Ottawa Light Rail Commission

Michael Palmer on Wednesday, May 4, 2022



77 King Street West, Suite 2020 Toronto, Ontario M5K 1A1

neesonsreporting.com | 416.413.7755

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	OTTAWA LIGHT RAIL COMMISSION
7	PARSONS/DELCAN - MICHAEL PALMER
8	MAY 4, 2022
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	Held via Zoom Videoconferencing, with all
15	participants attending remotely, on the 4th day of
16	May, 2022, 9:00 a.m. to 12:13 p.m.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
    COMMISSION COUNSEL:
 2
 3
    Kate McGrann, Co-Lead Counsel Member
    Carly Peddle, Litigation Counsel Member
 4
 5
 6
 7
    PARTICIPANTS:
 8
9
    Michael Palmer, Parsons/Delcan
10
    Allison Russell, Esq., Kelly Santini LLP
11
12
13
14
15
16
    ALSO PRESENT:
17
18
    Judith Caputo, Stenographer/Transcriptionist
19
    Talia Gillani, Virtual Technician
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Г

* * The following is a list of documents undertaken
to be produced or other items to be followed up \ast \ast
INDEX OF UNDERTAKINGS
The documents to be produced are noted by U/T and
appear on the following pages:

1 -- Upon commencing at 9:03 a.m. 2 3 CARLY PEDDLE: Mr. Palmer, I'm a member 4 of the Commission Counsel Team for the Ottawa Light 5 Rail Transit Public Inquiry. I am joined by my 6 colleague, who is co-lead counsel of the 7 Commission, Ms. McGrann. 8 The purpose of today's interview is to 9 obtain your evidence under oath or solemn 10 declaration for use at the Commission's Public 11 Hearings. This will be a collaborative interview, 12 such that my co-counsel may intervene to ask 13 questions. If time permits, your counsel may also 14 ask follow-up questions at the end of the 15 interview 16 This interview is being transcribed and 17 the Commission intends to enter this transcript into evidence of the Commission's Public Hearings, 18 19 either at the hearing or by way of procedural order 20 before the hearings commence. 21 The transcript will be posted to the 22 Commission's public website, along with any 23 corrections made to it, after it is entered into 24 evidence. 25 The transcript, along with any

1	corrections later made to it, will be shared with
2	the Commission's participants and their counsel on
3	a confidential basis before being entered into
4	evidence.
5	You will be given the opportunity to
б	review your transcript and correct any typos or
7	other errors before the transcript is shared with
8	the participants or entered into evidence. Any
9	non-typographical corrections made will be appended
10	to the transcript.
11	Pursuant to Section 33 (6) of the
12	Public Inquiries Act 2009: A witness at an inquiry
13	shall be deemed to have objected to answer any
14	question asked him or her on the ground that his or
15	her answer may tend to incriminate the witness, or
16	may tend to establish his or his liability to civil
17	proceedings at the instance of the Crown or of any
18	person, and no answer given by a witness at an
19	inquiry shall be used or be receivable in evidence
20	against him or her in any trial or other
21	proceedings against him or her thereafter taking
22	place, other than a prosecution for perjury, in
23	giving evidence.

As required by Section 33 (7) of that act, you are hereby advised that you have the right

1 to object to answer any question under Section 5 of 2 the Canada Evidence Act. 3 Mr. Palmer, if you need to take a break 4 at any point during this interview, please just let 5 us know and we can pause the recording. 6 Okay, thank you. MICHAEL PALMER: 7 CARLY PEDDLE: We'll also plan to take 8 a break about halfway through, just so you're 9 aware. 10 ALLISON RUSSELL: Counsel, may I ask, 11 how long are you intending the interview to last 12 this morning? 13 CARLY PEDDLE: You know, it really 14 depends. It could go up until noon, but I don't 15 imagine it will take that long. It depends on what 16 Mr. Palmer has to tell us. 17 So Mr. Palmer, just to start off, would 18 you please give us a brief overview of your 19 professional experience as it relates to the work 20 you did on Stage 1 of Ottawa's Light Rail Transit 21 System. 22 MICHAEL PALMER: So previous experience? 23 CARLY PEDDLE: Yes. 24 So I joined London MICHAEL PALMER: 25 Transport in 1982, I worked as a conductor on the

1 trains. In 1985, I went into control centres, and 2 I was what in London they called a "line 3 controller". So I would run a line of service on 4 one of the eight underground lines. 5 In 1995-'96, I joined the Jubilee Line 6 extension, which was doubling the length of the 7 Jubilee Line, with an underground section and an 8 at-grade section. And I opened the new control 9 centre recruited the --10 [Court Reporter intervenes for 11 clarification]. 12 MICHAEL PALMER: So I recruited the 13 team, and I then commissioned the new half of the 14 line, and I was involved with the commissioning of 15 new trains and so on. 16 I left that job at the end of 2000, and 17 I ran a division of drivers for two and a half And in around 2005, I joined a project 18 vears. 19 team, which had two objectives. To take 59 trains 20 and add a car into the middle of it, it was called 21 the "7-Car Project" on the Jubilee Line. And I did 22 the resignalling project for the Jubilee and the 23 Northern Lines which is called JNUP. 24 And there we were going from 25 conventional signalling on a Brownfield site to

1 Transmission Based Control Signalling, a moving 2 block from what was then Alcatel and is now Thales. 3 I worked on that until 2011. I then 4 took what London Underground call "voluntary 5 redundancy". So they paid me a lot of money to 6 And I took nine weeks off and started with leave. 7 Thales, the signalling company. And for two and a 8 half years, I worked for Thales as their lead 9 operator on rail projects in the UK. 10 And I worked on the project I just 11 left, and I worked on some main line rail projects 12 as well, and tram projects, including a very large 13 conversion of 867 single cabins to 12 regional 14 control centres, which Network Rail would run the 15 infrastructure in the UK were doing. 16 In 2014, I moved to Canada. And on the 17 14th of April, 2014, I joined the Toronto Transit 18 Commission as the Deputy Chief Operating Officer. 19 So Andy Byford, who was the CEO of the TTC at the 20 time, and is now the Commissioner of Transport for 21 London, via New York, where he was President of 22 NYCT. He brought me over to Canada to run the 23 subway. 24 So as the Deputy Chief Operating

²⁵ Officer, I had the control centre, railcars and

1	shops. Overall rail infrastructure, which would
2	have included, track, signals, plants, electrical
3	communications, the railcars and shops, so the car
4	houses and the engineers who worked there, worked
5	under me. And I ran the subway, four lines in
б	Toronto from 2014 to 2016.
7	In the middle of that, we turned Line 4
8	Sheppard, one person, we took a guard off the back
9	of the train. In 2016, I became the Acting Chief
10	Operating Officer for the TTC, where I had 4,200
11	people work for me, including bus and streetcar
12	maintenance, and a few other peripheral activities.
13	I won that job substantively in 2017,
14	so I was Chief Operating Officer for two years, and
15	I left the TTC in April 2018.
16	In May 2018, I joined Parsons, as the
17	Director of O&M, operations and maintenance, and
18	CBTC, communication-based train control. I'm not
19	an engineer, I've been an operator and a maintainer
20	all my life. But my most recent relevant history
21	is having run the operations of the subway of the
22	TTC as the Chief Operating Officer.
23	CARLY PEDDLE: Were any of the projects
24	you worked on P3s?
25	MICHAEL PALMER: Yes, they were. In

1	the UK, in around 2000 actually, I wrote the
2	date down, for the things. But I think in about
3	2004-'05 the PPPs, there were two in the
4	underground where the then government, hived off
5	maintenance to a PPP contractor. And so by hived
6	it to three, I worked with a company called "Tube
7	Lines", who were responsible for the maintenance
8	and the capital works for the Jubilee, North and
9	Piccadilly Lines, so the resignalling project, and
10	the 7-Car project both came under Tube Lines.
11	In the end, Metronet, the other company
12	running two of the three, I think went bust in
13	2008, and Tube Lines was bought out by London
14	Underground in 2009. So they were slightly
15	different, because they weren't design-build, they
16	were merely maintenance.
17	And in most projects, the maintenance
18	was high risk, low revenue. The money was really
19	made in the upgrades, where if Tube Lines upgraded
20	the infrastructure, stations, tracks, signalling
21	system, trains and so on, they would be paid a sum
22	every month for the next 30 years. And that's low
23	risk, high return stuff. And that's really where
24	they're going to make their money. But the model
25	was flawed in the UK, and both the P3 organizations

1 went under. 2 CARLY PEDDLE: And why was the model 3 flawed in the UK? 4 MICHAEL PALMER: I think the burden of 5 risk was too high on the maintenance side. The б maintenance of a national rail network had been 7 privatized, and a number of maintenance companies 8 were doing the maintenance on network rail, and 9 after a series of collisions, derailments, crashes, 10 each of the maintenance companies went bankrupt as 11 they were sued for negligence. So you only needed 12 one big accident and you were effectively 13 insolvent. 14 In the case of Tube Lines and Metronet, 15 I think it was a government -- I'm not sure if 16 ideology is the right word. It was a government 17 wish to prioritize and make the maintenance more 18 efficient. 19 In both cases, the staff were 20 transferred over to the new companies on protected 21 earnings, and they tried to operate as private 22 sector organizations in a public sector world. 23 CARLY PEDDLE: Were any of those 24 projects entirely new systems that you were 25 launching, like the London Underground?

1	MICHAEL PALMER: Yes.
2	CARLY PEDDLE: Can you tell me about
3	that?
4	MICHAEL PALMER: Yeah, so the
5	resignalling project was to take a conventional
6	fixed block column light signalling. So you have
7	signals going red and green; and train stops, which
8	go up and down. And so if the train went past a
9	train stop, with the signal in "danger", the train
10	would put the brakes on.
11	And we moved to transmission-based
12	train control, Seltrac40, exactly the same system
13	as Ottawa, but it was a simple "IS", not the
14	regular version, which is "MS."
15	And it was an inductive loop, two loops
16	in the track, but the logic was the same, using
17	Seltrac40, where the train would report its
18	position every second, and every three seconds the
19	centralized computers would tell the train how far
20	and how fast it can go, which is normally to the
21	next station.
22	And so it's exactly the same
23	technology, just perhaps one, perhaps two
24	generations further back, than the Seltrac40
25	installed in Ottawa by Thales, my old company.

Ottawa Light Rail Commission Michael Palmer on 5/4/2022

1	CARLY PEDDLE: And so it's just a
2	matter of the generation of the technology, it's
3	not that one is a more complex version?
4	MICHAEL PALMER: Yeah, indeed. The
5	premise is still the same, which is centralized
6	control of trains and movement with switches.
7	Then, the communication made was via
8	two conductor loops laid on the track, so it's like
9	two aerials with antennae on the train, picking up
10	its information and sending its information.
11	And then they were called "VCCs",
12	vehicle control centres. Now they're called "zone
13	controllers" but their premise is the same. If you
14	go in an area of the track for vital signalling,
15	train separation and interlocking. It's exactly
16	the same system. It's the means by which the train
17	reported itself and got its instructions.
18	The system is call Seltrac40
19	S-E-L-T-R-A-C. The "trac" is obvious. "Sel"
20	stands for "Standard Elektrik Lorenz", which is the
21	German company who invented SelTrac in the '70s, I
22	guess. And before it was the first place it
23	was opened, which is why it's relevant, was
24	actually in Toronto on Line 3, and Scarborough
25	Rapid Transit followed six months later by

1	Vancouver SkyTrain, were the first two lines in the
2	world to get SelTrac.
3	And so I was responsible in my four
4	years at the TTC, for the operation and maintenance
5	of a small line run by SelTrac.
6	CARLY PEDDLE: In terms of oversight
7	and accountability, did you see any differences
8	between the Ottawa Light Rail Transit Project Stage 1,
9	and the other projects you worked on?
10	MICHAEL PALMER: The most obvious
11	difference is that it was really a three-way
12	relationship in Ottawa. Because you have the City,
13	you have the construction project and
14	Infrastructure Ontario, and then you have the P3
15	contractor.
16	In London, you had London Underground
17	as the operator, and Tube Lines as the maintainer,
18	and the provider of capital renewals.
19	I think the other difference is that
20	London Underground is the oldest underground in the
21	world, obviously Metro, now carries 5 million
22	people a day. And in my 29 years at London
23	Underground, it was like being at the university of
24	how to run a subway. It was that experience,
25	skills and knowledge that I acquired in the

1	29 years, which allowed me to move to Canada. And
2	Andy Byford, the Chief Executive of the TTC
3	employed me. I applied for, and I was selected to
4	come over to Toronto and try and improve the subway
5	network here.
6	I think the other thing about the P3s
7	in the UK, is they're far less adversarial. In the
8	sense that both sides knew each other, and there
9	was a shared goal. So although they fell out with
10	each other, and there were, you know, claims, it
11	didn't descend into a difficult relationship. It
12	was just people successfully you know, we
13	introduced communication by train control with the
14	inductive loop on two lines. One was late, and the
15	second was under budget, early, on a new schedule.
16	It was really baseline just once. So, generally, I
17	think there was a collaborative atmosphere.

I think the other experience, which is not the same, but similar, was resignalling Line 1 in Toronto using CBTC from Alstom, and they have a system called Urbalis 400. I terminated a previous signalling contractor for poor performance, and we went with Alstom in March 2015, 30th of March we signed the contract.

25

And in the three years before I left

1	the TTC, we delivered half of Brownfield CBTC. In
2	that three years, my directive the project and I
3	did not go out of contract once with Alstom. Where
4	we disagreed, we would negotiate; we would use our
5	reserves; they would use their's. There was always
6	a way forward, and we felt that getting out of
7	contract was the last resort.
8	When I left, we were on time, slipping
9	slightly, and we have 13 million in reserves for
10	contingency still.
11	CARLY PEDDLE: So what impact did the
12	fact that there was the three-way relationship have
13	on the project in your view?
14	MICHAEL PALMER: It depends on the
15	three-way relationship, I think, to be honest. So
16	Ottawa is a city for the construction, the
17	commissioning and the operation of LRT, hadn't done
18	it before. So the City of Ottawa was new to this
19	game, if you'd like.
20	I think the rail construction project,
21	which was run by the City, OC Transpo, was a team
22	put together. Steve Cripps was in charge then
23	before Michael Morgan took over, and Steve returned
24	to Toronto. And so it was a very widespread team
25	from the States and from Canada.

1 I couldn't tell you exactly who put the 2 Project Agreement together. But, you know, I was 3 travelling some weeks from Toronto, some people 4 were flying from the States on a weekly basis. 5 The P3 company in the UK, they were 6 consortia as well, in our case it was Bechtel and 7 AMEY owned two-thirds and Bechtel owned AMEY. 8 one-third. 9 And you had three different contractors 10 here with experience of Canadian P3s, but not 11 necessarily in rail. And they just had a very 12 different culture and attitude towards the P3. 13 I think they were incredibly risk 14 averse commercially. They signed a contract, they were presumably -- and I wasn't part of selecting 15 16 the successful P3 -- a compliant, lowest cost bid. 17 And I think there's a saying which is applicable, 18 which is: If something sounds too good to be true, 19 it normally isn't true. And, you know, if you're 20 the cheapest bid, then the focus is clearly on 21 cost. 22 Sorry, just as a follow-on. Ι 23 apologize if any of you are project managers at 24 some point in the past. But there are three 25 pillars to a project, time, cost and quality. So

1	the perfect project is on time, on budget and the
2	quality is what is expected, which is generally
3	high and it's good.
4	In other words, any project you decide
5	which of those is most important to you of the
6	three. Now, in a rail project, to me, quality
7	always wins. Because if a rail project is late,
8	you're eventually forgiven. If a rail project is
9	expensive, once you've paid the money, you're
10	generally forgiven. But if the quality is not
11	there from the beginning, then you're living with
12	that for 27 years, and you're never forgiven.
13	But I think on this, certainly on
14	Confed and the nature of the P3 to the rail in
15	Ontario, if the time and the cost are really
16	important, and that transfer of risk, as well,
17	where you want the P3 to assume the risk for the
18	project in terms of reliability, technology that's
19	chosen and so on. I'm not sure that risk is always
20	fully transferred.
21	KATE McGRANN: Just a quick follow-up
22	question, which was: As you were describing the
23	Ottawa project, you mentioned that they were very
24	risk averse. Who were you referring to when you
25	said "they were very risk averse".

MICHAEL PALMER: I think Ottawa as a city, and as a construction project, did not want to fall afoul of the Project Agreement, correctly, and they really tried to let the P3 make the decisions and bear the risk and do what they were paid to do.

7 And I think the P3, having put in the 8 lowest compliant price, were very, very aware of 9 budget and time. With the time scale because of 10 payments, and the budget because it was a fixed 11 price contract. And typically in these contracts, 12 the claims start coming in, and the contractor will 13 try and make money on the additional claims. And 14 those claims are often very valid and sometimes 15 they are frivolous. And you see that on Eqlinton 16 Crosstown; you see that on Finch; you've seen it in 17 Ottawa as well. This kind of a claims culture I 18 think which is not prevalent in UK, in Europe.

CARLY PEDDLE: In Ottawa, where do you think this claims culture arises from, other than -if anything other than just the nature of the contractual relationship?

ALLISON RUSSELL: Sorry. I don't mean to interrupt. But in terms of that question, we have to keep in mind that Mr. Palmer is only able

1	to really answer these questions from his
2	perspective, and his role on the project.
3	As long as it's understood that it's
4	from that perspective, and only if Mr. Palmer feels
5	that he can answer from that perspective.
6	CARLY PEDDLE: Yes, absolutely.
7	So in your experience on the project,
8	was there anything that you observed that you
9	believe gave rise to, or contributed to the more
10	adversarial relationship?
11	MICHAEL PALMER: As I said earlier, it
12	depends on the P3 consortia. So where you had
13	SNC-Lavalin, Dragados and EllisDon, those
14	organizations have a very integrated aggressiveness
15	in their stance, you know, quite aggressive. They
16	have to be, because they have to make their money
17	from it. But they bid for the work, and they knew
18	what they were bidding in for.
19	And I think when a project starts to
20	slip time-wise, or when it gets expensive, then you
21	have two ways to go: Collaborative or adversarial.
22	And I would say, as soon as you go down the
23	adversarial road, it's very hard to pull back from
24	that.
25	When we went with Alstom, as I think I

1	said in 2015, for the line model resignalling, in
2	the three years we had that contract, we didn't get
3	the contract out once. Because I see that as a
4	last resort, not a first resort.
5	And so you go into a commercial
6	environment, the work still continues, there's no
7	doubt about that. But I think the P3s wished to
8	give a compliance solution, and there's a whole
9	fight about whether Stage 1 was compliant. But
10	they also need to do it on time and on budget,
11	otherwise they're not going to make any money.
12	And more recently, the number of P3
13	bidders has dropped in Ontario. And I think that
14	IO and safe Metrolinx with Phil Verster would agree
15	with that. Models change slightly around sharing
16	risk for Metrolinx. But I think you know, fewer
17	people are bidding for these contracts now.
18	SNC-Lavalin's last rail construction P3
19	was Trillium, which is going on alongside Confed.
20	They're getting out of that game. And so I think
21	a number of people aren't willing to take that risk
22	on.
23	Parsons are bidding for P3 works in
24	Ontario line, and I think Metrolinx have now
25	accepted that some of the risk inherently lays

1 in-house. It is unreasonable to ask a P3 2 to contract to take on all the risk without 3 And so the model here, I think, has moved caveats. 4 to more shared risk approach, which I think is 5 suitable. Because you both gain and both share 6 pain. 7 CARLY PEDDLE: Mr. Palmer, you said you 8 started with the OLRT project in May 2018; is that 9 right? 10 MICHAEL PALMER: No, I joined Parsons 11 in May 2018. I was trying to look for the date, 12 actually, it was either August or September. Jon 13 Hulse, who I believe you spoke to yesterday, 14 brought me to Ottawa to meet Richard Holder, who 15 led the Systems Group under Steve Cripps as the 16 Project Director. And in that first week, I met 17 Steve, I met Richard Holder, and I briefly met John 18 Manconi. 19 And then I started working perhaps two 20 weeks in a month, either remotely from Toronto or 21 in Ottawa, and that went up and down, depending on 22 where they were in the project.

So I would say, it was either August or
 September 2018 when I first came to Ottawa and met
 some of the key people.

