been able to take the position that trial running
18	had not been successfully completed if the original criteria in the trial running procedure
19	had not been met?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, can you say that again?
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Sure. It's a bit of a convoluted
22	question. Let's say the criteria had not been changed.
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And the trial running review
25	procedure that you had originally devised and that had been agreed to by all parties,
26	had been in place.
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: If the requirements in there had no

1 been met, would the City have been able to take the position that OLRTC had not successfully completed trial running? 2 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 3 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:** Okay. Even though, for instance, 4 the 98 or 96 per cent and those metrics are not in the PA, the project agreement itself? 5 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's an interesting thought. I think, 6 7 you know, they signed off on the procedure – I mean from my perspective, that was the 8 case. You know, if you didn't achieve the metrics – you know, trial running, like I said 9 before, it could have gone on for six months. It would have taken as long as it would have taken to achieve the metrics that were in there. That was my thought process. 10 And I'm pretty sure at a point in time that I had said to someone that, you know, this 11 could take six months. And so the fact that the PA wasn't prescriptive with regards to 12 the percentages; I mean it was a gap in the PA. But we wrote that document to close 13 that gap. 14 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** Right. And that was done jointly. 15 16 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE:** Right. And that's effectively what I'm trying to get at, because of course you're not a lawyer interpreting the project 17 agreement or what could have, in law, been sufficient or not, but in terms of OLRTC's 18 perspective, it was holding itself to the criteria that had been agreed to with the City, 19 right, in terms of achievement of trial running? 20 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 21 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. 22 23 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It was – if you compare it to all of the 24 testing that we did in testing commissioning – and I want to make sure everyone understands, I know you do, that trial running is not part of testing commissioning, it 25 comes afterwards. But all those tests that we did for testing commissioning, we, 26 27 OLRTC, wrote those test procedures with our supply chain, with who ever it might have been who was involved in those subsystems. And then we scored ourselves against 28

1 those. And that is the same process the trial running would have taken. We wrote a test procedure – well, it wasn't a test – we wrote a procedure and with a pass or fail 2 criteria, and we scored ourselves against it. It's no different from the testing 3 commissioning. We write a test that has a pass/fail criteria and you either pass or you 4 don't. 5 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Which is why, I take it, the criteria 6 7 had to be formally changed and agreed to, right, midway through to change the ---MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 8 9 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: Effectively, ORLTC, am I right, never told the City, you know, we don't need to meet the criteria, whether in the trial 10 running procedure or the RFI, because they're not in the PA? 11 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. We never challenged -- I'm not 12 aware of us ever challenging the contractual position of the PA with regards to trial 13 running or it's scoring. 14 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then if we just scroll 15 down a little bit, you'll see the term sheet also provides for RTG meeting to provide 16 additional -- or some vehicle technicians, as well as door technicians, right? 17 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 18 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that's because of some of the 19 issues that were not fully addressed or that remained outstanding? 20 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 21 22 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: And then if you go to the next page, I just want to ask about MSF maintenance equipment, and RTG needing to provide an 23 24 updated execution plan for the maintenance of the MSF equipment, including the wheel lathe, car wash, and other planned equipment. What did that address? 25 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE**: So, as it says there, so the MSF is the 26 27 maintenance facility at Belfast Road where all the maintenance is done to the trains,

and it's where the maintenance organization is based. So, that's RTM and Alstom. OC

28

Transpo are in that building as well for booking on and off their drivers. 1 But as part of the maintenance for the vehicles, there are some key 2 pieces of equipment. So, the wheel lathe that's listed there, the car wash, which is 3 exactly what it says, and there are other critical pieces of equipment that are used to 4 maintain the rolling stock of the trains. 5 And there was -- if I recall correctly at the time, the RTM 6 7 subcontractor Alstom had been quite vocal about some of that equipment not being fully 8 operational, or being -- the reliability of the performance of that equipment not being 9 ideal. And so, this was a measure that the City wanted to put in place such that they couldn't -- people couldn't claim that the equipment was the cause of any delays or 10 impairment to service. 11 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, this was to be done by 12 September 9th, so ahead of the start of service, right? 13 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It was to provide the execution plan by 14 September ---15 16 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Oh, I see. Right. Yes, okay. So, there would have still been ---17 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry. 18 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: No, go ahead. 19 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yeah. It was -- so, a lot of that 20 equipment is very specialist. A lot of it is not sourced in Canada, and, as a result, 21 22 technicians and people that specialized in that were having to be flown in from other 23 countries. So, at the time, it was a plan -- it was more about a plan about how the 24 equipment is kept operable a hundred per cent of the time. So, it was about service agreements or technicians coming to create -- undertake service work just to make sure 25 that the availability of that equipment was a hundred per cent. 26 27 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, do I understand that for some period of time after service started, there were some -- still some issues with this 28

1	equipment?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: There was a need to call in technicians
3	post revenue service, yes.
4	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And then just on the next
5	page, there is a provision for increased monitoring that RTG needs to pay for by
6	increased monitoring to be performed by STV
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: in relation to ongoing vehicle
9	maintenance monitoring, as well as Deloitte in relation to IMIRS monitoring?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
11	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And why was that required?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, as you stated, so part of it was
13	down to the performance of the vehicles, and I think with regards to IMIRS, it was more
14	of an audit process because, you know, we had seen during trial running that there
15	were, you know, I'm going to say issues with it. It's a piece of software that spoke for
16	the job that manages a number of things, but it was it was a case of having, I assume
17	I think from recollection, an audit function over that to make sure — because it affected
18	the payment mechanism — to make sure that everything was being processed
19	correctly.
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Am I right that there were
21	significant retrofits left to be done, both in terms of quantum and scale at the time of
22	RSA?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And the
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, you're talking about you're
26	talking about trains?
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Yes. Yes.
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And the sneer volume of the
2	retrofits that would need to be done in the MSF subsequent to RSA proved to be an
3	issue, correct?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: I think you indicated it was never
6	envisaged that you would be doing that work while trying to achieve service on a daily
7	basis, right?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that's reflected by the fact or
10	the issues, the challenges that were encountered, is reflected by the fact that more than
11	two and a half years later, final completion has not been met, right? There is still some
12	outstanding modifications to be made?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And that tells you something, I
15	expect, about the magnitude of the work that was deferred?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Partly. I think it's been compounded
17	and, I guess, delayed, extended, whatever word you want to use, for a number of
18	reasons, and it's not just the sheer volume of work that needed to be done. Part of it is
19	down to the other issues that the system has encountered that have delayed that
20	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right.
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: and the reason why we're here today.
22	But there are a host of reasons as to why as to what has caused the delay in that
23	regard.
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. Got it. Okay. And we can
25	take this down. I just want to take you to one last document, which is the RAMP report
26	that I believe OC Transpo would devise. That's COW0435176.
27	EXHIBIT NO. 142:
28	COW0435176 - RAMP Final Report to Program Management

1	Team - 17 July 2019
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Do you recall, were these the
3	reports that were issued for the purpose of RAMP meetings? So, if we go down a little
4	bit maybe
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: They were presented. I don't know if
6	they were we never they weren't issued to us.
7	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. They you basically
8	people went through these presentations during RAMP meetings that you attended?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And this one, I believe, says
11	it's the final report, status as of July 17 th , 2019. And do you recall that this included a
12	list of items that needed to be done from the City's perspective to be ready for rail?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I think so.
14	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: And let's just go to slide 4. Do you
15	recall this list, the Go/No Go list?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Not specifically, and I think you asked
17	me about this when we met before, and I asked if this is the document that I thought -
18	but I thought the whole document was what you meant when you referred to the Go/No
19	Go list. I didn't remember it being one specific slide within the slide deck. I thought it
20	was the whole document.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right.
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's why I was unsure whether you
23	meant the RAMP slide deck or this. I don't remember this specific slide, but
24	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay, yeah, I didn't take
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't remember the title. Let me put it
26	that way. I certainly remember the contents.
27	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. You do remember going
28	through this list at RAMP meetings?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Vaguely, yes.
2	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And I just well, first of all,
3	was it your understanding that these were things the items the City was tracking and
4	that, from their perspective, was required in terms of going into service, so Go/No Go
5	into service?
6	Okay. And I just want to ask you about a couple of items on well,
7	first of all, under vehicles, "Trains ready as per vehicle minimum operating standard."
8	Do you know what that standard is?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, the so, again, you will have
10	learned the railway is full of acronyms. We call that VMOS, V-M-O-S, and there is a
11	it's an Alstom document that is, I believe, agreed with the City that lists the I guess the
12	simplest way to describe it is the minimum condition that the vehicle can go into service
13	in on a daily basis.
14	So, every train, I mentioned earlier, is inspected before it goes into
15	service at 3:00 in the morning, 4:00 in the morning, and we RTM Alstom provides
16	RTM, RTM provides the City with, I'm going to say, 15 sheets for 15 trains. They
17	provide more because they have spares and whatever. They might provide 18 sheets,
18	at which you'll have the status of those vehicles.
19	And then the other thing that the VMOS includes is, again, I'm
20	going to simply it slightly.
21	So, the trains are highly technical and very clever, and they will tell
22	via the control, via the display in the cab, it will come up with codes, a bit like your
23	dashboard in your car. It will give you alarms and what have you. And those alarms,
24	we call them IOS codes, they have, depending on the severity of them, will determine
25	whether the train stays in service until the end of the line or needs to be removed from
26	service. And so, that document is a document that is it was presented by Alstom
27	originally and it was agreed at different levels, depending on those levels of issues with
28	the vehicle.

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay.
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It's quite those documents exist at
3	most I would say all transit agencies, but it is bespoke to that agency that to their
4	vehicle.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And I take it that was ready
6	without knowing, you know, on any given day whether it was met, but when the trains
7	went into service, there was an expectation they can meet that standard?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. They wouldn't go into service
9	otherwise.
10	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. Okay. And then in terms of
11	systems, if we just go down a little bit, in terms of the City's expectations that the
12	systems be ready such that there were no major impacts to customer experience, would
13	you say that that was ultimately met or not?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: You think it was met despite the
16	reliability concerns that we have discussed?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
18	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: So, you didn't expect major impacts
19	to customer experience after the trains went into service?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
21	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And in terms of the radio
22	systems, tunnel ventilation systems, train control, and traction power are 100 per cent
23	operational
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: am I right that they weren't, in
26	fact, at least the traction power wasn't 100 per cent operational?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, I think they were all 100 per cent
28	operational, and the comment there which says, "train control Thales", I mean, the

1 system was operational because we were using it, but it was awaiting a final software release, which was due to be released just before revenue service, which is quite 2 normal for signalling systems. You run on a -- you know, you are continually running on 3 a test piece of software, for want of a better term, and then at the point of which you are 4 ready to go into service, then you either put a patch onto it to pick up on any bugs that 5 you've got, or you do, you know, a revenue service release, which is what this was for. 6 7 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Okay. And so, that was effectively 8 resolved and operational when the trains went into service, even if issues were 9 encountered potentially later on, on some of these systems, right? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 10 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: Okay. And then just the last one, 11 "System performance during trial running is sufficiently robust/resilient to absorb service 12 impacts." 13 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 14 MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Would you agree with me that the 15 16 City perhaps did away with that item at the time of revenue service? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think you would have to ask the City. I 17 think from -- and I can't -- I can't -- I genuinely can't tell you. What I would say with 18 regards to this is that the system was robust and resilient. And like we talked about 19 maybe five minutes ago, a lot of it was about how the system was being operated. 20 **MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE**: Right. But that was something that 21 22 was to be ---23 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE**: We are still seeing issues this week that 24 we saw in 2019, but it's the way it is being managed and operated, and that has changed through skills and learning and everything else. So, I don't think the 25 robustness and the resilience of the system hasn't changed in that period of time 26 27 dramatically. So, the system that was installed is the same system that was installed in 2019. 28

1	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: But trial running was meant to, in
2	part, demonstrate that all the systems, including the operational and maintenance
3	response time, were at least to the City's satisfaction?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Right. Okay. And, as we
6	discussed, there were those systems were not entirely ready. They have made a lot
7	of progress since, right?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
9	MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: Those are all my questions. Thank
LO	you very much, Mr. Slade.
l1	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Thank you,c. Mr. Slade,
L2	you are going to be now questioned by a number of lawyers for various participants in
L3	the inquiry. The first is the City of Ottawa.
L4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Understood.
L5	MR. PETER WARDLE: Thank you. Peter Wardle, last name W-A-
L6	R-D-L-E, for the City of Ottawa.
L7	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PETER WARDLE:
L8	MR. PETER WARDLE: Good morning, Mr. Slade.
L9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Good morning.
20	MR. PETER WARDLE: I wanted to start, Mr. Slade, if I can, with
21	some background. You became systems director at OLRTC in April of 2018, correct?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
23	MR. PETER WARDLE: And project director in July of 2019?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
25	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you were there, as I think you told my
26	friend, right through the critical stages of the project?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: In that time period, yes.
Ω	MR PETER WARDLE: And you are familiar with the project

Т	agreement, correct?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
3	MR. PETER WARDLE: And I just want to review very quickly
4	some key concepts with you to start. So, first of all, RTG and OLRTC, through the
5	dropdown construction contract, have responsibility for design and construction of the
6	project, correct?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the schedule was OLRTC's obligation
9	correct?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
11	MR. PETER WARDLE: The customer, that is the City, or the
12	owner, had no ability to direct OLRTC to make changes to its schedule, fair?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MR. PETER WARDLE: And, in addition, the City had no ability to
15	direct OLRTC to make changes to its means and methods of carrying out the work,
16	correct?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
18	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the project agreement gave, and I
19	know you don't have it in front of you and it's a big document, but it gave RTG
20	responsibility for systems integration. Do you recall that?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I believe so, yes.
22	MR. PETER WARDLE: And substantial completion was a defined
23	milestone in the project agreement?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MR. PETER WARDLE: And there were criteria, and again, I am
26	not going to take you to them in the interest of time, but there were criteria that RTG had
27	to meet to obtain or achieve substantial completion, both for the track, the infrastructure,
28	and the vehicles, correct?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MR. PETER WARDLE: And there were specific requirements set
3	out in a commissioning schedule, correct?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MR. PETER WARDLE: Is it fair to say that RTG and its
6	subcontractor, OLRTC, had to make a professional assessment as to whether RTG
7	could meet the requirements of substantial completion?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, could you ask that again?
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: I will. I will ask it a little more slowly.
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Thank you.
11	MR. PETER WARDLE: Is it fair to say that RTG and OLRTC had
12	to make a professional assessment as to whether RTG could meet the requirements of
13	substantial completion?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MR. PETER WARDLE: And to put it another way, it would be
16	inappropriate to apply for substantial completion if RTG did not believe it had met the
17	criteria; is that fair?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
19	MR. PETER WARDLE: And following substantial completion, and
20	know I am doing some very basic stuff here, but the next milestone for RTG was
21	revenue service availability, correct?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MR. PETER WARDLE: And there were a series of and you may
24	not remember this, but there were seven conditions. Do you recall that?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I do.
26	MR. PETER WARDLE: And that included compliance with the
27	testing and commissioning requirements of the project agreement, correct?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.

1	MR. PETER WARDLE: And one of those was trial running, right?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
3	MR. PETER WARDLE: And it is not the City's obligation to pass
4	trial running, correct, it is OLRTC's obligation?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Everyone involved was obligated to
6	pass.
7	MR. PETER WARDLE: Well, but the obligation under the project
8	agreement, is it not fair to say, that it is RTG, and then of course this drops down to
9	OLRTC, that has to satisfy the criteria for trial run?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
11	MR. PETER WARDLE: And then at the end of the process, RTG
12	and OLRTC advise the City that they have met the requirements of revenue service
13	availability, correct?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
15	MR. PETER WARDLE: The City provides its own opinion, correct?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
17	MR. PETER WARDLE: And ultimately, the independent certifier
18	provides a certificate of RSA if she determines that the conditions have been satisfied,
19	correct?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the very phrase "revenue service
22	availability" means that the system is ready for passenger service; correct?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MR. PETER WARDLE: In fact, what it means is that it's safe and
25	fit for its intended use; fair?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
27	MR. PETER WARDLE: There's nothing in the project agreement
28	that suggests that the City had some obligation to conduct its own testing of the system

1	after it was handed over by RTG; correct?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
3	MR. PETER WARDLE: I just want to talk for a minute about
4	political and financial pressure. Now you've been involved in a number of projects, Mr.
5	Slade; correct?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I have.
7	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And isn't it the case that there's
8	often pressure to open?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MR. PETER WARDLE: And in this case, you said, "Everyone
11	wanted to get it finished. To get it finished, it was in no one's interest to delay it at all."
12	Do you recall saying that?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MR. PETER WARDLE: And that's particularly the case, I'm going
15	to suggest to you, when a project has been delayed; fair?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Fair.
17	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you're familiar with the Crossrail
18	project that I understand you worked on?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I did.
20	MR. PETER WARDLE: And there were delays with that project,
21	significant delays; correct?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
23	MR. PETER WARDLE: And do you recall that the owner on that
24	project, Transport for London, was unhappy with the delays?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MR. PETER WARDLE: Just like the owner in this case was
27	unhappy; correct?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.

1	MR. PETER WARDLE: And just like in this case, in Crossrail,
2	there was significant media attention and criticism?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I believe so.
4	MR. PETER WARDLE: And I'm going to suggest that it's not
5	uncommon to have that kind of pressure on these large infrastructure projects, and it's
6	simply a pressure the team has to deal with; is that fair?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, can you say that again?
8	MR. PETER WARDLE: I'm going to suggest it's not uncommon to
9	have that kind of pressure on these large projects, and it's simply a pressure the team
10	has to deal with?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay. Yes.
12	MR. PETER WARDLE: And similarly, when the project is behind,
13	there can be financial pressure on the contractor; fair?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MR. PETER WARDLE: And your obligation as project director was
16	to act in a professional manner and not cut corners; correct, Mr. Slade?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
18	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you didn't cut any corners on this
19	project; fair?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Fair.
21	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you certainly never told the City of
22	Ottawa that OLRTC was cutting corners; correct?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Definitely not.
24	MR. PETER WARDLE: I want to talk a little bit about some of the
25	delays and your evidence about soft launch. And first of all, I think we heard already
26	that you first became involved in the project in late 2017; is that correct?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MR. PETER WARDLE: And at the time you became involved, I'm

going to suggest that RTG had just advised the City that it was going to meet the initial 1 RSA date of May 2018; do you recall that? 2 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Quite possibly. I mean, I can't recall 3 specifically what they'd said on when I'd started to get involved, but I believe that's 4 5 probably the case ---MR. PETER WARDLE: And I'm not going to take you to the 6 7 specific letter, this would have been ---8 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay. MR. PETER WARDLE: --- a letter written in November 2017, and 9 just so we have it on the record, it's COW0523285, and it wasn't written by you. It was 10 written by one of your predecessors? 11 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, because I wasn't involved -- I wasn't 12 on the project at that time. 13 MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And in February 2018, RTG notified 14 15 the City that it was not going to be able to meet that date and proposed a new date of 16 November 2, 2018; do you recall that? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 17 MR. PETER WARDLE: And in fact, and I don't need to take you 18 through all the chronology because we've covered it with other witnesses, but that date 19 20 was never met: correct? **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** Which date? The November date? 21 MR. PETER WARDLE: The November date, that date ---22 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yeah. 23 MR. PETER WARDLE: --- was not met? 24 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. 25 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** And there were a series of other dates 26 27 proposed in 2019, and those dates were not met either; correct? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. 28

1	MR. PETER WARDLE: And as we know, RSA was not met until
2	late August of 2019; correct?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
4	MR. PETER WARDLE: Isn't it the case by that by the time you
5	became involved in the project, the City was developing major concerns about the
6	schedules it was receiving information about, and had brought in its own team of
7	experts to review the schedule?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know.
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: Do you recall that there was a group of
10	experts that Mr. Manconi brought in in 2018, which he called the independent
11	assessment team?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
13	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And isn't it fair, Mr. Slade, that the
14	purpose of bringing those folks in was to review and analyze the schedules that the City
15	was receiving updates on from OLRTC and RTG?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think that was part of their remit. I
17	wasn't aware it was their sole remit.
18	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And isn't it the case that over a
19	series of assessments, the independent assessment team concluded that OLRTC's
20	schedules were too optimistic?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know.
22	MR. PETER WARDLE: Well, weren't you present at meetings with
23	members of the independent assessment team during 2018, you and Mr. Lauch and
24	others?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I did attend meetings with the
26	independent assessment team, yes.
27	MR. PETER WARDLE: And don't you recall that at those meetings
28	the members of that team expressed skepticism about the schedules that were being

1	provided by your side?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
3	MR. PETER WARDLE: And I'm going to suggest to you that that's
4	the context for the first discussions you had with Mr. Manconi about a soft launch or a
5	partial opening, that there had been schedules proposed by OLRTC, and OLRTC had
6	consistently fallen behind those schedules. Do you agree with that or disagree, Mr.
7	Slade?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think that's fair.
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And I'm not trying to be difficult
10	here, but you and the RTG folks, and perhaps we should just focus on OLRTC, you
11	didn't have experience in running a rapid bus system; fair?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Fair. Well, I certainly didn't. I don't know
13	whether any of my colleagues did.
14	MR. PETER WARDLE: And Mr. Manconi and his scheduling staff
15	did have such experience; correct?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I assume so.
17	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And the proposal you made initially,
18	I'm going to suggest, according to the evidence you provided by way of your written
19	statement was that you raised in the late spring or early summer of 2018, a partial
20	opening of the system in the east end from Blair to the University of Ottawa. Do you
21	recall saying that in your interview?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MR. PETER WARDLE: And that was going to be six trains on a
24	loop between Blair and the University of Ottawa to get the system running and open, to
25	get the public familiar with it. Do you recall saying that?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't remember those precise words,
27	but it sounds right.
28	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And isn't it the case that running a

partial system in a loop between Blair and the University of Ottawa was not going to 1 assist people from the east end in getting to downtown Ottawa for work? 2 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** Sorry, I'm not sure I understand. 3 MR. PETER WARDLE: I'm suggesting to you that running a partial 4 system, as you suggested, in a loop between Blair and the University of Ottawa was not 5 going to assist people from the east end of Ottawa in getting downtown for work. 6 7 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I can't comment. I couldn't possibly 8 know the answer to that. 9 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** Well, that's exactly what I'm suggesting, you didn't know the answer to that because you weren't an expert in that field. That's 10 not your field of expertise; right? 11 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, I can't answer that because I don't 12 live in the east -- I don't know -- sorry, I -- okay. I don't understand what you're ---13 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** And didn't Mr. Manconi explain to you that 14 15 it would require multiple transfers for passengers to go from a bus system out in the 16 east end, running on an LRT system in a partial loop, and then having to go to another bus to get downtown; right? 17 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** That's what he said. 18 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** Right. And the bus schedule had already 19 been highly disruptive because of the construction that had gone on over the previous 20 21 four or five years; isn't that fair? 22 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I believe so. MR. PETER WARDLE: So isn't it the case that Mr. Manconi 23 24 turned you down for those reasons? **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** I think that's what he stated, yes. 25 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** And I'm going to suggest that there was 26 27 then another discussion and that was round September of 2018; and the reason I'm suggesting that date is because we have some documents that deal with that. And, 28

1	again, this would be you, I'm going to suggest, and probably Mr. Lauch; is that fair?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Possibly.
3	MR. PETER WARDLE: And in September 2018 it was becoming
4	clear that OLRTC wasn't going to meet the November 2018 date; correct?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
6	MR. PETER WARDLE: And one of the underground stations,
7	Rideau, was nowhere near completion; correct?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: You didn't have anywhere near all the
10	vehicles manufactured or through testing and commissioning; isn't that the case, in
11	September 2018?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
13	MR. PETER WARDLE: And what you and Mr. Lauch proposed to
14	Mr. Manconi, was a partial opening involving a modified fleet size, partial station
15	openings and reducing the requirements of trial running; do you recall that?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Vaguely, yes.
17	MR. PETER WARDLE: So I'm going to suggest that this wasn't
18	being done out of some suggestion on your side that the City needed a partial opening
19	or soft launch to test the system, it was being done because RTG and OLRTC were
20	behind and they were trying to revise and reduce the scope of work; isn't that right?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
22	MR. PETER WARDLE: But in any event, isn't it the case that the
23	City again said "No" and essentially for the same reasons, the City didn't want to put
24	additional stress on its passengers?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's what they stated.
26	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the City took the position that it was
27	entitled to insist on the bargain that had been struck in the project agreement; isn't that
28	fair?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's fair.
2	MR. PETER WARDLE: Let's talk for a moment, if we can, about
3	substantial completion. And I'm just going to take you through a little bit of the
4	chronology, Mr. Slade. So this project, as we heard I think a little bit about this morning,
5	RTG first applied for substantial completion in May of 2019?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MR. PETER WARDLE: And by that time RTG was almost a year
8	behind schedule; correct?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the City did not give a positive
11	opinion that substantial completion had been achieved; fair?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Fair.
13	MR. PETER WARDLE: In fact there's a lengthy letter, and we can
14	turn it up if you like, but there's a lengthy letter from Mr. Morgan setting out the City's
15	position and all the items that remained to be completed. Do you recall that letter?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I do.
17	MR. PETER WARDLE: And it's also correct, isn't it, that the
18	independent certifier agreed with the City's position and she had her own reasons for
19	rejecting RTG's application for substantial completion?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the result of the City taking that
22	position and the independent certifier agreeing, was that substantial completion was
23	delayed from May until July 26 th or 27 th , 2019; correct?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MR. PETER WARDLE: So is it fair to say that regardless of
26	political pressure, the City staff working on this project were doing their best to make
27	sure that RTG met the requirements of substantial completion?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.