1	CARLY PEDDLE: And I understand Parsons
2	had been working on the project for some years
3	since 2015?
4	ALLISON RUSSELL: Sorry. Again, I
5	don't mean to interrupt. But I think it's fair to
б	put questions to Mr. Palmer with respect to what he
7	knew at the time.
8	So I'm okay with him answering when he
9	started, but if Parsons started before he was with
10	the company, I'm not sure that's the right question
11	for Mr. Palmer.
12	CARLY PEDDLE: That's fine.
13	Mr. Palmer, did you take over your job
14	from someone else?
15	MICHAEL PALMER: No. I filled a gap
16	really that was missing. As I said to you, I'm not
17	an engineer, I'm an operator. And I spend my
18	entire life if you'll excuse the
19	colloquialism of beating up engineers and
20	consultants who don't do what they're meant to be
21	doing, or they tell me what I already know.
22	And there is a gap in Richard Holder's
23	team around O&M by people who have done this
24	previously. And so Mr. Hulse and Mr. McCurdy, who
25	I think you'll be speaking to this afternoon, both

1 have experience in Brownfield. And I have, I 2 quess, a proven track record in commissioning three 3 CBTC systems, two Brownfield in London, and one 4 Greenfield trope Brownfield in Toronto. 5 The Toronto experience was opening up 6 The Toronto, York Spadina extension, the TYSSE. which was opened in 2017, December 2017. So there 7 8 were seven stations that were brand new, and the 9 rest on the line we converted. So I brought to 10 Ottawa the experience of CBTC commissioning, 11 Greenfield and Brownfield, rules and regulations 12 how to run control centres, and so on. 13 I think that plugged a gap in Mr. 14 Holder's team, in terms of working with the rest of 15 the team and with OC Transpo and the P3. 16 CARLY PEDDLE: And you said "O&M", is 17 that "operations and maintenance"? 18 MICHAEL PALMER: Yes, ma'am. 19 CARLY PEDDLE: So you mentioned some of 20 the responsibilities that you took over. Was there 21 anything else that you were involved in, in this 22 role on the OLRT-1 project? 23 MICHAEL PALMER: No. I was in Richard 24 Holder's team throughout. I did meet John Manconi 25 in the first week for a 15-minute chat, which

1 turned into 45 minutes. And I was going to join 2 his deep dives led by Tom Prendergast, and the next 3 morning he changed his mind, and I didn't get involved with it. 4 5 So after that first day, I actually 6 never spoke to John Manconi again. So it was on 7 the construction side. I worked with people below 8 Mr. Manconi, so Joanna -- I can't think of the last 9 name -- who was in charge of operations. Trov 10 Charter, who is now in charge. Duane Duquette, 11 Joel Lemieux, so I worked a lot with the line team, 12 helping them understand what they were getting and 13 what the salient things were about the system, how 14 to operate it and so on. Including in a P3 15 environment. 16 CARLY PEDDLE: Why is it that you 17 understand you did not meet with Mr. Manconi? 18 Well, I met with him MICHAEL PALMER: 19 once, and he changed his mind, I can't tell you 20 I don't know. why. 21 Well, yeah, I'm not going to give you 22 my theory, but you would have to ask him why he 23 chose not to use me more. 24 But as it turned out, I was very happy 25 starting with Richard Holder's team. And there was

1 a hole to be filled, and I hopefully plugged that 2 to some degree. 3 CARLY PEDDLE: Did vour 4 responsibilities change over time? 5 MICHAEL PALMER: I would say they moved 6 So I took on more things from Mr. Holder, around. you know, some things which he didn't need to be 7 8 doing, like leading the SOP process from the City's 9 point of view. And I took on, I quess, things that 10 fell between the cracks, or hadn't really been 11 covered, or things that emerged. 12 So signage, updating the ConOps, 13 helping RTM write SOPs, which is part of the P3. 14 It's a very laborious process of drafting SOP and 15 commenting on it, and revisions and so on. 16 I picked up signage, which was 17 something kind of weird, really, which had fallen 18 between the cracks. So it was operation signage 19 along the line, which had been installed and had to 20 be viewed to see if it was correctly installed. 21 I got involved in the DITLOs, the 22 day-in-the-life-of. So SNC-Lavalin ran, I think 23 four days of DITLOs at their offices. And 24 OC Transpo provided with players amongst a small 25 number of stretch of line to ensure it was, it was

1 valid, it was an exercise. And that the operators, 2 OC Transpo, had the skills, knowledge and 3 experience on their side. And they did very well, 4 actually, for a company who has not really done 5 rail before Confederation Line. 6 I'm not sure I can really count 7 Trillium, the old Trillium Line, because it was 8 signaled by control centre by RailTerm in Québec. 9 And it was for trains going up and down 10 all day. I mean, they did a good job, but I think 11 I plugged the gap on rail experience, 12 operationally, for some of the people. 13 CARLY PEDDLE: And you just mentioned 14 "SOPs", that's "standard operating procedures"? 15 MICHAEL PALMER: Yeah. And it's 16 been -- it's probably on all of the P3s in Ontario. 17 And in fact, you know, when my team were taking on 18 contract work to write -- well, convert the SOPs in 19 Vancouver for the Broadway extension, whether 20 that's the right way to go, I think it's the 21 transfer of risk again, and getting the P3 22 providers to write these SOPs. 23 And so they would draft one, OC would 24 be allowed to comment on it, on the rail 25 construction project. We would list their

1	comments, send it back, and they would agree or
2	disagree, make the changes, send it back. And we
3	would either close out the comments, or keep them
4	open and they'd have a second go of trying to
5	resolve it. And there's this ping-pong between the
6	two sides, which was taking months and years to
7	complete.
8	CARLY PEDDLE: In your experience, is
9	that pretty typical for it to be this ping-pong
10	back and forth?
11	MICHAEL PALMER: No. Trying to write
12	SOPs by committee is just a hopeless task, because
13	everyone has a different view. And a lot of people
14	commenting were engineers commenting on operational
15	rules and procedures.
16	In my experience in London, it was done
17	by a much smaller team who had previous skills,
18	knowledge and experience. I think people did their
19	best, but you know, it became a distraction for
20	people who spent their entire time commenting on
21	the rules and procedures, where they probably have
22	better things to be doing. But it was part of the
23	contract.
24	And when I took over, there were

²⁵ probably about 20 outstanding SOPs, and we managed

Τ

25

1	to get them all over the line. For different
2	reasons, but it was just taking way longer.
3	CARLY PEDDLE: Who was involved in this
4	process of developing SOPs?
5	MICHAEL PALMER: The Chief Safety
6	Officer at the time, Jim Hopkins, myself, the
7	control centre manager, Joel Lemieux from
8	OC Transpo, and occasionally some of his team.
9	From RTM, it was led by Murray Hill.
10	And he had a chap helping him, whose name escapes
11	me, who left RTM. And then we had other people
12	from rail construction project. So we had the
13	person in charge of the actual location of rolling
14	stock, the signalling. So depending on the SOPs,
15	we called people who were subject matter experts on
16	the SOP.
17	Bearing in mind, they were either
18	operations or maintenance procedures, you know,
19	they're not meant to be technical books on how to
20	fix something, or how to maintain something. It's
21	operational procedures, maintenance procedures on
22	the daily basis to keep the railway safe and
23	running.
24	CARLY PEDDLE: And you mentioned what

you called DITLOs, "day-in-the-life-of"; is that

1right?2MICHAEL PALMER: Uhm-hmm.3CARLY PEDDLE: Can you explain ju4bit more of what that is?5MICHAEL PALMER: Normally, a DITH6takes place reasonably early in the project,7it's based on the concept of operations. And8role players from OC and RTM, play out a numb9scenarios over a number of days, from normal10scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scenar11and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken12Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2.13You have the same players, generar14because although you want people to get the15exposure and the experience, you can't keep16changing people around every day, because you17from a low baseline.18A scenario is given to the player19you normally have a map on the table, or a tr20model set, so you can move things around as to21scenario develops. And then some facilitator22be testing your skills, knowledge and experied23operate the railway safely.24And you start with easy scenarios		
2MICHAEL PALMER: Uhm-hmm.3CARLY PEDDLE: Can you explain ju4bit more of what that is?5MICHAEL PALMER: Normally, a DITH6takes place reasonably early in the project,7it's based on the concept of operations. And8role players from OC and RTM, play out a numb9scenarios over a number of days, from normal10scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scenarian11and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken12Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2.13You have the same players, generation14because although you want people to get the15exposure and the experience, you can't keep16changing people around every day, because you17from a low baseline.18A scenario is given to the players19you normally have a map on the table, or a tra20model set, so you can move things around as to21scenario develops. And then some facilitator22be testing your skills, knowledge and experied23operate the railway safely.24And you start with easy scenarios	1	right?
3CARLY PEDDLE:Can you explain ju4bit more of what that is?5MICHAEL PALMER: Normally, a DITH6takes place reasonably early in the project,7it's based on the concept of operations. And8role players from OC and RTM, play out a numb9scenarios over a number of days, from normal10scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scenario11and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken12Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2.13You have the same players, general14because although you want people to get the15exposure and the experience, you can't keep16changing people around every day, because you17from a low baseline.18A scenario is given to the player19you normally have a map on the table, or a tra20model set, so you can move things around as to21scenario develops. And then some facilitator22be testing your skills, knowledge and experied23operate the railway safely.24And you start with easy scenarios	2	MICHAEL PALMER: Uhm-hmm.
 bit more of what that is? MICHAEL PALMER: Normally, a DITI takes place reasonably early in the project, it's based on the concept of operations. And role players from OC and RTM, play out a numb scenarios over a number of days, from normal scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scena and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2. You have the same players, genera because although you want people to get the exposure and the experience, you can't keep changing people around every day, because you from a low baseline. A scenario is given to the player you normally have a map on the table, or a tr model set, so you can move things around as the scenario develops. And then some facilitator be testing your skills, knowledge and experied operate the railway safely. 	3	CARLY PEDDLE: Can you explain just a
5MICHAEL PALMER: Normally, a DITU6takes place reasonably early in the project,7it's based on the concept of operations. And8role players from OC and RTM, play out a numb9scenarios over a number of days, from normal10scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scenar11and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken12Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2.13You have the same players, generar14because although you want people to get the15exposure and the experience, you can't keep16changing people around every day, because you17from a low baseline.18A scenario is given to the player19you normally have a map on the table, or a the20model set, so you can move things around as the21scenario develops. And then some facilitator22be testing your skills, knowledge and experied23operate the railway safely.24And you start with easy scenarios	4	bit more of what that is?
 takes place reasonably early in the project, it's based on the concept of operations. And role players from OC and RTM, play out a numb scenarios over a number of days, from normal scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scena and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2. You have the same players, genera because although you want people to get the exposure and the experience, you can't keep changing people around every day, because you from a low baseline. A scenario is given to the player you normally have a map on the table, or a tr model set, so you can move things around as the scenario develops. And then some facilitator be testing your skills, knowledge and experied operate the railway safely. 	5	MICHAEL PALMER: Normally, a DITLO
 it's based on the concept of operations. And role players from OC and RTM, play out a numb scenarios over a number of days, from normal scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scenarian and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2. You have the same players, generarian because although you want people to get the exposure and the experience, you can't keep changing people around every day, because you from a low baseline. A scenario is given to the player you normally have a map on the table, or a tri scenario develops. And then some facilitator be testing your skills, knowledge and experied operate the railway safely. 	6	takes place reasonably early in the project, and
 8 role players from OC and RTM, play out a number 9 scenarios over a number of days, from normal 10 scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scenario 11 and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken 12 Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2. 13 You have the same players, general 14 because although you want people to get the 15 exposure and the experience, you can't keep 16 changing people around every day, because you 17 from a low baseline. 18 A scenario is given to the player 19 you normally have a map on the table, or a trip 20 model set, so you can move things around as to 21 scenario develops. And then some facilitator 22 be testing your skills, knowledge and experied 23 operate the railway safely. 24 And you start with easy scenarios 	7	it's based on the concept of operations. And the
 ⁹ scenarios over a number of days, from normal ¹⁰ scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scenario ¹¹ and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken ¹² Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2. ¹³ You have the same players, generaries ¹⁴ because although you want people to get the ¹⁵ exposure and the experience, you can't keep ¹⁶ changing people around every day, because you ¹⁷ from a low baseline. ¹⁸ A scenario is given to the player ¹⁹ you normally have a map on the table, or a transmother of the scenario develops. And then some facilitator ²⁰ be testing your skills, knowledge and experied ²¹ operate the railway safely. ²⁴ And you start with easy scenarios 	8	role players from OC and RTM, play out a number of
 10 scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scenarios 11 and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken 12 Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2. 13 You have the same players, general 14 because although you want people to get the 15 exposure and the experience, you can't keep 16 changing people around every day, because you 17 from a low baseline. 18 A scenario is given to the player 19 you normally have a map on the table, or a trip 20 model set, so you can move things around as to 21 scenario develops. And then some facilitator 22 be testing your skills, knowledge and experied 23 operate the railway safely. 24 And you start with easy scenarios 	9	scenarios over a number of days, from normal
and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2. You have the same players, general because although you want people to get the exposure and the experience, you can't keep changing people around every day, because you from a low baseline. A scenario is given to the player you normally have a map on the table, or a tr model set, so you can move things around as t scenario develops. And then some facilitator be testing your skills, knowledge and experies operate the railway safely. And you start with easy scenarios	10	scenarios, degraded scenarios, abnormal scenarios,
Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2. You have the same players, general Vou have the same players, general because although you want people to get the exposure and the experience, you can't keep changing people around every day, because you from a low baseline. A scenario is given to the player you normally have a map on the table, or a trimeded of the second develops. And then some facilitation be testing your skills, knowledge and experied operate the railway safely. And you start with easy scenarios.	11	and emergency scenarios, which is undertaken for
13You have the same players, general14because although you want people to get the15exposure and the experience, you can't keep16changing people around every day, because you17from a low baseline.18A scenario is given to the player19you normally have a map on the table, or a tr20model set, so you can move things around as to21scenario develops. And then some facilitator22be testing your skills, knowledge and experied23operate the railway safely.24And you start with easy scenarios	12	Stage 2 and for Trillium Stage 2.
 ¹⁴ because although you want people to get the ¹⁵ exposure and the experience, you can't keep ¹⁶ changing people around every day, because you ¹⁷ from a low baseline. ¹⁸ A scenario is given to the player ¹⁹ you normally have a map on the table, or a transmodel set, so you can move things around as to ²⁰ model set, so you can move things around as to ²¹ scenario develops. And then some facilitator ²² be testing your skills, knowledge and experied ²³ operate the railway safely. ²⁴ And you start with easy scenarios 	13	You have the same players, generally,
exposure and the experience, you can't keep changing people around every day, because you from a low baseline. A scenario is given to the player you normally have a map on the table, or a tr model set, so you can move things around as t scenario develops. And then some facilitator be testing your skills, knowledge and experies operate the railway safely. And you start with easy scenarios	14	because although you want people to get the
 16 changing people around every day, because you 17 from a low baseline. 18 A scenario is given to the player 19 you normally have a map on the table, or a transmoster of the set, so you can move things around as to 20 model set, so you can move things around as to 21 scenario develops. And then some facilitator 22 be testing your skills, knowledge and experied 23 operate the railway safely. 24 And you start with easy scenarios 	15	exposure and the experience, you can't keep
 17 from a low baseline. 18 A scenario is given to the player 19 you normally have a map on the table, or a transmodel set, so you can move things around as the 20 model set, so you can move things around as the 21 scenario develops. And then some facilitator 22 be testing your skills, knowledge and experied 23 operate the railway safely. 24 And you start with easy scenarios 	16	changing people around every day, because you start
18A scenario is given to the player19you normally have a map on the table, or a tree20model set, so you can move things around as tree21scenario develops. And then some facilitator22be testing your skills, knowledge and experied23operate the railway safely.24And you start with easy scenarios	17	from a low baseline.
19 you normally have a map on the table, or a table 20 model set, so you can move things around as table 21 scenario develops. And then some facilitator 22 be testing your skills, knowledge and experies 23 operate the railway safely. 24 And you start with easy scenarios	18	A scenario is given to the players, and
²⁰ model set, so you can move things around as to ²¹ scenario develops. And then some facilitator ²² be testing your skills, knowledge and experies ²³ operate the railway safely. ²⁴ And you start with easy scenarios	19	you normally have a map on the table, or a train
 21 scenario develops. And then some facilitator 22 be testing your skills, knowledge and experie 23 operate the railway safely. 24 And you start with easy scenarios 	20	model set, so you can move things around as the
 be testing your skills, knowledge and experie operate the railway safely. And you start with easy scenarios 	21	scenario develops. And then some facilitators will
 23 operate the railway safely. 24 And you start with easy scenarios 	22	be testing your skills, knowledge and experience to
And you start with easy scenarios	23	operate the railway safely.
	24	And you start with easy scenarios, just

25 to get them comfortable with the role play, if

Τ

1	you'd like. And as the week goes, then you get
2	more complex scenarios. A lot of the scenario
3	planning can go more than one way.
4	So if the operations team or
5	maintenance team take you down a certain direction,
б	they might be allowed to do that.
7	I used to run these co-run them in
8	London with the Head of Emergency Planning for
9	Metropolitan Police College. So the Met Police in
10	London, we would do a sergeant's day on transport
11	incidents. And we'd have a big set, and we would
12	have the prospective sergeants saying what they
13	would do. It was all about in their case, it
14	was about familiarizing themselves with incident
15	management organization in the UK.
16	In Ottawa, it was slightly more
17	unusual, because it was run much later. And it was
18	run by a third party called "SEMP". S-E-M-P, which
19	is a UK safety assurance company, I believe. And
20	they ran these did those quite late in the day.
21	And I think it was more to gather evidence that
22	what they provided was suitable, rather than it
23	being a genuine tabletop exercise.
24	And the agenda was known beforehand
25	that they were using this to demonstrate that what

1	they were providing was safe, operable, met the PA,
2	and you could run an LRT service with it.
3	CARLY PEDDLE: And you said it's
4	normally done earlier in a project. When is DITLO
5	normally done?
6	MICHAEL PALMER: You would normally
7	base a DITLO on your ConOps. And the ConOps should
8	be done at the beginning of the project. That
9	first high level stage, you know, there are reasons
10	why you have ConOps. It's done at a point where
11	your vanguard team, your advanced team, have enough
12	knowledge to be able to work through procedures.
13	It isn't a test of their knowledge and
14	their memory. And they might have the SOPs in
15	front of them to be fair, too. But it allows them
16	to work through step by step an incident, and
17	health check that everything they need to operate
18	or maintain the LRT during that incident, is there.
19	In the case of Confederation Line, it
20	was done, from memory, it was done in the summer
21	of '19, so perhaps four, five, six months before
22	the line opened. And I think its primary purpose
23	was more to gather assurance evidence for the line
24	to open as opposed to what I would see as, you
25	know, the usual purpose of a DITLO.

1	So I would say around the halfway mark
2	would be a good time. Your focus grew down, you
3	know what you're getting, you know the track
4	geography, you have enough asset information on
5	which to be able to accurately operate a DITLO.
6	CARLY PEDDLE: What was it, other than
7	the timing, that made you that led to your
8	belief that it was primarily used as assurance
9	evidence, rather than actual testing of the system.
10	MICHAEL PALMER: Well, primarily,
11	because it was being run by a company that OLRT-C
12	and RTG brought in to retrospectively assure the
13	system from the safety perspective.
14	I believe they were lacking assurance
15	evidence from documentation and so on. So this was
16	a means of assuring themselves and the City that
17	what had been built, or was in the final stages of
18	being built and commissioned, was good enough to
19	do, to run the line safely, and obviously
20	efficiently.
21	CARLY PEDDLE: What if any impact do
22	you think not doing this process of DITLO earlier
23	in the project had?
24	MICHAEL PALMER: I don't think it had a
25	major impact on the project in the sense of slowing

1 it down. I think earlier it could have exposed 2 issues with assets, or a bit of a gap, a bit of a 3 jiqsaw would have been identified earlier that was 4 missing. 5 You know, from the player's point of 6 view, they were drivers, instructors, control 7 centre managers, dispatchers, ERCs, electric rail 8 controllers, and EROs, for electric rail operators. 9 So they used rail operators who had been helping 10 with the testing, and so I don't think it 11 disadvantaged them. 12 Had there been anything missing as a 13 result of the DITLOs, then time is against them to 14 resolve it. You know, if you're finding out that 15 late that there's a gap in provision, then you 16 don't have many options. 17 CARLY PEDDLE: To your knowledge, were 18 there any gaps found in that process? 19 MICHAEL PALMER: I can't answer that, 20 because although we got through all of the 21 incidents, some faster than others, and some we 22 killed and some we didn't, not literally, but you 23 understand the meaning. 24 The results from that were taken by 25 SEMP and used as safety assurance for RTG and for

1	the P3. So I couldn't tell you which part of that
2	was used, and how useful they found it.
3	From the City's point of view, the rail
4	construction project's point of view, it was good
5	in that it tangibly demonstrated that the system
6	was being built and commissioned.
7	And even if it was in an office, moving
8	bodies around on a map. I think it gave people one
9	of their first feels of what it would look like as
10	a system.
11	CARLY PEDDLE: When did your work on
12	the project end?
13	MICHAEL PALMER: I think it reduced in
14	two or three stages. Once the once they went
15	into trial operations on the line, system proving,
16	trial running, we took a step back. I was in a
17	pool of people to observe during trial running, and
18	I was never used by the City.
19	Prior to that, we were busier and
20	busier. And I think once it went into that, our
21	work dropped because really the operator had to
22	stand up for themselves and demonstrate that they
23	could safely operate the system. And the same with
24	RTM.
25	So at line opening, I think I might
1 have been there once a month. And I think that was 2 fine, in the sense that the operators have to get 3 on with it. But I wasn't there to hold their hand 4 in the last month or so, I quess. 5 CARLY PEDDLE: So I take it no one took 6 over for you? 7 MICHAEL PALMER: I don't think they 8 necessarily needed to. One of the things I was 9 trying to do, was to help get people up to speed. 10 And so for the likes of Joel Lemieux and Duane 11 Duquette, so Joel is the TRCC manager, Duane was 12 his boss, I think, head of rail. You know, I would 13 send them bulletins from the UK on accidents. Т 14 would just send them articles that would be good 15 for them to read, and pass around, and, you know, 16 just talk about things. I was always at the end of 17 a phone or an e-mail for people. 18 But, you know, I think OC, the people 19 on the ground, did a pretty decent job given how 20 late and how squeezed it was at the end. I think 21 there's some really stelar performance within OC, 22 middle management and lower management levels. 23 CARLY PEDDLE: So I'll get to the 24 squeezing of transportations or of operations in a 25 second.