1	MR. PETER WARDLE: And if that meant a further two month
2	delay, as it did in this case, the City was prepared to live with that delay; is that not fair?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
4	And ultimately as we know, RTG applied for substantial completion
5	a second time and you would have been involved in that because of the drop-down
6	obligations; correct?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MR. PETER WARDLE: And, again, you and your team reached a
9	professional judgment that RTG and OLRTC had met the requirements of the project
10	agreement with respect to substantial completion; correct?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
12	MR. PETER WARDLE: And now at this point, late July, the City
13	was satisfied that you had met the requirements; correct?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the independent certifier now agreed
16	correct?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
18	MR. PETER WARDLE: And there's a substantial completion
19	agreement, and maybe we can just turn that up for a moment, it is RTG00332043.0002,
20	if I have it right.
21	And I believe – we can go to the end of this document, but either
22	you signed this document or in any event – sorry – to the signature line.
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: This is the term sheet; right?
24	MR. PETER WARDLE: This is the substantial completion
25	agreement.
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, it's not; this is the term sheet.
27	MR. PETER WARDLE: I think if we go back up, Mr. Slade, we'll
28	see – let's go to the top. Oh, I'm sorry, we have the wrong document. Give me one

1	second and I'll find the right document.
2	(SHORT PAUSE)
3	MR. PETER WARDLE: Can I just ask – we'll put up the document
4	number again, because the document number I have for the substantial completion
5	agreement is RTG00332043.002.
6	EXHIBIT No. 143:
7	RTG00332043.0002 – Substantial Completion Agreement
8	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Stand by, please.
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: So, Mr. Slade, if we turn down to the
10	bottom of this document, to the signature lines, it doesn't appear that you signed it, but
11	you would be familiar with this document; correct?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I'm familiar with it and I did not sign it.
13	MR. PETER WARDLE: So if we go back to the front page of the
14	document, I'm going to suggest to you that if we go to the reference to "deferred works"
15	in the preamble; do you see the work described in Schedule "A" defined as "deferred
16	works"?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
18	MR. PETER WARDLE: And if we go to Schedule "A" to the
19	documents, which is three or four pages down, and I'll just scroll through it quickly so
20	you can see the topics. We're not going to spend a great deal of time on this, but you'll
21	see "vehicle cab doors". Go over to the next page you'll see the "platform edge
22	cameras". If we could scroll down, please. "Passenger information systems" and then
23	over on the last page there's a reference to "elevator and escalator licences"; do you
24	see that?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I do.
26	MR. PETER WARDLE: And I'm gong to suggest that there were
27	certain works, including the vehicle cab doors, the platform edge cameras, the
28	passenger information system and the elevators, and the plan was for these to be either

1	addressed or mitigated by the time of revenue service was for these to be either
2	addressed or mitigated by the time of revenue service availability?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
4	MR. PETER WARDLE: And if I'm going to suggest that if that
5	happened and those works were satisfactorily addressed or mitigated before revenue
6	service availability, it would not affect the safety of the system; correct?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
8	MR. PETER WARDLE: And nor would it affect the use or
9	enjoyment of the system by the public; fair?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Fair.
11	MR. PETER WARDLE: And could we describe this as a situation
12	where the parties were actually working collaboratively to categorize the deferred works
13	and deal with them in a responsible fashion?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MR. PETER WARDLE: And then I'm going to suggest to you, and
16	I won't take it up I won't take you to it, but by the time of RTG's letter that sets out its
17	revenue service availability notice on August the 30th, it indicates in that letter that those
18	that these issues, the deferred works, have been either resolved or mitigated.
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.
20	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. Let's just move, then we'll take
21	this document down. And I think you've already indicated to my friend that the very nex
22	step under the project agreement in obtaining revenue service availability after
23	substantial completion was trial running; correct?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you advised the City that it was your
26	intention to start trial running as soon as you got substantial completion.
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MR. PETER WARDLE: And again, OLRTC had to make its own

1	professional assessment as to whether it was ready for trial running; is that fair?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
3	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you said in your evidence, and I think
4	you repeated it to my friend today:
5	"on paper yes, on the basis that all the systems had
6	passed all necessary tests and the vehicles were all
7	tested and passed all the necessary tests"
8	That's what you said in your interview; correct?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
10	MR. PETER WARDLE: And then you did indicate that:
11	"their reliability was probably quite a way short of
12	where we were hoping that they would be at that
13	point."
14	Right?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
16	MR. PETER WARDLE: And
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Thinking about the vehicles.
18	MR. PETER WARDLE: Yeah. And isn't it also fair, though, that
19	reliability was improving, and you expected that it would continue to improve?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That was an expectation, yes.
21	MR. PETER WARDLE: And at the time of substantial completion,
22	and when you start trial running, there was nothing in writing from OLRTC to the City
23	stating that there were any issues with the reliability of the vehicles; correct?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't recall.
25	MR. PETER WARDLE: And it's fair to say, isn't it, that nobody on
26	your team wanted to cut corners in connection with trial running?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MR. PETER WARDLE: I'm going to, again, just quote from your

1	evidence in your interview:
2	"There was, you know, an alignment that the sooner
3	we had it done the better for everybody's sake, but
4	not at any cost. We weren't cutting any corners or
5	doing anything unsafe, or that wasn't agreed to or
6	acceptable."
7	Is that what you said during your interview?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: And that remains your evidence today, sir;
LO	correct?
L1	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: You have to say, "Yes".
L2	MR. PETER WARDLE: You have to say, "Yes".
L3	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Yes, sorry, Mr. Wardle.
L4	You have to say "Yes" or "No"; you can't just nod your head.
L5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry.
L6	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: We need to have it for the record.
L7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry.
L8	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Okay?
L9	MR. PETER WARDLE: And readiness or maintenance was also
20	an obligation of OLRTC and its subcontractor, RTM; correct?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: RTM is not a subcontractor of OLRTC.
22	RTM is subcontractor of RTG.
23	MR. PETER WARDLE: That's fair enough, but readiness for
24	maintenance was actually an obligation of RTG under the project agreement, right?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And as you said this morning, RTG
27	and its subcontractors had a 30-year maintenance obligation under the project
28	agreement.

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the project agreement provided for
3	payment on performance; correct?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I believe so.
5	MR. PETER WARDLE: So RTG and its contractors had to
6	determine whether they were ready to take on the maintenance function, and if they
7	weren't, they shouldn't have moved forward with RSA; isn't that right?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry; can you say that again?
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: RTG and its contractors had to determine
10	whether they were ready to take on the maintenance function, and if they weren't, they
11	shouldn't have moved forward with RSA; isn't that fair?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
13	MR. PETER WARDLE: I just want to deal quickly with the RAMP
14	process. And some of this has been covered already so I'll go through it quickly. It was
15	actually called the Readiness Activation Management Plan; I don't know if you
16	remember that terminology?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't.
18	MR. PETER WARDLE: But it was a series of meetings involving
19	senior staff on the project.
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you and Mr. Lauch attended, and
22	other people from OLRTC?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MR. PETER WARDLE: They were initially monthly, then weekly,
25	then on an ad hoc basis and probably almost daily towards the end?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's how I recall, yes.
27	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And 20 or 30 people in the room, is
28	what you recall?

Т	IVIR. IVIAT I NEVV SLADE. 165.
2	MR. PETER WARDLE: Reporting on readiness, on and, again,
3	my friend took you to some of this, on red, yellow, green on a long list of things that
4	needed to be done.
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
6	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the City would present, and then your
7	side, and, on occasion, Alstom and Thales?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry; what's the question? Sorry.
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: Sorry. The City would present at these
LO	meetings, your side would present at these meetings?
l1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: We would yes. It was led by the City,
L2	and we were participants.
L3	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And Alstom and Thales were
L4	invited to the RAMP meetings occasionally; correct?
L5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Occasionally when they needed to be,
L6	yes.
L7	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And it covered everything from
L8	training, media, testing, commissioning, vehicle performance, and maintenance.
L9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
20	MR. PETER WARDLE: Everything with regard to being ready for
21	revenue service; correct?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you did tell my friend this morning that
24	the City had a huge thirst for knowledge; correct?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MR. PETER WARDLE: You thought there was a lack of trust?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's what I felt.
28	MR. PETER WARDLE: And is it fair to say that the City was

1	somewhat sceptical about RTG's and OLRTC's promises, given all the issues that had
2	arisen over the previous year and a half?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: You'd have to ask the City that, but I
4	suspect so.
5	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And is it also fair to say that the
6	City was scrutinizing OLRTC fairly carefully in the period around substantial completion
7	and trial running?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: In what regard? Sorry.
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: Well, put it this way, you didn't want to cut
LO	corners and the City didn't want you to cut any corners; isn't that fair?
l1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
L2	MR. PETER WARDLE: The trial running test team. So again,
L3	we've already covered this a little bit, I'll go through it quickly, but there was a team that
L4	had representatives of OLRTC, City, its consultants, and the independent certifier, and
L5	there were daily meetings.
L6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
L7	MR. PETER WARDLE: Correct?
L8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
L9	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you said in your Commission
20	interview, that there were no unilateral decisions; correct?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
22	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the idea was that the group would
23	review the data on a daily basis, but would apply its collective professional judgment to
24	determine whether any particular day should be a pass?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MR. PETER WARDLE: Senior management was told whether
27	there was a pass or a fail but didn't actually get access to the data; correct?
Ω	MR MATTHEW SI ADE: Certainly on my side yes

1	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay.
2	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you weren't asked this this morning,
3	but in your interview, I just want to make sure we get this right, you said, you thought
4	the whole:
5	"process was exceedingly goodvery well executed
6	and everybody bought into itI thought it was
7	perfectly fair."
8	Do you recall saying that?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MR. PETER WARDLE: So even though the team failed RTG on a
11	number of days, particularly those first two or three days at the end of July, you still
12	agree that the process was a fair process?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MR. PETER WARDLE: And when the day was close, the team
15	would come together to understand specifically what went wrong; is that fair?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
17	MR. PETER WARDLE: And then a determination would be made
18	by the team as to whether or not the day would be a pass or fail?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
20	MR. PETER WARDLE: And just on maintenance practices, there
21	were a number of failures during the trial running period, correct?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MR. PETER WARDLE: And some of this, as you described to my
24	friend, was a paperwork issue?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Some of it, yes.
26	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the City had concerns, is it not fair,
27	about whether RTM was sufficiently staffed for the maintenance period?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I think that's fair. I don't think that

1	was necessarily discussed during the trial running review team meetings, but it was a
2	conversation that I think it was probably held in the RAMP meetings or elsewhere, but
3	it wasn't necessarily part of those trial running meetings.
4	MR. PETER WARDLE: And I will just take you very quickly to
5	COW 0468165. And you will see, if we scroll down, and I appreciate this is not your
6	letter. I believe Mr. Lauch signs this letter, if we go over, you'll see it is Mr. Lauch who
7	signs it, but you are copied. Do you see that?
8	EXHIBIT No. 144
9	COW0468165 – Letter – RTM Readiness and OLRTC
10	Warranty Support – 24 July 2019
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MR. PETER WARDLE: If we go back to the first page, you will see
13	the subject is RTM readiness and OLRTC warranty report, and if we scroll down a little
14	bit, you will see there has been a readiness meeting and Mr. Lauch says,
15	"It is incumbent on RTG to provide and sustain ample
16	resources to support our trial running efforts, and it is logical
17	that RTG maintain augmented support for a sufficient period
18	minimum one month post passenger service, to ensure that
19	post RSA through the commencement of passenger service
20	is redundantly supported as we ramp up and enhance our
21	support systems as a function of real-time experience."
22	Do you see that?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I do.
24	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. So, I'm going to suggest — we can
25	take the document down — that the City had raised concerns about staffing on the
26	maintenance side and that RTG was providing some assurances that those issues
27	would be resolved.
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.

1	MR. PETER WARDLE: The trial running criteria, you told us this
2	morning that the final AVKR criteria of 98 per cent that is found in the trial running test
3	procedure document, that the metrics were probably higher than you would normally
4	have. Do you recall saying that?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't, but I don't dispute I said it.
6	MR. PETER WARDLE: And that it was intended to reflect the
7	regime in the payment mechanism for the period after revenue service, correct?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It reflects yes.
9	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And it is correct that during trial
10	running OLRTC had difficulty meeting that higher criteria, the 98 per cent, correct?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MR. PETER WARDLE: And I'm going to suggest to you, sir, that it
13	was RTG, and specifically Mr. Lauch, that suggested to the City returning to the 2017
14	criteria of 96 per cent, 9 out of 12 days.
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, I don't understand.
16	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. I am going to suggest to you that
17	OLRTC had difficulty meeting the 98 per cent and that it was Mr. Lauch's proposal to
18	Mr. Manconi to reduce the criteria from 98 per cent to 96 per cent and go back to the
19	2017 RFI document.
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: You would have to ask Mr. Lauch, but
21	that's not my recollection. That's not what I experienced.
22	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And if I suggested to you, and I
23	won't take you to it now, that we have a WhatsApp chat message on August 14 that
24	describes "Meeting to discuss Peter's suggestion," that would be consistent, I am going
25	to suggest to you, with your recollection of when the decision was made to change from
26	98 per cent to 96 per cent. In other words, it was around August 14th; isn't that fair?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
28	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the decision to move from 15 to 13

Т	trains, that decision is made by the City, correct?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I believe so.
3	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. And you thought it was appropriate
4	because it is the City that would know how many trains they're going to need for
5	passenger service, correct?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MR. PETER WARDLE: You felt, at the end of the process, that
8	OLRTC had successfully achieved trial running, correct?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MR. PETER WARDLE: And I am just going to quote you. "We
11	were, RTG, OLRTC, we went through substantial completion. We went through trial
12	running. We had the independent safety assessment. The independent certifier said
13	that, all said, it's ready. It meets the requirements. It's safe." Do you recall saying
14	that?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
16	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you've already told my friend that
17	there was no vetting in period required for the Alstom vehicles under the project
18	agreement?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I said there was no burn-in requirement
20	for the vehicles under the project agreement.
21	MR. PETER WARDLE: Sorry, that's
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Vetting in is a different thing. But burn-
23	in, I said there wasn't a requirement.
24	MR. PETER WARDLE: But I want to be very clear. No burn-in
25	period was required for those vehicles under the project agreement, correct?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
27	MR. PETER WARDLE: But, in fact, your testimony was that those
28	vehicles probably had about a million kilometres on the trains before they went into

1	revenue service?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, I don't think I said that.
3	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay.
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: They had about 10,000 kilometres on
5	probably each car or an average of about 10,000 across 34 cars.
6	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay, 10,000 a car?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you didn't have any concerns about
9	the burn-in period for the vehicles going into revenue service availability, correct?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
11	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. I just want to, before I finish off,
12	deal with the question of the opening. And I don't want to spend a lot of time on this,
13	but I think what you suggested in your evidence was that you understood that the
14	from a letter from Mr. Morgan, that the system was going to open to the public in Q4 of
15	2019, right?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think the letter said early Q4 2019, yes
17	MR. PETER WARDLE: Right. And my friend did take you to the
18	email, and that is RTC 00885419.0001. If we could turn that up again. And when you
19	look at this email, and, of course, this email is in June, June 24th, but as I read the
20	email, it suggests that the targeted RSA date is August 16, correct?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
22	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the last sentence says,
23	"Committing" sorry, the two stars.
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MR. PETER WARDLE: It says, "Committing to the date is
26	important for the City as they need to book drivers' schedules by 17 July for the three
27	weeks of parallel bus/LRT service that will start second week of September." And that
28	would suggest that there would be three weeks between RSA and launch; correct?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No. Sorry, I don't agree with that.
2	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay.
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's there'd still be three weeks of
4	parallel bus and LRT service. It doesn't mean there's three weeks between launch.
5	MR. PETER WARDLE: Well, sorry, the parallel bus service would
6	start at launch; wouldn't it?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay. Let's look at a second document,
9	sir, RTG00429222.0001.
10	EXHIBIT No. 145:
11	RTG00429222.0001 - Minutes RTG Board Meeting No. 33
12	25 July 2019
13	MR. PETER WARDLE: This is a minutes of a board of the RTG
14	general partnership, and you'll see the date on it is July 25, 2019. And if we go to page
15	2, under item 2, executive summary, you'll see, the City in the second paragraph, sir,
16	it says, "The City will need three to four weeks after RSA to prepare for public launch."
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.
18	MR. PETER WARDLE: So doesn't that suggest that at least the
19	RTG board knew that that was the time period?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: They might have done. I'm not
21	MR. PETER WARDLE: Okay.
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: RTG board.
23	MR. PETER WARDLE: I realize you're not the RTG board, sir.
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't work for RTG either.
25	MR. PETER WARDLE: I know you don't work for RTG, Mr. Slade.
26	I'm quite aware of that.
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.
28	MR. PETER WARDLE: You then said in response to a question

from my friend this morning, and we can take this question -- we can take this document

- down -- you said in response to a question from my friend that you and Mr. Lauch found
- out about the public launch date on August 30th. Do you recall saying that?
- 4 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE**: 1 do.
- 5 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** Okay. Isn't it a fact, sir, that the date of the
- 6 public launch was announced by the mayor on August 23, a week earlier?
- 7 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Quite possibly. I can't recall. It was in
- 8 the media. I mean, it's easy to prove what ---
- 9 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** Well, in fact, I have it as being a Global
- News item on August the 23rd.

- 11 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** Okay.
- MR. PETER WARDLE: So it couldn't have come as a big surprise
- to you, Mr. Slade, on August the 30th that the system was going to be launched on
- September 14th when the mayor had already announced it a week earlier ---
- 15 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** Correct.
- 16 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** --- right?
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. My statement of the 30th is
- wrong. I was shocked on the 23rd.
- 19 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** Okay.
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: If that's the day that that occurred, that's
- the day that I was shocked. The fact that I said the 30th is incorrect.
- MR. PETER WARDLE: I'm going to suggest to you that aside from
- pulling something out of a letter Mr. Morgan wrote, you and Mr. Lauch were always
- 24 aware throughout that the City was planning to open the system three to four weeks
- 25 after public launch -- sorry, after RSA as these documents that we've just gone through
- 26 indicate?
- 27 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** I disagree.
- MR. PETER WARDLE: Let me just finish out quickly with some

questions about some of the events that have taken place since the launch of the 1 system. Can we agree, Mr. Slade, that in that first winter, starting on New Year's Eve 2 2019, the system experienced catenary failures? 3 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: There was an issue that affected the 4 catenary, but I wouldn't necessarily call it catenary failure. 5 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** There were inductor failures? 6 7 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. **MR. PETER WARDLE:** There were switch heater failures? 8 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay. Yes. 9 MR. PETER WARDLE: And in July of 2020, there were cracked 10 wheels? 11 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 12 MR. PETER WARDLE: None of those things could have been 13 detected with more trial running; isn't that fair? 14 15 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Probably. 16 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** There were two derailments in 2021? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 17 MR. PETER WARDLE: The August derailment was a wheel axle 18 bearing assembly issue? 19 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 20 **MR. PETER WARDLE:** That wouldn't have been detected by 21 22 additional trial running; correct? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. 23 24 MR. PETER WARDLE: The September 2021 derailment was a result of human error: correct? 25 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 26 27 **MR. PETER WARDLE**: That wouldn't have been detected by additional trial running? 28

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
2	MR. PETER WARDLE: And lastly, can we agree that with respect
3	to operator preparedness that RTG was responsible for training the trainers?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MR. PETER WARDLE: And the fact that the system was late
6	meant that the operators had more time to train and use the simulator; correct?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you commented in your interview on
9	the concept of a shadow operator; do you recall saying that?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I do.
11	MR. PETER WARDLE: And you described it as a seasoned team
12	of operators in the control room who sit next to the actual operators; fair?
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
14	MR. PETER WARDLE: But you actually don't know, do you, sir,
15	what plan OC Transpo had in place with respect to having experienced rail expertise in
16	the room at the time of launch; do you?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
18	MR. PETER WARDLE: All right. Thank you, Mr. Slade. Those
19	are all my questions.
20	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Thank you, Counsel.
21	Next is Alstom.
22	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner.
23	Michael Valo for Alstom. V-A-L-O.
24	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MICHAEL VALO:
25	MR. MICHAEL VALO: How do you do, Mr. Slade?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Very well, thank you. How are you?
27	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Well, thank you. I just want to was
28	hoping to finish before lunch, but we may carry over just after, but I'll do my best, sit.