1	But I first just want to ask, who did
2	you primarily interact with at the City? You've
3	mentioned Richard Holder, who else
4	MICHAEL PALMER: So Richard Holder ran
5	the systems group. His deputy was Eric Dube.
6	CARLY PEDDLE: Sorry.
7	MICHAEL PALMER: D-U-B-E.
8	There is some other staff and
9	contractors within Mr. Holder's group. I can't
10	pronounce the full name, but Leyla. Her initials
11	are "LCP" which is just how I called her. Somebody
12	was doing tunnel ventilation, she was doing power,
13	somebody was doing rolling stock, somebody was
14	doing communications.
15	So Richard had a small team, but we
16	always reported to Richard and through Mr. Hulse
17	to Richard Holder.
18	And then really just a line to people
19	in OC Transpo. So the control centre manager, Joe
20	Lemieux and Duane Duquette. A little bit with
21	Joanne, whose last name I can't remember, sorry.
22	And her successor is Troy Charter.
23	So I would deal with Troy now and then,
24	and just generally not report to, but work with
25	RTM. So the people in the Belfast Yard, I would

1	talk to, just in the course of my work.
2	CARLY PEDDLE: Anyone specific from RTM
3	that you worked with?
4	MICHAEL PALMER: Mainly Murray Hill,
5	who now works on the Eglinton Crosstown here in
6	Toronto, and the late Tom Pate. I think you
7	probably know that Tom Pate died of a heart attack
8	about five or six weeks ago. He was then the
9	Operations Director for RTM.
10	RTG, the only person I really dealt
11	with was Matt Slade from EllisDon, and that was
12	just in a handful of meetings that we had with them
13	in my time there.
14	CARLY PEDDLE: When you joined Parsons
15	to work on the project, when was revenue service
16	availability expected to be achieved?
17	MICHAEL PALMER: I honestly can't
18	remember, because there was more than one date.
19	And so every quarter, the general manager, John
20	Manconi and Tom Prendergast, who I think then
21	worked for AECOM, would lead a deep dive.
22	And that's what I was invited to join,
23	and then he changed his mind, on a particular
24	aspect. So it could have been power, it could have
25	been rolling stock, it could have been the

1	signalling. And so every quarter in their deep
2	dive, they would review the commissioning date.
3	And the only thing else I know is that
4	it kept moving to the right. And then it did
5	finally open in the fall of 2019, I think probably
б	driven by the universities returning.
7	But there does come a point where you
8	have to put the stake in the ground, and stick to
9	that date. You can't just keep moving it to the
10	right, because it's convenient, and that costs
11	money and time for everybody. And so we were all
12	being kept on for Stage 1, and subsequently I'm
13	working on Stage 2 now for Mr. Holder as well.
14	But I couldn't tell you what the
15	previous dates were, or how many of them there
16	were. I'm aware of the fact there's more than one.
17	CARLY PEDDLE: When you arrived in
18	Ottawa in 2018, what can you tell me about the
19	status of the system and its general readiness?
20	MICHAEL PALMER: Well, it was nowhere
21	near ready, it was nowhere near constructed.
22	Clearly the sinkhole on Rideau Street
23	had an impact on the civil construction. Typically
24	in a project, the construction group had primacy to
25	all of the work sites until they're done.

Ottawa Light Rail Commission Michael Palmer on 5/4/2022

1	And it's only then that the systems
2	team can move in and install their equipment and
3	test it and you have to integrate it.
4	So if you think about the there's a
5	three-way relationship between the train, the
6	signalling well, four-way track and the
7	power. And so that systems integration started
8	late. Because if you keep your end date fixed, and
9	your construction keeps; you're compressing the
10	systems' testing availability. And they weren't
11	the systems teams weren't getting enough track
12	access to commission LRVs, to integrate the
13	signalling into the LRV, and tune it so the
14	signalling and vehicle were of one mind, you know,
15	working in harmony.
16	And although the systems on the
17	stations when I first went onto the stations to
18	visit, fairly early on I did a tour of all the
19	stations over about three days. Because you really
20	have to see each station and have it embedded in
21	your mind, if you're going to be on the project
22	team.
23	It's kind of interesting, really, with
24	COVID, that all the projects I'm working on
25	currently, I'm doing remotely. And you definitely

1 miss out on not being able to see things, and you 2 know, pictures are great, videos are great, but 3 being there. 4 And I think at that point, Rideau was 5 months away from being anywhere near finished. б Parliament and Lyon were better, the East End was 7 So from Belfast Yard to Blair, that was fine. 8 being used for commissioning of the LRVs, and the 9 integration of the signalling, we were testing the 10 signalling. I mean, I went to the West End once, 11 the guideway, the track, the right-of-way was 12 complete. 13 And so until you had track throughout, 14 and power throughout, you wouldn't get a vehicle 15 beyond probably Tremblay or Hurdman. 16 CARLY PEDDLE: At the time -- sorry, I 17 didn't mean to cut you off. 18 MICHAEL PALMER: I was just going to 19 say, the problem with the station -- if you take 20 the station as the best example, it's a little bit 21 like you're decorating your house. It looks almost 22 finished and ready, because, you know, there's not 23 much activity. But actually there's a tremendous 24 amount of activity in the equipment rooms. And the 25 whole documentation of the project, with the safety

1 assurance, the proof, the training manuals, 2 maintenance manuals, spares, all of that stuff 3 typically is at the end and gets compressed. 4 So long as the constructors have 5 primacy, the systems will always come second, it's 6 just how it is. It's unfortunate, really. 7 When you arrived in CARLY PEDDLE: 8 Ottawa to start your work on the project, what was 9 your view regarding if the City was where it should 10 be? 11 ALLISON RUSSELL: Sorry, Counsel. Ι 12 apologize for interrupting. But you went in and 13 out a little bit there. Do you mind repeating that 14 question from the beginning, please? 15 CARLY PEDDLE: Yes, absolutely. When 16 you arrived in Ottawa to start your work on the 17 project, what was your view regarding if the City 18 was where it should be, in terms of its readiness? 19 MICHAEL PALMER: That's hard to answer, 20 because I don't know where it should have been as 21 opposed to where it actually was. 22 The only thing that comes to mind is, I 23 quess surprise. It wasn't as advanced as it should 24 have been for the opening date that was being 25 published. The thing about the opening date it has

1 to be credible. 2 And to give you an example, with the 3 TYSSE in Toronto, Andy Byford can set a date and we 4 met that date. And it focused everybody's mind, 5 including the systems side. 6 I was leading operational readiness, I 7 was in charge of the operational readiness for the commission of TYCC, which we were doing the 8 9 signalling for. 10 And some of the dates that were 11 announced, or public within the organization, it 12 was pretty clear that was never going to happen, 13 just from the sheer churn rate and progress being 14 made. And in particular with systems design, 15 having enough trains, having a mature signalling 16 system, having an overhead catenary system that was 17 reliable and so on, escalators and elevators. Just 18 all the systems, components, you know, were very 19 late and compressed. 20 And so even if it looked almost 21 complete, somebody driving along the highway 22 alongside University of Ottawa, you see trains 23 going up and down, but actually that was a cosmetic 24 picture of the actual completion percentage. 25 And I think those last -- that last

1	10 percent, it's a little bit like, again, if you
2	did, say, a house extension, that last 10 percent
3	is the hardest piece, because you're putting a
4	disproportionate amount of effort in to that last
5	10 percent. And some of it actually comes late,
6	and some of it is difficult, or it was running
7	late, or it wasn't ready.
8	And so just that end piece is really
9	hard to manage, particularly when it's compressed.
10	CARLY PEDDLE: When you joined, did the
11	City have the kind of oversight plan in place that
12	you would expect to see?
13	MICHAEL PALMER: I would like to answer
14	that two ways, if I may.
15	Yes. Certainly, at the John Manconi,
16	Steve Cripps, Michael Morgan level, I think they
17	would have had some visibility. At our level, we
18	had almost no visibility at all on the
19	documentation and assurance, and so on, there is a
20	complete firewall between RTG and the rail
21	construction project in terms of getting documents,
22	we just didn't get any.
23	And there are many examples of where we
24	should have documents, but for some I believe it
25	was because the commercial disputes had already

1	started, it was not the environment created to
2	share documentation.
3	And so that could be release notes to
4	signalling software, you know, all sorts ofwe
5	just didn't get. So in a way, we were operating
6	blind in trying to, you know, learn about the
7	system and commission it.
8	CARLY PEDDLE: Can you explain a bit
9	more about that? What other information or
10	examples can you give me of
11	MICHAEL PALMER: So the best example I
12	can give you is on a Thursday, Mr. McCurdy brought
13	to my attention, he walked over to my desk and
14	said, "The TOCC are testing the signalling on new
15	software, and they don't have the release notes."
16	And so partly because I worked for
17	Thales, you know, Thales would release software
18	notes for every drop. And it would tell you all
19	the things that were fixed, all the things that
20	weren't fixed, any new things they found during
21	testing, any workarounds, and things not to do.
22	"Do not use this command. If you do, you will
23	crash the system", type of stuff.
24	And so the TOCC, and the ERCs, and
25	managers were helping with the testing. The

L

1	tracking is good, you know, it gives them early
2	access to the system. So we're not handing the
3	keys on day one, you know, and they have no
4	hands-on experience.
5	So OC was assisting with the testing,
6	but the electric rail control during the testing
7	had no release notes to say what changes had been
8	in that software drop. They've been doing it for
9	three days, for me, that is not good. Well, it's
10	very poor. Because you had these controllers
11	flying blind, effectively, not knowing what was
12	fixed and what wasn't.
13	And some of the responses were, "well,
14	it's Thursday. So they may have worked it out by
15	now." Or, "we're not stopping testing."
16	What we did do is, put pressure on RTG
17	to give us the notes and we got them the next day.
18	But to ask a number of people to test the
19	signalling system, where they don't know what's
20	been fixed and what hasn'tanyway, they are going
21	to find out, they had trouble because but I just
22	The approach to releasing document in a
23	timely way for it to be a benefit to the City, I
24	think was poor. And my belief is it's because the
25	contractual relationship meant that OLRT-C, RTG

1 didn't wish to show their hand on a particular 2 asset at that time, by releasing valid software 3 notes or whatever that would help the operator and 4 RTM manage the railway. 5 CARLY PEDDLE: Were there any 6 instances, to your knowledge, of RTG or RTM not 7 releasing information that they were contractually 8 obligated to? Or not providing information they 9 were contractually obligated to? 10 MICHAEL PALMER: I cannot tell you 11 whether it was contractually obligated in their 12 Project Agreement, which is a very long document 13 and was written well before my arrival. 14 I would say for best practice, and you 15 would be releasing, say, signalling software notes 16 in advance. In Toronto and in London -- and I can 17 give you evidence, should you want it -- we would 18 get the notes perhaps a week in advance, we would 19 discuss with Thales, or Alstom, what the fixes 20 were. And we would issue a booklet to everyone in 21 the control centre, one for drivers, one for 22 station staff, one for control centre staff, with 23 every restriction or information statement 24 included. And it was colour-coded, so red, yellow, 25 green and blue.

1 So every control centre person had to 2 read that, have it at the desk and sign for it 3 before they started using that software. So they 4 understood what the limitations and restrictions 5 And they would go into that open-eyed and were. 6 not in the dark. And that's good practice, that's 7 just commonsense. 8 Whether it was in the PA, I can't tell 9 Whether it was explicit or it was implicit. vou. 10 CARLY PEDDLE: When you joined, did the 11 City have the expertise needed to oversee the 12 construction and maintenance portion of the project? 13 MICHAEL PALMER: I can't answer to the 14 construction side, because I was part of Richard 15 Holder's team, which is the systems group. 16 I believe the individuals that were 17 there, I guess my coworkers who were either sole 18 traders, consultants or probably another 19 consultancy within Richard's group knew their 20 domain well, they were competent people. But the 21 systems integrator would have been RTG. 22 In a meeting with RTG, one of the few 23 we had, we talked about systems integration. And 24 you all know that Mr. Hulse is Systems Integration 25 Lead for Parsons. And it is important to make sure

1	all the systems sit together as one system, and
2	it's operable and maintainable.
3	And I actually said to somebody in RTG,
4	"Who's the systems integrator?" And they said,
5	"That's a difficult question."
6	I said, "No, it's not. It has to be
7	you. You're buying the trains, you're buying the
8	signals, you're buying all these products; you have
9	to integrate them."
10	And the response was, "It's not in the
11	Project Agreement being the systems integrator."
12	And I think that may have been implicit
13	in the PA or expected. But because it wasn't
14	explicit, the same with standards, application of
15	the standards, it wasn't going to be done. And a
16	lot of these are false economies, because they're
17	now spending more money, and even later through a
18	lack of systems integration.
19	CARLY PEDDLE: When did this
20	conversation happen?
21	MICHAEL PALMER: Probably six to
22	nine months before opening. It may have been in
23	the same meeting, we were demonstrating the SCADA
24	system.
25	So "SCADA" is "Supervisory Control

1 Acquisition Data System" so it's hardware and 2 software which allows you to command things on 3 stations, ventilation, power, and they were 4 integrated into one. 5 And the company called "Willowglen" 6 provided the SCADA. And it was very good. You 7 know, it looked nice. And we had a show and tell 8 down in Belfast Yard, and I said to the gentleman 9 from Willowglen, "What standards do you use to 10 allocate alarms?" 11 And he said, "We didn't use standards. 12 We just used our own skills, knowledge and 13 experience." 14 And that's why I see we're getting 15 15,000 alarms daily. And normally with alarm 16 systems, you send it to the people that need to 17 know. You apportion to the right people, they 18 hadn't done any apportionment. So every terminal 19 on the system got every alarm, 15,000 a day before 20 opening. 21 And when I asked, "Why didn't you use 22 the alarm standard?" The response was, "It's not 23 in the PA." 24 And I think there were probably 25 standards and quality thresholds that the City

1	expected, and were implicit, perhaps, in the PA,
2	but I'm not familiar with it. But may not be
3	explicit.
4	And unless something was explicit in
5	the PA as a deliverable, it may not have got done.
6	And the irony is, that it's costing them more money
7	now to retrospectively go in and fix some of this
8	stuff.
9	CARLY PEDDLE: And that conversation
10	with the individual from Willowglen, who was that
11	individual?
12	MICHAEL PALMER: I couldn't tell you
13	his name, he was contractor. I never saw him
14	before that day, and I never saw him after it.
15	I think I might have met him a second
16	time when they made a new version. And the person
17	from RTG made a statement. And from their point of
18	view, that was probably a correct statement. I
19	think there's inherent series of implicit
20	expectations of things being done to standards, and
21	correctly, which may have been abused by the P3.
22	CARLY PEDDLE: And by the "P3", do you
23	mean the consortium?
24	MICHAEL PALMER: Yeah, RTG.
25	CARLY PEDDLE: Other than the systems

1	integration piece, and the other aspects that
2	you've just spoken of, are there any other steps
3	you thought the City should have taken that it did
4	not?
5	MICHAEL PALMER: I can't answer that,
6	because there were at a high level within
7	OC Transpo, and within the construction group,
8	there was a lot of conversation, I guess, which we
9	weren't privy to.
10	We were told what we were needed to be
11	told when the time was right. But I can't tell you
12	what discussion went on at the high level between
13	the rail construction project, OC Transpo and the P3.
14	Light rail is not regulated by Transpo
15	Canada, and so I'm used to a regulation environment
16	in the UK from Her Majesty's Railway Inspectorate.
17	When we, say, opened the Jubilee Line extension in
18	1999, where the regulator had sight of what you
19	were doing, and was able to force, or ensure
20	compliance for standards and best practice.
21	But I can't tell you what went on at
22	probably the top two levels of OC and the rail
23	construction project. And the discussions they had
24	with RTG, that's just above my pay grade. It would
25	have been my pay grade four years ago, but not in

1 this project. 2 CARLY PEDDLE: When you arrived in 3 Ottawa, what was the first issue that you were 4 asked to deal with? 5 MICHAEL PALMER: Gosh, SOPs. There 6 were 20 or so outstanding at different stages, some 7 of the SOPs had done several rounds of comments, 8 where they'd gone backwards and forwards, following 9 this process of written comments. And the process 10 means only the person who raised the comment can 11 close the comment. 12 So if that person wasn't satisfied, I'd 13 leave it open. And I found that people who had had 14 two, three, four goes of raising comments, would 15 find something else to raise. 16 And so when I came in, we established 17 the status of each one, I produced a colour-coded 18 Excel chart, which is probably in the documents 19 that you were able to obtain from my laptop or 20 And we had a fortnightly meeting, from server. 21 memory, where we would track these, and I stopped 22 people being allowed to make more comments. 23 There And a lot of it was procedural. was a standard, I think it was "Systems Minimum 24 25 Operating Standards", you know, which were required

1	to run the LRT safely, and it was the wrong title.
2	And so I wanted to change the title of the SOP to
3	make it more explicit and more obvious of what the
4	purpose of the SOP was. And I was told you can't
5	change the name, because the title was in the
6	Project Agreement.
7	And so to remove that stalemate that
8	had been there for months, I guess, I changed the
9	title and put in brackets underneath, "formerly",
10	its original title, so it could still be traceable
11	through the PA.
12	But I think there are a lot of SOPs
13	which had just ground to a halt. And they tend to
14	be the tricky ones, or involving systems they
15	hadn't been delivered because they were late. So I
16	think the whole SOP process was delayed because of
17	an absence of information.
18	RTM are writing these, and so Murray
19	Hill and Matt Bienvenue, was his name, who was his
20	assistant, wrote these SOPs. And they were sent to
21	copy signalling, rail construction, could all
22	comment on it. So there were hundreds of comments
23	on one SOP. And some of them would be repeated
24	from different people, and they were all to be
25	closed out.

1 And so my role was to check with 2 people, close them out. Almost determine whether a 3 comment was valid, and we should still push it. Or 4 whether somebody was being pedantic in an academic 5 way, when the railway had to be built. So that was 6 my first task. 7 Plus, being part of the team, attending 8 all the team meetings, and going into Belfast Yard 9 and looking at things like SCADA and signalling 10 when it was being tested. So getting out and 11 around was important as well. 12 CARLY PEDDLE: Can you tell me about 13 the frequency of your team meetings, and who they 14 were with, generally? 15 MICHAEL PALMER: So Richard held, I 16 think he held a weekly team meeting, which was --17 which had a punchlist of items. 18 We had a monthly meeting with a quad 19 which we had to populate with -- qosh, it's long 20 ago now -- things going well, things of concern, 21 and so on. 22 And so at Richard's level, the team 23 meetings were frequent and good. But we were 24 operating on an absence of information from RTG. 25 And a lot of the stuff, we were talking

1 about, tunnel ventilation is a good example. The 2 trains, you know, where we just didn't have enough 3 information or evidence. In any project, the 4 spares and the owner manuals always come late and 5 last. It's always part of the contract to say, you б need to deliver a certain inventory of spares and 7 the owner manuals. 8 And those manuals form the basis of 9 training, and train the trainer. So training the 10 trainer is then late, which means that the railway 11 training is late, because you don't have this 12 information, it's not incentivized in the 13 contracts. And so the interesting bit, the sexy 14 bit, is to build the railway or commission it. The 15 boring thing is to write the documents that support 16 it. And every project I've worked on, that 17 documentation was always late. 18 And partly because it's real 19 information, you know, they have to include all of 20 the configuration of hardware and software in 21 release notes and maintenance manuals. 22 And, you know, that's the role of the 23 supplier to provide that stuff. It's not 24 incentivized financially, and it should be, really,

1	the end.
2	CARLY PEDDLE: So you mentioned you
3	were missing information from RTG. What kind of
4	information was that?
5	MICHAEL PALMER: Owner manuals, O&M
б	manuals, trainer training notes, configuration.
7	For the role I was doing, I didn't need the
8	as-built drawings, particularly of any of the
9	technical stuff. It was the information you would
10	need to understand to then, in my own mind, merge
11	it into an operable system.
12	Mr. Hulse leads systems integration,
13	but increasingly, operational integration, making
14	sure that the train, the signalling, the catenary,
15	the track, the tunnel ventilation, the station,
16	communication system, the signage, all sit together
17	and they're operable and maintainable, as well as
18	wholly as a system.
19	So that information comes late. The
20	City may have had it, but it wasn't passed down to
21	our level. So I can't answer who had it in the
22	City and when.
23	CARLY PEDDLE: So you do not know why
24	you didn't have the information, but just that you
25	didn't have it?

1	MICHAEL PALMER: The two reasons I
2	believe we didn't have it was, firstly, the systems
3	were all late. And so when you start to get to
4	commission late, you're only going to get the
5	documentation when it's done. So that was all
6	squashed into that last period.
7	But I also think the contractual
8	involvement between the P3 and the City meant that
9	there were things that couldn't be or wouldn't be
10	released to the City.
11	I do have a sympathy with the P3,
12	because they've taken on the risk commercially, and
13	they're not going to syndicate that risk out
14	through sharing documentation that might hurt them.
15	I think the environment that everyone was in, that
16	would have been the main driver for this firewall
17	of information between them.
18	CARLY PEDDLE: Why is it that RTG
19	wouldn't want certain or couldn't or wouldn't
20	want certain information to be released to the
21	City?
22	ALLISON RUSSELL: Sorry. I was going
23	to say, I'm not sure that's something Mr. Palmer
24	can answer, because he's not with RTG. It's really
25	something that you'd have to put to RTG.