1	Mr. Slade, your evidence to Commission Counsel in your interview		
2	was that Alstom refused to properly prepare itself for its maintenance obligations. Do		
3	you recall that?		
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know if I used those precise		
5	words, but, yes.		
6	MR. MICHAEL VALO: To paraphrase, you had said, for example,		
7	that OLRTC regularly invited them out to the field to see how things were done and to		
8	help prepare them; right?		
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.		
10	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Thank you, sir. Now to be fair, you did		
11	acknowledge in your interview that Alstom's maintenance obligations only actually		
12	started upon RSA; right?		
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I believe that's what their contractual		
14	responsibility was, yes.		
15	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Right. And that had those obligations		
16	started perhaps six months earlier, that may have been a better arrangement?		
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.		
18	MR. MICHAEL VALO: In fact, sir, what I'd like to look at first to		
19	start are some emails that I think are going to indicate that your criticisms of Alstom in		
20	this regard are not accurate or correct. If we could pull up COMH25, please?		
21	EXHIBIT No. 146:		
22	COMH0000025 – Re: CCTV troubleshooting		
23	MR. MICHAEL VALO: If I could have the operator scroll down,		
24	please, so we could start with the first email? This is an email, sir, as you can see, from		
25	Denison Crossley of OLRTC. He's an electrical coordinator for OLRTC, and it's to Eloy		
26	Fernandez of Alstom. And what Mr. Crossley's doing is inviting Alstom maintenance		
27	techs to attend with them to work on some cameras, and this is January 2019. Do you		
28	see that?		

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And this is prior well prior to the start of
3	revenue service; right?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And if we scroll up, there's a response from
6	Dean Gorman, and do you know Mr. Gorman was a superintendent in the Alstom
7	maintenance team?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I vaguely remember, yes.
9	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Right. And he was actually I should have
10	his title corrected. He was the maintenance rail system manager. And his response is,
11	to your team, sir, whenever you guys are chasing gremlins out of the system, if you
12	have time to let us know, I most definitely want to get my team involved. Trystan is the
13	comm's sig team lead. So, if you can lead him know and he can let you know who and
14	if we can make it over, we have some other inspections training already scheduled, so
15	there might be a few times we can't make it." Do you see that, sir?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I do.
17	MR. MICHAEL VALO: So, you would agree that at least in this
18	instance, January 2019, nine months prior to the start of revenue service, Alstom's
19	maintenance rail system manager is accepting offers from OLRTC to get out, get their
20	hands on the system, and see how it works?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
22	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Now, I want to fast forward in time to June
23	2019. I'm going to ask the court operator to bring up ALS 56191. And what we are
24	looking at here, sir, as I said, we fast-forwarded to June, middle of June, June 14, 2019,
25	and this is an internal email, sir, from Dean Gorman, the same manager from earlier.
26	It's internal to Alstom, though, so you haven't seen this, of course. And what we see
27	here is Mr. Gorman reporting to Richard France. And do you know Richard France to
28	be the project manager for the Alstom maintenance team?

1	EXHIBIT NO 14/:
2	ALS0056191 – Email Alstom 14 June 2019 Infra – What we
3	can do
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.
5	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And what he says under OCS, sir, is I'm
6	looking at the second sentence. I am just fast-forwarding just past
7	"RTM OLRTC failed to provide us any hands-on training
8	on the OCS, so we decided to bring our own people to
9	ensure the power techs were properly taught these
10	issues. Once our techs get some real hands on, we can
11	do all the things listed in red."
12	And then under TPSS,
13	"We've asked for almost eight months to shadow
14	OLRTC's power team to see what they're doing in the
15	TPSS, that has never happened. Our power techs
16	received a decent bit of training on the TPSS from
17	Siemens, but we have had no info from OLRTC on what
18	the procedures for rack in and out, or anything specific to
19	the TPSS is being operated. For the TPSS, we can do
20	the preventative maintenance, but any corrective will
21	require our techs to create their own procedures."
22	So, again, now we are fast-forwarded in time and you will agree
23	with me, sir, that the report Mr. Gorman is giving is inconsistent with your recollection
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MR. MICHAEL VALO: to Commission counsel?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
27	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Thank you. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to
28	speak over you all. I will try and avoid that. Now, I want to just look at one last letter in

this regard, if we could. It is a formal letter this time, not an internal email. It is ALS 14029.

 FXH	IBIT	No.	148:
	1011	110.	170.

ALS0014029 – Letter re: Support Maintenance Activities

prior to Handover – 28 March 2019

MR. MICHAEL VALO: And while that is being cued up, I will

introduce it, give you the context, sir. This is now March 28, 2019. It is an Alstom letter,

as I said, to RTM from Mr. Justin Bulpitt of Alstom. If we scroll down -- if the court

reporter can -- thank you very much. That's terrific. I'm focused on the first paragraph,

10 sir.

"Alstom wants to support RTM to achieve its goal of beginning some maintenance activities as soon as possible prior to revenue service. Alstom has suggested a proactive plan of action, including a review of documentation very recently provided to gain an understanding of the baseline of acceptable conditions to maintain to, and, in the absence of maintenance records, as an assessment of the track and OCS, by which it can gain sufficient information as to the condition of the system, so that Alstom can start certain maintenance under RTM's responsibility and liability before handover. Based on that, assuming that Alstom is given the access and permits, Alstom will start to inspect the assets."

So, you'll agree that even formally, through the formal channels -- and I acknowledge, sir, you weren't at RTM at the time, so perhaps you didn't know when you gave your evidence to the Commission, but Alstom is doing exactly what you suggest, I believe, they ought to have been doing in order to prepare themselves.

Would you agree with that?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, they wrote a letter, but I don't know
2	that it ever happened.
3	MR. MICHAEL VALO: I agree. We can't know it ever happened.
4	But, certainly, the indications from the emails and the letter we have seen is that they
5	were at least making the ask and appear to have been stifled in their efforts?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Possibly, yes.
7	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Now, I would just like to look at the last
8	paragraph of this letter, if we could. And I hope you're able to see that. I know it's a
9	little small, sir. But what Alstom says here is,
10	"Alstom would like to have a discussion to understand
11	the handover process, as we believe it's not clear.
12	Alstom is concerned about the potential for the system to
13	be handed over before the actual asset condition is
14	known and corrective actions are completed, and seeks
15	clearly that Alstom will not be held liable for the cost
16	deductions and failure points for deficiencies in the asset
17	found during the warranty period, even if Alstom has
18	inspected the asset prior to handover, but not agreed that
19	the asset is in an acceptable condition."
20	So, would you agree the concern expressed by Alstom is that the
21	condition of the system when they get it may not be as per the specifications? There
22	may be deficiencies that have to be addressed?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, the contract allows for deficiencies.
24	Everybody knows that, including Alstom. I don't really understand what you're asking
25	me, I'm sorry.
26	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Sorry, I will try to be more clear, because I
27	do agree with you, everybody does understand there could be deficiencies. All Alstom
28	is asking to do here, and I am asking you to confirm you understand, is that they want to

- understand the condition of the asset before revenue service starts so that if
- deficiencies arise, they are in a position to say whether they existed before or after the
- 3 start of revenue service. Do you agree?
- 4 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, that's what the minor deficiency list
- 5 is.
- 6 **MR. MICHAEL VALO**: Right. Well, this pertains to more than just
- what is on the MDL, sir. Let's turn to another issue from your interview and we will see
- 8 if we can make the connection.
- 9 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE**: Sure.
- MR. MICHAEL VALO: Your evidence -- we can take this down,
- please. Your evidence, sir, to Commission counsel is that, if I'm paraphrasing correctly,
- is that Alstom maintenance is to blame, or at least in part to blame, for the kinked or
- warped rail that was experienced on the system; is that right?
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, can you say that again?
- MR. MICHAEL VALO: Sure. We can -- if the transcript is
- available, it's at page 215 of your transcript, sir. I don't know if that can be cued up.
- 17 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN**: It can, if you give us the transcript
- 18 number.
- 19 **MR. MICHAEL VALO**: Sure. That will take me just a moment.
- The copy I use, unfortunately, is not the one in the system. Let me try it without the
- 21 transcript.
- 22 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN**: No, no, we've got it. Just stand
- by, we'll find it for you.
- MR. MICHAEL VALO: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. I was in
- particular looking at page 215, line 8, if that can be brought up. And all I was driving at,
- sir, was your evidence to Commission Counsel was that Alstom's maintenance team
- was at least in part responsible for the sun kinks and warped rail that were experienced
- during the summer months. Do you recall that?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't recall the specifics that you are
2	referring to, but
3	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. Well, we will have a look when it's
4	up. So, unfortunately, the page number I have is the transcript page. So, it continues
5	from the previous transcript. So, I think we need the May I think it's the transcript of
6	the 24 th . Sorry about that, Mr. Court Operator, I should have been more clear. It's TRM
7	173, and it's transcript page 215. So, we will just have to skip forward about 45 pages.
8	I think we should be in the vicinity. Perfect. Here we are. So, you can see we are
9	talking about sun kinks, and if we go to line 8,
10	"Again, it is not an uncommon thing. And, again, I think
11	the manner in which it was managed and dealt with in
12	Ottawa probably and I think they are probably getting
13	better at it, but I guess in the first couple of years the way
14	we managed and dealt with it was not ideal."
15	And if you scroll down, Mr. Court Operator, to the next page, to line
16	1, we'll see,
17	"The guideway techs from Alstom maintenance and the
18	way in which they're instructed to deal with the
19	temperature related track movement has been
20	challenging. The City giving them access to the
21	guideway during the day and the amount of maintenance
22	that gets done on the track has probably been insufficient
23	to minimize the amount of movement."
24	So, as I read that
25	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Sorry, Counsel, let the witness
26	read the whole answer. So, we skipped from the top to the bottom, so I think it's fair if
27	he could read the whole paragraph.
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.

1	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Absolutely.
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.
3	MR. MICHAEL VALO: So, if I have misinterpreted your evidence,
4	sir, please do let me know. I had read this as at least part of the blame being on Alstom
5	Maintenance for these sun kinks and rail movements, and if I am wrong, please let us
6	know.
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think "blame" is a strong word. So,
8	what I was trying to convey of what I the way so track moves every day, every day
9	of the year, doesn't matter what the temperature is; it's constantly moving, and the
10	degree to which it moves is dependent on temperature. The amount that it moves can
11	be controlled it will still move but can be controlled through maintenance, and all I
12	was saying was that maybe it's moving further than it would if a certain level of
13	maintenance activity was undertaken.
14	But I also say in here that it's partly down to the amount of track
15	access that they get. And the track access is not under their control; that is under the
16	control of others. So, it is not I'm not blaming them. I was stating my opinion as to
17	and trying to explain how the track moves, and some of the things that can contribute to
18	not the cause of it necessarily, partly the cause, but more about the rectification.
19	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. And I appreciate that clarification,
20	and I certainly didn't mean to infer you were laying all the blame and also, I think I said
21	"partial blame." But when we talk about maintenance of the track, are you aware, sir
22	would you agree that OLRTC performed no maintenance at all on the track after it was
23	constructed but before RSA, which was a period of about three years, from 2016 to
24	2019?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: They undertook limited maintenance, not
26	no maintenance. But yes
27	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Well, let's pull up if the Court Operator
28	would assist PRR 182?

2 PRR00000182 – Email Trackwork – 24 September 2020 MR. MICHAEL VALO: And this is -- if we slide down to page 2, 3 you'll see here, sir -- sorry, if we could scroll just up a little bit, Mr. Court Operator, so we 4 could see the -- yeah, that information there. It's an email from you, sir, Mr. Slade, to 5 Mario Guerra, September 2020. Do you recall sending this email? 6 7 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. And if we scroll down just a little bit, 8 9 you can see the subject line is "Track Work Warranty", and I believe what you are doing here is drafting for Mr. Guerra a letter you want sent to OLRTC as a warranty claim; is 10 that right? 11 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** Sorry, can you repeat the question? 12 MR. MICHAEL VALO: Sure. If I understand what this email is, it 13 is -- you've drafted an email to Mr. Guerra that is to be turned into a formal letter to be 14 15 delivered to OLRTC for a warranty claim? 16 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know whether it turned into a letter or not. It was -- it's a draft. 17 MR. MICHAEL VALO: And I can assist with that. I'm happy to 18 show you the formal letter after, but I want to start here. What you say is "as you're 19 aware, during the heat of the summer, the track moved significantly" -- that's the first 20 paragraph there. 21 22 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 23 MR. MICHAEL VALO: And that resulted in numerous temporary 24 speed restrictions, extensive work to introduce stress relief, et cetera. RTM has suffered service penalties and the cost of unplanned work. So, that's establishing what 25 we're talking about here. And then if you go to the fourth paragraph, sir, which is where 26 27 I'm going to focus,

--- EXHIBIT No. 149:

1

28

"There appears to have been no maintenance

1	undertaken on the track since it was constructed other
2	than the grinding that was done just after RSA and the
3	greasing of switch plates and machines. It is clear the
4	balance was never tamped from when it was laid until
5	revenue service. This is some three years, 2016 to '19,
6	with little or no maintenance. As a result, the guideway
7	now requires extensive additional balance and
8	tamping."
9	So, I'm going to suggest to you, sir, the real reason in 2020 that the
LO	system experienced more sun kinks than perhaps it should have and there was
l1	excess track movement, as you described was because of this, was because it was
L2	the system was not properly maintained by OLRTC after it was constructed.
L3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think it was a contributing factor, but I
L4	don't think it's the sole factor. And as I said before, like I said, the word is "little
L5	maintenance"; it's not "no maintenance."
L6	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Would you
L7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It is a potential contributing factor, yes.
L8	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Would you agree, sir, that the engineering
L9	joint venture, RTG's engineering joint venture, did a study and concluded the neutral
20	temperature of the rail at installation was too low, which results in excess kinks in the
21	summer?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think what you are if I think if I
23	understand what I think you're saying, so there was again and I can't remember
24	whether it was around the same sort of time, and I know there was conversations held
25	with the engineering joint venture with regards to track neutral temperatures, and those
26	conversations also engaged with the City and the City's track engineer because the
27	track neutral temperature as was designed was driven as a result of a requirement
28	within the project agreement. Is that what you're referring to?

1	MR. MICHAEL VALO: It could be. I'm not particularly interested in
2	why the design was what it was; I'm just asking whether the conclusion drawn by the
3	EJV and the City was that the neutral rail temperature specified, which was between 10
4	and 20 degrees
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Mm-hmm.
6	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Results in excessive sun kinks in hot
7	Ottawa summers.
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: The track neutral temperature does have
9	an impact on the track's movement in the summer, yes.
10	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Can we pull up
11	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Counsel, we're going to take the
12	lunch break now.
13	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Oh, thank you, Mr. Commissioner
14	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Until 2:00.
15	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. The Commission will adjourn
16	until 2:00 p.m.
17	Upon recessing at 12:58 p.m.
18	Upon resuming at 2:00 p.m.
19	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right, Mr. Valo, continue
20	please?
21	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Just to
22	reorient us very quickly, we were talking about rail movements and the kinks and
23	buckling rail that were experienced on the project in the summer. I had shown you, Mr.
24	Slade, an email that you sent to Mr. Guerra. It was a draft letter and I had promised just
25	before the break that I would show you it was, in fact, turned into a project letter. I will
26	bring it up for you, sir. It's PRR 182.0004, just for the sake of closing the loop on this.
27	EXHIBIT No 150:
28	PRR00000182.0004 – RTM Letter Trackwork Warranty

1	Claim – 23 September 2020
2	MR. MICHAEL VALO: So, you will see here, sir, it is on RTM letter
3	head to Gonzalo Gomeza of OLRTC, and if you scroll down, I will just validate this is the
4	same letter. We can see sorry, Mr. Court Operator, just the first page will be fine.
5	Thank you.
6	"As you are aware, during the heat of the summer, the track moved significantly." And
7	then fourth paragraph, which is the one we had focused on, sir, "There appears to have
8	been no maintenance undertaken at the track." And then if you go just to the start of the
9	next page, Mr. Court Operator, thank you. "With regards to the neutral temperature and
LO	the thermal stress on the rail, it would appear the design has been insufficient." And
l1	that is from Mario Guerra, as you can see, right?
L2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
L3	MR. MICHAEL VALO: So, certainly, the position of RTM, and you,
L4	yourself, Mr. Slade, was that at least the issue of the buckling and the rail kinks was a
L5	construction and design deficiency; would you agree?
L6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Can you say that again, please?
L7	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Sure. From your perspective, sir, and
L8	RTM's perspective, at the time, in September 2020, the rail kinks and the rail warping
L9	that were experienced in the summer, were the result of construction and design
20	defects?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That was my position at the time. It is
22	not my position now.
23	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. We can take that down, please. Mr.
24	Slade, do you agree that RTM was required to supply two-wheel lathes to the project?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
26	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. Can we pull up, please, the
27	maintenance subcontract? And it is PRR 119. And I am going to ask for us to be taken
28	to page 418, which is attachment 48 of the maintenance subcontract. And if we scroll

1	down just a little bit, please sorry, let me just read the heading into the record, if I
2	might. Attachment 48, "CC Equipment". That is construction contractor equipment?
3	EXHIBIT No 151:
4	PRR0000119 – RTM – Alstom Amended and Restated
5	Maintenance Subcontract – 2 October 2019
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.
7	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Is that right, sir?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know.
9	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And I will just direct your attention to about
10	I am looking for the line item here that says "dual-headed wheel truing machine with
11	chip removal system". Oh, pardon me, that's the next one. We are at 418. I am going
12	to get there. So, if we go down to the bottom, you will see there "single-axle wheel
13	truing machine with chip removal system." Do you see that, sir?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
15	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. And that is a wheel lathe. You'd
16	agree?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It sounds like one.
18	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Right. And if we scroll further to page 421,
19	please, what we have here is the Stage 2 Belfast MSF expansion, and there is
20	additional equipment that was required to be provided under the maintenance
21	subcontract by RTM. And if we scroll down a little lower, what we will see is I'm sorry,
22	just it is about halfway on the page, sir, the "dual-headed wheel truing machine with
23	chip removal system." Do you see that?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MR. MICHAEL VALO: So, you would agree that under the
26	maintenance subcontract, RTM did, in fact, have a requirement or an obligation to
27	provide two-wheel truing machines, one single and one double?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.

1	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. And would you agree that it was
2	RTMs responsibility to maintain the wheel lathe?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know.
4	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Pardon me?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know.
6	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Oh, okay. So, if we can go to page 414 of
7	this
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, can I just what is this document
9	sorry?
10	MR. MICHAEL VALO: This is the maintenance subcontract.
11	Alstom's maintenance subcontract with RTM.
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Right. Okay. And just, before we just go
13	away from these, so
14	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Sure.
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Because I have not seen this before,
16	okay? The wheel lathes that you had there, was one for Stage 2 and one for Stage 1?
17	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Correct. But to be clear, Stage 2 of the
18	MSF, sir, not Stage 2 as in Stage 2 of the project.
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: But the Stage 2 of the MSF is part of
20	Stage 2 of the project.
21	MR. MICHAEL VALO: But you would agree that the Stage 2 MSF
22	was intended to be complete by RSA so that maintenance activities could continue in
23	parallel with vehicle manufacturing?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.
25	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. So, I was just asking you, sir, if you
26	were aware whether or not RTM had the obligation to maintain the wheel lathe, that
27	piece of equipment.
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Right.

1	MR. MICHAEL VALO : And you had said you weren't sure, so I
2	was going to take us to the section of the subcontract which confirms that to be the
3	case, and that is at page and here we are at 414. And I will just find where we are
4	at. But if you look, sir, under "Depot Fixed Plant", so that's the second large category
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
6	MR. MICHAEL VALO: I am not at the second item there
7	underneath maintenance subcontractor conducts first line maintenance and qualifier to
8	report all of the failures for the wheel lathe. So, the maintenance subcontractor, that's
9	Alstom. They do the first line maintenance, and then everything else gets reported to
LO	the centre, is that correct?
l1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's what that says.
L2	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. And the maintenance contractor,
L3	that's RTM, sir? I am looking on the far right?
L4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.
L5	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And that so this column indicates the
L 6	maintenance contractor's responsibility and they if you look at wheel lathe, have a
L7	four-hour response time.
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Okay.
L9	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. So you'd agree with me that RTM is
20	in fact responsible for maintaining the wheel?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's what this looks like, yes.
22	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. And a functioning lathe or wheel
23	truing machine is critical to ensure that the vehicle's wheels are always true, always
24	perfectly round?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And a flat wheel can cause an LRV to be
27	taken out of service; is that right?
Ω	MR MATTHEW SI ADE: Depending on the extensiveness of the

1	flatness, yes.
2	MR. MICHAEL VALO: So a wheel lathe, or wheel lathes, are
3	critical to maintaining service levels?
4	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
5	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Now are you aware, sir, that RTM in fact
6	only provided one wheel lathe and not two at the start of service?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
8	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And in the system's first winter of revenue
9	service, there was an excessive number of wheel flats that required wheel truing; would
10	you agree with that?
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
12	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And in fact, during that period, the wheel
13	lathe was broken for an extended period of time, and so wheels couldn't be cut; is that
14	right?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
16	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And as a result, trains were not available
17	for service?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know that the wheel lathe was the
19	only cause, but it was a contributing factor.
20	MR. MICHAEL VALO: That's all I'm asking. That's fair, sir. Thank
21	you.
22	Now would you agree that had RTM supplied two wheel lathes as it
23	was required, the defect in the first wheel lathe would not have been as big a deal?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Potentially.
25	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And eventually, as I understand it, and in
26	fact on your recommendations, as I understand from your evidence, our team ultimately
27	hire a permanent millwright for their staff to address wheel lathe issues in real time; is
28	that right?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It was to address equipment issues, not
2	just the wheel lathe.
3	MR. MICHAEL VALO: But the wheel lathe was one of the pieces
4	of equipment that millwright would be there to assist in
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
6	MR. MICHAEL VALO: fixing. And would you agree the
7	reliability of the wheel lathe has improved as a result of the millwright being on staff?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That has contributed. It's not been the
9	only reason that it has improved.
10	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. That's all fair. Thank you, sir.
11	I want to turn next to the issue of switch heaters, and, Mr. Court
12	Operator, we can take that the document down. Thank you very much.
13	You told Commission Counsel, sir, that one of the reasons the
14	switch heaters don't work is that they're not being operated and maintained correctly.
15	Do you recall that?
16	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
17	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And your evidence, if I'm paraphrasing
18	correctly, was that Alstom should have learned how to use the switch heaters prior to
19	RSA by tagging along with OLRTC. Do you recall giving that evidence?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Vaguely, yes.
21	MR. MICHAEL VALO: But in fact, sir, I don't know whether you
22	know, that is actually what happened, and I'd like to look at an email, if we could, from
23	Steve Nadon. It is COMH23. And if we could pull that up?
24	EXHIBIT No 152:
25	COMH0000023 – Email Switch Heater Inspection – 8
26	November 2018
27	MR. MICHAEL VALO: This is a November 2018 email email
28	chain, actually. And I'm going to ask that we scroll to the bottom and start where the

it was determined that the electric switch heaters were under powered?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't know that that's the reason.
2	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Well, are you aware that the City originally
3	rejected OLRTC's position that they simply needed to be maintained and redirected and
4	modified?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I'm aware the City rejected that position,
6	yes.
7	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And those switch heaters were replaced?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: They were.
9	MR. MICHAEL VALO: And at RTG's cost; is that right?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: RTG did pay for it, yes.
11	MR. MICHAEL VALO: Okay. Mr. Slade, I appreciate your time
12	today. Those are all my questions. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner.
13	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Thanks for that, Counsel.
14	Next up is STV.
15	We can't hear you, Counsel.
16	MR. THEO MILOSEVIC: Good afternoon. Apologies. Can you
17	hear me now?
18	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Yes, I can.
19	MR. THEO MILOSEVIC: This is Theo Milosevic for SUV. SUV has
20	no questions for this witness. Thank you.
21	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Thank you.
22	Next is RTG EJV.
23	MR. MICHAEL VRANTSIDIS: Yes, hello, Mr. Commissioner. I'm
24	just getting on video here. Michael Vrantsidis for RTG EJV. We do not have any
25	questions for this witness. Thank you.
26	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Thank you.
27	Next up is Thales?
28	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner.

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. JENNIFER McALEER:
2	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: Good afternoon, Mr. Slade.
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Good afternoon.
4	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: My name is Jennifer McAleer and I'm
5	one of the lawyers who's acting for Thales in these proceedings. I only have a few
6	questions for you this afternoon.
7	You testified that you initially were involved during the off-project
8	review that you did before you formally joined the project later in 2018; is that correct?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
10	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: Okay. And during that off-project
11	review, did you have the opportunity to work with anybody from Thales?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
13	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: Okay. And did you meet Michael
14	Burns?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
16	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: And Allan Crew?
17	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
18	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: And would you agree that Thales was
19	transparent with the OLRTC about the challenges it saw on the project?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
21	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: And would you agree that Thales also
22	worked collaboratively with the OLRTC towards a revised RSA date?
23	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
24	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: And since the OLRT system has gone
25	into revenue service, is it true that you have found the Thales system to be reliable?
26	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
27	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: And overall, you have found the
28	Thales system has performed as expected?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
2	MS. JENNIFER McALEER: Thank you, sir. Those are all of my
3	questions.
4	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Thank you, Counsel.
5	Next is Amalgamated Transit Union Local 279.
6	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner.
7	Thank you for the time.
8	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JOHN McLUCKIE:
9	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Mr. Slade, I represent the Amalgamated
10	Transit Union, which in turn represents the employees both at Alstom and at the OC
11	Transpo, and I just have a few questions for you. I have about five minutes.
12	I'd like to focus first on the parallel bus service, if I could. So in July
13	of 2019, when the trial run is happening, the City is still running buses to and from the
14	downtown core?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I believe so.
16	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And it's those buses that are transporting
17	passengers, not the train at this point; right?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.
19	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And when the City introduces the idea of
20	bringing the service into operation in September, did you have a view towards whether
21	that bus service should continue or not?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And did you express that view to the City?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I was part of a conversation with other
25	people where I suggested that that would be a sensible thing to do.
26	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And why did you feel continuing the bus
27	service would be a sensible thing to do?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Because I regarded it as good industry

1	practice. I thought turning off the buses in one gob was not a wise thing to do.
2	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And do you recall in the interview you
3	gave with Commission Counsel earlier that you indicated the City was in fact eager, to
4	use your words, to remove the parallel bus service?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
6	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And you indicated in your interview with
7	Commission Counsel that that eagerness related to the fact that they had issued layoff
8	notices for about 350 bus drivers?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Well, that was what I believed was the
10	reason for it. I don't know that for a fact. That was my feeling, my assumption.
11	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Okay. So your assumption, based on the
12	information that you had, was the City wanted to eliminate and thus stop paying for the
13	350 bus operators that that involved?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, I believe – I seem to recall reading
15	something as well in the media along those lines that sort – because where my thought
16	process was – I had seen something similar around the same time in the media that –
17	the media had obviously been thinking the same thing, so I didn't think I was necessarily
18	wrong.
19	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And given what you knew of the reliability
20	of the system at that point, so this was in September of 2019, did you have an opinion
21	on the wisdom of stopping that parallel bus service?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I'm not sure what you mean, sorry.
23	What do you mean by the "wisdom" of it?
24	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Did you consider it to be a good idea?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
26	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Moving on to another area, if I could
27	again, I have a fairly limited amount of time here, sir. The maintenance at Alstom, you
28	gave an interview earlier with the commission counsel and you indicated that in your

1	view they were not properly staffed for the maintenance function; do you remember
2	saying that?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
4	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And you indicated that there were not
5	only gaps in their staffing level, you also indicated there were gaps in their skills' level?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I was concerned, yes.
7	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And you also indicated you had a
8	concern as to gaps in their equipment, in the equipment that they had?
9	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I don't remember that part specifically,
10	but I may have
11	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And in your interview you indicated that
12	even if the service had been operating at full reliability, you would still have had
13	concerns with respect to the number of staff that Alstom had for the maintenance
14	functions; do you remember giving that answer?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
16	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And do you continue to have that opinion,
17	that Alstom at that point in time was understaffed for the maintenance operations?
18	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
19	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And do you feel that that impacted the
20	reliability of the system?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Partly, yes.
22	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: So had Alstom been properly staffed, the
23	system might have been more reliable?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
25	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: A few questions about the maintenance
26	of way and the maintenance of the electrical system within the light rail system. So that
27	was also Alstom's responsibility, not just to maintain the trainsets, but they also
28	maintained the guideway and the overhead electrical systems?

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes, they have all of the systems and all
2	of the infrastructure.
3	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And that's again their maintenance teams
4	that are responsible for that; correct?
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
6	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And that's their obligation under their
7	contract with RTG and in turn RTG's contract with the City?
8	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: RTM and then RTM with RTG and then
9	RTG with the City; I believe so, yes.
10	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: I'm sorry, I skipped a loop.
11	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's right.
12	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: You offered some commentary in terms
13	of how track maintenance, for example, should be done as a best practice; do you recall
14	giving that interview to Commission counsel?
15	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I do.
16	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And you indicated the best practices in
17	your opinion, are that you get out and walk the track on a daily basis; do you recall
18	telling her that?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
20	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And do you still believe that to be true?
21	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I do.
22	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And you indicated that rather than walk
23	the track, that Alstom instead used a pick-up truck that's equipped with a rail wheel
24	converter kit?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And instead of walking the track, they
27	effectively drive the track?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct.

1	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And I'm going to put to you, that that
2	allows you to more quickly go from one end of the track to the other; correct?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
4	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And there's a labour saving involved in
5	performing track maintenance in that fashion rather than walking, as you indicated, was
6	a better practice? It takes less people?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Not necessarily.
8	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Would you agree that Alstom should have
9	conducted track maintenance in that fashion?
10	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I would like them to have done, yes.
11	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Did you express that opinion to them?
12	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
13	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And did they change their practice?
14	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
15	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: You also offered some comments in
16	terms of the electrical systems and the overhead wires and you indicated the best
17	practices would be, again, to get up in a bucket truck and visually inspect the wires on a
18	regular basis; do you recall that?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
20	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: And you indicated that instead Alstom
21	was inspecting the wires from track level?
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Again, was that best practices?
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: In my opinion, yes.
25	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: What Alstom was saying best practice or
26	what you were suggesting was a better practice?
27	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Sorry, getting up in a bucket truck I
28	regard as being a better practice.

1	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Did Alstom accept your suggestion?
2	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No.
3	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Had Alstom accepted either of those
4	suggestions with respect to the rail inspections or the overhead power inspections, do
5	you feel it would have improved reliability of the service?
6	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
7	MR. JOHN McLUCKIE: Those are all my questions, sir. Thank
8	you.
9	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right, thank you, counsel. All
10	right, next up is the witness's counsel, so counsel for OLRTC or RTM?
11	CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY:
12	MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Good afternoon, Mr. Slade.
13	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Good afternoon.
14	MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: I think you clarified in your
15	evidence with Commission counsel and then with Mr. Wardle for the City what a
16	burning-in period is. Can I ask you about the sort of three terms we've heard somewhat
17	frequently in the evidence in this inquiry: a "bedding-in" period, a "soft launch", a "partial
18	opening". Can you distinguish what all of those terms mean, to the extent they mean
19	something different?
20	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I can try. And others might have a
21	different opinion, of course.
22	We'll start with the first one, "bedding-in", I think that's the first one
23	you mentioned. So "bedding-in", for me, is essentially very similar to what we did for
24	trial runnings. It's the period between trial running and going into service. It is a period
25	when you operate the system as though it was live with passengers but without the
26	passengers. It's kind of a "soak test", for want of a better term. And it's just that
27	reliability growth period that you would run a period of time prior to opening up to – I
28	would say before a soft launch or before going into service.

I know certainly there are some contracts that have a contractual 1 definition term with "bedding-in" as well. We didn't have that in the project agreement 2 here. 3 So the "soft launch", it's a term that comes from the restaurant 4 industry actually, and although it's used extensively in transit and infrastructure projects. 5 It is where you would open the system up at a progressive rate rather than going all the 6 7 way to full service. 8 So you would either – I think as I mentioned earlier, you would 9 either operate the system at reduced hours so that you still have an opportunity to have 10 increased maintenance hours to deal with any issues that crop up during those operating hours. And it give everyone a chance to become familiar with the system, 11 whether that's the operators or the maintenance team or the public. 12 And then "partial opening" that you mentioned, is when you might – 13 I'll say "segregate" or utilize parts of the system rather than the whole of the system. 14 15 And that's normally a geographic portion. So on this job, we talked about between Blair 16 and the University of Ottawa which is probably close to half the length of the railway. And I think from the conversation earlier, we talked about operating 6 LRVs on that. 17 And that's purely because you wouldn't – you can't physically run 15 LRVs on there. 18 When you reduce the size of the geography, you have to reduce the number of 19 vehicles. So a partial opening is that, it's where you might then, again, only open up a 20 21 portion of the line. 22 And I think one of the things that came out; I didn't discuss it at the 23 time because the question didn't read that way. But when we were talking about that 24 partial opening, and I think it was Mr. Wardle who asked me about it, and then talked

My expectation, it wasn't that the buses would carry passengers to the light rail and then they would travel on the light rail and get off the light rail and then get back on the bus. I was still expecting buses to run adjacent to the line, in parallel

about the parallel or the buses at the time.

25

26

27

- service still. And people would have the choice as to whether or not they chose to
- deviate on to the LRT or remain on the bus. It was not a case of forcing people to use
- it; that was the plan with a partial opening. But as we know, the City didn't like that
- 4 option..
- 5 MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Thanks. I want to ask a bit about
- the disruptions that occurred post-revenue service and before that the issues, in
- 7 particular, that you were experiencing at OLRTC with Alstom trains in the period before
- 8 revenue service. So to do that, I think I'd like to show you a document that's number
- 9 COW0548732, COW0548732.
- ls this something you recognize as having -- something you would
- 11 have seen at the time, September 2019?
- 12 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
- MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Could we scroll down slowly to the
- 14 first graph, just on the next page. Here we are.
- So there's a table here of what's titled "Main events per function".
- 16 Can you explain what you understand this table is showing?
- 17 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So this, as I understand it, shows time
- and mileage on the left-hand side, and then the majority of the columns are, I guess, the
- core subsystems on a vehicle, and then across the bottom it shows the number of
- occurrences. It says, "Main events"; I can't honestly recall what defined the word,
- "Main" but these are a number of events in each of those different main subsystems on
- the vehicle in that time period.
- 23 MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Are you able to say, either from the
- information you have here or from your memory, what ratio, what number of these
- events were related to systems integration problems?
- MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I think at the time, not many. I think at
- 27 the time there was potentially one under the -- what's identified as PIS there, which is
- Passenger Information System, I think some of those -- not all of them but some of them

were related to an integration issue with regards to an input and an output between

2 Alstom and Thales. But if I recall correctly, that was rectified, either just before or just

after RSA, with a software update. The majority of the rest of these are, I would not

regard as an integration-related issue; they are a component-reliability issue.

driver, has a view down the edge of the platform.

MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Is the -- the one issue you do remember being related to systems integration, did that relate to that rear-view camera?

MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So there was -- the rear-view camera is -- at the time there was some deep discussion around integration and there was an understanding there was a change to the inputs and outputs from the -- what the Alstom system was reading from the Thales system, and that was corrected. But the issue with the rear-view cameras has persisted to this day. And I believe that is still -- rests in a system that is an Alstom system and not an integration system. The integration piece with that -- I'm going to get a little bit technical but basically as a train pulls into a station, it relies on something called High-Speed Data Radio, HSDR, to capture images from the fixed cameras that are on the platform canopies or platform ceilings, and it transmits that image wirelessly to screens within the train cab, so that the operator, the train

The reason I don't regard it as an integration issue is the fact that all the cameras on the platforms can be viewed from the control rooms and they're all perfectly visible. And, also, the issue that is occurring, that is causing the problems which is either the driver either doesn't get an image at all or sometimes gets a distorted image or something like that, is not consistent across all trains and all fleets, and therefore it's not an integration issue because if it was an integration issue, it would affect the entire fleet, because they all have the same software on them, they all have the same interface with the platform and with the High-Speed Data Radio. And it's inconsistent, the failures; it's not every train, every station, every time. It's not even every train at one station at a time; it is random, and therefore I don't regard it as an integration issue, I see it as a component issue, either with the software on the train that

is carrying that data, or it's with the screens or a wiring issue within the train of some 1 sort. I'm not entirely sure. It's still being -- it's still an issue and it's still something else 2 that we're looking at. 3 MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: If you think back to the period 4 around substantial completion when we've heard, I think you said this morning, there 5 were still some reliability issues with the train, what was the status of systems 6 7 integration at that point? 8 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** The system integration was -- if it wasn't 9 complete, it was in the 90th percentile; at substantial completion. All the tests had been complete, so other than any of the integration tests that were on the list that were shown 10 earlier that we agreed with the City we'd deal with during RSA, the integration was 11 complete. 12 MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: So the problems you were 13 experiencing that time with reliability of the trains, were they related to that systems 14 15 integration, or not? 16 **MR. MATTHEW SLADE:** Not in my opinion. And as an example, here on the screen, at the bottom there, the last line, PACIS, which is software on the 17 train, it does interface with other things but -- and then HPU, for example, which is the 18 High-Pressure Unit in the brake circuitry of the train, doesn't interface with anything 19 other than the brakes of the train, so there is no integration issue there at all; it's part of 20 a closed circuit on the train, so it's a mechanical device that adjusts the pressure and 21 22 brake fluid in the system. 23 MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: And then I'll ask you some more 24 guestions for the period after revenue service, the fall of 2019, those few months where

there were a number of reports of problems that essentially caused service disruptions

that were very impactful on the public. Without having a detailed list of all occurrences

before you, what do you recall about the nature of those problems and the extent to

which they were related to the integration if the systems or to something else?

25

26

27

1	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So the most, I guess disruptive, I think is
2	the way is the easiest way to describe them, the most disruptive issues on the service
3	and on the public I won't list them all but some of them have been mentioned today
4	were not integration-related. So we had line inductor failures on the roof of the train
5	which were not integration related; that was a quality issue with the component and an
6	issue with regards to dirt and grime. We had, someone mentioned earlier, a catenary
7	failure. It wasn't strictly a catenary failure, but that was a either a loose bolt or
8	another mechanical issue associated with how the catenary was affixed to the civil
9	infrastructure aside to next to the track. And then brake issues that we had, again
10	component-issue related. Crack wheels, no interface issue there, it's not an integration
11	issue. The majority of the things that have had a systematic or a major disruption factor
12	on the travelling public and service, have not the root causes have not been in system
13	integration, in my opinion.
14	MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Okay, thanks.
15	We can take this document down. I have another document to
16	show you, moving onto a slightly different topic. It's AGG0000129. And the last page of
17	this document.
18	Do you recognize this list?
19	EXHIBIT No. 153:
20	AGG0000129 – Ottawa Light Rail System – IC Report on
21	RSA – 31 August 2019
22	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
23	MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Am I right that this is the list of
24	minor deficiencies that were to be resolved before revenue service?
25	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes.
26	MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: And scrolling down a little bit, is it
27	right that those deficiencies that have a number that starts with LRV are vehicle related?
28	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: That's my understanding, yes.

1	MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY : Do you know if these were, in fact,
2	all resolved before revenue service?
3	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: No, they were not. Some of them are
4	still at large now.
5	MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Do you know which remain
6	unresolved to this day?
7	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, I know for a fact LRV 41 there, that
8	says NVR tamper-proof seals, it's still not closed, as an example. So, NVR is a network
9	video recorder. That's an onboard recording that records the CCTV footage either from
10	within the train or the forward-facing and rearward-facing cameras. And as a result of,
11	unfortunately, incidents like the ones that we had with regards to derailments, the whole
12	purpose is these things are supposed to be sealed and tamper-proof, a bit like a black
13	box on an aircraft, and then when there is an event, that it gets removed. If it doesn't
14	have a tamper-proof seal on it, you don't know when it was last removed or inserted.
15	And those tamper-proof seals either don't exist on all the trains or some were installed
16	and have not been replaced as a result of improper installation, just as an example.
17	MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Sticking with that example, do you
18	know anything about why that minor deficiency isn't resolved yet?
19	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I could only provide an opinion; I don't
20	know for a fact.
21	MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: That's fair enough. I am essentially
22	wanting to give you the chance to give whatever explanation you know about as to why
23	it might not be resolved.
24	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: So, I think, and I can't remember how
25	many were on here in total at the beginning, and I don't need you to scroll through them
26	but I think my understanding is that as of this week, and I don't know whether it's
27	today or not, there is about 65 LRV minor deficiencies still open, and a lot of them are
28	very minor. You know, in all fairness, a tamper-proof seal on a device on a train that is

1 locked inside the cabin, you know, it doesn't affect the service, but it is something that is

2 required to be there. A number of these obviously require time, resources and access

3 to the vehicles, and these were all supposed to have been closed by now.

As a result of the events that have occurred, whether it be cracked wheels, derailments, or whatever, an amount of time and effort that has been spent on working on the vehicles to make them more reliable and to get them through preventative and corrective maintenance, there is just not enough hours in the day or people on the job to be able to do all of that work and all of this work simultaneously.

So, things have to be prioritized, just purely based on what work has to occur in any 24-hour period. And you have to remember that Monday to Friday, the trains spend very, very little time actually in the workshop. They are mainly out on the guideway serving the public. There is not a lot of down time for this work to be done. So, it has taken or is taking longer than anybody ever envisaged. But a lot of that is because the resources have been diverted onto far more important things, still associated with the vehicles, that need to be addressed in a far more urgent manner.

MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Okay. Thank you. I am going to move onto another topic. Jacques Bergeron gave evidence earlier this week. One of the pieces of evidence he gave was that he was aware that the track that OLRTC had built had a gauge that was narrower than the specification required, he said up to minus six millimetres in some places. Do you know anything about that?

MR. MATTHEW SLADE: I do. So, that statement was true at a point in time, and I can't remember when. I want to say summer of 2018. It's all a long time ago for me. OLRTC at the time went through a campaign of correcting those areas of tight gauge. So, there's a couple of things that are important. Firstly, it wasn't the entire alignment, it was some distinct areas, predominantly to the east end of the job. And OLRTC spent extensive time adjusting that to within -- so at the time of going into revenue service, there was nothing at a tighter gauge than minus one millimetre, which met the maintenance tolerances for the track, as per the maintenance manual. And I

And as far as I understand from track inspection reports from the maintenance team, 2 there is no track for this type anywhere on the mainline. There might be some areas in 3 the yard still, but there are no areas on the mainline that are tight in gauge anymore. 4 MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: When you say "the yard", that's the 5 MSF. 6 7 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Correct. Belfast yard, yes. MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Is track gauge static from the time 8 9 you install it, or can it change over time? MR. MATTHEW SLADE: It can change over time. It is more likely 10 to change on the sections of track that are made up of ballast and ties. It is unlikely to 11 change -- well, it will change everywhere through wear. Obviously, steel wheels running 12 on steel rails, it wears. But I talked about track moving with temperature, et cetera, 13 earlier. The tracks that are installed on what we call slab track with direct fixation, it's 14 15 less likely. It shouldn't ever get narrower; it will only ever get wider as it wears. The 16 ballasted track can, it can get narrower on a curve in hot weather and in cold weather, unless it's maintained properly. But certainly, the records to date don't show any areas 17 of tight gauge on the mainline. 18 MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: And from the evidence you just 19 gave, I guess we can understand that it is also reparable if the gauge ---20 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. 21 **MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY**: --- has changed? 22 23 MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Yes. You can adjust track gauge. 24 MR. JEAN-CLAUDE KILLEY: Okay. Those are all the questions I

know that since then, obviously the track is now in operation and being maintained.

1

MS. CHRISTINE MAINVILLE: No. No questions, Mr.

COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Any re-examination?

MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Thank you.

have for you, Mr. Slade. Thanks.

25

26

27

1	Commissioner.
2	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Mr. Slade, thank you for coming.
3	Thank you for testifying. It's been very helpful to the Commission. We appreciate your
4	time. You are now excused. Thank you.
5	MR. MATTHEW SLADE: Thank you very much.
6	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: We have another witness coming
7	up. So, we are going to just take a few minutes to get organized. We will be down for
8	five or so minutes and then we will deal with our last witness of the day. Thank you.
9	THE REGISTRAR: All rise. The Commission will adjourn for five
10	minutes.
11	Upon recessing at 2:45 p.m.
12	Upon resuming at 2:52 p.m.
13	THE REGISTRAR: Order. All rise. The Commission has
14	resumed.
15	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Our final witness of the
16	day is Yang Liu.
17	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
18	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. Mr. Liu, you can hear us
19	all right?
20	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I can hear you.
21	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. You are going to be
22	asked questions by a number of lawyers today, but before we do that you have a choice
23	to either swear to tell the truth or make a solemn affirmation to tell the truth. Which
24	would you prefer?
25	MR. YANG LIU: I can swear to tell the truth.
26	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Okay. Stand by.
27	MR. YANG LIU: Sworn
28	THE REGISTRAR: The witness has been sworn in.