1	CARLY PEDDLE: Do you have any direct
2	knowledge of why RTG did not release information to
3	the City?
4	MICHAEL PALMER: No. It just wasn't
5	there. There was this complete absence of
6	documentation coming over. It's quite different on
7	Stage 2, which I can talk about, where these first
8	connectors with Kiewit, Vinci and Eurovia which
9	I can now pronounce properly we have joint
10	meetings.
11	On Stage 1, I do not recall a single
12	joint meeting of Thales as signalling supplier.
13	The meetings were held between Thales and RTG.
14	And, you know, we were at the end of the food
15	chain.
16	And I find Stage 2 much more collaborative
17	which I think is the culture of the three
18	organizations. And probably looking back at Stage
19	1, and we have joint meetings on everything,
20	including signalling.
21	And so the difference between the P3s
22	is chalk and cheese, to me. It's a black and white
23	difference in the collaboration. You can still
24	disagree, and you can still have claims, but it's
25	not a hostile environment is probably the best

1 description. 2 CARLY PEDDLE: In the event that design 3 or an element of construction was modified, how was 4 that accounted for in operating plans and 5 procedures? 6 MICHAEL PALMER: I'm not sure I 7 understand your question and where you're going 8 with it. Could you rephrase it, please? 9 So if operating CARLY PEDDLE: 10 procedures or plans are developed, and an element 11 of the construction or design is changed, how is 12 that then translated into a new operating plan to 13 make sure that it covers this new element of the 14 design? 15 MICHAEL PALMER: There was an indirect 16 impact. The SOPs, if you've read any of them, are 17 not prescriptive technically. They don't say that 18 you push this toggle, and you turn this widget, and 19 this happens. 20 They're talking about the people and 21 the procedures and the processes that I have to 22 follow in a certain incident. And no two incidents 23 are the same. 24 So you have this toolbox of SOPs which 25 you apply to any incident, depending where it is in

1	time of day, and the players, and the failure, or
2	the type of incident.
3	And so in that sense, the SOPs were
4	generally high level than say a technical piece of
5	information. But it fundamentally changed how you
б	managed that incident. Say, tunnel ventilation,
7	then obviously that would then be written in, and
8	you would have to retrain all of the operators with
9	this delta, this difference in the baseline
10	training.
11	And that's really where configuration
12	control and documentation and functionality really
13	kicks in. So you have full traceability of any
14	changes and how you responded to them.
15	CARLY PEDDLE: Are you aware of a
16	operations restriction document?
17	MICHAEL PALMER: There was a it
18	depends on the title of the document you're talking
19	about. Sorry, because there were, you know, the
20	safety hazards transferred over. They were
21	suffering much from Thales on that particular
22	software. There was, on the desks, a document in
23	the TRCC listing the restrictions: Do this, don't
24	do this. If you get this, at this station, this
25	work is expected. I'm aware of the document, I

1	wasn't part of putting it together.
2	CARLY PEDDLE: If you can just briefly
3	outline any additional measures you took, or
4	actions you took to plan for operational readiness?
5	MICHAEL PALMER: I attended one or two
6	tabletop exercises at City Hall which were run by
7	the rail construction project and OC Transpo in the
8	lead up to trial running and system proving. Where
9	the City tabletopped trial running, and the trial
10	base of trial running. And I sat in an audience
11	section, just observing. And at the roundtable you
12	had mainly senior folk walking through the process
13	for the trial running.
14	So I experienced some of those. I did
15	signage sighting, which came late. And this is
16	operational signage drivers need to use, or a
17	supervisor, or a maintainer, to safely do their
18	job. It's not passenger facing signage, like way
19	out, emergency exit. Any directional signing, way
20	finding, commercial signage. This is signage on
21	the track that the driver may use in certain
22	failure conditions to help them locate themselves,
23	or pass a signal of danger, that sort of stuff.
24	It sounds low level, but it was late
25	and we had to go out. I had an instructor driver

1	and we would go out on an LRV the first LRV,
2	two-car LRV on the line, while the testing was done
3	in one-car units, and we had to sign off every
4	operational sign.
5	So if a driver is seated between a 10th
6	percentile or 90th percentile man, sitting
7	correctly could look sideways or look forward and
8	see the sign in their vision. If it wasn't
9	correct, we would fail it, and they would have to
10	move it for the driver to see it. There's no point
11	in putting in a sign if you can't see it.
12	There was some discussion of tunnel
13	ventilation, and the purpose of tunnel ventilation.
14	Just a lot of the stations were maybe finished or
15	almost finished, which is partly just to have a
16	look at things, and also to have this mental image
17	in my mind of the station.
18	In my previous roles, I would do that.
19	On the Jubilee Line extension in London, the teams
20	who were going to work with control centre, I gave
21	them a day to walk the entire station at street
22	level, so they can see the outside of every station
23	and every intervention point. So when they send
24	the fire service there, they can visualize it
25	because they've been there to see it.

1 So I was doing a lot of that for 2 myself. And just generally helping the control 3 centre team, help with the commissioning, really, 4 and being out on the line. Or being available, 5 actually, for the people, if they didn't understand 6 something, or why it was done in that particular way, I would try and help. Both proactively and 7 8 when asked. 9 CARLY PEDDLE: And you mentioned that 10 you were not -- your expertise wasn't used in trial 11 running, but you observed it; is that right? 12 MICHAEL PALMER: No, I didn't say that. 13 CARLY PEDDLE: Thank you. 14 MICHAEL PALMER: What I said was I was 15 part of the pool of observers to be used in trial 16 running to assess scripts, you know, tests that 17 they would pass or fail. But I was never used out 18 of that pool. 19 And so my actual involvement formally 20 in trial operations, just wasn't there. I followed 21 it from the offices, and remotely from Toronto each 22 day. But I wasn't part of that final team. 23 CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. Were you involved 24 in developing the operators' safety case? 25 MICHAEL PALMER: No.

1 CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. Did you have any 2 involvement in the determination of substantial 3 completion? 4 MICHAEL PALMER: No. 5 CARLY PEDDLE: What about readiness for 6 revenue service? 7 MICHAEL PALMER: The one word answer is 8 no. 9 In the table tops at City Hall when we 10 went through, there were discussions that I took 11 part in around, say, the percentage required, you 12 know, 99 percent reliability is an interesting 13 term, because you can measure reliability many 14 ways. 15 For you to get 90 percent reliability 16 of an asset, or of a system capable to indicate it 17 through headway, journey time, punctuality, delays 18 under five minutes and so on, I didn't necessarily 19 have metrics for those. 20 And I didn't have the historical 21 evidence to get -- the 99 percent target of five 22 years in steady state reliability, you know, it 23 will take you a good year up to five years to 24 operate a service at that sort of level. 25 There's now way on earth you're going

1	to do it on a brand new LRT with brand new assets
2	that's late and not fully integrated to get
3	99 percent. Is futile; it's a nonsense target.
4	You would never achieve it.
5	CARLY PEDDLE: So in your view and your
6	experience, what would be a realistic target?
7	MICHAEL PALMER: That depends on the
8	asset or the key performance measure. Journey
9	time, making sure the train did get to one end of
10	the line to the other on the schedule provided.
11	Previously I measured mean distance between
12	failures on the rolling stock, five-minute delays.
13	And with the Rockets in Toronto, we
14	actually run up to, I think from memory,
15	1.86 million kilometres for the rocket fleet before
16	we had a five-minute failure in August of 2017,
17	just before I left.
18	I think with assets, generally hardware
19	over age starts to decrease in its reliability and
20	as software matures your system is going to get
21	better and better.
22	It depends if you're talking individual
23	asset, a performance indicator for the service
24	around punctuality, which we discussed, headways.
25	You know, the service Level 1 headway, I believe,

1	is 3 minutes 22 using 15 trains.
2	When the line opened, they had 13
3	trains and four were late. So the headway was
4	always a minute and adrift from what it should've
5	been on opening.
6	You might expect that, but you would
7	expect that gap to close over time, as people got
8	better at operating it and familiar, and learning
9	the tricks in what to do, and what not to do.
10	CARLY PEDDLE: Do you recall any
11	discussions of starting revenue service with less
12	than full service?
13	MICHAEL PALMER: The only discussions I
14	had, and it's a bit of a headline, really, was a
15	message from the GM, we were only going to open
16	with 15 trains in service.
17	The requirement was 34 trains within
18	the Project Agreement, I think if you look at. I
19	think it's in 15-2, Appendix C. 15 trains
20	operating of 3-22 headway, and I believe the
21	general manager correctly said, we're only going to
22	open with 15 in service. We're only going to open
23	with 15, fleet of 34, we're only going to open with
24	15. And then suddenly, we're going to open with
25	13.

25

1 On that, that was a good decision, but 2 it should have been made much earlier, you know, 3 it's going from 0 to 100 overnight. 4 If you want to do a three-minute-22 service with 15 trains, you're not going to do that 5 6 on the first day of service. That takes a lot of 7 practice, and a lot of experience and skills for 8 the teams, simply where that training and 9 experience come quite late in the process. 10 So to open less than 15 was a good 11 thing, you know; you're learning to walk before you 12 And so the late decision to go to 13 was a run. 13 qood decision, but it was -- it should have been 14 sooner. Just to be realistic. 15 Going back to the systems testing, they 16 didn't have enough trains. The rolling stock and 17 the signalling suppliers and RTM were really the 18 last in the food chain for access. 19 So correctly, until the construction 20 was finished, they only had between Belfast Yard 21 and Blair to do all the testing and commissioning. 22 And each LRV is subtly different in terms of its 23 performance. 24 And each LRV has to be tuned with the

signalling system, so it works perfectly well in

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

1	track and train operation and it's stopping on the
2	mark every time. And that takes time.
3	And you know, the suppliers and RTM
4	were denied access. Understandably they wanted to
5	finish construction. They didn't necessarily move
б	it proportionately back, and so there's this
7	squeeze at the end.
8	It's typical on projects that the
9	operators and systems team get squeezed because
10	they're the last part of the project.
11	CARLY PEDDLE: In other projects,
12	you've worked for, or worked on, where an extension
13	of a line or a new line is opened, has there
14	generally been reduced service at the beginning of
15	revenue service availability?
16	MICHAEL PALMER: Sorry, I missed the
17	last part of that question. Would?
18	CARLY PEDDLE: Would there generally be
19	a reduced service at the start of public service?
20	MICHAEL PALMER: It depends. In
21	Toronto on line 1, we had full fleet of trains. We
22	had 76 Toronto Rockets, and I needed 60, 61 for
23	service. So there wasn't a shortage of trains and
24	the extension in Toronto was not the first
25	signalling section; it was a second or third.

1 And so a lot of the assets I needed to 2 run a good service were already there, the trains 3 and the signalling further down the line. I think 4 when you're starting on a green filled LRT from 5 scratch and you're building up reliability in 6 real-time, it's a totally different environment 7 that you're working in. 8 If you look at any service, whether 9 it's a new aircraft or a factory, very few go in 10 100 percent on day one. Open one shift, two shift 11 you have to train people up, and so on and you 12 build up reliability in realtime as people get 13 familiar with the equipment. 14 And system proven trial running would 15 have been part of that, but I can't tell you what 16 happened on those days or what the figures were. 17 CARLY PEDDLE: What was your 18 understanding of how many vehicles OC Transpo 19 believed was required to --20 [Court Reporter intervenes for 21 clarification]. 22 CARLY PEDDLE: Ms. Russell, was that 23 your issue as well, that you couldn't hear me? 24 Yes, I apologize I ALLISON RUSSELL: 25 couldn't hear the question.

Ottawa Light Rail Commission Michael Palmer on 5/4/2022

1	CARLY PEDDLE: Okay, I just wanted to
2	make sure, thank you.
3	What was your understanding of how many
4	vehicles OC Transpo believed was required to meet
5	morning demand at the beginning of public service?
6	MICHAEL PALMER: So the Project
7	Agreement in Appendix C within I think it's 15-2 is
8	explicit, 34 vehicles provided, and 30 needed for
9	service, which is 15 pairs. That was always a
10	target and I know Mr. Manconi kept saying, he
11	wanted seven
12	[Court Reporter intervenes for
13	clarification].
14	MICHAEL PALMER: The Project Agreement
15	in Appendix C is explicit, that 34 LRVs, which is
16	15 pairs of 2, and 4 spare single LRVs were needed
17	for service Level 1, which is first level of
18	service when the LRT opened.
19	There was no lower level service. Over
20	13 was a hybrid of service Level 1.
21	And I believe the numbers were below
22	34, and it's a lot of work for each LRV to be
23	signed off, getting up the kilometer accumulation
24	if you move with a new car or anything to make sure
25	it's working, and then integrating the signalling
1	onto it, the train radio, the cab to platform CCTV.
----	---
2	So until those other elements, as soon as you start
3	bolting things on trains it becomes inherently more
4	unreliable. You have to get reliability back up
5	again.
6	In the end my understanding there was
7	just too few LRVs that were fully ready for
8	service. And they had a load of them sitting in
9	Belfast Yard and they weren't given access.
10	CARLY PEDDLE: I want to talk briefly
11	about certification of OC Transpo staff. What was
12	your involvement in training and certification of
13	OC Transpo staff?
14	MICHAEL PALMER: No involvement. If I
15	observe OC staff doing stuff on the tabletops and
16	the exercises, I would feed back to their managers,
17	or to bring in Joel Lemieux, on occasion, Troy
18	Charter, to say, this person is really good, you
19	know, they've got it.
20	I think it's like any job you do. Some
21	people naturally take to it and others struggle
22	with it. And working in control centres is a good
23	example; you can either do it or you can't.
24	If you go to a power station, if you go
25	to a production factory, if you go to a railway

1	control centre, if you go to air traffic control,
2	the environments are similar.
3	And the work is, you start a service
4	up, you operate it, you close it down, you maintain
5	it, you deal with problems. And I was involved in
6	people's certification. Certification is a
7	snapshot of the person's competence. Their skill,
8	knowledge and experience, they are safe.
9	When you pass the driving test it
10	doesn't mean you're a good driver; it means you've
11	passed a particular threshold. And I think that's
12	the same with this one where those in authority are
13	involved in assessing people's competence.
14	But equally, had I been worried, I
15	would have raised a red flag. And I didn't need to
16	do that, because I think the OC staff on the
17	ground, given the lack of experience, were really
18	good.
19	They listened, they wanted to do well,
20	they were safe, you know, and I can't speak highly
21	enough of the OC staff on the ground and the job
22	they did in difficult circumstances.
23	CARLY PEDDLE: Did you understand that
24	given the delay, the training schedule had to be
25	changed at all for OC Transpo staff?

1	MICHAEL PALMER: I'm aware that the
2	training was running late. I'll put it back to the
3	same, availability of training trains, availability
4	to go on to the line and to have a train and a
5	system that was reliable enough to train on.
6	Probably the most experience they got
7	was fault-finding, you know, during that hands-on
8	experience. Because the system may not have been
9	mature enough really for me, for training to have
10	taken place.
11	It's like anything else in life. You
12	use ten percent of your knowledge 90 percent of the
13	time. And there's 90 percent of your knowledge
14	somewhere up there which you very rarely have to
15	recall, because it's that stuff you just don't use
16	all the time.
17	But I was involved in assessing
18	individuals' competence or threshold for drivers or
19	control centre staff. Definitely not RTM; that
20	wasn't their job.
21	But I would say I was generally
22	impressed with the competence and the attitude of
23	the control centre staff, the drivers, the
24	supervisors who were trying to make it work.
25	CARLY PEDDLE: Are you aware of a

1	shadow operator ever being considered to be brought
2	into the project to assist in operations?
3	MICHAEL PALMER: Yes. And I've been
4	head hunted two or three times to run a shadow
5	operation in Sydney, in Melbourne, both in
6	Australia, and in America.
7	Generally you try to run a shadow
8	organization of people who have experience of the
9	types of assets. And so Urbalis 400, which is
10	U-R-B-A-L-I-S 400, which we used on Line 1 in
11	Toronto, was going in on the Sydney Metro and I was
12	approached twice by the same headhunter because
13	they couldn't fill the job, running a shadow
14	operations and maintenance organization in the
15	testing and commissioning.
16	And just in design, you know, having a
17	say in the design. At London Underground, we had a
18	variation on that where I ran an operational team
19	and I was what was called user acceptance manager,
20	so I was the lead operator on the project in London
21	Underground, and then the operation design had to
22	go through me to sign off.
23	So you have a controlling mind
24	operation, controlling mind maintenance-wise, what
25	that indicates, what the speed would look like,

1	what alarm did you want to have for this particular
2	thing, alarm management using standards.
3	I'm familiar with it in the sense of
4	the shadow team within, in relation of OC Transpo
5	and in the P3 context, I didn't take the jobs,
6	because I'm still thrown out but, you know, a lot
7	of P3s elsewhere the world, we use a shadow level
8	organization, really, as the pseudo operator and I
9	think that's best practice. Still have to get the
10	right people.
11	CARLY PEDDLE: Do you have any
12	knowledge about why that was not done in this
13	project?
13 14	project? MICHAEL PALMER: No.
13 14 15	project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it?
13 14 15 16	project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it? MICHAEL PALMER: I didn't explicitly
13 14 15 16 17	project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it? MICHAEL PALMER: I didn't explicitly suggest a shadow operator. And I think it's
13 14 15 16 17 18	project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it? MICHAEL PALMER: I didn't explicitly suggest a shadow operator. And I think it's difficult to see, whether within OC Transpo within
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it? MICHAEL PALMER: I didn't explicitly suggest a shadow operator. And I think it's difficult to see, whether within OC Transpo within the rail construction project, I think in reality I
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it? MICHAEL PALMER: I didn't explicitly suggest a shadow operator. And I think it's difficult to see, whether within OC Transpo within the rail construction project, I think in reality I ended up partially not wrong trying to help the</pre>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it? MICHAEL PALMER: I didn't explicitly suggest a shadow operator. And I think it's difficult to see, whether within OC Transpo within the rail construction project, I think in reality I ended up partially not wrong trying to help the operator decide what they wanted.</pre>
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it? MICHAEL PALMER: I didn't explicitly suggest a shadow operator. And I think it's difficult to see, whether within OC Transpo within the rail construction project, I think in reality I ended up partially not wrong trying to help the operator decide what they wanted. And so when I were asked, which was
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	<pre>project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it? MICHAEL PALMER: I didn't explicitly suggest a shadow operator. And I think it's difficult to see, whether within OC Transpo within the rail construction project, I think in reality I ended up partially not wrong trying to help the operator decide what they wanted. And so when I were asked, which was infrequently, if you take the SCADA signalling</pre>
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 	<pre>project? MICHAEL PALMER: No. CARLY PEDDLE: Did you ever suggest it? MICHAEL PALMER: I didn't explicitly suggest a shadow operator. And I think it's difficult to see, whether within OC Transpo within the rail construction project, I think in reality I ended up partially not wrong trying to help the operator decide what they wanted. And so when I were asked, which was infrequently, if you take the SCADA signalling design, I don't think the operators were asked</pre>

1 So I didn't have a voice. If I had a voice, I'm not sure they 2 3 would have had the skills, knowledge and experience 4 to give a good answer. And, so in a way, I would 5 argue that myself and a few others probably filled 6 that void unintentionally. 7 I'm 59. I've been very blessed. I've 8 been in the railway industry 40 years now, this 9 And you know, I've done the three vear. 10 resignalling projects, and I've done two 11 extensions. 12 So I've been there and done it, and it 13 was about imparting that knowledge and experience 14 to others, but also just watching out everywhere 15 that things were being done okay. 16 I think okay to the P3 is the best you 17 could reasonably expect. You might get a few nice 18 bits of equipment where they splash money because 19 they have to, but you know, I think, you know, P3 20 was, did not give you brilliant engineering across 21 the spectrum. Because it's all money. 22 Can I just grab a coffee off the shelf, 23 please? 24 CARLY PEDDLE: Why don't we take a 25 ten-minute break. It's about halfway through

1	anyway. So we can just come back at 10:55.
2	MICHAEL PALMER: Allison, the other
3	Allison, could you give me a call on my cell,
4	please?
5	ALLISON RUSSELL: Yes. We're going to
6	go off the record for ten minutes?
7	CARLY PEDDLE: Yes.
8	RECESS TAKEN AT 10:46
9	UPON RESUMING AT 11:03
10	CARLY PEDDLE: I understand you were
11	also involved in overseeing the maintenance
12	readiness; is that correct?
13	MICHAEL PALMER: No, not directly. I
14	had it my involvement with Rideau Transit
15	maintenance as the maintainer under the P3, was to
16	work with them on the SOPs.
17	And some of the meetings were held in
18	Belfast Yard, when we were shown the SCADA
19	recruitment. I was at Belfast Yard, but I didn't
20	directly help RTM with how to maintain their fleet.
21	Which in fact was tendered out to Alstom anyway, so
22	it was subcontracted by RTM to Alstom as the train
23	builder and they were going to maintain it for the
24	period of the contract.
25	CARLY PEDDLE: So Parsons was not

1	involved in overseeing?
2	MICHAEL PALMER: You asked if I was
3	involved. So I can't answer whether Mr. Hulse, or
4	Mr. McCurdy, or Mr. Fodor were involved in that,
5	but knowing their backgrounds, I wouldn't believe
б	SO.
7	CARLY PEDDLE: Okay, thank you very
8	much.
9	Were you involved in developing the
10	concept of maintenance?
11	MICHAEL PALMER: No. That would have
12	been for RTM to do. They're currently producing
13	the content of maintenance for Stage 2 of
14	Confederation Line.
15	The content of maintenance and the
16	concept of operation had to be written really by
17	people familiar with the maintenance or the
18	operation of the project, but that would have been
19	RTM.
20	CARLY PEDDLE: Did your work involve
21	the integrated management systems, or IMS systems?
22	MICHAEL PALMER: No.
23	CARLY PEDDLE: Did any of your work
24	involve availability to the maintenance storage
25	facility?

1 MICHAEL PALMER: Availability to the 2 storage maintenance? 3 CARLY PEDDLE: Yes. 4 MICHAEL PALMER: If you're talking 5 about maintenance storage facility, the MSF 6 Belfast? 7 CARLY PEDDLE: Yes, yes. 8 MICHAEL PALMER: Around its 9 availability? 10 CARLY PEDDLE: Yes. 11 MICHAEL PALMER: However, only in No. 12 the sense of the drivers' handover platform. So 13 the interface where the train would be handed over 14 to OC, the driver would then take it into service 15 I've been on that platform a number of times. 16 And just during the discussions about 17 the yard being fully automatic, which it's still 18 not fully automatic even now. And what's needed to 19 get it into that automatic state. 20 But it was conversations, it wasn't 21 meetings. 22 CARLY PEDDLE: That wasn't part of your 23 focus in your work? 24 MICHAEL PALMER: No. But I, you know, 25 I did get dragged into conversations around things

Τ

25

1	like that within the rail construction project, or
2	conversations with RTM about when it was going to
3	be commissioned, how it was going to be
4	commissioned. It kept moving to the right.
5	CARLY PEDDLE: Can you just tell me a
6	bit about those conversations?
7	MICHAEL PALMER: Well, no, just, you
8	know, how many trains I had available when the
9	how the signalling testing was going. The concept
10	is for the yard to be fully automatic other than
11	the workshop areas. So when a train was ready for
12	service, the yard controller could click on the
13	train and bring it to the handover platform and the
14	train would drive itself automatically. And the
15	driver would open the door, get on and go into
16	service.
17	But my understanding is the Belfast
18	Yard is still not commissioned for its own
19	controller from Thales. And the train is still
20	being driven manually to the pick up point.
21	And then conversely when they come out
22	of service and the driver gets off they're driven
23	manually to their maintenance location or staging
24	location.

So the discussions were: How is it

1	going? When is RTO? "Remote train operation".
2	It's called "GOA4", which is "grade of automation",
3	which is a UITP term for "fully automatic train
4	service".
5	We were following when that was going
6	to be available. Because as a service ramps up
7	through the service levels of Stage 2 and more
8	trains going into service, really, that yard has
9	got to be in automatic, in my view, to get the
10	trains pushed out onto the line ready for the
11	morning rush hour.
12	It was conversations, no formal
13	meetings. It was just on my radar as something of
14	interest.
15	CARLY PEDDLE: UITP what does that
16	stand for?
17	MICHAEL PALMER: It is a benchmarking
18	group I can Google it for you, just as quick for
19	somebody else, I don't know, my Counsel, whether
20	you've got the chance.
21	It is a benchmarking organization in
22	the world which works with different forms of
23	transit. And part of it is benchmarking and they
24	just issued a document on the different grades of
25	automation in rail.

1 They go from GOA0 to GOA4 being the 2 highest, GOA4 is fully automatic, no driver on the 3 train. It's just a separate vehicle. 4 CARLY PEDDLE: Leading up to revenue service availability, what did you understand the 5 6 parties expected out of maintenance? 7 In other words, were the parties 8 expecting in this new system for there to be issues 9 to work through? Or were the parties expecting 10 maintenance to be fully responsive and able to 11 respond to any issues that arose? 12 MICHAEL PALMER: I can't answer what 13 the expectation was, but I would expect for the 14 maintainer to be fully trained, to have sufficient 15 spares, sufficient trains available, you know, to 16 manage service. And I can't tell you to what stage 17 that was achieved before revenue service other than 18 the fact they were short of trains. 19 And they had the trains on property; 20 they just hadn't been fully commissioned and 21 integrated with the signalling. 22 And of course the other thing is 23 because RTM had subcontracted maintenance back to 24 Alstom, which is common -- if you build the train 25 to maintain it as well -- I can't tell you what

> neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

1 state of readiness Alstom were at the time. 2 CARLY PEDDLE: You had no visibility 3 into Alstom? 4 MICHAEL PALMER: No, other than the 5 lack of trains on a diagram. 6 CARLY PEDDLE: Are you aware of any 7 effort on the City to test the system once it 8 entered revenue service to check for faults and 9 flaws? 10 MICHAEL PALMER: In the handover 11 process, there are three or four different terms 12 from the point of technical completion to revenue 13 service. 14 So some of them are called "trial 15 running"; you have "system proving", usually comes 16 first. System proving is really demonstrating it 17 does what it says on the tin. 18 And having proved that, you then go 19 into a period of trial operations or trial running. 20 Trial operations scenarios based on the line for 21 normal upgraded -- normal/abnormal degraded 22 emergency scenarios. So anything from somebody hit 23 by a train to a door not closing. 24 Then trial running is normally after 25 that, and it is a period of service without

1	passengers. In Toronto, I had a three-week period
2	called ghost running, which was effectively trial
3	running where we when the trains got to the end
4	of a line, we threw the passengers off and it went
5	on to the extension and back in a scheduled path
б	with the drivers.
7	So that helped with driver
8	familiarization, reliability of service. And after
9	three weeks of doing that we then opened the doors.
10	So when Prime Minister Trudeau opened
11	the line he was doing it on day 22, not day 1.
12	Because we'd had that practice of controllers being
13	familiar with the new schedule, service and new
14	stations and a longer line and faster trains.
15	CARLY PEDDLE: So after testing and
16	commissioning and after trial running, once the
17	system is opened to the public for service, are you
18	aware of the City wanting to make sure that faults
19	were being responded to, and therefore initiating
20	work orders in response to faults that they were
21	going out to discover?
22	MICHAEL PALMER: That entirely depends
23	on the scale of the fault. Through system proving,
24	trial running, trial operations, those would be
25	flagged anyway.

1 You would have trains with minor 2 defects on the line which would need fixing. Ι 3 believe those processes would have been tested 4 prior to revenue service sufficiently to be 5 satisfied that RTM were able to respond. 6 I think a lot of the early failures 7 were of such a magnitude and frequency where, you 8 know, well, the damage was done, you know. You 9 wouldn't expect that high level of failures and the 10 type of failures on a new line that had just been 11 signed off. 12 CARLY PEDDLE: In previous projects, 13 once the line entered service, in any of those 14 projects did you experience significant problems as 15 the OLRT-1 did here? 16 MICHAEL PALMER: No. And the reason 17 why -- I'm sorry, if I'm anticipating your next 18 question. 19 Is the period of trial running the 20 operators and maintainers are involved all the way 21 through the project, and so they are familiar with 22 things, you know, the system. And I think the 23 period of trial operators and trial running had a 24 set of criteria which we stuck to. 25 And we would extend it need be so at

86

1 the point we went into revenue service, there was a 2 high confidence that the system was ready. 3 We did have failures, but if you want 4 to excuse the expression they were kind of "shit 5 happens" failures rather than systemic failures of 6 the system through its immaturity or functionality 7 that wasn't there from day one. 8 And that's kind of the London 9 Underground mantra, and that's why I carried it to 10 Toronto when we did the extension to line 1. Even 11 now in London, they are test running the Elizabeth 12 Line and Andy Byford, as the commissioner, will not 13 open it until he's satisfied he's not going to make 14 the front page of the papers every day or every 15 week. That's a good yardstick. You have to be 16 confident that you can operate and maintain the 17 system before you operate it. I cannot answer that 18 about this case here. 19 CARLY PEDDLE: And so you mentioned in 20 previous projects there was criteria during testing

20 previous projects there was criteria during testing 21 and commissioning that were stuck to; was that not 22 the case here?

MICHAEL PALMER: I can't answer that.
 I can't answer what the process was and what the
 daily results were for them to stick at day one.

87

1	The only thing I do know is they ran
2	day one, it failed; ran day one again, it failed.
3	They suspended trial operations. They restarted
4	trial operations or trial running and the figures
5	a figure was achieved and the line opened;
6	that's all I know.
7	CARLY PEDDLE: Okay. You've touched on
8	this throughout the interview, but can you describe
9	the relationship between the City and RTG from the
10	time you began working on the project, how it
11	changed over time up until your work completed?
12	ALLISON RUSSELL: Counsel, sorry. I'm
13	just going to interrupt there, because you're
14	asking Mr. Palmer to speak to the relationship
15	between two parties where he may have made
16	observations during certain interactions, but
17	wasn't always part of those communications or
18	interactions to. He wasn't part of RTG or part of
19	the City.
20	So maybe if you were to ask that
21	question a different way, but as it's been
22	presented, I'm not prepared to let Mr. Palmer go
23	ahead and answer that question.
24	CARLY PEDDLE: What was your perception
25	when you started working on the project of the

1	relationship between the City and RTG?
2	MICHAEL PALMER: So I can't answer
3	before the fall of 2018. I can only answer from
4	what I saw, and I saw very little headway because
5	there were no meetings with the P3 that I was at.
6	And where there were meetings at a high level, I
7	can't describe what that relationship was like.
8	I think the two things I would say is
9	firstly, I followed things in the media, like
10	everybody else. And all I saw was a series of
11	claims and counterclaims and both sides criticizing
12	the other side, and that was public to everybody.
13	In terms of the rest of it, really, not
14	much, because there was this firewall. So we never
15	met the supplier. We only ever met RTG except when
16	we were shown a piece of equipment. We weren't
17	privy to any correspondence between the City and
18	the P3 or any strategy. There were some strategies
19	where Richard would ask me what did I think the
20	City should do with this in terms of going into
21	service.
22	So there's a verbal discussion with
23	Richard Holder as my boss, good honest discussions,
24	but I couldn't tell you beyond him what happens on
25	either side other than what I've read in the media,

1	really.
2	CARLY PEDDLE: Okay, thank you.
3	Could please describe any activities
4	you were involved in at the end of your the term
5	of your project to close out your activities? What
6	did that involve?
7	MICHAEL PALMER: Once the line was
8	open, I was still travelling to Ottawa and remote
9	involvement from Toronto. And I worked from home
10	for four years since I've joined Parsons because I
11	spend a lot of my time travelling within the U.S.
12	and Canada.
13	There was discussion about how to close
14	out particular functionality on particular assets
15	and trying to get the trains the number of LRVs
16	increased, how to mature the signalling system and
17	so on.
18	But I wasn't really involved in
19	representing the construction project or the City
20	to the P3. And I think the environment was such
21	that, you know, the P3 had no money but weren't
22	being paid and you know it was they were
23	arguing, both sides were arguing about whose fault,
24	what needed to be done whether it was part of the
25	PA, or whether it was, you know, a new piece of

1 work, scope creep. 2 So all that was going on, so I can't 3 tell you how productive that was and it was way 4 above my pay grade on this job. 5 CARLY PEDDLE: You mentioned you are 6 involved in Stage 2 of the LRT? 7 MICHAEL PALMER: Yes. 8 CARLY PEDDLE: Any of the issues you 9 identified during your work on Stage 1, did that 10 result in any changes to the approach in Stage 2? 11 ALLISON RUSSELL: Sorry, Counsel. 12 I'm just getting my head around the 13 question, because I understood the purpose of today 14 was to ask specifically about OLRT-1. 15 CARLY PEDDLE: Let me rephrase. 16 ALLISON RUSSELL: Okay. 17 CARLY PEDDLE: That may assist. 18 ALLISON RUSSELL: Maybe that will help. 19 CARLY PEDDLE: What lessons learned 20 from -- have there been any lessons learned from 21 Stage 1 that have, to your knowledge, have been 22 applied to Stage 2? 23 MICHAEL PALMER: A number of "lessons 24 learned" sessions were held to document what was 25 learned from Stage 1 and what will be done

1 differently in Stage 2. 2 The Parsons contract is a five-year on 3 call contract. Basically we get asked to get 4 involved in pieces of work and that's still going 5 on, but I think the amount of work has dropped off 6 recently. That's typical in a project, where 7 you're very busy in the beginning, there's a midway 8 period where things go guiet, things are being 9 constructed and designed and so on. Then you get 10 busy during the end. 11 During that short period, it's hard to 12 compare apples to apples because I think the P3 has 13 a different approach on Stage 2, which is 14 refreshing and more correct. 15 I believe Stage 2 is more collaborative 16 between the sides. Whether all the lessons have 17 been learned and applied, it's one thing to learn 18 lessons and another to actually do it next time 19 around correctly. I won't answer that actually and 20 I can't answer that because I don't have 21 visibility. 22 CARLY PEDDLE: I may have asked you 23 this -- I just want to make sure I have your 24 evidence on it. Prior to going into public 25 service, what was your view as to the readiness on

1 the operational side of the project? 2 MICHAEL PALMER: I believe the 3 operators were ready; so this is not the 4 maintainers now, it is now RTM. I can't comment on 5 the readiness of subcontractors. 6 I believe OC Transpo, on the ground, as 7 to say the drivers, the instructors, the control 8 centre staff, the mobile supervisors, were at the 9 threshold of, using my analogy earlier, passing 10 their driving test. They passed a threshold of 11 which they were competent and safe to operate the 12 system. 13 Whether the assets were in the same 14 condition, I think, is a different question. And 15 in the early days, when you're keen to operate and 16 apply your knowledge, skills and experience that 17 you've learned, it's difficult to do that if the 18 railway is not reliable. 19 It's a very steep learning curve in 20 fault-finding and how to deal with system problems, 21 but actually you just want it to go smoothly. Ι 22 think that probably wasn't the case early on from 23 the evidence I saw, from the media and from the 24 internal communications. 25 CARLY PEDDLE: And so you said "the

1 assets". You were not sure whether the assets were 2 in the same condition? 3 Can you just further elaborate on that? 4 MICHAEL PALMER: Most assets have a 5 bathtub curve, where their reliability dips and it 6 certainly improves with time as the system matures 7 and people understand how to operate it and 8 maintain it. 9 I think the degree of failures early 10 on, not just the two derailments, but when overhead 11 wires came down, signals failing, switches failing, 12 switch heaters failing, you have across the piece 13 the level of failures at start of service was in my 14 opinion, too high for service to be successful. 15 There were just too many unreliable pieces of 16 equipment. 17 CARLY PEDDLE: And so the pieces of equipment you've mentioned, those failures occurred 18 19 after opening public service, correct? 20 MICHAEL PALMER: Before and after. And 21 you had to expect the magnitude of the failures and the number of the failures to reduce as the systems 22 23 improved and matured. 24 And I think that Confederation Station 25 Line 1 has been plaqued. Many failures tend to go

1	in groups. You have a period of great running and
2	you think you've cracked it and you're really on
3	this reliability improvement and you have a really
4	bad day or really bad week. I think they still had
5	those three years in, almost three years in, which
6	is surprising.
7	CARLY PEDDLE: I'm just going to turn
8	to my co-counsel, Ms. McGrann; do you have any
9	questions for Mr. Palmer?
10	KATE McGRANN: Just a couple.
11	You mentioned that you had some
12	discussions with Mr. Holder about strategy.
13	Could you tell us a little bit about
14	what those discussions were focused on?
15	MICHAEL PALMER: I think the best
16	example was alarm management, where we knew that
17	the SCADA system was giving out 15,000 alarms a
18	day, and every work station got all 15,000.
19	If I may just use an example to
20	demonstrate alarm management. If you're in an
21	aircraft, the two pilots have a master control
22	alarm panel. And all the alarms on the aircraft go
23	into that one panel, whether it's an engine on
24	fire, or a toilet is blocked or someone has burned
25	the toast in the galley. And the alarms have to be

1	intuitive. They have to be often accompanied
2	with tones, so a particular tone may mean a fire.
3	The nomenclature of the description of the alarm,
4	the level of the alarm, whether it's an information
5	statement or whether it's an alarm whether it's
6	an alarm you need to do something about, or you
7	just acknowledge it, but something is up.
8	And I think the alarms were immature,
9	early on, which you would expect. But 15,000 a day
10	is a lot of alarms. And the alarm stack would
11	scroll through really fast; it was easy to miss
12	alarms.
13	And so the City were aware that the
14	alarms were an issue, and a obstruction to opening,
15	if you'd like. Or, you know, something was
16	potentially going to not be good in service. And
17	so I was asked to produce a short-term, long-term
18	alarm strategy for OC on how to manage the system
19	of alarms, and that was probably in your bundle of
20	documents, I would suspect.
21	And I had a short-term strategy of
22	additional floor workers, additional information,
23	shelving, what they call shelving so you can make
24	some alarms dormant and forget about them. And
25	long-term, for OC to write a strategy based on

Т

1	EEMUA191, which is an alarm standard generally
2	adopted by everyone, as best practice for alarms.
3	And so Mr. Hulse wrote that standard on
4	behalf of OC, and it was published by OC as their
5	alarm standard So any vendor either in the
6	automation or new piego of equipment would have to
0	extension or new piece of equipment, would have to
7	follow that standard on alarm management.
8	And so it was strategies about how to
9	make it work in the short term and how to solve it
10	in the long-term with that long-term aim in mind.
11	I think that's probably my best example of helping
12	the City manage it in the short-term, in service.
13	And it was manageable, just annoying more than
14	anything else, for the sheer number of alarms.
15	And then you know what their long-term
16	fix was to do it. You could argue it's the
17	responsibility of the P3 to mature the alarms
18	because they didn't do it in the first place. And
19	actually, ultimately, as an operator, I don't care
20	whose contractual responsibility it is. It just
21	needs to be fixed so that the operator, maintainer
22	is given a good piece of equipment they can safely
23	operate and maintain.
0.4	

And that would be my aim. Putting the contract aside briefly, but being cognizant of

1	other contractual obligation. It just needs to be
2	fixed, otherwise you're being unfair to the
3	operators and maintainers.
4	KATE McGRANN: Quick follow up question
5	so I can understand.
6	Your short-term solution and the
7	long-term approach that Mr. Hulse wrote, were they
8	required because the standard you referred to was
9	not implemented in the creation of the alarm
10	system?
11	MICHAEL PALMER: Yes, ma'am. So when
12	we were shown the SCADA system, I asked the
13	question: Which standards have you used? Because
14	the description for each alarm just appeared a bit
15	erratic or inconsistent. And they said we haven't
16	used standards. We've used our skills, knowledge
17	and experience, and this is Willowglen. And that's
18	a legitimate statement if you then apply the
19	standard at the same time.
20	And because RTG stated that it wasn't
21	in the Project Agreement to use the standard for
22	alarms, they didn't use it. And it's a nonsense
23	viewpoint, because eventually, you've got to make
24	sense of the alarm management. And so using the
25	standard early on is not just good practice but it

1	saves you time and money because you get it right
2	first time and you can forget about it because it's
3	good and it's reliable.
4	KATE McGRANN: Were there any
5	suggestions or advice that you provided to
6	Mr. Holder or the City more generally that you
7	didn't see followed?
8	MICHAEL PALMER: I saw lots followed
9	up, including the alarm management strategy. So
10	the standard was written, it was sent and I believe
11	OC, now retrospectively applied that or were trying
12	to get RTG to improve the SCADA.
13	A lot of it I can't answer you. You
14	know, Mr. Holder was very competent in his job,
15	very good and I had a good rapport with him and he
16	listened.
17	How it was dealt with after it left him
18	further up I can't answer that. All I can say is
19	that it appeared that things I was asked an opinion
20	on and I gave a strategy, like the alarm thing, was
21	generally adopted by him. But I can't answer about
22	OC or at the top of the project.
23	KATE McGRANN: Nothing that you thought
24	or suggested should be implemented that you saw was
25	not implemented in the system?

1 MICHAEL PALMER: It's quite hard to 2 answer, because my activity was Stage 1 dropped off 3 and Stage 2 kicked in. And so I am involved with 4 Stage 2 and I think, generally, most problems have 5 gone away because with the Stage 2 P3 is more 6 I'm not sure that's the right word. professional. 7 Or they have a higher standard around the client 8 standards.

9 And with your client standards, if you 10 do it early on in the project, it doesn't cost you 11 anything; it's just applying best practice. But to 12 not do it, then you have to do it retrospectively 13 because in hindsight it's a bad design, it's 14 expensive. So it's a false economy when you don't 15 apply the standards.

16 KATE McGRANN: I think you mentioned 17 all the testing and commissioning was done on 18 single car units? Did I get that right?

MICHAEL PALMER: Until just before the end, the strategy described to me by EllisDon, which I partially agree with, is that they were struggling to marry up headers (ph) together reliably. And so when they did it early on, it was breaking down the testing, because the two LRVs were not talking to each other very well.

1 When we did the signage sighting we 2 needed a two-car train. We actually went out the 3 first week a two-car train was running around end 4 to end because the signage was for two-car trains. 5 The strategy was to fix the trains 6 individually, before they married them up. I think 7 perhaps the problem, it was likely the problem was 8 two unreliable LRVs being married up together made 9 it even more unreliable as a two-car. So the 10 strategy was to provide it crack it with one car 11 units but running of two-car units on the line came 12 quite late in the project. 13 KATE McGRANN: Did the approach taken 14 that you just described raise any concerns in your 15 mind about the reliability of the system as it was 16 heading into revenue service? 17 MICHAEL PALMER: I believe the amount 18 of time that the married pairs were running around 19 was probably insufficient reliability-wise. Part 20 of the struggle was to get enough married pairs 21 available and reliable for service. 22 And it's a weird thing. You can pair 23 two LRVs up together. They work perfectly fine in 24 harmony, and you marry one of them up with another 25 train, there's something about a cross-coupler face

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

1	where the trains have to communicate both sides,
2	there's a signal computer on both.
3	But the systems integration, you know,
4	the track to train CCTV, so the driver can look at
5	the cameras in front of him to close the doors.
6	That all came very late, and I think that's because
7	the vehicles were commissioned late and so
8	integration was both late and squeezed.
9	At the end of it, most trains in their
10	own right are reliable. But as soon as you
11	introduce signalling onto them, CCTV, the train
12	radio, you're introducing a period of instability
13	which you need to go through to come out the other
14	side of this fully integrated, all singing, all
15	dancing two-car LRV.
16	KATE McGRANN: It sounds like you do
17	need to treat each individual LRV as its own unique
18	entity, which may have its own issues to be
19	identified and addressed, particularly once you
20	have, as you've described, added elements into it;
21	is that fair?
22	MICHAEL PALMER: Yeah, they appear to
23	be working through the reliability of each LRV.
24	And getting that right before they operate and
25	marry pairs I think is probably the right approach.