1	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: All right. First is Commission
2	counsel, Ms. Peddle.
3	EXAMINATION IN-CHIEF BY MS. CARLY PEDDLE:
4	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Good afternoon, Mr. Liu. My name is Carly
5	Peddle, and I'm Commission counsel on the Ottawa Light Rail Transit Public Inquiry.
6	Can you hear me okay?
7	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I can.
8	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So, to begin today, would you briefly
9	summarize for the Commissioner your education and professional experience as it
10	relates to your work on Ottawa's Light Rail Transit Project?
11	MR. YANG LIU: Okay. My education was I have a Bachelor of
12	Applied Science from the University of Waterloo. I have a Master of Science from the
13	Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich. I'm a licenced professional engineer of
14	Ontario. I have been in the train industry since 2010, working on various rail projects
15	and in the rolling stock design side.
16	I joined the Ottawa Light Rail Project in December of 2015, in the
17	construction phase, as the test and commissioning manager for Alstom where I was
18	responsible for the testing of the fleet. That included electrical testing in the production
19	line, as well as serial testing at the end of the production line, as well as acceptance
20	testing to present these trains to the City.
21	I later moved to the maintenance project in May 2020 after a year
22	away from the project from May 2019 to May 2020. And I joined the maintenance
23	project in the role of project engineering manager for the maintenance scope where I
24	led the team of engineers to be responsible for the engineering activities related to the
25	maintenance of the trains, the track and the various infrastructure access that's under
26	the Alstom's code.
27	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And you remain in that role today?
28	MR. YANG LIU: I recently moved onto Ottawa within the same

company, with Alstom. 1 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And prior to working on the Ottawa project, 2 you had various roles with Bombardier? 3 **MR. YANG LIU**: Yes, with Bombardier Transportation. 4 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: So, you were working in the rolling stock in 5 2010 as a systems engineer? 6 7 MR. YANG LIU: Yes, exactly. 8 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And then in 2014, you came to Canada and 9 worked for Bombardier as a consultant contractor for a year? **MR. YANG LIU**: Exactly. On one specific project. 10 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And then immediately after that, you joined 11 the -- Alstom for this project? 12 MR. YANG LIU: Exactly. 13 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So, first, I want to talk about your role as 14 15 testing and commissioning manager for Alstom. So, you mentioned that you were 16 responsible for the serial testing for all Stage 1 trains; is that right? MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 17 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And serial testing is used to ensure the 18 train is functional? 19 MR. YANG LIU: Serial testing is basically, you know, factory 20 acceptance testing. That means that every train as it comes off of the production line, 21 22 it's a dead train more or less and in serial -- for serial testing, we analyze the train. We 23 bring up the various functions; we load the software to ensure the train is leaving serial 24 testing as a finished product. MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Now, could you please just distinguish that 25 from validation testing? 26 27 MR. YANG LIU: Sure. So, validation testing is engineering-related testing. It's normally done on the first two prototypes or first two units of the feed to 28

- prove the engineering design, to validate that everything is working as per the design
- intent. Serial testing is after validation testing. So, after validation is done normally,
- then your design is proven to be okay, after which point all of the fleet are manufactured
- 4 according to that design, and then serial testing is simply to ensure that every train is
- 5 built to the validated design.
- 6 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: Thank you. Now, you mentioned that it's --
- validation testing should occur before serial testing; why is that?
- 8 MR. YANG LIU: Because the design needs to be finalized. It's a --
- 9 with any product, you need the design to be fully -- to be mature enough that you can
- build that design onto every train or any other product. So, essentially, you do need to
- validate the design first before you can build to it.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And what problems, if any, arise from not
- conducting validation testing before serial testing?
- MR. YANG LIU: So, in our project, yes, we -- it was more or less
- going on in parallel. We had validation testing and serial testing going on in parallel.
- 16 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: And ---
- 17 MR. YANG LIU: And so --
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: --- what are the consequences of that?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes. So, the consequences, you have to deal
- with changes because as you're validating the functions, there could be changes
- introduced to the design. And as you have built the serial trains already, you would
- have to incorporate these design changes into your trains as they're in the
- 23 manufacturing process.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And when you're incorporating these
- 25 design changes, is that retrofitting?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes, that's retrofitting.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And I'm correct that after retrofitting, then
- the vehicle would have to go through another series of testing, non-regression testing?

1	MR. YANG LIU: Exactly. Correct. Yes.
2	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And does that create any risks for the
3	reliability of the vehicle?
4	MR. YANG LIU: It can. It can.
5	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And why is that?
6	MR. YANG LIU: Because, you know, if it was an ideal situation,
7	every train would come off the production line in its final state. We do one round of
8	testing and that's it. When we do retrofits, especially, you know, complex retrofits
9	involve a lot of wiring changes. You introduce new elements to a product that you have
10	already essentially tested. So to address that, we have to define non-regression
11	testing, which means to prove that function in the regress or if any existing testing
12	functions did not show any regression. So after every batch-up change you needed to
13	redo certain tests to ensure that the trains are still at the fully updated design.
14	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And am I right that even despite that non-
15	regression testing, that any kind of retrofit adds risk to the reliability of the vehicle?
16	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I guess – in my opinion it does but you have
17	to mitigate this risk with the non-regression testing.
18	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Sir, you just mentioned that validation
19	testing did not occur before serial testing this project; it occurred in parallel?
20	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
21	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Was that the plan on arrival?
22	MR. YANG LIU: So when I joined the project, that was already the
23	plan. I don't think that was the plan at the beginning of conception of the project. Let
24	me put it that way - but when I arrived in 2015 basically the schedule was already
25	squeezed. We didn't have time to wait for it, but the year in between validation and start
26	of serial production, so more or less it was accepted. It was told to me that, okay, we're
27	probably going to have to do both.

MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And the compression to this schedule that

1	you've just mentioned, or the fact that the schedule was squeezed, why was that?
2	MR. YANG LIU: I mean I think the start of the service, it was an
3	altered milestone. We had to meet that date, at that time, which was on the 18th. And
4	then for whatever reasons that I'm not fully aware of, we were already, you know, quite
5	late in that stage in 2015. So we had to revise the – there was no time to do a detailed
6	validation campaign and then increment the design changes to the design and then
7	start serial testing.
8	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Mr. Liu, you mentioned three things in your
9	interview with Commission counsel that you said you believe contributed to the
10	compression of the testing schedule, and that was unstable design – and I think you've
11	just mentioned that – lack of access to the light maintenance bay and lack of access to
12	the test track; do you remember that?
13	MR. YANG LIU: Those were all issues that resulted – shall we
14	say, that actually delayed our process to test the trains in the suitable amount of time.
15	Yes, I remember that and I still stand by that.
16	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And, sorry, just to clarify it; so those
17	resulted in delayed testing but is it your evidence that those did not actually cause the
18	squeezing of the schedule?
19	MR. YANG LIU: So what I wanted – what I meant to say was that
20	by the original idea – and I think when we started this project the idea was to finish
21	validation testing, implement the design changes and then do the serial collection and
22	then serial testing, which, you know – why all the non-regression or the retrofits
23	associated with validation, but by the time I arrived in December 2015, that has
24	changed. So the plan has already changed from doing that to doing validation and
25	serial testing parallel.
26	But even that, we went ahead with that plan, but still we had issues
27	all along the way of validation and serial testing.
28	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Thank you for that clarification. I first do

- just want to talk about design and stability; you mentioned in your interview with
- 2 Commission counsel that Alstom would receive new design schematics frequently. Do
- 3 you remember that?
- 4 MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- 5 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** And I understand that as a result you
- 6 adapted the testing program to the schematics?
- 7 MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- 8 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** And what does that mean; can you explain
- 9 that a little bit more?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes. So schematics, the electrical schematics I
- was referring to basically shows how the different subsystems and equipment on the
- train are wired together. Because we do have a fully electric train.
- As part of the validation there would be new changes to, for
- example, which pins and connectors the wires are run to. And that, of course, came
- from findings during validations to say, okay, we need this function now; it doesn't work
- 16 like we specified it; so we need to change that wire to a different place.
- And then because of that change in the designing, a new schematic
- has to be released to show, okay, now we're wiring it this way. Afterwards we would
- have to change the serial test procedure to show that, okay, we're going to test it like
- that based on the new schematics.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: What were the consequences of design
- 22 and stability? And I think you did mention retrofits. So I just want to is that the
- 23 primary consequence of this design and stability?
- MR. YANG LIU: So the design kept changing; we kept doing
- retrofits and kept doing non-regression testing. And that sort of, you know, went all the
- way until pretty much I want to say I can't build until 2019. And the impact of design
- stability, at least in the production phase, was that you had to redo a lot of the testing.
- So any time, you know, any time that we save by doing things in parallel, we would

In-Ch(Peddle)

- 1 have to do a lot of extra work to essentially bring the trains back into the testing area to
- 2 redo part of the serial test, or sometimes large portions of the serial test, and that was
- 3 the main part.
- 4 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So it would be fair to say that it's more
- 5 resource-intensive for Alstom?
- 6 MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- 7 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: And less efficient?
- 8 **MR. YANG LIU:** Absolutely, less efficient.
- 9 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** Okay. Mr. Liu, the second thing you spoke
- of in your interview with Commission counsel that caused delay in serial testing, was the
- unavailability of the light maintenance bay; do you remember that?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And I understand that static testing was to
- be completed in the light maintenance bay on the project?
- 15 MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Let me just ask this first, when did you
- expect to gain access to the light maintenance bay?
- MR. YANG LIU: I think I expected to get it when the building was
- 19 first handed over.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And when was that?
- MR. YANG LIU: Before I joined, I think.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And when did you gain access to the light
- 23 maintenance bay?
- MR. YANG LIU: It was 2016, sometime in August, if I recall
- 25 correctly.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And at that time what you received, was it
- what you expected to receive?
- MR. YANG LIU: No, because it wasn't powered. So the whole

- point of the light maintenance bay was that it needs to be in an area with 1.5 kilowatts,
- which is what the train needs in proportion of the auxiliary systems. So essentially when
- 3 we first got to that area it was unpowered; it was more ——
- 4 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And so I take that Alstom couldn't perform
- 5 the test that required power?
- 6 **MR. YANG LIU:** No.
- 7 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: At that time did Alstom have any sense of
- 8 how they would get access to a powered light maintenance bay?
- 9 **MR. YANG LIU:** It was there was a shift in schedule. We were
- 10 − I knew that the OLRT was working very hard to get this power; they do recognize that.
- That was the main deficiency at that point. And that was the main deficiency at that
- point. But I think it was a couple months after we moved into the bay where we got
- power to one area, one quadrant, shall we say.
- 14 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: But not power to the entire ---
- MR. YANG LIU: No. No, it was only what we call the shock power.
- It was not the OCS, the overhead catenary, which would be the ideal power source, but
- it was a short supply. So, another power source that is very helpful, but it doesn't allow
- us to perform the full suite of tests.
- 19 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And am I correct that you shared the light
- 20 maintenance bay for its use in validation testing? So, it was being used for both serial
- 21 and validation testing?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes. For the majority of the period in the
- construction phase, we shared the bay.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Did that have any impact on your ability to
- 25 conduct serial testing?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes. So, space constraints, fighting for space in
- the powered area was a big challenge for us. We had validation testing ongoing,
- sometimes not with only one train, but two trains validation testing. And, keep in mind,

- the bay only -- you can fit four trains in there. So, if you fit the two trains for validation,
- then you only have two spots left, and sometimes we were supposed to test four trains
- 3 in parallel in the serial test.
- So, we had to shuffle around the trains, you know, quite a lot, move
- 5 the trains in and out, depending on what they are doing. As well, the bay, there is an
- 6 issue that -- okay, so if you energize or if you are doing energized testing on one train,
- 7 high voltage is applied to the area, and you cannot access the roof of the adjacent bay.
- 8 So, if validation was testing -- was high voltage, we would lose access to the roof on the
- 9 adjacent bay when we were doing serial testing. A lot of conflicts in that sense, yes.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And so, I take it that would also cause
- inefficiencies in completing the serial testing?
- 12 MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And I understand from your interview with
- 14 Commission counsel that even after Alstom was granted access to the light
- maintenance bay, that serial testing continued to be delayed due to continued power
- 16 issues?
- 17 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. Power interruptions was a significant
- problem for us, because without power, the bays are essentially storage spaces. There
- were issues with the -- we call it the stinger system, which is the auxiliary plug that I just
- mentioned a bit earlier. Basically, you know, it's a connector that plugs into the train,
- you get kilowatts. Looking back now, we can clearly see that it was a design issue. It
- was the power supply to that connector, the convectors and the infrastructure system
- was not adequate, you know, to supply the train. Sometimes the train would be okay
- and then suddenly we would lose power and it seems that the fuse on the infrastructure
- had blown. There was also a fire in the cabinet that took down the whole system, the
- whole auxiliary supply system for a couple months, or half a year. I recall it was half a
- year, or maybe a bit longer. So, we couldn't test with that short supply for a long time.
- OCS was a little bit better. It was more or less stable, but there

was also periods of time where the OCS would go down as well. That would extremely 1 delay our testing progress. 2 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And you just said that it was clearly a 3 design issue, and that the infrastructure was inadequate. What is the basis for that 4 belief? 5 MR. YANG LIU: Looking at it now, at that time, I had no access to 6 7 the design. I didn't know it. I was simply saying why does the fuse keep blowing on the 8 infrastructure when everything on the train is okay? So, looking back at it now, I think it 9 was a bit underrated. So, the electrical contractor that supplied the maintenance base was undersized, and in fact, after the fire happened, the whole assembly was changed 10 to a more robust system. 11 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: When did these power issues occur? 12 During what period? 13 **MR. YANG LIU**: Throughout the testing period, from when we first 14 15 entered the bay to towards the end of assembly. 16 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So, from, you said, August 2016 until 2019? 17 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 18 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: So, a period of nearly three years? 19 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 20 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And you mentioned that a solution was 21 22 implemented, in that the power was changed, so it wasn't undersized. Whose 23 responsibility was that? 24 **MR. YANG LIU**: At that time, it was OLRT. **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: The constructor, OLRTC? 25 MR. YANG LIU: OLRTC, yes. OLRTC. 26 27 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And do I understand correctly that Alstom created some workarounds without the light maintenance bay to conduct serial testing? 28

1	MR. YANG LIU: It was not really possible to do workaround
2	without the light maintenance bay, but we were able to make workarounds, for example,
3	with only the OCS, without the shop supply.
4	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Did that have any impact on your ability to
5	test?
6	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. You basically with the shop supply, the
7	difference between the shop supply and the overhead cabin areas is mainly that if you
8	use the shop supply, you still have roof access. You could be on the roof of the train.
9	Whereas if you were testing on OCS, nobody can be allowed to be on the platforms on
10	the train.
11	So, we created workarounds that basically tested the functions of
12	the equipment that we needed to, but we had to, you know, figure out different ways to
13	do it because, you know, you cannot stand there anymore. New equipment was being
14	bought that fit our purpose. And, you know, it caused, certainly, some thinking on our
15	side of, how do we do these tests now?
16	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So, again, it caused some inefficiencies?
17	MR. YANG LIU: Inefficiencies, yes.
18	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And was more resource intensive?
19	MR. YANG LIU: Resource intensive, as well as scheduling
20	became hard because you no longer you lost also the roof access of the adjacent
21	bay, because you energized the whole track.
22	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. The third thing that you mentioned
23	in your interview with Commission counsel as creating pressure or delaying serial
24	testing was the unavailability of the test track. Do you remember that?
25	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
26	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And am I correct that the test track is used
27	for dynamic tests during serial testing?
28	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.

1	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Alstom's subcontract provided that Alstom
2	was to be given use and access to the test track on a certain schedule; is that correct?
3	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I think so.
4	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And was that schedule met?
5	MR. YANG LIU: No.
6	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Do you understand that the schedule was
7	met?
8	MR. YANG LIU: I don't think it was met. I don't recall the exact
9	dates, but I know that we were given it much very late. Originally, 3.5 kilometres of
10	test track, I don't remember the date, but we were really waiting for the test track with
11	the trains, especially the first train that was supposed to do validation. It needed to go
12	to the test track, but we didn't have it.
13	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Do you recall when you did receive the test
14	track?
15	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. It was around November 2016.
16	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And was the track as you had expected to
17	receive? Was it consistent with what you expected?
18	MR. YANG LIU: Well, I think, personally, I expected, for validation
19	purposes, a much larger test track. Because we were given only the stretch between
20	Sorrel and Blair eastbound. So, basically, it was one track for one kilometre, or
21	something like that. Whereas, you know, for serial testing maybe we could have done it
22	because we don't need to do a lot of dynamic testing, but for validation testing where
23	you need to go round and round, you know, the test track for days at a time, I think it
24	was not maybe not efficient.
25	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you raise those concerns with anyone?
26	MR. YANG LIU: Maybe informally with because I'm not in
27	charge of validation. There's a different validation team with a validation manager.
28	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: After the test track was completed, were

you given reasonable access to perform testing on it?

1

MR. YANG LIU: So after the test track was given to us, there was 2 only, you know, one stretch, you can only fit one train on the test track at any time. It 3 became a struggle between serial testing and validation testing, to have access to the 4 test track. Validation testing would need the test track for extended periods of time. 5 Whereas, as part of the serial test program, every train at the end of the static test 6 7 needed to do a dynamic test. So it needed to go the main, so we -- it was again delays 8 and inefficiencies. 9 At a certain point, we were forced to do dynamic testing in the MSF, and it was not ideal because we could only achieve speeds up to 15 kilometres per 10 hour, we had to put spotters everywhere to ensure that the safety was ---11 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** Did you say 15 or 50 kilometres an hour? 12 MR. YANG LIU: Fifteen (15), 1-5. And then for the -- I mean, and 13 that didn't even help, because afterwards we still needed, you know, as part of the final 14 15 acceptance with the City, we still needed to put these trains onto the test track. So we 16 essentially added a new light dynamic test just for the purpose of proof of concept. **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** Mr. Liu, when you left the project in May 17 2019, what was the status of serial testing? 18 MR. YANG LIU: Serial testing was pretty much completed. We 19 walked through all the non-aggression testing because of the -- all the changes that 20 were happening. And even so, I think it was nearing completion. The major retrofits 21 22 have all been done and we've done the non-aggression test for most of it. There were 23 some bits and pieces to that but was not that significant. 24 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** What was your view as to the readiness of the trains when you left in May 2019? Were the trains where they should be with the 25 schedule? 26 27 **MR. YANG LIU:** They were all pretty much tested to the validated design. I don't think there was much gaps in that, okay, we had many functionalities 28

- that were still unproven or huge retrofits that were happening. I think, at that time, I did
- 2 feel pretty good about the trains. They were running on the test track, and we didn't
- have -- the systems were relatively stable at that time. There was -- the Thales
- 4 interface was still -- that was actually I think the biggest retrofit that the interface with the
- 5 -- with system. There were still changes pending for that. For example, I noted that the
- on manual change was not done, so the trains couldn't have -- couldn't operate
- 7 unmanned. That was one of the more notable functions. So in terms of other things, it
- 8 was pretty good.
- 9 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** So we touched on this briefly at the
- beginning of your testimony today, but am I right that late testing and the parallel serial
- and validation testing essentially means that modifications were discovered later?
- 12 MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And that's a problem because -- and I'll just
- quote you from your interview with Commission Counsel, that every time you touch the
- train, you're introducing new potential points for failure. Is that right?
- 16 **MR. YANG LIU:** That's right.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And so even though non-regression testing
- is done to ensure that it's functioning, it's -- there's just a higher likelihood that there'll be
- issues; is that correct?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes, and I can explain a little bit more. So if a
- design change was made only to one wire, shall we say, let's assume there's a very
- 22 minor change, but to be able to do that change, sometimes you need to do an entire
- panel on a train, and that involved disconnecting and connecting many connectors. And
- when the panel's put back, you know, you are -- we are not simply going to test that one
- wire. We now have to test all the functions involved and all the functions, you know,
- that's going through that panel. So anything that could have been touched or anything
- that could have been, you know, modified or, shall we say, any functions that go
- through those connectors to that panel now need to be tested again to make sure that

1 there's no regression to the functionality. MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Thank you. 2 **MR. YANG LIU:** So it's really an exponential increase, you know, 3 in the work load because you -- everything has been tested before it was functional, and 4 then after you do a retrofit, you have to test many functions. 5 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Just switching topics now, Mr. Liu, you're 6 aware of the various breakdowns and derailments on the Confederation line after 7 8 revenue service? 9 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And you mentioned in your Commission 10 interview that you were confident in the quality of testing that was done. 11 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 12 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Knowing what you know now, that there 13 were these breakdowns and derailments, do you still remain confident in the quality of 14 15 Alstom's testing? 16 **MR. YANG LIU:** Yes, and I can tell you why, because the -- none of these breakdowns or derailment happened because of an issue that, you know, 17 happened in testing, or an issue with the construction of the train that should have been 18 caught. Really, all the analysis and the work so far into all of these breakdowns were 19 20 due to issues that you couldn't have caught in serial tests. **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** So let me just make sure I got your 21 22 evidence on that last point. You're saying that the breakdowns and derailments, the 23 issues that the trains were experiencing, those would not have been caught in serial 24 testing? MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 25 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So first, Mr. Liu, I'd like to discuss the 26 27 power issues that line 1 experienced after revenue service and through the winter of 2020. You're aware of those issues? 28

1	MR. YANG LIU: Which ones are you referring to?
2	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: The overhead catenary system.
3	MR. YANG LIU: Okay.
4	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And
5	MR. YANG LIU: I'm aware of that, but I wasn't there actually when
6	they happened, because the for the period between May 2019 and May 2020, I was
7	actually away from the project.
8	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Or when you rejoined the project, are you
9	aware of any of Alstom's analysis of the issue in terms of what the root cause was?
10	MR. YANG LIU: For the whole CS?
11	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Yes.
12	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, so when I rejoined the project, I knew that
13	we had sent an expert from Mexico, Alstom Mexico to come to Canada to do a survey
14	and an audit of the line. This was around I think December, January December 2019
15	and January 2020, around that timeframe. And he has made a list of observations and
16	basically recommendations based on what he has seen.
17	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. And what was the cause of these
18	issues, as you understand it?
19	MR. YANG LIU: I mean, there was some issues with the wire, with
20	the OOCS in the tunnel not having enough stagger. So by that I mean, normally the
21	wire, the wire catenary would be wired in a zigzag form, so that you you know, it's an
22	interface a piece of interface between the train and the infrastructure. And it's subject
23	to wear because it constantly, you know, rubs against the pantograph as the
24	pantograph is moving, as the train's moving. So normally you want to make it in a
25	zigzag fashion, so you don't wear in the same spot on the pantograph. But in a tunnel,
26	for example, there was no zigzag, so one of the recommendations was to introduce
27	more zigzag in the tunnel. Others were including how to certain ground connections
28	when we see in the traction power substations, for example.