1	Most subway trains now are permanently formed. You
2	put six cars together; you never break them up.
3	And with these, they're designed to be coupled and
4	uncoupled on a regular basis as you do maintenance
5	and fault-finding.
6	But it does introduce in two trains
7	coupled together, the failure across a coupler face
8	between the two trains wherever they are
9	communicating, you know, is a difficult
10	relationship to get right technically.
11	KATE McGRANN: With respect to the
12	tabletop exercises that were run at City Hall, were
13	RTG and RTM and Alstom involved in those exercises?
14	MICHAEL PALMER: RTG and RTM were
15	around the table at a senior level.
16	KATE McGRANN: By "around the table",
17	does it mean they were actually participating at
18	the exercises?
19	MICHAEL PALMER: Yes, it was a
20	three-sided table with a facilitator, and so
21	directors of RTG, RTC were there, Mr. Manconi was
22	there. Mr. Charter was there, and senior folk from
23	the rail construction project were there.
24	I think the ones of the City were more
25	of a governance simulation about how the groups

1	would interact during trial running and operations
2	at a senior level as opposed to the bones down at
3	you know, the ground level. There's more
4	strategic is probably a good description.
5	KATE McGRANN: With respect to the
6	trial running period, I want to make sure I
7	understand the role that you were playing. I
8	understand you were observing; is that fair?
9	MICHAEL PALMER: I was in the pool of
10	people to observe, but I was never asked to
11	participate. There are documents around trial
12	running that showed the pool of people that could
13	be chosen from, and I was in some of those groups,
14	but never asked to physically observe.
15	KATE McGRANN: So were you on deck and
16	you could have been called to be part of an
17	observation team, but you were not called?
18	MICHAEL PALMER: Yeah, I could be at my
19	desk in Ottawa, or I could be at my desk at home,
20	or working on another project. I wasn't on this
21	100 percent of the time.
22	So my participation went up and down,
23	but towards the end, it became busier as issues
24	emerged. But once I got into trial operations, I
25	wasn't really well, I wasn't involved in the

1	actual activity.
2	KATE McGRANN: With respect to the lack
3	of the fully automated maintenance and service
4	facility, in your view, would that have
5	implications for the reliability of service once
б	the system was launched into the public?
7	MICHAEL PALMER: It would have had a
8	minor impact. 15 trains for service, so around
9	4:20, four trains were put out to what we call
10	"sweep the lines". So four trains come out from
11	the yard and two go towards Blair and two go
12	towards Tunney's Pasture.
13	Because of the signalling system not
14	being track-circuited, because the track and
15	guider, it would clear of people and all
16	obstructions before the first passenger trains at
17	5 o'clock.
18	Once they got to the end, another three
19	trains came onto the line to position for a
20	5:00 a.m. shotgun style. So down on 5 o'clock,
21	seven trains would open their doors and depart from
22	termini and mid line. And then another eight would
23	join between 5:00 a.m. and 6:30, right before the
24	morning peak, which was 15 trains in service
25	operating at 3-minute 22 headway.

1 And so the number of trains that had to 2 come in were such that that level was manageable. 3 It was slower, and RTM had to throw people at it to 4 manually drive the train to the nearest loading 5 location to the handover platform. 6 And once they left the handover 7 platform they had to go in a restricted mode 8 because the yard controller was not commissioned, 9 and I don't believe is commissioned now. So the 10 process took longer, but it was manageable because 11 of the number of trains involved. 12 KATE McGRANN: With respect to the 13 decision to run 13 trains during the peak period as 14 opposed to 15, I think you mentioned that decision 15 came late in the day; is that fair? 16 MICHAEL PALMER: My understanding is 17 that OC railroad construction project held out for 18 15 in service, 30 cars available as of 34. And at 19 some point, which I can't recall, that was lowered 20 to 13 in service, from 15. 21 I think the decision was correct to go 22 with less, because you were doing something and you 23 could build up your reliability and your service 24 from a lower base, trying to run 100 percent on day 25 one.

1 KATE McGRANN: Did you have a view as 2 to the appropriateness of the timing of that 3 decision? 4 MICHAEL PALMER: I'm not sure my view 5 would have been relevant at the time or wasn't 6 asked. 7 KATE McGRANN: Let me ask you this. 8 Based on your experience, could things have been 9 done differently in a way that was beneficial to 10 the system if that decision had been made earlier 11 than it was? 12 ALLISON RUSSELL: Excuse me, Counsel, I 13 feel a hypothetical question is being put to 14 Mr. Palmer. 15 KATE McGRANN: Let me rephrase it 16 differently. 17 When the decision was made to only run 18 13 trains, did you have any regrets about what you 19 could have done if you had known about that? 20 MICHAEL PALMER: I can't answer that, 21 not whether or not my Counsel tells me not to, 22 because I wasn't part of that decision-making 23 process. 24 If a line was to open with fewer trains 25 more reliably and allow staff to get used to that
Τ

1	level of service and the demand was not there for
2	15 trains, you could have done it differently.
3	But the reduction from 15 to 13 was
4	really quite close to the end, and it felt more
5	reactionary to a lack of LRVs than anything else.
6	Had these been available and reliable, then I don't
7	think the City would have reduced the numbers.
8	There are different ways of doing it to
9	that. I'll go back to my previous answer, running
10	at 100 percent from day one on any of the systems
11	is a stretch by anyone's ability.
12	KATE McGRANN: The Commission has been
13	asked to investigate the commercial and technical
14	circumstances that led to the breakdowns and
15	derailments on Stage 1.
16	Are there any areas or topics that from
17	your experience on the train you would suggest the
18	Commission look into in its work that we haven't
19	discussed today?
20	MICHAEL PALMER: Am I allowed to answer
21	that, Counsel?
22	ALLISON RUSSELL: So Counsel, what
23	you're looking for is if there's any areas that
24	Mr. Palmer thinks the Commission should be looking
25	to in addition to the areas that you've canvassed

1	this morning?
2	KATE McGRANN: That's correct.
3	ALLISON RUSSELL: So you're looking for
4	his opinion in that regard?
5	KATE McGRANN: I'm looking for his
6	reaction to that question based on the work that he
7	did directly and the information that he became
8	aware of through the course of that work.
9	MICHAEL PALMER: I'm surprised they had
10	two derailments in close succession. I'm surprised
11	the same unit was involved both times.
12	I'm surprised of the amount of time it
13	took to identify a train is being derailed.
14	If you take the first derailment, a
15	wheel fell off at Cyrville, or they found it at
16	Cyrville. When the train is jacked at Tunney's
17	Pastures to re-rail it, they found a wheel missing.
18	I find it concerning that the train
19	traveled from one end of the line to the other with
20	the wheel off, and you can imagine the potential
21	implications to that.
22	With the second derailment, I'm
23	surprised it came off, such at the stage not long
24	after people have departed, and crossed the highway
25	and only derailed at a placing switch where the

1	derailed wheels just sent all the train and it
2	derailed.
3	So I'm surprised at that. Could
4	anything from the construction have prevented that?
5	I have no idea.
6	Any accident, if you look at safety
7	management and so on, there's a Swiss cheese model
8	which says, all the holes in your Swiss cheese have
9	to line up for an accident to happen.
10	If any of the components hadn't lined
11	up, then it would have been prevented by human
12	intervention or alarm management, or an alarm on
13	the train or track that was 100 percent. And so I
14	wasn't involved in either investigation, so I can't
15	say anything about those.
16	But I would say, if you were to ask the
17	industry, including me, I am surprised at those two
18	incidents. I wasn't involved in any of the
19	investigation or the return to service.
20	KATE McGRANN: The Commission has also
21	been asked to make recommendations to try to
22	prevent the kinds of issues seen on Stage 1 from
23	happening again in the future.
24	Do you have any specific
25	recommendations or areas for recommendation that

1 you would suggest the Commission consider in that 2 work? 3 MICHAEL PALMER: Well, I have lots, but 4 I don't know that they're relevant. 5 I'm not sure if this is allowed, but 6 it's a document that is not related to Ottawa at 7 If I may speak out freely, Allison, my all. 8 counsel, as to whether it's --9 ALLISON RUSSELL: Maybe what we can do, 10 Counsel, because this is a document that I haven't 11 spoken to Mr. Palmer about. I'm not sure what he's 12 about to take us to. I'm okay to go off the record 13 and see if this is something appropriate to raise 14 on the record. But I'm not comfortable raising it 15 on the record at this point in time. 16 KATE McGRANN: That's understandable. 17 If you want to take that away and come back to us 18 in an e-mail after the --19 MICHAEL PALMER: It gives a description 20 of the presentation. It might give you the answer 21 you're after. 22 ALLISON RUSSELL: Let's wait, 23 Mr. Palmer, and see what we can -- we can take this 24 off line. I understand, Ms. McGrann, you're 25 suggesting Mr. Palmer and I discuss this after the

1 examination and get back to you on this point? 2 KATE McGRANN: It would be my strong 3 preference to complete the conversation today 4 because if we have follow up questions I would 5 prefer to not have to ask Mr. Palmer to come back. 6 I do believe that there are breakout 7 rooms that can be used for a discussion of this 8 nature and I wonder if our colleagues at Neesons 9 can assist? 10 MICHAEL PALMER: If I may, the title of 11 the presentation, that might help. 12 ALLISON RUSSELL: Why don't we just 13 wait until we're in the breakout room, Mr. Palmer. 14 We'll get those instructions from the 15 Typically we get a popup box court reporter. 16 inviting us to click to go into a breakout room. 17 -- OFF THE RECORD DISCUSSION --18 -- RECESS TAKEN AT 11:56 --19 -- UPON RESUMING AT 12:09 --20 KATE McGRANN: Let's go back on the 21 record. 22 ALLISON RUSSELL: Counsel, what I'm 23 prepared to share with you is that off the record, 24 Mr. Palmer shared with me what I'll loosely called 25 a presentation he prepared outside of the context

1	of the OLRT Stage 1 project and before his
2	involvement with the OLRT project.
3	But where he had developed ten I'll
4	call them ten points for consideration when
5	involved with communication-based train control
6	projects similar to this type of project.
7	I'm not sure that I'm prepared to agree
8	to allow him to share the presentation with you
9	because he's not here as an expert witness. But
10	I'm prepared to allow him to share with you what
11	those ten points are, as long as you understand it
12	was something he prepared generally speaking and
13	not specific to the OLRT Stage 1.
14	KATE McGRANN: I understand. I take it
15	that the points you think would be relevant to this
16	project and to projects like it into the future?
17	MICHAEL PALMER: Yes, ma'am.
18	KATE McGRANN: And I wonder,
19	Ms. Russell, given the time constraints, whether
20	you'd be comfortable providing those points in
21	writing?
22	ALLISON RUSSELL: Yes, I think that
23	would be okay if we provided those ten points in
24	writing.
25	KATE McGRANN: If we have any follow up

1 questions we can schedule a very quick session but 2 in order to get Mr. Palmer on his way today, if 3 that's okay with everybody then that's what we'll 4 do. 5 MICHAEL PALMER: So, the reason I 6 thought of this when you asked a question, you 7 know, the presentation I've prepared which is for 8 Brownfield signalling [sic]. 9 When you asked me the question, it just 10 seemed absolutely a perfect response and I could 11 have read out the ten. 12 But there's one slide which lists "Ten 13 Golden Rules For Brownfield CBTC". If you replace 14 "Brownfield CBTC" with "LRT extensions", I think 15 that answers your question. 16 So counting down from 10 to 1 of the 17 trichotomy of projects: Time, cost and quality. 18 Having an operational concept; good human factors; 19 operational engineering integration. Number six is 20 irrelevant. Secondary detection versus backup. 21 Number five, winning hearts and minds; early users and maintainers; being intelligent 22 23 operator owner. Number three: Is practice, 24 practice, practice, practice, Number two 25 is migration strategy, how you move from the old to

1 the new. 2 And number one is: It's all about the 3 people, and really winning those hearts and minds. 4 Nine of those ten are highly applicable to Stage 2, 5 which is why your question prompted me to think of 6 this. 7 KATE McGRANN: Can you unpack the 8 winning hearts and minds for us a little bit? 9 MICHAEL PALMER: Number five, 10 approaching an operator as a one-stop shop; 11 appointing maintainer a one-stop shop. 12 Write the ConOps syndicate -- validated 13 with endusers. Develop an early vanguard team for 14 testing and commissioning, training, development, 15 delivery. 16 Work alongside the contractor and 17 co-locate as one team. 18 Use the team again, and it should 19 compose of the best business reps, and not 20 "children". Putting children sent on special 21 projects -- where "special" is in inverted 22 commas -- you know, you want your best people 23 upfront to crack it. But people often loath to 24 release them, because they're their best people. 25 That was KATE McGRANN: Understood.

very helpful. Thank you for sharing that, and I
think both for timing reasons and because our
questions are done for the day, subject to any
follow-up questions your counsel had, we can call
it a day today.
ALLISON RUSSELL: I don't have any
follow-up questions this afternoon, so thank you.
OFF THE RECORD DISCUSSION
Concluded at 12:13 p.m.

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I, JUDITH M. CAPUTO, RPR, CSR, CRR,
4	Certified Shorthand Reporter, certify;
5	That the foregoing proceedings were
6	taken before me at the time and place therein set
7	forth; at which time the interviewee was put under
8	oath by me;
9	That the statements of the presenters
10	and all comments made at the time of the meeting
11	were recorded stenographically by me;
12	That the foregoing is a Certified
13	Transcript of my shorthand notes so taken.
14	
15	Dated this 5th day of May, 2022.
16	lite of lepto, Car, Can
17	- Cart
18	NEESONS, A VERITEXT COMPANY
19	PER: JUDITH M. CAPUTO, RPR, CSR, CRR
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

WORD INDEX	79:13 82:7 91:6 10 22	5:00 105:20, 23 59 7:19 77:7	accumulation	ago 38:8 52:25
< 0 >	92.1.13.15	5th 117.15	accurately 33.5	agree 21.14
0 68.3	100:3 4 5 115:4		achieve 66.4	28.1 100.21
• • • • • • •	20 28:25 53:6	< 6 >	achieved 38:16	113.7
~1 \	2000 7:16 10:1	6 5.11	83.17 88.5	$\Delta areament 17.2$
1 6·20 1/1·8	2000 7.70 10.7 2007-105 10.3	6.30 105.23	acknowledge	10.2 /7.12
15.10 21.0	2004-05 10.5 2005 7.19	60 60:22	06.7	10.11 51.6
10.19 21.9	2003 1.10	61 60:22	90.7	43.11 34.0
59.12 59.11, 19 66:25 60:24	2000 10.73	01 09.22	Acquired 14.20	01.10 11.1, 14
00.23 09.21	2009 0.72 10.74	.7.	Acquisition 50.7	90.21
71:17,20 75:10	2011 8:3		Act 5: 12, 25 6:2	anead 88:23
85:11 87:10	2014 8:76, 77	7 5:24	Acting 9:9	aim 97:10, 24
91:9, 21, 25	9:0 204 F 45:00	70s 13:21	actions 62:4	air 73:7
94:25 100:2	2015 15:23	76 69:22	activities 9:12	aircraft 70:9
108:75 110:22	21:1 23:3	7-Car 7:21	90:3, 5	95:21, 22
113:1, 13 114:16	2016 9:6, 9	10: <i>10</i>	activity 41:23,	alarm 50:15, 19,
1.86 66:15	2017 9:13 24:7	•	24 100:2 105:1	22 76:1,2
10 44:1, 2, 5	66:16	< 8 >	actual 29:13	95:16, 20, 22
114: <i>16</i>	2018 9:15, 16	867 8:13	33:9 43:24	96:3, 4, 5, 6, 10,
10:46 78:8	22:8, 11, 24		64:19 105:1	18 97:1, 5, 7
10:55 78:1	39:18 89:3	< 9 >	add 7:20	98:9, 14, 24
100 68:3 70:10	2019 39:5	9:00 1: <i>16</i>	added 102:20	99: <i>9</i> , <i>20</i> 110: <i>12</i>
104:21 106:24	2022 1:8, 16	9:03 4:1	addition 108:25	alarms 50: <i>10</i> ,
108: <i>10</i> 110: <i>13</i>	117:15	90 65: <i>15</i> 74: <i>12</i> ,	additional 19:13	15 95:17, 22, 25
10th 63:5	22 67:1 85:11	13	62:3 96:22	96: <i>8, 10, 12, 14</i> ,
11:03 78:9	105:25	90th 63:6	addressed	19, 24 97:2, 14,
11:56 112: <i>18</i>	27 18: <i>12</i>	99 65: <i>12</i> , <i>21</i>	102: <i>19</i>	17 98:22
12 8: <i>13</i>	29 14:22 15: <i>1</i>	66:3	adopted 97:2	Alcatel 8:2
12:09 112: <i>19</i>			99:21	Allison 2:11
12:13 1:16	< 3 >	< A >	adrift 67:4	6: <i>10</i> 19:23
116: <i>10</i>	3 13:24 67:1	a.m 1: <i>16</i> 4: <i>1</i>	advance 47: <i>16</i> ,	23:4 42:11
13 16:9 67:2,	30 10:22 71:8	105:2 <i>0</i> , 23	18	58:22 70:24
25 68:12 71:20	106: <i>18</i>	ability 108:11	advanced 32:11	78:2, <i>3</i> , 5 88:12
106: <i>13</i> , <i>20</i>	30th 15:23	abnormal 30:10	42:23	91: <i>11, 16, 18</i>
107:18 108:3	3-22 67:20	absence 54:17	adversarial 15:7	107: <i>1</i> 2 108:22
14th 8: <i>17</i>	33 5:11, 24	55:24 59:5	20:10, 21, 23	109:3 111:7, <i>9</i> ,
15 67: <i>1</i> , <i>16</i> , <i>19</i> ,	34 67:17, 23	absolutely 20:6	advice 99:5	22 112: <i>1</i> 2, 22
22, 23, 24 68:5,	71:8, <i>15</i> , 22	42:15 114:10	advised 5:25	113:22 116:6
10 71:9, 16	106: <i>18</i>	abused 51:21	AECOM 38:21	allocate 50:10
105: <i>8</i> , <i>24</i>	3-minute 105:25	academic 55:4	aerials 13:9	allow 107:25
106: <i>14</i> , <i>18</i> , <i>20</i>		acceptance	afoul 19:3	113: <i>8</i> , <i>10</i>
108:2, 3	< 4 >	75:19	after 4:23 11:9	allowed 15:1
15,000 50:15, 19	4 1:8 9:7 71: <i>16</i>	accepted 21:25	25:5 51: <i>14</i>	27:24 31:6
95:17, 18 96:9	4,200 9:10	access 40:12	84:2 <i>4</i> 85: <i>8</i> , <i>15</i> ,	53:22 108:20
15-2 67: <i>1</i> 9 71:7	4:20 105:9	46:2 68: <i>18</i>	16 94:19, 20	111:5
15-minute 24:25	40 77:8	69: <i>4</i> 72: <i>9</i>	99: <i>1</i> 7 109:24	allows 32:15
19 32:21	400 15:2 <i>1</i> 75: <i>9</i> ,	accident 11:12	111: <i>18</i> , <i>21</i> , 25	50:2
1982 6:25	10	110:6, 9	afternoon 23:25	alongside 21:19
1985 7:1	45 25: <i>1</i>	accidents 36:13	116:7	43:22 115:16
1995-'96 7:5	4th 1: <i>15</i>	accompanied	age 66: <i>19</i>	Alstom 15:20,
1999 52:18		96:1	agenda 31:24	23 16:3 20:25
	< 5 >	accountability	aggressive	47:19 78:21, 22
< 2 >	5 6: <i>1</i> 14:2 <i>1</i>	14:7	20:15	83:24 84:1, 3
2 30:12 39:13 59:7, 16 71:16	105: <i>17</i> , <i>20</i>	accounted 60:4	aggressiveness 20:14	103: <i>13</i>

America 75.6	appropriateness	attack 38.7	hase 32.7	bid 17.16 20
AMEY 17.7	107·2	attended 62.5	62·10 106·24	20.17
amount 41.24	April 8.17 9.15	attending 1.15	Based 8.1 30.7	bidders 21.13
44:4 92:5	area 13:14	55:7	84:20 96:25	bidding 20:18
101:17 109:12	areas 81:11	attention 45:13	107:8 109:6	21:17.23
analogy 93.9	108.16.23.25	attitude 17.12	baseline 15.16	Bienvenue
Andv 8:19 15:2	110:25	74:22	30:17 61:9	54:19
43:3 87:12	argue 77:5	audience 62:10	Basically 92:3	big 11:12 31:11
announced	97:16	August 22:12.	basis 5:3 17:4	bit 30:4 34:2
43:11	arguing 90:23	23 66:16	29:22 56:8	37:20 41:20
annoving 97:13	arises 19:20	Australia 75:6	103:4	42:13 44:1
answering 23:8	arose 83:11	authority 73:12	bathtub 94:5	45:8 56:13.14
answers 114:15	arrival 47:13	automated	bear 19:5	67:14 81:6
antennae 13:9	arrived 39:17	105:3	Bearing 29:17	95:13 98:14
anticipating	42:7, 16 53:2	automatic 80:17,	beating 23:19	115:8
86:17	articles 36:14	18, 19 81:10	Bechtel 17:6, 7	bits 77:18
anyone's 108:11	as-built 57:8	82:3, 9 83:2	began 88:10	black 59:22
anyway 78:1,21	aside 97:25	automatically	beginning	Blair 41:7
85:25	asked 5:14	81:14	18:11 32:8	68:2 <i>1</i> 105: <i>11</i>
apologize 17:23	50:21 53:4	automation	42:14 69:14	blessed 77:7
42:12 70:24	64:8 76:22, 24	82:2, 25	71:5 92:7	blind 45:6
appear 3:8	79:2 92:3, 22	availability	behalf 97:4	46:11
102:22	96:17 98:12	38:16 40:10	Belfast 37:25	block 8:2 12:6
appeared 98:14	99: <i>19</i> 104: <i>10</i> ,	69:15 74:3	41:7 50:8 55:8	blocked 95:24
99:19	14 107:6	79:24 80:1, 9	68:20 72:9	blue 47:25
appended 5:9	108: <i>1</i> 3 110:2 <i>1</i>	83:5	78:18, 19 80:6	bodies 35:8
Appendix 67:19	114:6, 9	available 64:4	81: <i>17</i>	bolting 72:3
71:7, 15	asking 88:14	81:8 82:6	belief 33:8	bones 104:2
apples 92:12	aspect 38:24	83: <i>15</i> 101:2 <i>1</i>	46:2 <i>4</i>	booklet 47:20
applicable	aspects 52:1	106: <i>18</i> 108:6	believe 20:9	books 29:19
17:17 115:4	assess 64:16	averse 17:14	22:13 31:19	boring 56:15
application	assessing	18:2 <i>4</i> , 25	33:14 44:24	boss 36:12
49: <i>14</i>	73:13 74:17	aware 6:9 19:8	48:16 58:2	89:23
applied 15:3	asset 33:4	39:16 61:15, 25	66:25 67:2 <i>0</i>	bought 10:13
91:22 92:17	47:2 65:16	74:1,25 84:6	71:21 79:5	box 112: <i>15</i>
99:11	66:8, 23	85:18 96:13	86:3 92:15	brackets 54:9
apply 60:25	assets 34:2	109:8	93:2, 6 99:10	brakes 12:10
93:16 98:18	66:1, 18 70:1		101: <i>1</i> 7 106: <i>9</i>	brand 24:8 66:1
100: <i>15</i>	75:9 90:14	< B >	112:6	break 6:3, 8
applying 100:11	93:13 94:1,4	back 9:8 12:24	believed 70:19	77:25 103:2
appointing	assist 75:2	20:23 28:1, 2,	71:4	breakdowns
115: <i>11</i>	91: <i>17</i> 112:9	10 35:16 59:18	benchmarking	108:14
apportion 50:17	assistant 54:20	68:15 69:6	82:17, 21, 23	breaking 100:24
apportionment	assisting 46:5	72:4, 16 74:2	beneficial 107:9	breakout 112:6,
50:18	assume 18:17	78:1 83:23	benefit 46:23	13, 16
approach 22:4	assurance	85:5 108:9	best 28:19	brief 6:18
46:22 91:10	31:79 32:23	111:1/ 112:1, 5,	41:20 45:11	Drietly 22:1/
92:73 98:7	33:8, 14 34:25		47:14 52:20	02:2 12:10
101:73 102:25	42:1 44:19		59:25 /b:9	9/:20
approached	assure 33:12	/9:5	11:10 95:15	bring 70:47
15:12	assuring 33:76	backup 114:20	97:2, 17 100:11	pring (2:1/
approaching	at-grade /:8	bad 05:4	115:19,22,24	01:13 Breedweer 07:40
115:10	atmosphere	JOD: 12	Detter 28:22	brought 0:00
appropriate	10:17	100:73	41:0 00:27 67:8	
111:73	I	bankrupt 11:70	I	22:14 24:9

33:12 45:12	Caputo 2:18	catenary 43:16	Charter 25:10	109: <i>10</i>
75:1	117:3. 19	57:14	37:22 72:18	closed 54:25
Brownfield 7:25	car 7:20 9:3	caveats 22:3	103:22	closing 84:23
16:1 24:1.3.4.	71:24 100:18	CBTC 9:18	chat 24:25	co-counsel 4:12
11 114:8. 13. 14	101:10	15:20 16:1	cheapest 17:20	95:8
budget 15:15	care 97:19	24:3. 10 114:13.	check 32:17	coffee 77:22
18:1 19:9.10	Carly 2:4 4:3	14	55:1 84:8	cognizant 97:25
21:10	6:7. 13. 23 9:23	CCTV 72:1	cheese 59:22	Co-Lead 2:3
build 56:14	11:2.23 12:2	102:4. 11	110:7.8	4:6
70:12 83:24	13:1 14:6	cell 78:3	Chief 8:18.24	collaboration
106:23	16:11 19:19	centralized	9:9, 14, 22 15:2	59:23
builder 78:23	20:6 22:7 23:1,	12:19 13:5	29:5	collaborative
building 70:5	12 24:16, 19	centre 7:9 8:25	children 115:20	4:11 15:17
built 33:17, 18	25:16 26:3	27:8 29:7 34:7	chose 25:23	20:21 59:16
35:6 55:5	27:13 28:8	37:19 47:21,22	chosen 18:19	92:15
bulletins 36:13	29:3, 24 30:3	48:1 63:20	104: <i>13</i>	colleague 4:6
bundle 96:19	32:3 33:6, 21	64:3 73:1	churn 43:13	colleagues
burden 11:4	34:17 35:11	74:19,23 93:8	circumstances	112:8
burned 95:24	36:5, 23 37:6	centres 7:1	73:22 108:14	College 31:9
bus 9:11	38:2, 14 39:17	8:14 13:12	City 14:12	collisions 11:9
busier 35:19,20	41:16 42:7, 15	24:12 72:22	16:16, 18, 21	colloguialism
104:23	44:10 45:8	CEO 8:19	19:2 33:16	23:19
business 115:19	47:5 48:10	certain 31:5	35:18 37:2	co-locate 115:17
bust 10:12	49:19 51:9, 22,	56:6 58:19,20	42:9, 17 44:11	colour-coded
busy 92:7, 10	25 53:2 55:12	60:22 62:21	46:23 48:11	47:24 53:17
buying 49:7, 8	57:2, 23 58:18	88:16	50:25 52:3	column 12:6
Byford 8:19	59:1 60:2, 9	certainly 18:13	57:20, 22 58:8,	come 15:4
15:2 43:3 87:12	61:15 62:2	44:15 94:6	10, 21 59:3	39:7 42:5 56:4
	64:9, 13, 23	CERTIFICATE	62:6, 9 65:9	68:9 78: <i>1</i>
< C >	65:1,5 66:5	117: <i>1</i>	84:7 85:18	81:2 <i>1</i> 102: <i>1</i> 3
cab 72:1	67:10 69:11, 18	certification	88: <i>9</i> , <i>19</i> 89: <i>1</i> ,	105: <i>10</i> 106:2
cabins 8:13	70:17,22 71:1	72:11, 12 73:6	17, 20 90:19	111: <i>1</i> 7 112:5
call 8:4 13:18	72:10 73:23	Certified 117:4,	96:13 97:12	comes 42:22
78:3 92:3	74:25 76:11, 15	12	99:6 103:12,24	44:5 57:19
96:23 105:9	77:24 78:7, 10,	certify 117:4	108:7	84:15
113:4 116:4	25 79:7, 20, 23	chain 59:15	City's 26:8 35:3	comfortable
called 7:2, 20,	80:3, 7, 10, 22	68: <i>18</i>	civil 5:16 39:23	30:25 111: <i>14</i>
23 10:6 13:11,	81:5 82:15	chalk 59:22	claims 15:10	113:2 <i>0</i>
12 15:21 29:15,	83:4 84:2, 6	chance 82:20	19:12, 13, 14, 17,	coming 19:12
25 31:18 37:11	85:15 86:12	change 21:15	20 59:24 89:11	59:6
50:5 75:19	87:19 88:7,24	26:4 54:2, 5	clarification	command 45:22
82:2 84:14	90:2 91:5, 8, 15,	changed 25:3,	7:11 70:21	50:2
85:2 104:16, 17	17, 19 92:22	19 38:23 54:8	71:13	commas 115:22
112:24	93:25 94:17	60: <i>11</i> 61:5	clear 43:12	commence 4:20
cameras 102:5	95:7	73:25 88:11	105: <i>15</i>	commencing
Canada 6:2	carried 87:9	changes 28:2	clearly 17:20	4:1
8:16, 22 15:1	carries 14:21	46:7 61: <i>14</i>	39:22	comment 27:24
16:25 52:15	cars 103:2	91:10	click 81:12	53:10, 11 54:22
90:12	106: <i>18</i>	changing 30:16	112:16	55:3 93:4
Canadian 17:10	case 11:14	chap 29:10	client 100:7, 9	commenting
canvassed	17:6 31:13	charge 16:22	close 28:3	26:15 28:14, 20
108:25	32:19 64:24	25:9, 10 29:13	53:11 55:2	comments 28:1,
capable 65:16	87:18, 22 93:22	43:7	67:7 73:4 90:5,	3 53:7, 9, 14, 22
capital 10:8	cases 11:19	chart 53:18	13 102:5 108:4	54:22 117:10
14:18	I	I	I	

	e e manata a se a	a onfiguration	10:10 51:10	2000 and 10:2
commercial		configuration	19:12 51:13	correctly 19:3
21:5 44:25	73:7, 13 74:18,	56:20 57:6	115:16	26:20 51:21
62:20 108:13	22	61:11	contractors	63:7 67:21
commercially	competent	connectors 59:8	17:9 37:9	68:19 92:19
17:14 58:12	48:20 93:11	ConOps 26:12	contracts 19:11	correspondence
COMMISSION	99:14	32:7, 10 115:12	21:17 56:13	89:17
1:6 2:1 4: <i>4</i> , 7,	complete 28:7	consider 111:1	contractual	co-run 31:7
17 8:18 40:12	41: <i>12</i> 43:21	consideration	19:22 46:25	cosmetic 43:23
43:8 45:7	44:20 59:5	113:4	58:7 97:20 98:1	cost 17: <i>16</i> , <i>21</i> ,
56:14 58:4	112:3	considered 75:1	contractually	25 18: <i>15</i>
108: <i>12, 18,</i> 24	completed 88:11	consortia 17:6	47:7, 9, 11	100: <i>10</i> 114: <i>17</i>
110:20 111: <i>1</i>	completion	20: <i>12</i>	contributed 20:9	costing 51:6
commissioned	43:24 65:3	consortium	control 7:1, 8	costs 39:10
7:13 33:18	84:12	51:23	8:1, 14, 25 9:18	COUNSEL 2:1,
35:6 81: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i> , <i>18</i>	complex 13:3	constraints	12:12 13:6, 12	3, 4 4:4, 6, 13
83:20 102:7	31:2	113: <i>19</i>	15:13 24:12	5:2 6:10 42:11
106: <i>8</i> , <i>9</i>	compliance	constructed	27:8 29:7 34:6	82:19 88:12
Commissioner	21:8 52:20	39:2 <i>1</i> 92: <i>9</i>	37:19 46:6	91: <i>11</i> 107: <i>12</i> ,
8:20 87:12	compliant 17:16	construction	47:21, 22 48:1	21 108:21, 22
commissioning	19:8 21:9	14:13 16:16, 20	49:25 61: <i>12</i>	111:8, <i>10</i>
7:14 16:17	components	19:2 21:18	63:20 64:2	112:22 116:4
24:2, 10 39:2	43:18 110:10	25:7 27:25	72:22 73:1	count 27:6
41:8 64:3	compose 115:19	29:12 35:4	74:19.23 93:7	counterclaims
68:21 75:15	compressed	39:23.24 40:9	95:21 113:5	89:11
85:16 87:21	42:3 43:19 44:9	44:21 48:12.14	controller 7:3	counting 114:16
100.17 115.14	compressing	52.7.13.23	81.12, 19, 106.8	couple 95.10
Commission's	40.9	54.21 60.3 11	controllers	coupled 103.3 7
4.10 18 22 5.2	computer 102.2	62.7 68.19	13.13 34.8	coupler 103.7
committee 28:12	computers	60·5 76·10	46.10 85.12	
common 83.24	12.10	81.1 00.10	controlling	83.22 100.8
commonsense	$\frac{12.75}{\text{concent}} 30.7$	103.23 106.17	75.23 2 <i>1</i>	Court 7.10
18·7	70.10 16 81.0	100.25 100.77 110· <i>A</i>	convenient	70.20 71.12
40.7	11/1.18	constructors	20·10	112.20 11.12
102.1	concorn 55:20		conventional	112.70 covorad 26:11
102.7	concerning	42.4		
communicating	concerning		7.23 12.3	COVERS 00.73
103.9	109.70	40.79		$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{COVID} 40.24 \\ \textbf{cowerkers} 40.17 \\ \end{array}$
	Concerns 101.14		49.20 51.9	COWOIKEIS 40.17
13:7 15:73	Concluded	23:20 48:18	52:8 112:3	Crack 101:10
57:70	116:70	content 79:73,	conversations	115:23
communication-	Condition 93:74	15 a antawt 70.5	80:20, 25 81:2,	cracked 95:2
based 9:18	94:2	context 76:5	6 82:12	Cracks 26:10, 18
113:5	conditions	112:25	conversely	crasn 45:23
communications	62:22	contingency	81:27	crasnes 11:9
9:3 37:14	conductor 6:25	16:10	conversion 8:13	created 45:1
88:17 93:24	13:8	continues 21:6	convert 27:18	creation 98:9
companies 11:7,	Confed 18:14	contract 15:24	converted 24:9	credible 43:1
10, 20	21:19	16:3, / 1/:14	copy 54:21	creep 91:7
company 8:7		19:11 21:2, 3	correct 5:6	Cripps 16:22
10:6, 11 12:25	27:5 32:19	22:2 27:18	51:18 63:9	22:15 44:16
13:21 17:5	/9:14 94:24	28:23 56:5	/8:12 92:14	criteria 86:24
23:10 27:4	confidence 87:2	78:24 92:2, 3	94:19 106:21	87:20
31:19 33:11	confident 87:16	97:25	109:2	criticizing 89:11
50:5 117:18	confidential 5:3	contractor 10:5	corrections	cross-coupler
compare 92:12		14: <i>15</i> 15:22	4:23 5:1,9	101:25
				crossed 109.24

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

crossed 109:24

4 _

•			a a d a a d a	
Crosstown	decide 18:4	derailed 109: <i>13</i> ,	88:21 92:13	document
19:16 38:5	76:21	25 110: <i>1</i> , 2	93:14 108:8	46:22 47:12
Crown 5:17	decision 68:1,	derailment	differently 92:1	61: <i>16</i> , <i>18</i> , 22, 25
CRR 117:3, 19	<i>12, 13</i> 106: <i>13,</i>	109: <i>14</i> , 22	107: <i>9</i> , <i>16</i> 108:2	82:24 91:24
CSR 117:3, 19	<i>14</i> , <i>21</i> 107: <i>3</i> , <i>10</i> ,	derailments	difficult 15:11	111:6, <i>10</i>
culture 17:12	17	11:9 94: <i>10</i>	44:6 49:5	documentation
19: <i>17</i> , 20 59:17	decision-making	108: <i>15</i> 109: <i>10</i>	73:22 76:18	33: <i>1</i> 5 41:25
currently 40:25	107:22	descend 15:11	93: <i>17</i> 103: <i>9</i>	44:19 45:2
79:12	decisions 19:5	describe 88:8	dips 94:5	56:17 58:5, 14
curve 93:19	deck 104:15	89:7 90:3	direct 59:1	59:6 61: <i>12</i>
94:5	declaration 4:10	described	direction 31:5	documents 3:1,
cut 41:17	decorating	100:2 <i>0</i> 101: <i>14</i>	directional	7 44:21, 24
Cyrville 109:15,	41:21	102:2 <i>0</i>	62:19	53:18 56:15
16	decrease 66:19	describing	directive 16:2	96:20 104:11
	deemed 5:13	18:22	directly 78:13,	doing 8:15
< D >	deep 25:2	description	20 109:7	11:8 23:21
daily 29:22	38:21 39:1	60:1 96:3	Director 9:17	26:8 28:22
50:15 87:25	defects 86:2	98:14 104:4	22:16 38:9	33:22 37:12, 13.
damage 86:8	definitely 40:25	111: <i>19</i>	directors 103:21	14 40:25 43:8
dancing 102:15	74:19	design 43:14	disadvantaged	46:8 52:19
danger 12:9	degraded 30:10	60:2. 11. 14	34:11	57:7 64:1
62:23	84:21	75:16.17.21	disagree 28:2	72:15 85:9.11
dark 48.6	degree 26.2	76:24 100:13	59·24	106.22 108.8
Data 50:1	94.9	design-build	disagreed 16.4	domain 48.20
date 10:2	delay 73.24	10·15	discover 85.21	door 81.15
22.11 38.18	delayed 54.16	designed 92.9	discuss 47.19	84.23
30.2 0 40.8	delays 65.17	103.3	111.25	doors 85.0
12.2, 3 40.0 12.21 25 12.3 1	66.12	dock 15.13	discussed	102.5 105.21
42.24, 20 40.0, 4	00.72 doliver 56.6	18.2 101.10	66·24 108·10	dormant 06:24
dates 30:15	deliverable 51.5	40.2 104.79	discussion	doubling 7:6
13.10	deliverable 51.5	detection 114.20	52.12 63.12	doubt 21.7
43.70 day 1.15 14.22		determination	52.72 05.72 90.22 00.12	doubl 21.7
25.5 27.10	04.70 dolivory 115.15	65.2	09.22 90.73	drafting 26:14
20.16 21.10	delivery 115.75	dotormino 55.2	discussions	Dragados 20:14
30.70 31.70,20	demand 71.5	Develop 115:12		draggad 20.75
40.3, 17 30.19		developed	52.23 55.70 67:44 42 90:46	dragged 60.25
51:74 61:7	108:7		07:11, 13 80:10	drawings 57:8
03:27 04:22		60:70 113:3	81:25 89:23	arive 81:74
00:0 /0:10	31:25 35:22		95:72, 74	100:4
85:11 87:7, 14,	95:20	64:24 79:9	dispatchers	driven 39:6
25 88:2 95:4,	demonstrated	development	34:7	81:20, 22
18 96:9 106:15,	35:5	115:14	disproportionate	driver 58:16
24 108:10	demonstrating	develops 30:21	44:4	62:21, 25 63:5,
116:3, 5 117:15	49:23 84:16	diagram 84:5	disputes 44:25	10 73:10 80:14
day-in-the-life-of	denied 69:4	died 38:7	distance 66:11	81:15, 22 83:2
26:22 29:25	depart 105:21	difference	distraction	85:7 102:4
days 26:23	departed 109:24	14:11, 19 59:21,	28:19	drivers 7:17
30:9 40:19	depending	23 61:9	DITLO 30:5	34:6 47:21
46:9 70:16	22:21 29:14	differences 14:7	32:4, 7, 25 33:5,	62:16 74:18, 23
93:15	60:25	different 10:15	22	80:12 85:6 93:7
deal 37:23	depends 6: <i>14</i> ,	17:9, 12 28:13	DITLOs 26:21,	driving 43:21
53:4 73:5 93:20	15 16:14 20:12	29:1 53:6	23 29:25 34:13	73:9 93:10
dealt 38:10	61: <i>18</i> 66: <i>7</i> , 22	54:24 59:6	dive 38:21 39:2	drop 45:18 46:8
99:17	69:2 <i>0</i> 85:22	68:22 70:6	dives 25:2	dropped 21:13
December 24:7	Deputy 8:18, 24	82:22, 24 84:11	division 7:17	35:21 92:5
decent 36:19	37:5			100:2