1	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And I'm also right that there were some
2	issues with the line inductors around the same time?
3	MR. YANG LIU: Line inductors though are not about CS. The line
4	inductors are part of the traction equipment on the train. Yes
5	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And they I'm sorry. Let me allow you to
6	finish your answer.
7	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I'm aware of the line inductor issues. I didn't
8	experience them, but after I joined, I learned that that was actually one of the main
9	issues affecting fleet availability in the winter.
10	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: In the winter of? And that would be the
11	winter of 2020?
12	MR. YANG LIU: The winter of, yes, 2019-2020.
13	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Am I correct that the cause of the issues
14	with the inductors, was that there was pollution from carbon dust and debris?
15	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. Basically, the line inductor is in a box on top
16	of the train that has a vent on top. And the root cause analysis done basically showed
17	that carbon dust deposits, combined with, I think, salt, salt water, presumably from
18	overpass during winter where they're removing snow sorry, salting for ice melting, and
19	that degraded the insulation strength of the equipment. So, that made its way into the
20	equipment box and caused short circuits inside the line inductor.
21	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Why was this pollution carbon dust debris
22	not caught by Alstom's preventative maintenance?
23	MR. YANG LIU: I think in the first winter, the inspection, you know,
24	doesn't really call for sorry, the preventative maintenance inspection does not involve
25	examining that piece of equipment on a very routine basis. So, the fact that it happened
26	three months into revenue service, I think nobody would have inspected back then.
27	What did happen was after it did happen, we added all sorts of
28	mitigations into the preventive maintenance, including checking it before and after every

winter, cleaning it. So, it was more because of experience that was added to the 1 preventive maintenance. 2 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And the solution was also that the covers of 3 the line inductors were changed? 4 **MR. YANG LIU**: Yes. Simple fix. It was just to ensure that it 5 doesn't -- that deposits don't come as easily. 6 7 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And since those solutions were 8 implemented, more preventative maintenance, the new covers, have the line inductor issues continued? 9 MR. YANG LIU: No. Since I joined, I actually haven't seen any --10 don't recall seeing a line inductor failure. 11 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Mr. Liu, now I want to talk about door 12 faults. I understand that door faults occurred during the testing phase of the vehicle, but 13 also the system experienced numerous door faults after revenue service in the fall of 14 15 2019. Is that your understanding as well? 16 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Did Alstom do an analysis of what caused 17 the door fault issues? 18 MR. YANG LIU: I mean, I can speak to this in my role of test and 19 20 commissioning manager ---**MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: Yes, please. 21 22 **MR. YANG LIU**: --- because in the testing phase, the doors, you 23 know, would frequently have issues when they come into the serial test, whereas it was 24 very strange for us because as part of the installation of the door, it requires the testing of the opening and closing to ensure that the functionality was okay before it even 25 reaches test. 26 27 So, it was strange for us to see a large number of door faults after

trains essentially having been coupled together. And what we found out was that, as

- the process or raising, as lifting and unlifting the cars during the assembly process, the
- doors could have seen -- you know, could become out of adjustment. So, essentially,
- you would have to redo door adjustments while the train is in working test.
- And after revenue service, I know that there were a lot of door
- faults, but at that time, it wouldn't have been myself to take the lead in resolving those
- 6 issues. It would have been the -- well, I wasn't here, first of all, in that year. So, it would
- 7 have been the rolling stock team at that time, the engineering team, to look at the root
- 8 cause and come up with the solutions.
- 9 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: Can you tell the Commissioner what the
- solutions were that Alstom implemented?
- MR. YANG LIU: I know there were retrofits done on these doors
- after revenue service. I don't know the details of the retrofits because it was not done
- under the maintenance project.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And you didn't actually join the project
- again until May 2020, so this was before your time?
- 16 MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: I do understand, however, that door faults
- continue to occur on the line; is that right?
- 19 **MR. YANG LIU**: That's correct.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And, Mr. Liu, can you just explain why that
- is the case?
- MR. YANG LIU: I think door faults are perhaps among the top
- 23 three or five issues with any fleet around the world. It's just -- so the system is prone to
- issues. Right now, on the Ottawa fleet, during the maintenance phase, the doors -- I
- mean, when door faults happen, it is normally due to adjustments needed on various
- parts of the door. Simply, a technician has to go there and adjust, tune the door so that
- it fits better mechanically, and then the door is fine. So, I think it is wear and tear right
- 28 now that is more or less causing the doors to become out of adjustment.

1	MS. CARLY PEDDLE : Thank you. So, moving on to some issues
2	with the wheels that I understood occurred shortly after you rejoined the project in May
3	2020. So, first, I just want to talk about cracked wheels. Am I right that cracked wheels
4	were discovered on vehicles in the summer of 2020?
5	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
6	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: The Transportation Safety Board
7	investigated the incident, right?
8	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
9	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And a total of four bogies were discovered
10	with cracked wheels initially?
11	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I believe so.
12	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And then between July and August 2020, a
13	total of eight cracked wheels were discovered?
14	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
15	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: What did Alstom do in response?
16	MR. YANG LIU: So, we grounded the fleet, actually, when we
17	realized that there was when we realized the issue. So, in an incident such as the
18	cracked wheels or the derailment, in Alstom, we follow a problem-solving process based
19	on the 8D problem solving process or 8D problem solving methodology, where we
20	would gather the required expertise, not only from maintenance. So, in this case, we
21	would get the expertise from the rolling stock design, we would get the centre of
22	competence involved, in Le Creusot, France, and quality engineering. All the different
23	functions would form a working group and we would by containment actions, we
24	would identify actions to find the root cause and basically what we need to do to prevent
25	future recurrence, so we followed this sort of this strategy.
26	In this case, for the cracked wheels, so we grounded the fleet and
27	Le Creusot our centre of competence who designed these bogies, basically issued a
28	safety risk assessment saying, okay, every wheel needs to be inspected every day

In-Ch(Peddle)

1	based on their analysis of what we have seen, and their perception of the risk involved
2	with operating these trains.
3	So, what we did was implement this check, I believe it was a large
4	number many operators were hired to do this inspection where every train every day
5	was stopped for a wheel crack inspection. There were other actions, for example, on
6	how to okay, so we launched the containment about inspecting the wheels every day,
7	but other actions such as how to identify if a wheel is safe or if it is affected by this
8	failure. So, that inspection was launched. We identified green wheels and red wheels,
9	basically, had strategies of dealing with all situations.
10	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: What do you mean by green wheels and
11	red wheels?
12	MR. YANG LIU: So, basically, it was a term implemented to say,
13	okay, whether a wheel could be at risk of cracking after the root cause investigation.
14	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And that would be a red wheel?
15	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
16	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: That would be a red wheel.
17	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
18	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: What's the status of the wheels today?
19	MR. YANG LIU: I think they're fully green wheels today on the
20	fleet.
21	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: When was that completed?
22	MR. YANG LIU: I'd say 2021. I think 2021, the fall, around that
23	period, but, you know, I'm not - I'm not responsible for actually overseeing that program
24	so I cannot say that date with too much confidence.
25	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Was it the rolling stock team or who is
26	responsible for
27	MR. YANG LIU: It was the rolling stock team.
28	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So the second wheel issue that occurred

around that time, I believe, is wheel flats; do you remember that? 1 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 2 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And wheel flats are just what they sound 3 like, that instead of wheels being perfectly round, the wheels develop flat spots? 4 **MR. YANG LIU:** Yes, exactly. 5 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And that causes noise and discomfort on 6 the train? 7 8 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. You would hear a thumping noise as the 9 train is traveling. **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** And when it's significant enough the train 10 has to be taken out of service? 11 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 12 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: I understand that Alstom undertakes an 13 assessment of the wheel flats issue; am I right? 14 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 15 16 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And the wheel flats were determined to be related to issues with emergency braking? 17 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 18 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** What were those issues specifically? 19 **MR. YANG LIU:** So the flat is – well, to start – so a flat spot is 20 created when the wheels are not turning. So more or less they're sliding on the rail. 21 22 There are different braking – there are different types of brakes on this train. So there are electric brakes – there's electric braking and mechanical braking. The electrical 23 24 braking uses the moleculars to regenerate current back to the line. It's a much, shall we say, a softer brake. Whereas mechanical braking are really clamping on the brake pads 25 to mechanical brake the train. But the emergency braking, we are applying a certain 26 27 force to the brake pads such that the wheels, you know – it could be that the wheels are no longer turning. But because it's the emergency brake, there is no slide protection 28

- that activates. And by that I mean that in other types of mechanical brakes, when the
- train realizes that that wheel Is no longer turning, it reduces the brake effort applied to
- that wheel so that the wheel begins to turn again. But in emergency braking, it's a
- 4 safety brake. So the idea is brake the train the shortest distance possible so the wheels
- 5 will not let go. And that has the tendency of creating flat spots.
- 6 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** So you mentioned sliding, the wheels
- sliding on the rails; am I also right that there was increased emergency braking from low
- 8 rail adhesion?
- 9 **MR. YANG LIU:** No.
- 10 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: No?
- Low adhesion would cause sliding slipping and sliding, but it is
- not really related between the emergency brake. The emergency brake could be
- caused by a lot of factors such as the driver can activate the emergency brake or the
- train equipment and can trigger the emergency brake if it deems the train to be in a
- situation that requires intervention. The CBTC system sorry, the VOBC, "vehicle on
- board controller", so the Thales system, could also trigger the emergency brake.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And we've just heard evidence that there
- was an issue regarding the availability of the wheel lathe in the maintenance and
- storage facility; is that right?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Did that, in your view, contribute to the
- 22 number of frequency of wheel flats that the Line 1 experienced?
- 23 MR. YANG LIU: Well, I think that really contributed to the lack of
- 24 availability of trains after wheel flats. Because you had basically a que of trains waiting
- 25 to enter the wheel lathe to get rid of the flats. But the wheel lathe doesn't cause the
- 26 flats.
- 27 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** And Alstom the wheel lathe isn't used as
- 28 preventative maintenance to prevent wheel flats?

MR. YANG LIU: It is; it is. So the wheel lathe was not – it's used

2	in preventative maintenance because every 30,000 kilometres a train would need to go
3	into the wheel lathe to get the wheel profile – the wheel profile to the nominal profile so
4	that we maintained a good interface with the brake. It's also used to correct issues such
5	as flat wheels.
6	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And am I right then, that the wheels had
7	not reached the point where Alstom needed to use the wheel lathe on them for
8	preventative maintenance when these wheel flats occur?
9	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, because you can't really wait any more.
10	When the wheel flats happen, we have a clear criteria of what's acceptable and what's
11	not acceptable. Any wheel flat that's not acceptable needs to be corrected immediately
12	before the train can be used again.
13	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: What solutions did Alstom identify as
14	short-term mitigation strategies?
15	MR. YANG LIU: For the wheel flats?
16	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Yes.
17	MR. YANG LIU: So there was a joint working group formed to
18	look at the wheel flats issue in I think 2020, the winter – so winter 2019, 2020. And that
19	working group came with many recommendations which, looking back, I think were all
20	valid, such as reducing the sensitivity of the GID system, by the intrusion of the GID
21	system that was activating too frequently sometimes during snow. So that sensitivity
22	was reduced. As well, we worked with the City to implement a reduced braking rate.
23	So the brake rate in the winter was a big cause for the wheel flats because the
24	difference between the rail and wheel, steel on steel, is reduced in the winter time when
25	the weather is cold and we have rain more or snow. So if we reduce the brake rate,
26	then the trains have a tendency, a lower tendency to go into a state where they're over-
27	speeding essentially and needs to be stopped by the emergency brake. There were
28	other mitigation factors in there as well and over time we have implemented those and

in the last winter the number of wheel flats actually – we can see a noticeable 1 improvement. 2 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Thank you. 3 Now, I would like to move on to the issue of track buckling. Do you 4 recall that in May and June of 2020 that the track on Line 1 buckled? 5 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 6 7 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And buckled sections of the track had to 8 be taken out of service for repair? 9 **MR. YANG LIU:** Normally we would do a train speed restriction first, so a TSR first, and depending on the severity we would take the track out of 10 service. 11 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** And in May and June of 2020 was the 12 track taken out of service? 13 MR. YANG LIU: I don't recall having taken large sections of the 14 track out of service. 15 16 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And the track buckling issues were focused on the curve of the track? 17 **MR. YANG LIU:** Yes, so the track buckles really only – mainly in 18 the balis track sections; so where you have the balis around the ties. And it mainly 19 20 occurs – they would tend to take more stress under the heat. MS. CARLY PEDDLE: You mentioned in your interview with 21 22 Commission counsel that you believed this was caused by a combination of the 23 temperature of the track being incorrect for the environment and that too much steel 24 was used in the rail; do you recall that? MR. YANG LIU: Yes. But I think what I mean to say was 25 **MR. YANG LIU**: Yes, but I think what I meant to say was, it wasn't 26 27 that the temperature was too low on the track, but rather, when we laid the track in, there is a stress-free temperature where at that temperature, the track wouldn't 28

1	experience any stress. I think the temperature
2	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.
3	MR. YANG LIU: I think that temperature was a bit low.
4	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And by that, are you referring to the rail
5	neutral temperature?
6	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. I am not a track expert so these terms that I
7	am using could be not the ideal ones, yes.
8	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And you said that you thought that the
9	temperature was too low. What impact would that have?
10	MR. YANG LIU: So, this is based on my discussions with my track
11	expert on my team. So, basically, if the track if the neutral temperature is below, that
12	means when the temperature exceeds that neutral temperature, your steel will expand
13	and that will introduce stress to your tracks, to your rails. In the sections of track where
14	it is on, you know, it is on concrete, the tracks can't move, whereas on the sections of
15	the track where it's ballasted, the ties, the stress experienced by the rails will be
16	transferred onto the ties, and if the ballast is not firm enough, then your rails will move.
17	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So, essentially, it can cause additional
18	forces pulling on the track?
19	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, pushing.
20	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Pushing. Thank you. How were those
21	issues resolved?
22	MR. YANG LIU: So, what we would do is if a track buckled, we
23	would send a technician immediately to assess the situation. Depending on the severity
24	of the situation, different courses of action would be taken. If the deflection is significan
25	enough that there poses to be a safety issue, then I think that portion of the track would
26	come down, would be no longer used.
27	The short-term solution would be to cut the rail. As the steel
28	expands there was basically an excess of steel in that section. So, we would need to

1	come overnight and cut a section out and weld it back together so that there is no	
2	longer the stress in the rail.	
3	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Is that called "destressing the rail"?	
4	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. Except a proper destressing campaign	
5	takes I would say it takes more time because you would need to you cannot	
6	destress, you know, one area. Normally, you would destress a long stretch of track	
7	because it is continuously welded, and that would require an extensive maintenance	
8	period.	
9	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Is work still ongoing on this issue?	
10	MR. YANG LIU: I think so, yes.	
11	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And do you know what work that is?	
12	MR. YANG LIU: There would be a destressing campaign to	
13	destress all the track.	
14	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay, Mr. Liu, I just want to speak briefly	/
15	about the first derailment. We've already heard from Mr. Goudge that Alstom recentl	y
16	produced a preliminary investigative report and made preliminary findings in relation	to
17	the first derailment. Are you aware of that report?	
18	MR. YANG LIU: Are you referring to the interim report that was	
19	published in October 2021?	
20	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: No, this was a more recent report from	
21	2022.	
22	MR. YANG LIU: So that report was prepared by the rolling stock	(
23	team, and I haven't seen that report.	
24	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay.	
25	MR. YANG LIU: I was moving to a different role.	
26	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay, that's fine. Actually, I didn't intend	d to
27	go over the technical aspects with you regardless, but let me just ask if you are famili	ar
28	with this from the report. Mr. Goudge testified that there was some relationship with i	rail

1	corrugation on the curves of the track which caused vibrations. Are you aware of that
2	conclusion?
3	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
4	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: I understand that reduction in rail
5	corrugation was identified as a mitigation measure; is that right?
6	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
7	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So, if I could just take you to Document
8	COW 0466007. And just while that is being pulled up, Mr. Liu, I will just advise you that
9	this is the operations restrictions document.
10	MR. YANG LIU: Okay.
11	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Are you familiar with this document?
12	MR. YANG LIU: So, the first time seeing this document was this
13	week, when it was sent to me as part of the preparation for this inquiry.
14	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: As the project engineering manager for the
15	maintenance project, would you expect to have seen this document before?
16	MR. YANG LIU: I mean, if I knew this document existed, I think it
17	would make sense for the project engineering manager to be aware of it and to see it.
18	Maybe it as shown to the previous person in the role, but I haven't seen it before.
19	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Do you agree that these are the restrictions
20	to be observed by the operator and maintainer to ensure the safety of the system?
21	MR. YANG LIU: Having read it, yes, I think it is a very important
22	document.
23	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. If we could just go to page 29 of that
24	document? At the very bottom of the page, 6.4.1., yes, perfect. Mr. Liu, if you could
25	just read that to yourself? If you could just actually go down slightly so we can see the
26	top of page 30? Yes, that's perfect.
27	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
28	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: So, do you agree that in this document,

1	there is a recommendation to establish a working group to monitor the wheel and rail
2	data?
3	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
4	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Was that done prior to your arrival in May
5	2020, to your knowledge?
6	MR. YANG LIU: Not to my knowledge.
7	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Has it been done since?
8	MR. YANG LIU: There is no there isn't a working group
9	established, I would say, but rail and wheel wear is now a significant topic that we are
10	putting a lot of attention on, and I believe RTM is also putting a lot of attention on it as
11	well.
12	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And that attention has been since some of
13	the issues experienced following revenue service?
14	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
15	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And so, maybe for the sake of efficiency, I'll
16	just ask, the other recommendations here, so ultrasonic testing, monitoring the wheel
17	profile wear rates through visual inspection and monitoring LRV-mounted lubricator
18	performance, were any of those done prior to your arrival in May 2020, to your
19	knowledge?
20	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
21	MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. Can you tell me a bit more about
22	that? Which ones?
23	MR. YANG LIU: So, with respect to the first one, rail wear visual
24	inspection, so that is actually part of our preventative maintenance on the track. Every
25	month, during the monthly track inspection, that is one of the criteria where we must
26	or the technician actually doing the maintenance needs to identify areas with high wear.
27	Ultrasonic testing was being done through a contractor of Alstom before my arrival on
28	the project. Monitoring of the wheel profile wear rates through visual inspection, so that

175 In-Ch(Peddle)

LIU

1 is also being done as part of the preventative maintenance program where every three

- months we would get the wheel profile, measure the wheel profile, and then reprofile the 2
- wheels to the nominal wheel profile. And monitoring the effectiveness of the LRV-3
- mounted lubricators, so these would be the wheel flange lubricators that apply grease 4
- on the wheel flange to lubricate the wheel-rail interface. That was being done -- we 5
- started to do that after the issues we were seeing with the derailment and the high 6
- 7 roughness between the wheel and the rail.
- 8 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. Now, I see I am almost out of time,
- 9 so I will just ask you one last set of questions here, Mr. Liu. With respect to the second
- derailment, I understand it was a result of human error on the part of Alstom 10
- maintenance staff, correct? 11
- MR. YANG LIU: I would say Alstom retrofit staff. 12
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. Yes, thank you. 13
- And Alstom introduced more steps in the process as assurance 14
- 15 measures and your evidence to Commission counsel during your interview was that this
- 16 would not occur again; is that right?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 17
- **MS. CARLY PEDDLE**: There are now quality checks for this work 18
- because it's a safety critical issue? 19
- **MR. YANG LIU**: There are a lot of -- a lot more quality involvement 20
- in the whole retrofit process in regards to each normal quality case that's being 21
- 22 introduced and more sign off needed on -- or for a quality inspector on these safety
- 23 critical tests.
- 24 MS. CARLY PEDDLE: And is that the case for all safety critical
- tests? 25
- MR. YANG LIU: I cannot answer that with full certainty because it 26
- 27 was really a quality process.
- MS. CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. Thank you. Those are all my 28

1 questions for you, Mr. Liu. MR. YANG LIU: Oh, thank you very much. 2 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN**: All right. Thank you, counsel. We 3 will take the afternoon break. 4 **THE REGISTRAR**: Order. All rise. The Commission will recess 5 for 15 minutes. 6 --- Upon recessing at 4:00 p.m. 7 8 --- Upon resuming at 4:13 p.m. 9 **THE REGISTRAR**: Order. All rise. The court is now resumed. **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN**: All right. Mr. Liu, you will be 10 examined now by a number of counsel for various participants in the inquiry. The first is 11 the City of Ottawa. Go ahead, counsel. 12 MS. SHARON VOGEL: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner. Sharon 13 Vogel, V-O-G-E-L, for the City of Ottawa. 14 15 --- CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. SHARON VOGEL: MS. SHARON VOGEL: Mr. Liu, Alstom's plan about where to 16 manufacture the vehicles for the Ottawa LRT changed repeatedly over time as you 17 advised in your Commission interview, correct? 18 **MR. YANG LIU**: Yes. At least -- I'm not sure "repeatedly," but it 19 did change over time. 20 **MS. SHARON VOGEL**: Well, when you started in 2015, the first 21 22 vehicle was being manufactured at Hornell, New York? MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 23 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And the first two cars were to be 24 manufactured there, correct? 25 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 26 27 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And there were no cars at all ready when you started at the project in 2015, correct? 28

1	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
2	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And it was Alstom's decision about where
3	it was to conduct manufacturing, correct?
4	MR. YANG LIU: I cannot really say yes; I was not involved in
5	making that decision.
6	MS. SHARON VOGEL: You were not involved in any way in the
7	decision about where manufacturing was to be conducted?
8	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, that's right.
9	MS. SHARON VOGEL: It was Alstom's responsibility to properly
10	staff and train its assembly staff in Ottawa once it decided to move manufacturing to
11	Ottawa, correct?
12	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
13	MS. SHARON VOGEL: In relation to the local content requirement
14	in your Commission interview, you reference the local content requirement as a cause
15	of problems; do you recall that, sir?
16	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
17	MS. SHARON VOGEL: But that was in the project agreement and
18	the Alstom contract from the outset, correct?
19	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
20	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And Alstom was obligated to find
21	appropriate suppliers, correct?
22	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
23	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And these new suppliers, they're Alstom's
24	responsibility, correct?
25	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
26	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you've been with Alstom for seven
27	years now
28	MR. YANG LIU: That's correct.

1	MS. SHARON VOGEL: correct? And you're aware that Alstom
2	is a large publicly traded company with a global reach and has 150,000 vehicles in
3	commercial service worldwide according to its website, correct?
4	MR. YANG LIU: Mm-hmm. Yes.
5	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And it has supplied vehicles to over
6	300 cities around the world, correct?
7	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
8	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And it has 74,000 employees worldwide
9	and 11,900 employees in the Americas alone, correct?
10	MR. YANG LIU: If it yeah, I cannot say I memorized those
11	numbers, but yes, I would assume so
12	MS. SHARON VOGEL: In that ballpark based on its website
13	MR. YANG LIU: Yeah.
14	MS. SHARON VOGEL: correct?
15	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. Based on the website, if it's on the website,
16	it's true, yes.
17	MS. SHARON VOGEL: So, it is a sophisticated entity?
18	MR. YANG LIU: Definitely, yes.
19	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And Alstom, with the Ottawa LRT being its
20	first project in Canada, it committed to establish relationships with local suppliers,
21	correct?
22	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
23	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And if there were problems in Alstom
24	failing to meet that commitment, that is not the City of Ottawa's cost to bear, is it?
25	MR. YANG LIU: No. And that wasn't really what I was trying to say
26	in my testimony.
27	MS. SHARON VOGEL: But just to be clear, taxpayers in Ottawa
28	should not be forced to pay more to help bring Alstom up the curve to become familiar

1	with the Canadian market, correct?
2	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I agree with that. The City of Ottawa
3	myself, I will agree with it.
4	MS. SHARON VOGEL: So, if Alstom didn't realize that we have
5	weather conditions in this country like freezing rain, as you referenced in the interview,
6	that's Alstom's responsibility, correct?
7	MR. YANG LIU: Well, I wouldn't say Alstom didn't realize there will
8	be freezing rain because all of those parameters was all of the climate conditions
9	were tested in the climate chamber. What I was trying to say in my just to elaborate a
10	little bit, what I was trying to say in my testimony was that it was not easy to find the
11	staff with the technical knowledge locally in Ottawa to have a enough skilled
12	technicians at the beginning to really test this, to in my scope to test these trains, so
13	that was a challenge for us.
14	MS. SHARON VOGEL: A challenge that you were obligated to
15	overcome, correct?
16	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. Yes.
17	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And Alstom, at the time that it agreed to
18	joint this contract, this project, sold itself as experienced in cold weather countries like
19	Sweden, Finland, Russia and Kazakhstan. So, it understood that we have freezing rain
20	in Canada, correct?
21	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. It understood we have freezing rain.
22	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And to take you now to some questions
23	about the testing, the group you led was responsible for factory-acceptance testing or
24	serial testing of all the Stage 1 vehicles as you described this afternoon, correct?
25	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
26	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And that involved both static and dynamic
27	testing to ensure all of the functionalities on the vehicle were working, correct?
28	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.

1	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And I believe you indicated this afternoon
2	that testing starting in August 2016 when you finally got access to the light maintenance
3	bay, although it wasn't completely powered, correct?
4	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
5	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And the fact that the light maintenance bay
6	was then not powered as of August fully powered as of August 2016, that OLRTC's
7	responsibility, correct?
8	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
9	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Not the City's responsibility, correct?
10	MR. YANG LIU: I wouldn't imagine it to be the City's responsibility.
11	MS. SHARON VOGEL: I'm sorry?
12	MR. YANG LIU: I would not imagine it to be the City's
13	responsibility, in my opinion
14	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Thank you. And in terms of testing, you
15	spoke of the challenges of finding local people to be involved in the testing, but you had
16	an adequately sized test team that worked with you at Alstom?
17	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I did.
18	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And those team members were
19	adequately trained, correct?
20	MR. YANG LIU: That's correct.
21	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And it was Alstom's responsibility to recruit
22	and train adequate numbers of individuals for this task?
23	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I think we were that's what we did,
24	actually.
25	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you had full confidence, as you
26	advised the Commission in your interview, that every test was performed properly,
27	correct?
28	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.

Cr-Ex(Vogel)

1	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you indicated this afternoon that when
2	you left in May 2019, you were feeling pretty good about the trains, correct?
3	MR. YANG LIU: That's correct. Yes.
4	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you indicated in your Commission
5	interview that at the time you left, you were confident in the quality of the testing done
6	and that it was done properly, correct?
7	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
8	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you were on a one-year break from
9	May 2019 to May 2020, so you weren't present for any of the trial running so you have
10	no first-hand knowledge of what occurred in that time period, correct?
11	MR. YANG LIU: That's correct.
12	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you were just the testing and
13	commissioning manager, but in that role, you were responsible for ensuring full and
14	proper testing of the vehicles, correct?
15	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, of the serial testing. Yes.
16	MS. SHARON VOGEL: So, regardless of any schedule testing
17	compression that you described this afternoon, by the time that serial testing was done,
18	you did everything you needed to do to make sure the vehicles were safe and fit for use
19	correct?
20	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. So, actually, I would phrase it like I ensured
21	everything that was done to ensure the serial test was performed to the validated
22	design.
23	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And the fact that you ensured that the
24	serial testing was done to confirm the validated design, and the fact that you might have
25	had to redo some testing, that did not mean that the testing was not done, correct? All
26	of the testing was done?
27	MR. YANG LIU: You're correct, yes.
28	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And it was your role to ensure that that

1	testing was completed properly, correct?
2	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
3	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And Alstom had to do all the testing that it
4	deemed appropriate before the fleet safety certificate was issued, correct?
5	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
6	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you indicated today that serial testing
7	took place pretty much in parallel with the validation testing, but despite that fact you still
8	did all the testing, but despite that fact, you still did all the testing you needed to do,
9	didn't you?
10	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
11	MS. SHARON VOGEL: You didn't cut any corners in your testing,
12	did you?
13	MR. YANG LIU: No.
14	MS. SHARON VOGEL: In respect of the delays to the completion
15	of the test track which you referenced today, which you advised you received access to
16	in November 2016, those delays were delays by OLRTC, correct?
17	MR. YANG LIU: I don't know why there were delays, but I I don't
18	know all the factors that went into the delays, but I know that the test track was delayed
19	to be handed over to Alstom.
20	MS. SHARON VOGEL: But the lack of availability of the test track
21	and other infrastructure, which you referenced, that lack of availability was OLRTC's
22	responsibility, correct?
23	MR. YANG LIU: In my understanding, yes.
24	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And your past experience before this
25	project was always working on projects, adding trains to existing systems, correct?
26	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
27	MS. SHARON VOGEL: You have never, before this project, been
28	involved in the launch of a new system, correct?

1	MR. YANG LIU: That's correct.
2	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And other witnesses have referenced
3	issues with the Alstom vehicles, and the vehicles were even referred to as "fragile" by
4	Mr. Palmer of Parsons in his evidence. They weren't fragile at the time you left in May
5	2019, were they?
6	MR. YANG LIU: I mean, fragile is, you know, a subjective word. I
7	don't really know what he means by "fragile". I mean, I think there were also the
8	opinion, you know, while this is a light rail, it is more fragile than a metro, yes. So, it sort
9	of depends on what he means by "fragile".
10	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Well, let's ask within the realm of your
11	scope of work, which was testing. So, in your view, was the testing program that you
12	implemented robust?
13	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. So, in my opinion, we tested the trains to the
14	validated design. So, this was the design that was chosen for Ottawa, and this was
15	validated, and we ensured that every train coming off of the production line met those
16	requirements.
17	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And, in terms of winterization testing, I
18	believe you referred to the fact that cars went through the climate testing at the NRC,
19	correct?
20	MR. YANG LIU: One train, yes.
21	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you saw no problems as a result of
22	that testing?
23	MR. YANG LIU: That was part of the validation testing, which I am
24	not significantly involved in. I cannot really speak to that, what are the exact problems.
25	MS. SHARON VOGEL: But you understood that Alstom also ran
26	trains on the line in Ottawa during the winter prior to RSA, correct?
27	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
28	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And all retrofits that were necessary for

1	the vehicles to be safe were completed before RSA, correct?
2	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
3	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And retrofits are a normal part of the
4	vehicle manufacturing process, correct?
5	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, to
6	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And
7	MR. YANG LIU: some degree.
8	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Sorry?
9	MR. YANG LIU: To some degree, some retrofits are always
10	common, I would say.
11	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you mitigated any risks associated
12	with the retrofits through regression testing, correct?
13	MR. YANG LIU: Non-regression testing.
14	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Non-regression. I'm sorry. And you did all
15	the non-regression testing that was necessary, correct?
16	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
17	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you returned to the project in May
18	2020 as maintenance engineer, correct?
19	MR. YANG LIU: Maintenance engineering manager.
20	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Maintenance engineering manager,
21	apologies. And so, you are aware that in the maintenance term the City helped Alstom
22	deal with issues that arose following revenue service availability, and particularly during
23	COVID, correct?
24	MR. YANG LIU: Which issues are you specifically referring to?
25	MS. SHARON VOGEL: I'm specifically referring to the fact that
26	during the maintenance term, issues arose, as described with Commission counsel this
27	after, including in relation to the OCS and other
28	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.

Cr-Ex(Vogel)

1	MS. SHARON VOGEL: issues, the door problems and other
2	issues. And the City, during COVID, took the collaborative step of agreeing to reduce
3	service very early in the pandemic, as of March 27, 2020, correct?
4	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
5	MS. SHARON VOGEL: At this time, it agreed to reduce service by
6	three trains, down to 11 in the morning service, correct?
7	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
8	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you advised Commission counsel that
9	on the technical front, City staff have been reasonable to deal with; is that correct?
10	MR. YANG LIU: In yes.
11	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And, in respect sorry, I should let you
12	finish.
13	MR. YANG LIU: In my opinion, yes, there has been I mean, I will
14	say generally speaking, yes, they are reasonable.
15	MS. SHARON VOGEL: You were asked some questions about the
16	use of emergency brakes, which you have explained, that they brake the train in the
17	shortest distance possible. And you said that emergency brakes can be applied for a lot
18	of reasons, as I understand it, correct?
19	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
20	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And some of those reasons would involve,
21	for example, if a train is close to a station, a false trigger could be prompted by the
22	guideway intrusion detection system, which would automatically trigger the emergency
23	brakes. And that, in fact, did happen in the early days by blowing paper or falling snow,
24	correct?
25	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
26	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And the pantograph malfunctioning, that
27	can trigger the emergency brake, correct?
28	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I believe so, but I don't think we have any

LIU

1 pantograph -- emergency brake trigger due to pantograph malfunctioning. MS. SHARON VOGEL: Well, you did have inductors fail, and the 2 inductor failing could trigger the emergency brake, correct? 3 MR. YANG LIU: I don't believe so. I don't believe so. 4 MS. SHARON VOGEL: Well, another circumstance where the 5 emergency brake could be triggered is if the vehicle did not detect a transponder 6 7 between the tracks and the vehicle had a loss of position. It didn't understand where it 8 was, then that might trigger the emergency brakes, correct? 9 MR. YANG LIU: Correct. MS. SHARON VOGEL: And faulty valves in the braking units, they 10 could trigger the emergency brakes, correct? 11 MR. YANG LIU: Maybe locally on one bogie, not across the train. 12 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And standing systems not working 13 properly, that could trigger emergency brakes? 14 MR. YANG LIU: No. 15 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And in relation to wheel flats, you were 16 asked a whole series of questions about wheel flats. The wheel flats, that was not an 17 issue known about as of revenue service availability, was it? 18 MR. YANG LIU: It was not. 19 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you also explained the use of the 20 wheel lathe and why it is an important piece of equipment. It is an important piece of 21 22 equipment, correct? MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 23 24 **MS. SHARON VOGEL**: And it is Alstom that operates the wheel lathe, correct? 25 MR. YANG LIU: Correct. 26 27 **MS. SHARON VOGEL**: And it wasn't functioning in the winter of 2020, was it? 28

1	MR. YANG LIU: There were frequent breakdowns, that's my
2	understanding.
3	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And I believe you indicated in your
4	interview with Commission counsel that RTM wouldn't share the details of what was
5	wrong with the wheel lathe and why it was breaking down frequently, correct?
6	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
7	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And the railcar mover also breaks down
8	frequently, correct?
9	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
10	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you indicated in your Commission
11	interview that there was no hot water in the shed to wash down the trains, correct?
12	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
13	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And it is important to keep the trains
14	washed to clean off the excess dust and pollution on the line inductors, as you
15	explained this afternoon, correct?
16	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, but the line inductors wouldn't be cleaned on
17	a daily basis. It is actually a different cleaning.
18	MS. SHARON VOGEL: But it is important to keep those line
19	inductors clean, is it not?
20	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, it is.
21	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And for a low-floor vehicle, the majority of
22	the equipment is located on the roof, correct?
23	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
24	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And it is important to inspect and clean
25	that roof, correct?
26	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
27	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And in terms of the issues that arose with
28	the Alstom vehicles during the maintenance term, you were already asked a series of

Cr-Ex(Vogel)

issues about the overhead catenary system and door fault issues, and so those were 1 issues that arose during the maintenance period, correct? 2 MR. YANG LIU: Correct. 3 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And those were not issues that were 4 known about as of revenue service availability, correct? 5 MR. YANG LIU: Correct. 6 7 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And there were also switch failures in the 8 maintenance term, correct? **MR. YANG LIU**: You mean the switches on the main line, right? 9 MS. SHARON VOGEL: Yes. 10 MR. YANG LIU: Yes, that's correct. 11 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And those issues were not known about 12 as of revenue service availability, correct? 13 MR. YANG LIU: You are correct. 14 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And Commission counsel reviewed with 15 16 you the fact that in the summer of 2020, the vehicles experienced wheel cracking, and that was a serious issue, correct? 17 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 18 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you indicated that Alstom identified 19 these cracks, and it did so during a proactive bogie retrofit program, correct? 20 MR. YANG LIU: Correct. 21 22 MS. SHARON VOGEL: And the wheel cracking, that was not the 23 fault of the City, was it? 24 MR. YANG LIU: No. MS. SHARON VOGEL: The TSB indicated that the wheel cracking 25 involved certain Lucchini resilient wheels installed on the fleet equipped with the jacking 26 27 screws, correct? MR. YANG LIU: That's correct. 28

1	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And it was the installation of those jacking
2	screws that were the problem, correct?
3	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
4	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And Alstom committed to inspect the fleet
5	and replace the impacted wheels, correct?
6	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
7	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And it took Alstom over 17 months, after
8	repeatedly failing to meet scheduled dates, to fix the cracked wheels; correct?
9	MR. LIU YANG: I cannot speak to that.
10	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Well, let's pull up a document.
11	COW0534279.
12	EXHIBIT No. 154:
13	COW0534279 – Letter Green Wheels for Service – 22
14	December 2021
15	(SHORT PAUSE)
16	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And if you turn to the next page, have you
17	seen this letter before, Mr. Liu?
18	MR. LIU YANG: No, I haven't seen this letter before.
19	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Okay. We'll give you a second to look at
20	it.
21	And if we could scroll down, please, but still so that Mr. Liu can see
22	the whole letter.
23	(SHORT PAUSE)
24	MR. LIU YANG: Okay.
25	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And do you see Mr. Liu, that 17 months
26	after the issue of the cracked wheels was first detected after four different schedule
27	commitments were made, the wheel replacement program was not complete; and, in
28	fact, it wasn't until February 25 th , 2022 that the wheel crack wheel replacement

T	program was not complete, correct?
2	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Well, sorry; hang on. Do you have
3	any knowledge of this, outside of this letter? I mean, the witness said he didn't know.
4	You've now sent him to a letter that says some things. What are you asking him;
5	whether that's what the letter says?
6	MS. SHARON VOGEL: I'm asking him if
7	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: No, I'm speaking.
8	MS. SHARON VOGEL: he has an understanding. I'm sorry.
9	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Ms. Vogel, I'm speaking.
10	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Sorry, apologies.
11	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Let me finish my thought.
12	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Yeah, apologies.
13	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: You asked him if he knew
14	anything about this. He said he didn't. Now you take him to a letter that he's never
15	seen before, it's not addressed to him. So you need to be very clear in terms of what
16	you're asking him, all right?
17	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Yes. I'm asking him if he knows when the
18	last LRV underwent the cracked wheel replacement, because I believe he said to
19	Commission counsel that it was in 2021, and I believe that, based on this letter, it was
20	actually not until February 2022 that that program was complete. And I would just like
21	to know if he has any understanding of that.
22	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Go ahead and ask him that
23	question.
24	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Mr. Liu, do you have any understanding of
25	whether it was not until February 2022 that the last LRV underwent the cracked wheel
26	replacement?
27	MR. LIU YANG: I didn't have that understanding I didn't I'm
28	not aware of the exact dates. I stated earlier that this whole program was mandated by

1	a different group. I'm it was my estimate of fall 2021. I could very well be wrong on
2	that date, so if it's February if you're telling me it was February 2022, and it's written
3	on the letter, I will say, okay, it is what it shows.
4	MS. SHARON VOGEL: You can take down the share. Thank you.
5	Mr. Liu, are you aware that in relation to corrugation, grinding did
6	happen in 2021?
7	MR. LIU YANG: Yes.
8	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And in 2021, the entire line was re-grinded
9	back to the normal profile; correct?
10	MR. LIU YANG: It was re-grinded much as possible to the normal
11	profile.
12	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And in relation to the OCS, you'd agree
13	with me that there were specific challenges with the maintenance of the OCS system;
14	correct?
15	MR. LIU YANG: Yes.
16	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And there was inadequate training for the
17	power technicians, was there, Mr. Liu?
18	MR. LIU YANG: In what sense are you referring to?
19	MS. SHARON VOGEL: I'm referring to a presentation, and we can
20	pull up a document; it's ALS0013631.
21	EXHIBIT No. 155:
22	ALS0013631 – Powerpoint Alstom QMS: OCS Maintenance
23	Closing meeting: Discussion of Draft Audio Findings – 12
24	June 2020
25	(SHORT PAUSE)
26	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Are you familiar with this presentation, Mr.
27	Liu? It's an RTM presentation if you look at the top left corner from June 12, 2020.
28	MR. LIU YANG: Yes, I've seen it.

C . F	/\ / I\
Cr-EX	(Vogel)

MS. SHARON VOGEL: You are familiar with this?
If we could go to Slide 6, please, that's headed "Alltrade" at the
top?
And it indicates that:
"Alstom recognized that in this period it did not have
sufficient resources with the correct training to
maintain the network and manage various OCS
rectification activities that still remained after the
complication of the T&C phase." (As read)
And I'm reading from the slide.
Is that correct, sir?
MR. LIU YANG: Because I was not actually present at the
beginning of revenue service, I don't think I can confirm this fact.
MS. SHARON VOGEL: Okay. We can take down the slide.
Would you agree with me that Alstom could have used more
supervisors in the maintenance phase on operations and rolling stock, and it could have
been faster in its responses?
MR. LIU YANG: I mean, the staff was really put under a lot of
pressure during the especially during the early stages of the maintenance. I think
more supervisors would have helped.
MS. SHARON VOGEL: And would you agree with me that there
were resourcing issues on this project on the part of Alstom?
MR. LIU YANG: Resourcing issues? What sense are you referring
to; lack of resources, or?
MS. SHARON VOGEL: Lack of adequately qualified resources
and sufficient numbers of resources on the Alstom side.
MR. LIU YANG: I think at the beginning, at least in the engineering
team, where I am responsible for, there is adequate numbers of qualified resources. I

1	cannot really speak for the other functions.
2	MS. SHARON VOGEL: I'd like to show you a document, please.
3	It's Document COW0593599. It's a letter from Mr. Michael Keroullé, the President and
4	CEO of Alstom Americas, dated December 24, 2021, and the letter is addressed to
5	Mayor Watson and Mr. Allan Hubley, a Councillor and Chair of Transit Commission.
6	Have you seen this letter before, sir?
7	EXHIBIT No. 156:
8	COW0593599 – Alstom Letter to Mayor Jim Watson and
9	Councillor Hubley – 24 September 2021
10	MR. LIU YANG: No, I have not seen this letter.
11	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Well, I would like to show it to you. You'll
12	see at the bottom of the second page, Mr. Keroullé states that he would like to
13	summarize the main directions of the Alstom plan going forward, and this is post the
14	second derailment.
15	And turning to the next page, we see that the first item he
16	references here at the top item on this page, is to uplift the competencies of the Alstom
17	team onside, both in terms of site leadership and supervision at the MSF, and in terms
18	of a better coverage during all shifts.
19	So Mr. Keroullé saw a resourcing problem and committed to
20	address it, didn't he?
21	MR. LIU YANG: That what it appears to say in this letter, yes.
22	MS. SHARON VOGEL: So effectively he is committing to bringing
23	the A team to Ottawa, didn't he?
24	MR. LIU YANG: The A he said I don't okay, it could be
25	interpreted that way, but also it could mean that he's going to strengthen the leadership
26	team here.
27	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Because previously the leadership team, a
28	strong leadership team had not been brought to bear, previously, by Alstom; is that

1	correct?
2	MR. LIU YANG: In my opinion, it was always a strong leadership
3	team in Ottawa.
4	MS. SHARON VOGEL: You would agree that both derailments,
5	the derailments in August 2021 and the derailment in September 2021, were the result
6	of issues with the vehicles; correct?
7	MR. LIU YANG: The second one in 2021, yes. The first one, I
8	think the root cause investigation has been done. I haven't seen that report. I cannot
9	really confirm what you just said.
10	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Well, in relation to the second derailment,
11	you were asked about the second derailment, and the September 19, 2021 derailment
12	which involved the derailment of LRV 21, it derailed, and it was one of the LRVs that
13	had undergone remedial work that was because of the mitigation put in place because
14	of the first derailment; correct?
15	MR. LIU YANG: That's correct.
16	MS. SHARON VOGEL: So the bolt on the hub of the gearbox
17	cover was not torqued properly; correct?
18	MR. LIU YANG: Correct.
19	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And a shift change was a contributing
20	factor for that failure to properly torque the bolt; correct?
21	MR. LIU YANG: Correct.
22	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you'd agree with me that the
23	derailment and the significant damage to the vehicle and the infrastructure was caused
24	by Alstom staff inspecting the vehicle, not noting that the bolt was not retorqued;
25	correct?
26	MR. YANG LIU: I don't think it's possible to know that after the
27	whole assembly has been put back together, you really cannot inspect it any more. I
28	think it was the fact that it wasn't bolted on properly in the first place.

Cr-Ev	(Vogel	١
CI-EX	vogei	1

1	wis. Shakon vogel. But there were not proper checks in place
2	to ensure that that function was carried out properly; correct?
3	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, in hindsight looking at it, additional quality
4	checks have been put in place to do those checks?
5	MS. SHARON VOGEL: But at the time there was a lack of
6	oversight by Alstom with regards to the refurbishment work; correct?
7	MR. YANG LIU: Looking back at it, yes.
8	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And in relation to the OC Transpo driver
9	who was driving LRV-1119, the fact that he did not notice that the train had derailed,
10	that was not the cause of that derailment; was it?
11	MR. YANG LIU: No, it was not the cause, not the cause, no.
12	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And in March 2021 there was a
13	derailment in the MSF yard; correct?
14	MR. YANG LIU: I think it was in the
15	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Do you recall that?
16	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, it was in the yard.
17	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And at that time LRV, it was a derailment
18	of LRV-1116 which was coupled to LRV-1117?
19	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
20	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And as the vehicle moved through a
21	curve in the maintenance and facility yard, there was a derailment of LRV-1116;
22	correct?
23	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
24	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And even after the bogie had climbed and
25	derailed the lead car, which was LRV-1117, did not see any errors and it continued;
26	correct?
27	MR. YANG LIU: It continued up to a certain point.
28	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And there was sufficient damage to the

1	infrastructure; correct?
2	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
3	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And significant damage to LRV-1116;
4	correct?
5	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
6	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And LRV-1116 is still out of service;
7	correct?
8	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I believe so, yes.
9	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And this derailment occurred when
10	Alstom was operating the train; correct?
11	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
12	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And Alstom advised the City at the time
13	that the driver would not have felt anything unusual given that it was the trailing car
14	which had derailed; correct?
15	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
16	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And isn't that the same situation as the
17	September derailment where the derailment was on the trailing vehicle such that the OC
18	Transpo operator would not have felt anything?
19	MR. YANG LIU: In my opinion I don't think the driver felt anything,
20	but I think the one difference is, that there was a CCTV footage on the screen that
21	showed the platform edge during the LRV-21 derailment, whereas the LRV-16
22	derailment, there was no such CCTV footage. Whether or not the driver could have
23	noticed it, I don't know; I cannot say that.
24	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And Alstom was placed under increased
25	monitoring by RTG after the second derailment; correct
26	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
27	MS. SHARON VOGEL: by RTM? And there have been
28	additional issues since the second derailment in September 2021, haven't there?

1	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, there has been issues.
2	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Are you aware that there was a significant
3	issue where RTG failed to put oil in the gearbox of a vehicle which resulted in a service
4	interruption?
5	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
6	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And Alstom investigated and determined
7	that there had been a failure to fill the gearbox with oil; correct?
8	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
9	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And the vehicle was then removed due to
10	damage; correct?
11	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
12	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And a number of other vehicles were
13	found to have gearboxes that were not filled with oil properly; correct?
14	MR. YANG LIU: Just to clarify there, so a fleet check was
15	conducted and a number of gearbox – there was no gearbox found without oil; there
16	was no gearbox that was empty, but a number of gearboxes had to be topped up.
17	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Right. And I believe it was six vehicles
18	had at least one gearbox with oil levels below the minimum allowance; is that correct?
19	MR. YANG LIU: I don't recall the specific number, but there was a
20	few vehicles, yes.
21	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And a number of the gearboxes actually
22	needed to be replaced; correct?
23	MR. YANG LIU: Those at risk; those that may be at risk were
24	replaced, yes.
25	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And you'd agree with me that this is yet
26	another issue that has arisen with respect to the performance of the maintenance
27	services; correct?
28	MR. YANG LIU: Over the global – the entire Ottawa team, yes.

198 LIU Cr-Ex(Vogel)

1	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And are you aware that the City's
2	independent expert, Mott MacDonald, issued a report in April 2022 regarding the
3	Confederation Line, including the maintenance services?
4	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
5	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Have you read that report?
6	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I have.
7	MS. SHARON VOGEL: I'd like to pull up that report; it's
8	COM0010116. It's the Mott MacDonald report dated April 2022. And if we go to page
9	12 of the pdf.
10	EXHIBIT No. 157:
11	COM0010116 – Report Ottawa LRT Independent Review
12	Report – April 2022
13	MS. SHARON VOGEL: Mott MacDonald, looking at page 12, if we
14	go down to the conclusion, please?
15	Mott MacDonald, in the second paragraph under the conclusion,
16	Mr. Liu, states:
17	"In the longer term we believe that Project Co should adjust their
18	maintenance practices in accordance with good industry practices
19	defined in other jurisdictions to gather and track the necessary data
20	to prove traceability and continuity on how often assets have been
21	adjusted, how long they have run and the magnitude of any
22	adjustments and replacements made. This data should be
23	maintained through the lifecycle of the project and used to apply a
24	pro-active approach to maintenance and asset management."
25	Would you agree with me that gathering and tracking data, to
26	provide traceability and continuity is an important step in the maintenance of an asset?
27	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
28	MS. SHARON VOGEL: And that this information will assist a

Cr-Ex(Vogel)

LIU

1 maintainer in performing pro-active maintenance, not simply reactionary maintenance; correct? 2 MR. YANG LIU: That's correct, but I do want to highlight, this is 3 already being done, and I also want to highlight that, you know, this report when I read 4 it, it wasn't – there wasn't a consultation with Alstom; at least with the management 5 team who I reviewed it with, so I don't believe they got our inputs to this report. 6 7 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN:** All right, counsel, you're about ten 8 minutes over, so if you want to start wrapping up, please. 9 MS. SHARON VOGEL: Yes, I will. Thank you. But you would agree that this recommendation for proactive maintenance as opposed to reactive 10 maintenance, accords with good industry practice; correct? 11 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 12 **MS. SHARON VOGEL:** Those are my questions. Thank you. 13 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN:** All right, thank you. Next is RTG. 14 --- CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: 15 16 MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner, and good afternoon, Mr. Liu. Can you hear me, Mr. Liu, by the way? 17 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 18 **MR. MANU CHOWDHURY:** For the record, Manu Chowdhury, for 19 the RTG parties. Mr. Liu, I have a few questions for you on behalf of RTG. I want to 20 start off by talking about the first derailment that happened on August 8th, 2021. Do you 21 22 remember discussing a bit about that with Commission counsel during your interview? 23 And, sorry, Ms. Peddle brought it up today as well a little bit. 24 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And in your Commission counsel 25 interview, if I have it right, you said that while the root cause analysis was ongoing, what 26 27 you do know is that the axel hub came apart; do you remember that? MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 28

1	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. Now, I just want to be clear,
2	and I think Ms. Peddle covered this a bit, but just for my sake, have you read the root
3	cause report that Alstom issued on May 5 th , 2022?
4	MR. YANG LIU: No, I haven't read it.
5	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. And you didn't read it as part
6	of preparation for today or anything; correct?
7	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: He already testified he hadn't see
8	it.
9	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. So, Mr. Liu, may I just take
10	you to one document which is ALS0018035.
11	As we're pulling it up, Mr. Liu, this is the incident report; I think you
12	mentioned this with Ms. Peddle, that was issued on October 28 th – pardon me, October
13	27 th of 2021?
14	EXHIBIT No. 158:
15	ALS0018035 – Alstom Incident Report – LRV 1119 Mainline
16	Derailment – 27 October 2021
17	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
18	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And did you review this one?
19	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, I did.
20	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. May I please take you to page
21	nine or section 3.3. So, Mr. Liu, section 3.3 says, as you can see it on the screen:
22	"The point of the switches in the effect area showed signs of
23	wear; however, the gauge was still within maintenance
24	tolerance, and there were no work orders in the system for
25	this observation. As such, there were no defects present in
26	the Tunney's Pasture area that would lead directly to a
27	derailment."
28	Do you see that, sir?

1	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
2	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. And so, this was Alstom's view
3	of the first derailment, in relation to the track at least, immediately after, is that fair to
4	say, sir?
5	MR. YANG LIU: This was shall we say there was no noticeable
6	defect that would have directly caused the derailment, and that was the position at that
7	time.
8	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Right. So
9	MR. YANG LIU: But in the previous, just one addition there, we do,
10	however we did not reach any conclusions about the long-term effects of railway
11	interface in this section, but it was, you know
12	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: No. No, I understand that point, sir. I
13	take it that your evidence is, on just sort of an observational basis, there wasn't anything
14	obvious standing out with respect to the track
15	MR. YANG LIU: That's correct.
16	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: would that be fair to say?
17	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
18	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. And so, sir, it's fair to say in
19	this incident report, at least, Alstom didn't conclude that the tracks are unsafe, correct?
20	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
21	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And Alstom didn't conclude that
22	vehicles should stop running on the track, would that be fair to say as well?
23	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, that's correct.
24	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. And you mentioned this to Ms.
25	Peddle, but later on you have some knowledge that in the root cause analysis,
26	something about the track was mentioned. I know you haven't read it, but that's your
27	understanding?
28	MR. YANG LIU: I think, yes, that's part of my my discussion with

1	members of the rolling stock team. I think elements of the track was looked at.
2	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Right. So, Mr. Liu, may we just go to
3	a second document now please? It is a presentation from Alstom. The document ID is
4	very complicated. It is RTC 00079996.0003.0002. Mr. or Madam Operator, let me
5	know if you need that again. I know it's a big clunky.
6	EXHIBIT No. 159:
7	RTC00079996.0003.0002 - OTT LRT Axle Spline
8	Connection Report – 30 June 2021
9	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Mr. Liu, this is an Alstom presentation
10	dated June 30, 2021. So, this would be about five weeks, I guess, before the first
11	derailment. Have you seen this presentation before?
12	MR. YANG LIU: I saw it as part of the preparation for today.
13	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And the presentation focused on
14	spline wear problems and, in particular, if we go to page 5, please? Sorry, we may just
15	have to scroll down a bit. I think it is page 6. There it is. Thank you. Yes, that's the
16	diagram.
17	So, sir, a spline, as I understand it, is a component with grooves
18	that connects the two axle hubs, as you can see in this diagram. Would that be fair to
19	say?
20	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, that's right.
21	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. And it is fair to say that spline
22	is an integral component of the broader axle system because it is connecting the two
23	hubs; is that fair to say?
24	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, that's fair to say.
25	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. And just so we are clear, you
26	told Commission counsel during your first interview that what you know about the first
27	derailment is that the axle hub came apart, right? So, one of axles just fell off. That's
28	correct, right?

1	MR. YANG LIU: Right.
2	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Right. Now, if we could just go back,
3	Mr. Operator, up to the fifth page, please, just a slight above it? Thank you. It sets out
4	in this slide that there were some issues with the spline. In particular, you can see the
5	third bullet, there was studies done in Istanbul about it, and certain conclusions were
6	reached. Do you see that, sir?
7	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
8	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. And sorry, I don't mean to be
9	flipping back and forth between slides, but if we just go back to the next slide again with
10	the diagram, and you see below exactly in yellow the third box, what the problems are.
11	There's power dissipation in spline wear and grease mitigation of the extremities. So,
12	these were issues that were thought of that would emanate from the spline issue. Now,
13	sir, I presume that, you know, Istanbul doesn't have identical track systems as Ottawa
14	does, would that be fair to say?
15	MR. YANG LIU: I don't know the track system in Istanbul. I don't
16	think it is 100 per cent comparable.
17	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Right. It probably is reasonable to
18	think that tracks in Istanbul were perhaps constructed differently than from the way they
19	were constructed in Ottawa?
20	MR. YANG LIU: I don't I mean
21	COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Sorry, he's given you his answer,
22	and it was a fair answer. He can't tell you what went on in Istanbul. So, I think you
23	have to take the answer he's given you and move on, please.
24	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Yes, Mr. Commissioner. If Mr.
25	Operator, could we go to Slide 10, please? Apologies. It might be the next slide.
26	Sorry, my numbering seems to be off from yes, this is it. Thank you,
27	So, Mr. Liu, you know that to address this problem Alstom
28	contemplated that there may be an axle redesign to be had, and this was the T20 axle,

1	correct?
2	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
3	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And if we go to the next slide, please.
4	So, this was the T20 axle design that was thought of. And if we go to the I am pretty
5	sure it is page 14. If we go to page 14, please, it will talk about the implant, or page 15.
6	And, Mr. Liu, in this slide, it speaks to the fact that in the Toronto
7	context, the T20 axles are being implanted, correct?
8	MR. YANG LIU: Yes. I believe so, yes.
9	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And in Ottawa, with respect to Ottawa
10	it is in consideration. It is a V5 model that looks like is in place. Is that fair to say, sir?
11	MR. YANG LIU: So, in Ottawa, it is the V5 that is in service right
12	now. It is not the same as the T20.
13	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Not the same as T20. So, sir, based
14	on this presentation it is fair to say that Alstom knew that there was a spline wear
15	problem, correct?
16	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
17	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And that it was reaching a point where
18	it was considering retrofits and, in fact, in some places, it had implemented such retrofit,
19	correct?
20	MR. YANG LIU: For the spline, yes.
21	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Yes. And, sir, you already agreed
22	with me that the spline is an integral component of the whole axle hub system, correct?
23	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, it is part of the whole axle hub system.
24	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Right. So, sir, just what I want to sort
25	of get at is, as a general proposition, sir, you would agree with me that when the root
26	cause analysis report is done, it rules out all sort of reasonable causes that may have
27	precipitated a particular event, right?
28	MR. YANG LIU: Sorry, I don't understand the question.

1	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Sure, sir. So, if a root cause analysis
2	is thorough, right
3	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
4	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: it is comprehensive
5	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
6	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: it will set out that, you know, there
7	may be one, two, three, four, five potential things that may have caused it.
8	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
9	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: We think number one caused it, and
10	one through four didn't cause it. That would be a thorough analysis. Would that be fair
11	to say, sir?
12	MR. YANG LIU: It could be, yes. That will be could be a good
13	root cause analysis, yes.
14	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Yes. And if a root cause report does
15	not mention at all a reasonable cause that a party has documented themes, then there
16	are some reasons to say that perhaps that root cause analysis is not thorough; would
17	you agree with that?
18	MR. YANG LIU: I think I am okay, I think I understand where you
19	are going. You are trying to see if there is a link between the spline and the hub, right?
20	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: So, sir, the link between the spline
21	and the hub, I think you just told me that they are integral to it.
22	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
23	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And what we know from this
24	presentation alone is that the spline has a wear issue, fair?
25	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, but it is completely different than the hub
26	issues. These are, shall we say, two separate issues that were dealing with the same
27	component.
28	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Certainly, sir. And it may be an

1	entirely different issue, I am not pretending to be an engineering expert here, but all I
2	am trying to ask you is, whether or not it's a different issue or not, for a report to be
3	thorough, it needs to rule out reasonable alternatives; is that fair?
4	MR. YANG LIU: So, normally, in a root cause analysis report, you
5	will identify different contributing factors like if you have the Ishikawa process or
6	fishbone process, and then you would confirm or discount each of the potential factors.
7	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Correct. So, in other words, you
8	consider alternative causes
9	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
10	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: and you then say this would not
11	have caused this, but this may have; is that fair?
12	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
13	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. Sir, can I just ask you briefly
14	about track maintenance a bit?
15	MR. YANG LIU: Okay.
16	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Do you remember telling Commission
17	counsel in your interview that Alstom was responsible for all track maintenance?
18	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
19	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. So, just to understand that, if
20	the track requires any grinding from regular wear and tear, that is Alstom's
21	responsibility?
22	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
23	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And that has been Alstom's
24	responsibility since RSA, which is almost three years now. Is that fair to say, sir?
25	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
26	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: So, if there is rail corrugation that has
27	occurred from usual track just the usual business of running trains, Alstom is to
28	address that?

1	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
2	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. And, Mr. Operator, if we could
3	just go to one more document, please? It's ALS 00136505. Oh, pardon me, sorry. It is
4	0013605. So, sir, this is a track test that Alstom did from 2021. Are you familiar with
5	this document?
6	MR. YANG LIU: I don't believe I've seen this presentation before.
7	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay, sir. We don't need to go to it if
8	you are not aware of it. Can I just ask, sir, while we are on the issue of track
9	maintenance, if there is an issue with construction contractor defect, correct? If Alstom
10	says, look, we think this track issue is because of construction contractor defect, the
11	issue sorry, the task at that point is that Alstom still completes the maintenance work
12	necessary on the track, but then there is a question of who indemnifies for that task. Is
13	that a fair assessment, sir?
14	MR. YANG LIU: I cannot confirm that because in my role as
15	engineering manager, that would be a very contractual topic, and my
16	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: You are just not familiar with this.
17	That's totally understandable, sir.
18	MR. YANG LIU: It's not really my responsibility to say who is
19	actually responsible for it.
20	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Of course. Of course. Can I just ask
21	you a few, sort of, quick follow up things from Ms. Peddle with respect to validation
22	testing? Sir, you gave evidence to Ms. Peddle that back in May 2019, lots of
23	modifications were being made to the vehicle as part of validation testing, correct?
24	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
25	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And at that time, you said there were
26	actually hundreds of changes being made to the vehicle; isn't that right?
27	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
28	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And you said that each changes were

1	sort of memorialized by an individual number, correct?
2	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
3	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And you called those numbers "fix-a-
4	problem", correct?
5	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
6	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Or FAP.
7	MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
8	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And at one time, there were about 600
9	changes coming in at one time. Do you recall saying that to Commission counsel, sir?
10	MR. YANG LIU: I think what I sort of meant was that there was a
11	large number of FAP changes in the pipeline. I don't think at any time it was all coming
12	at once. It normally comes in one at a time or two at a time.
13	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: I see. But there was nevertheless a
14	very substantial number of changes?
15	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
16	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And, sir, in your experience, the
17	number and the extent of the changes were unusual, weren't they?
18	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
19	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And you were coming up with sorry,
20	you were encountering issues being identified during validation testing up until or close
21	to the completion of testing; isn't that true?
22	MR. YANG LIU: Yes, there was changes throughout the whole
23	validation phase.
24	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Right. And you told Ms. Peddle this
25	already, that in view of the validation pardon me, in view of the modifications made
26	during validation, there were a number of retrofits that had to be made, correct?
27	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
28	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And, of course, retrofit triggers for you

1	certain non-regression tests?
2	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
3	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And taken together, sir, that process
4	took much longer than you perhaps initially anticipated; is that fair to say?
5	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
6	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Can I just ask you briefly about the
7	supplier issues? Now, on the Confederation Line project, Alstom had suppliers that
8	were based in Canada and North America that were new suppliers for Alstom, correct?
9	MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
10	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: So, you were working with them for
11	the first time as suppliers?
12	MR. YANG LIU: I think either they were new or they were shall
13	we say they were subsidiaries of known suppliers Alstom used to work with in Europe,
14	but it was their local company or local partner that we were working with for the first
15	time.
16	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Right. And when you are working with
17	the subsidiary, you were receiving components that were not to the quality or the level
18	that you previously saw from their parent company, let's say, is that fair to say?
19	MR. YANG LIU: Can we say there were a lot of issues with these
20	components that were delivered to us that we had to work through? Yes.
21	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. So, certainly, this had an
22	impact on both the quality and the timeline of the project, fair?
23	MR. YANG LIU: On the timeline, yes. Quality wise, I mean, yes,
24	there was a lot of unexpected workload. We had to basically equipment that is
25	supposed to be working was not working, so we had to go through changes to the
26	integration process, or shall we say we needed to go through additional design changes
27	to get it to work.
28	MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Right. And you already gave

- evidence about what it was like for you to do serial testing. Just one line I want to pick
- 2 up a little bit on is, you mentioned to Commission counsel that when you started this
- tenure doing the serial testing, you didn't think you had sufficient number of people. Do
- 4 you recall that?
- 5 **MR. YANG LIU**: When I started serial testing, we had enough
- 6 people. It's just as we were progressing with all the design changes and the
- 7 compressed schedule, we realized we didn't have enough people.
- 8 MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Right. So, you had to double your
- 9 team, correct?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes, that's correct.
- MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: And what was the number that you
- went from, sir?
- MR. YANG LIU: Oh, I think we went to 15 technicians, 15 to 18
- 14 technicians in the end.
- MR. MANU CHOWDHURY: Okay. Well, thank you, Mr. Liu, on a
- 16 Friday afternoon for taking the time to speak with us. Mr. Commissioner, no further
- 17 questions for me.
- 18 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN**: All right. Thank you. STV?
- 19 MR. THEO MILOSEVIC: STV has no questions for this witness
- 20 either.
- 21 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN**: All right. Thank you. Thales?
- MR. PETER MANTAS: Counsel for Thales here, Mr.
- 23 Commissioner. We have no questions of this witness.
- 24 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN**: Mr. Jeanes, Transportation Action
- 25 Canada?
- 26 --- CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. DAVID JEANES:
- MR. DAVID JEANES: Yes. Thank you very much. Hello, Mr. Liu,
- I am David Jeanes, J-E-A-N-E-S, for Transport Action Canada. I only have a few

- 1 minutes to ask you questions. I am going to focus on the testing, the serial testing. You
- talked about the use of the light maintenance bay and I'm wondering whether you had
- any opportunity in that bay to actually operate the motor or the gear box, the brakes?
- 4 Like, did you have any dynamometer capability, or could you actually do that, or was it
- 5 just statistic testing?
- 6 **MR. YANG LIU**: We could do what we call a bump test, which is to
- 7 move the train at extremely low speed for a few metres.
- 8 MR. DAVID JEANES: So, basically, just to check that the wheels
- 9 can turn?
- MR. YANG LIU: Check that the circuits are working, and the
- traction is working, yes.
- MR. DAVID JEANES: All right. And similarly, testing within the
- MSF, you said that you were limited to 15 kilometres an hour, so to test a normal
- operating speed or maximum speed you really had to be out on the main line?
- MR. YANG LIU: Correct.
- 16 **MR. DAVID JEANES:** And you said that you were only given use
- of a single track from Cyrville to Blair; is that correct?
- 18 **MR. YANG LIU:** That's correct.
- 19 **MR. DAVID JEANES:** And that's only about 1.7 kilometres, so it's
- 20 a lot less than what we heard originally was that the plan was for four kilometres of
- 21 double-track?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes.
- MR. DAVID JEANES: And you could only have one train in
- service and you only had a couple of switches; you were not negotiating any complex
- track work; it was straight, mostly a straight and level track?
- MR. YANG LIU: Yes, and I want to add one more detail that I
- think it was maybe missed. So at the beginning we had access to one track, a single
- track from Cyrville to Blair. Around I think a year later in 2017 we got the westbound

track as well from Cyrville to Blair. So for the latter half of the construction phase there 1 was two – shall we say two tracks available from Cyrville to Blair. 2 **MR. DAVID JEANES:** But for some time you had a very limited 3 testing ---4 **MR. YANG LIU:** And for your question; we – in the serial test, 5 actually we only wanted to run on a straight track because we needed to test the 6 7 acceleration and braking rates and we needed a straight track to do it, and that's why 8 we only used the straight section from Cyrville to Blair and we didn't cross the switch as 9 part of the serial test. **MR. DAVID JEANES:** Okay. And in terms of testing one vehicle 10 after another, did you – was the access from the MSF to Cyrville difficult initially? That 11 wasn't part of the energized line that had been turned over to you? 12 MR. YANG LIU: Well, we always start with the train under its own 13 14 power to the test track. 15 **MR. DAVID JEANES:** Okay. But it still must have taken time to 16 take one train out of service and get the next test train into position? MR. YANG LIU: Yes, yes. 17 MR. DAVID JEANES: Okay. I have another question about the 18 use of the wheel lathe and wheel flats. Mr. Slade indicated that the trains had about 19 10,000 kilometres on average at RSA, probably, and I think you indicated that reprofiling 20 happens normal – scheduled reprofiling is about 30,000 kilometres. So with typical 21 22 operation several months between reprofiling of a particular train? 23 MR. YANG LIU: Yes. 24 **MR. DAVID JEANES:** And therefore you would expect for 34 vehicles, to have several days of lathe time available for each scheduled reprofiling, so 25 maybe one wheel lathe was considered to be sufficient for expected wheel 26 27 maintenance? If it had been working?

28

MR. YANG LIU: I mean I know that we – it was always a fight to

get access to the wheel lathe and whether it's because of the unplanned reactive wheel 1 reprofiling or it was because, you know – it was one of our blocking points in the winter 2 time. Whether – if everything was working perfectly, whether one wheel lathe would 3 have done it, I would have to look at the data. 4 MR. DAVID JEANES: Okay. And my last question. You talked a 5 fair bit about emergency braking and that an emergency brake application, unlike 6 7 normal braking, there is no wheel slip detection. So it's like driving a car where the anti-8 lock braking system stops working if you're doing a hard braking; right? 9 MR. YANG LIU: That's correct. **MR. DAVID JEANES:** And in fact, that may not be the most 10 effective way of stopping a vehicle, to allow a wheel slip to happen? 11 MR. YANG LIU: To allow a wheel slip to happen? Well ---12 MR. DAVID JEANES: Because a car driver is always told that it's 13 better to pump the brakes in an emergency rather than to have a hard braking. And I'm 14 15 just wondering, is it really normal that train brakes like this would disable the anti-lock 16 function or the wheel slip detection in an emergency brake application? **MR. YANG LIU:** As far as I know it is common and it's the normal 17 solution to deactivate wheel slide protection, your emergency brake. 18 **MR. DAVID JEANES:** Okay. Because you had mentioned that 19 and that was the point that was interesting. Okay, I think that's my time for questions, 20 so thank you very much. 21 22 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN:** Thank you, Mr. Jeanes. Next is 23 witness counsel, so Alstom's counsel? 24 MS. LENA WANG: Good afternoon, Mr. Commissioner. It's Lena Wang, counsel for Alstom, we have no questions for this witness. 25 **COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN:** All right. Any re-examination? 26 27 **MS. CARLY PEDDLE:** No re-examination, thank you.

28

COMMISSIONER HOURIGAN: Mr. Liu, I want to thank you for

1	testifying today; your answers were very helpful to the Commission. You're excused.
2	The Commission is down until Monday at 9:00 a.m.
3	MR. YANG LIU: Thank you.
4	THE REGISTRAR: Order, all rise. The Commission is adjourned
5	until Monday at 9:00 a.m.
6	Upon adjourning at 5:17 p.m.
7	
8	CERTIFICATION
9	
10	I, Mathieu Bastien-Marcil, a certified court reporter, hereby certify the foregoing pages to
11	be an accurate transcription of my notes/records to the best of my skill and ability, and I
12	so swear.
13	
14	Je, Mathieu Bastien-Marcil, une sténographe officiel, certifie que les pages ci-hautes
15	sont une transcription conforme de mes notes/enregistrements au meilleur de mes
16	capacités, et je le jure.
17	
18	
19	Mathieu Bastien-Marcil
20	
21	
22	
23	