Duana 25:10	omorgonev	overvbody	71.6 8 75.8	fair 23.5 32.15
26:10 11 27:20	20:11 21:0	20.11 00.10 12	74.0, 0 75.0	102.21 101.0
30.10, 11 31.20 Duba 27.5	30.77 31.0	39.11 09.10, 12	11.3, 13 00.14	102.27 104.0
	62.19 64.22	4.3 avenuk a duda	93.10 90.17	100.70 fointe 40:40
D-U-B-E 3/17	employed 15:3	everybody s	107.8 108.77	fairly 40:78
Duquette 25:10	ended 76:20	43:4	experienced	Tall 19:3 39:5
36:11 37:20	endusers 115:13	evidence 4:9,	62:14	89:3
_	engine 95:23	18, 24 5:4, 8, 19,	expert 113:9	tallen 26:17
< E >	engineer 9:19	23 6:2 31:21	expertise 48:11	false 49:16
earlier 20:11	23:17	32:23 33:9, 15	64: <i>10</i>	100: <i>14</i>
32:4 33:22	engineering	47:17 56:3	experts 29:15	familiar 51:2
34:1, 3 68:2	77:20 114:19	65:2 <i>1</i> 92:24	explain 30:3	67:8 70:13
93:9 107: <i>10</i>	engineers 9:4	93:23	45:8	76:3 79:17
early 15:15	23:19 28:14	exactly 12:12,	explicit 48:9	85:13 86:21
30:6 40:18	ensure 26:25	22 13:15 17:1	49: <i>14</i> 51: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i>	familiarization
46:1 86:6	52:19	examination	54:3 71:8, 15	85: <i>8</i>
93:15,22 94:9	enter 4:17	112: <i>1</i>	explicitly 76:16	familiarizing
96:9 98:25	entered 4:23	example 41:20	exposed 34:1	31: <i>14</i>
100: <i>10</i> , 23	5:3, 8 84:8	43:2 45:11	exposure 30:15	fast 12:20
114:22 115:13	86:13	56:1 72:23	expression 87:4	96:11
earnings 11:21	entire 23:18	95:16, 19 97:11	extend 86:25	faster 34:21
earth 65:25	28:20 63:21	examples 44:23	extension 7:6	85: <i>14</i>
East 41:6	entirely 11:24	45:10	24:6 27:19	fault 85:23
easy 30:24	85:22	Excel 53:18	44:2 52:17	90:23
96:11	entity 102:18	excuse 23:18	63:19 69:12, 24	fault-finding
economies	environment	87:4 107:12	85:5 87:10 97:6	74:7 93:20
49:16	21:6 25:15	Executive 15:2	extensions	103:5
economy 100:14	45:1 52:15	exercise 27:1	77:11 114:14	faults 84:8
EEMUA191 97:1	58:15 59:25	31:23		85: <i>18</i> , 20
effectively	70:6 90:20	exercises 62:6	< F >	feed 72:16
11:12 46:11	environments	72:16 103:12,	face 101:25	feel 107:13
85:2	73:2	13, 18	103:7	feels 20:4 35:9
efficient 11:18	equally 73:14	exit 62:19	facilitator	feet 56:25
efficiently 33:20	equipment 40:2	expect 44:12	103:2 <i>0</i>	fell 15:9 26:10
effort 44:4 84:7	41:24 70:13	67:6, 7 77:17	facilitators	109: <i>15</i>
Eglinton 19:15	77:18 89:16	83: <i>13</i> 86: <i>9</i>	30:2 <i>1</i>	felt 16:6 108:4
38:5	94:16, 18 97:6,	94:2 <i>1</i> 96: <i>9</i>	facility 79:25	fewer 21:16
elaborate 94:3	22	expectation	80:5 105: <i>4</i>	107:2 <i>4</i>
electric 34:7, 8	ERCs 34:7	83:13	facing 62:18	fight 21:9
46:6	45:24	expectations	fact 16:12	figure 88:5
electrical 9:2	Eric 37:5	51:20	27:17 39:16	figures 70:16
Elektrik 13:20	EROs 34:8	expected 18:2	78:21 83:18	88: <i>4</i>
element 60:3,	erratic 98:15	38:16 49:13	factors 114:18	fill 75:13
10, 13	errors 5:7	51: <i>1</i> 61:25 83:6	factory 70:9	filled 23:15
elements 72:2	escalators 43:17	expecting 83:8,	72:25	26:1 70:4 77:5
102:2 <i>0</i>	escapes 29:10	9	fail 63:9 64:17	final 33:17
elevators 43:17	Esq 2:11	expensive 18:9	failed 88:2	64:22
Elizabeth 87:11	establish 5:16	20:20 100:14	failing 94:11, 12	finally 39:5
EllisDon 20:13	established	experience 6:19,	failure 61:1	financially 56:24
38: <i>11</i> 100: <i>20</i>	53:16	22 14:24 15: <i>1</i> 8	62:22 66:16	Finch 19:16
e-mail 36:17	Europe 19:18	17:10 20:7	103:7	find 46:21
111: <i>18</i>	Eurovia 59:8	24:1, 5, 10 27:3,	failures 66:12	53:15 59:16
embedded 40:20	event 60:2	11 28:8, 16, 18	86:6, 9, 10 87:3,	109: <i>18</i>
emerged 26:11	eventually 18:8	30:15, 22 46:4	5 94:9, 13, 18,	finding 34:14
104:2 <i>4</i>	98:23	50:13 66:6	21, 22, 25	62:2 <i>0</i>
		68:7, 9 73:8, 17		

fine 23:12 36:2	foreaoina 117:5.	34:2. 15 67:7	99: <i>3. 15</i> 104: <i>4</i>	happen 43: <i>12</i>
41:7 101:23	12	gaps 34:18	114: <i>1</i> 8	49:20 110:9
finish 69:5	forget 96:24	gather 31:21	Google 82:18	happened 70:16
finished 41:5,	99:2	32:23	Gosh 53:5	happening
22 63:14, 15	forgiven 18: <i>8</i> ,	general 38:19	55:19	110:23
68:2 <i>0</i>	10, 12	39:19 67:21	governance	happens 60:19
fire 56:25	form 56:8	generally 15:16	103:25	87:5 89:24
63:24 95:24	formal 82:12	18:2, <i>10</i> 30: <i>13</i>	government	happy 25:24
96:2	formally 64:19	37:24 55:14	10: <i>4</i> 11: <i>15</i> , <i>16</i>	hard 20:23
firewall 44:20	formed 103:1	61: <i>4</i> 64:2	grab 77:22	42:19 44:9
58:16 89:14	formerly 54:9	66:18 69:14, 18	grade 52:24, 25	92:11 100:1
firstly 58:2 89:9	forms 82:22	74:21 75:7	82:2 91:4	hardest 44:3
five-minute	forth 28:10	97:1 99:6, 21	grades 82:24	hardware 50:1
66:12, 16	11/:/	100:4 113:72	great 41:2 95:7	56:20 66:18
five-year 92:2	fortnightly 53:20	generation 13:2	green 12:7	harmony 40:15
TIX 29:20 51:7	forward 16:6	generations	47:25 70:4	101:24
97:16 101:5	63:7 forwarda 52:0	12:24	Greenfield 24:4,	nasn'tanyway
TIXED 12:0	forwards 53:8	gentieman 50.8	// arow 22:2	40:20
19.10 40.0	100110 34.70 25.2 45.20	genuine 31.23	grew 33.2	
45. 19, 20 40. 12,	30.2 40.20 52.12 100.15 17	Germon 12:21	ground 5.14	Heau 31.0
20 97.27 90.2 fixes 17.10	55.75 109.75, 77	abost 85.2	50.19 59.0 51.12 73.17 21	01·12 / 0.4
fixing 86.2	frooly 111.7	Gillani 2:10	34.13 13.11, 21 03.6 104.2	boadors 100.22
flag 73.15	frequency	Give 6.18 21.8	Group 22:15	headhunter
flagged 85.25	55.13 86.7	25.21 A3.2	37.5 0 30.24	75·12
flawed 10.25	frequent 55.23	45.10 12 46.17	48.15 19 52.7	heading 101.16
11.3	frivolous 19.15	43.10, 12 40.17	82.18	headline 67:14
flaws 84.9	front 32.15	78:3 111:20	aroups 95.1	headway 65.17
fleet 66:15	87·14 102:5	given 5:5 18	103.25 104.13	66.25 67.3 20
67:23 69:21	full 37:10	30:18 36:19	quard 9:8	89:4 105:25
78:20	61:13 67:12	72:9 73:17.24	quess 13:22	headways 66:24
floor 96:22	69:21	97:22 113:19	24:2 26:9 36:4	health 32:17
flying 17:4	fully 18:20	gives 46:1	42:23 48:17	hear 70:23, 25
46:11	66:2 72:7	111:19	52:8 54:8	hearing 4:19
focus 17:20	80:17, 18 81:10	giving 5:23	guider 105:15	Hearings 4:11,
33:2 80:23	82:3 83:2, 10,	95:17	guideway 41:11	18, 20
focused 43:4	<i>14</i> , <i>20</i> 102: <i>14</i>	GM 67:15	-	heart 38:7
95: <i>14</i>	105:3	GOA0 83:1	< H >	hearts 114:21
Fodor 79:4	functionality	GOA4 82:2	half 7:13, 17	115:3, 8
folk 62:12	61: <i>12</i> 87:6	83:1,2	8:8 16: <i>1</i>	heaters 94:12
103:22	90: <i>14</i>	goal 15:9	halfway 6:8	Held 1: <i>14</i>
follow 60:22	fundamentally	Golden 114:13	33:1 77:25	55:15, 16 59:13
97:7 98:4	61:5	good 17: <i>18</i>	Hall 62:6 65:9	78:17 91:24
112:4 113:25	futile 66:3	18:3 27: <i>10</i>	103: <i>1</i> 2	106: <i>1</i> 7
followed 3:2	future 110:23	33:2, 18 35:4	halt 54:13	help 36:9 47:3
13:25 64:20	113: <i>1</i> 6	36:14 46:1, 9	hand 36:3 47:1	62:22 64:3, 7
89:9 99:7, 8		48:6 50:6	handed 80:13	76:20 78:20
following 3:1, 8	< G >	55:23 56:1	handful 38:12	91:18 112:11
53:8 82:5	gain 22:5	65:23 68:1, 10,	nanding 46:2	nelped 85:7
tollow-on 17:22	galley 95:25	13 /0:2 /2:18,	nandover 80:12	nelptul 116:1
tollow-up 4:14	game 16:19	22 13:10, 18	81:73 84:10	neiping 25:12
18:27 116:4, /	21:20	11:4 01:15	100:0, 0	20:73 29:70
1000 09:14	yap 23:10,22	03.23 30.10	nanus-on 40:4	04.9 40.20 61.2 07.11
00.10	24.13 21.11	91.22 90.23	14.1	04.2 91.11
10166 02.19				

high 10: <i>18</i> , <i>23</i> 11:5 18:3 32:9	107: <i>13</i>	incriminate 5:15 INDEX 3:5	insufficient 101: <i>19</i>	invented 13:21 inventory 56:6
52:6 12 61: <i>1</i>		indicate 65:16	integrate 40.2	inverted 115:21
52.0, 12 01.4				
86:9 87:2 89:6	idea 110:5	indicates 75:25	12 49:9	investigate
94: <i>14</i>	identified 34:3	indicator 66:23	integrated	108: <i>13</i>
higher 100:7	91:9 102: <i>19</i>	indirect 60:15	20:14 50:4	investigation
highest 83:2	identify 109:13	individual 51: <i>10</i> ,	66:2 79:2 <i>1</i>	110: <i>14</i> , <i>19</i>
highly 73:20	ideology 11:16	11 66:22 102:17	83:21 102:14	invited 38:22
115.4	image 63.16	individually	integrating	inviting 112.16
highway 43.21	imagine 6:15	101.6	71.25	involve 79:20
100.2 <i>1</i>	100:20	individuals	integration 40.7	24 00.6
				24 90.0
FIII 29.9 30.4	immaturity 90.0	40./0 /4./0 inductive 12:15	41.9 40.23, 24	$\frac{11001000}{24\cdot24} = \frac{7.14}{25\cdot4}$
54. <i>19</i>	ininiaturity 87.0		49.10 52.1	24.21 25.4
ninasignt	Impact 16:77	15:14	57:12, 13 102:3,	26:27 29:3
100: <i>13</i>	33:21, 25 39:23	industry 77:8	8 114: <i>19</i>	64:23 73:5, 13
historical 65:20	60: <i>16</i> 105: <i>8</i>	110: <i>17</i>	integrator 48:21	74:17 78:11
history 9:20	imparting 77:13	information	49: <i>4</i> , <i>11</i>	79: <i>1, 3, 4,</i> 9
hit 84:22	implemented	13:10 33:4	intelligent	86:20 90:4, 18
hived 10:4, 5	98: <i>9</i> 99:24, 25	45:9 47:7, 8, 23	114:22	91:6 92:4
hold 36:3 56:25	implications	54:17 55:24	intending 6:11	100:3 103: <i>13</i>
Holder 22:14.	105:5 109:2 <i>1</i>	56:3. 12. 19	intends 4:17	104:25 106: <i>11</i>
17 26.6 37.3 4	implicit 48.9	57.3 4 9 19 24	interact 37.2	109.11 110.14
17 39.13 89.23	49.12 51.1 19	58.17 20 59.2	104.1	18 113.5
95·12 99·6 14	important 18:5	61.5 96.4 22	interactions	involvement
Holder's 23.22	16 18:25 55:11	100.7	88.16 18	58·8 6/·10
$24 \cdot 14 \ 24 \ 25 \cdot 25$	10 40.20 00.11	infractructure	00.10, 10	50.0 04.79
24.14,24 23.23	impressed 74.22		interest 02.14	00.2 12.12, 14
37:9 48:75	Improve 15:4	8:75 9:7 10:20		78:74 90:9
hole 26:1	99:12	14:14	40:23 56:13	113:2
holes 110:8	improved 94:23	infrequently	65:12	involving 54:14
home 90:9	improvement	76:23	interface 80:13	IO 21: <i>14</i>
104: <i>19</i>	95:3	inherent 51:19	interlocking	irony 51:6
honest 16:15	improves 94:6	inherently	13: <i>15</i>	irrelevant
89:23	IMS 79:21	21:25 72:3	internal 93:24	114:20
honestly 38:17	incentivized	in-house 22:1	interrupt 19:24	issue 47:20
hopefully 26:1	56:12,24	initials 37:10	23:5 88:13	53:3 70:23
hopeless 28:12	incident 31:14	initiating 85:19	interrupting	96: <i>14</i>
Hopkins 29:6	32:16, 18, 60:22.	Inquiries 5:12	42:12	issued 82:24
hostile 59.25	25 61 2 6	Inquiry 4.5	intervene 4.12	issues 34.2
hour 82.11	incidents 31.11	5·12 19	intervenes 7:10	83.8 11 91.8
	34.21 60.22	insolvent 11.13	70.20 71.12	102.18 104.23
1003C 41.27	110.18	Inspectorate	intervention	1102.70 104.23
44.2 houses 0:4	include 56:10	ED: 16		itomo 2:2 55:17
	include 50.79	JZ. /U	03.23 110.72	items 5.2 55.77
HUISE 22:13				
23:24 37:16	47:24	102:12	11, 15, 16 6:4,	< J >
48:24 57:12	including 8:12	install 40:2	11 88:8	Jacked 109:76
79:3 97:3 98:7	9:11 25:14	installed 12:25	interviewee	jigsaw 34:3
human 110: <i>11</i>	43:5 59:20	26:19, 20	117:7	Jim 29:6
114: <i>18</i>	99: <i>9</i> 110: <i>17</i>	instance 5:17	introduce	JNUP 7:23
hundreds 54:22	inconsistent	instances 47:6	102: <i>11</i> 103:6	Joanna 25:8
hunted 75:4	98: <i>15</i>	instructions	introduced	Joanne 37:21
Hurdman 41:15	increased 90:16	13: <i>1</i> 7 112: <i>14</i>	15: <i>13</i>	job 7:16 9:13
hurt 58:14	increasingly	instructor 62:25	introducing	23:13 27:10
hybrid 71:20	57:13	instructors 34:6	102:12	36:19 62:18
hypothetical	incredibly 17:13	93:7	intuitive 96:1	72:20 73:21
,				

71.20 75.12	11.11 57.2	loarned 01:10	Litiantion 2.1	lowest 17:16
14.20 15.15 01.4 00.14	44.11 51.5 97.1 0	20 24 25 02.17	Liugation 2.4	10west 17.70
91.4 99.14 iohe 76:5	07.4,0 kinds 110.22	20, 24, 20 92.17		IDT 16.17 32.2
JODS 70.0	know 15.8	loarning 67.8	LLF 2.77	18 51.1 66.1
Joe 37.19	20.17 22.7	68.11 03.10	loading 106:1	$70 \cdot 7 \cdot 71 \cdot 18$
20.7 26.10 11	20.17 25.7	00.77 93.79	loath 115.22	01.6 11.70
29.7 30.70, 77 72·17	40.79 95.70 knowing 76:11	led 22:15 25:2	locato 62:22	91.0 114.14 IDV 10.12
12.17 John 22:17	70.5	100 22.75 25.2	location 20:12	62.1 2 69.22
JUIII 22.17	79.0 knowledge	29.9 33.7	0000000 29.75	03.1, 2 00.22, 24.71.22
24.24 25.0	14.25 27.2	100.14 loft 7:16 0:11	01.23, 24 100.3	24 11.22
30.19 44.10	14.20 21.2	0:15 15:25	logic 12.70	102.10, 17, 23
JUIII 23.7 30.22	20.10 30.22	9.70 10.20	LUNUUN 0.24	LRVS 40.72
100.23	32.12, 13 34.17 47:6 E0:12	10.0 29.11	1.2 0.4, 21	41.0 / 1.70, 70
Joined 4.0 0.24	47.0 30.72 50:2 72:0	00.17 99.17 106:6	10.73 11.20	12.7 90.10
1.0, 10 0.17	09.2 10.0 74:10 10 76:10	100.0	14.70,20,22	100.24 101.0,
9:10 22:10	74:12, 13 70:12 77:2 42 01:24	legitimate 98:78	24:3 28:70	23 108:5
38:14 44:10	77:3, 73 91:27	Lemieux 25:77	31:8, 10 47:16	Lyon 41:6
48:10 90:10	93:16 98:16	29:7 36:10	63:19 75:17,20	. NA .
Joint 59:9, 12, 19	known 31:24	37:20 72:17	87:8, 11	< IVI >
Jon 22:12	107:19	length 7:6	long 6:11, 15	ma'am 24:18
journey 65:17		lessons 91: <i>19</i> ,	20:3 42:4	98:11 113:17
66:8	<l></l>	20, 23 92:16, 18	47:12 55:19	made 4:23 5:1,
Jubilee 7:5, 7,	laborious 26:14	level 32:9	109:23 113:11	9 10:19 13:7
21, 22 10:8	lack 49:18	44:16, 17 52:6,	longer 29:2	33:7 43:14
52:17 63:19	73:17 84:5	12 55:22 57:21	85: <i>14</i> 106: <i>10</i>	51:16, 17 68:2
Judith 2:18	105:2 108:5	61:4 62:24	long-term 96: <i>17</i> ,	88: <i>15</i> 101: <i>8</i>
117: <i>3</i> , <i>19</i>	lacking 33:14	63:22 65:24	25 97:10, 15	107: <i>10</i> , <i>1</i> 7
	laid 13:8	66:25 71: <i>17</i> , <i>19</i> ,	98:7	117: <i>10</i>
< K >	laptop 53:19	20 76:7 86:9	looked 43:20	magnitude 86:7
Kate 2:3 18:21	large 8:12	89:6 94:13	50:7	94:21
95:10 98:4	late 15:14 18:7	96:4 103: <i>15</i>	looking 55:9	main 8: <i>11</i>
99: <i>4</i> , 23 100: <i>16</i>	31:20 34:15	104:2, 3 106:2	59: <i>18</i> 108:23,	58: <i>16</i>
101:13 102:16	36:20 38:6	108: <i>1</i>	24 109:3, 5	maintain 29:20
103: <i>11, 16</i>	40:8 43:19	levels 36:22	looks 41:2 <i>1</i>	32:18 73:4
104: <i>5</i> , <i>15</i> 105:2	44:5, 7 54:15	52:22 82:7	loop 12: <i>15</i>	78:20, 23 83:25
106: <i>12</i> 107: <i>1</i> , <i>7</i> ,	56:4, 10, 11, 17	Leyla 37:10	15: <i>14</i>	87:16 94:8
15 108:12	57: <i>19</i> 58: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i>	liability 5:16	loops 12:15	97:23
109:2, 5 110:20	62:15, 24 66:2	life 9:20 23:18	13:8	maintainable
111: <i>1</i> 6 112:2,	67:3 68:9, 12	74:11	loosely 112:24	49:2 57:17
<i>20</i> 113: <i>14</i> , <i>18</i> ,	74:2 101: <i>1</i> 2	LIGHT 1:6 4:4	Lorenz 13:20	maintainer 9:19
25 115:7, 25	102:6, 7, 8	6:20 12:6 14:8	lot 8:5 25:11	14:17 62:17
keen 93: <i>15</i>	106: <i>15</i>	52:14	28: <i>13</i> 31:2	78:15 83:14
keeps 40:9	launched 105:6	likes 36:10	49:16 52:8	97:21 115: <i>11</i>
Kelly 2:11	launching 11:25	limitations 48:4	53:23 54:12	maintainers
kept 39:4, 12	lays 21:25	lined 110:10	55:25 63:14	86:20 93:4
71:10 81:4	LCP 37:11	lines 7:4, 23	64: <i>1</i> 68: <i>6</i> , 7	98:3 114:22
key 22:25 66:8	lead 8:8 38:21	9:5 10:7, <i>9</i> , <i>10</i> ,	70:1 71:22	maintenance
keys 46:3	48:25 62:8	<i>13, 19</i> 11: <i>14</i>	76:6 86:6	9: <i>12, 17</i> 10: <i>5, 7,</i>
kicked 100:3	75:20	14: <i>1</i> , <i>1</i> 7 15: <i>14</i>	90:11 96:10	<i>16</i> , <i>17</i> 11: <i>5</i> , <i>6</i> , <i>7</i> ,
kicks 61:13	leading 26:8	105: <i>10</i>	99:13	8, 10, 17 14:4
Kiewit 59:8	43:6 83:4	listened 73:19	lots 99:8 111:3	24:17 29:18, 21
killed 34:22	leads 57:12	99:16	low 10:18, 22	31:5 42:2
kilometer 71:23	learn 45:6	listing 61:23	30:17 62:24	48:12 56:21
kilometres 66:15	92:17	lists 114: <i>12</i>	lower 36:22	75:14 78:11, 15
kind 19:17		literally 34:22	71:19 106:24	79:10, 13, 15, 17,
26:17 40:23		-	lowered 106:19	24 80:2, 5

91.22 92.6 10	maturas 66.20	01.19 05.11	00.8 100.1 10	months 12.25
01.23 03.0, 70,		94.10 95.11	99.0 100.7, 79	
23 103:4 105:3	94:6	100:16 106:14	101:17 102:22	28:6 32:21
maintenance-	McCurdy 23:24	merely 10: <i>16</i>	103: <i>14</i> , <i>19</i>	41:5 49:22 54:8
wise 75:24	45: <i>1</i> 2 79: <i>4</i>	merge 57:10	104: <i>9</i> , <i>18</i> 105:7	Morgan 16:23
Majesty's 52:16	McGrann 2:3	message 67:15	106: <i>16</i> 107: <i>4</i> ,	44:16
maior 33:25	4:7 18:21 95:8.	met 22:16.17.	20 108:20	morning 6:12
making 57.13	10 98.4 99.4	24 25 18 31.9	109.9 111.3 19	25:3 71:5
66·0	23 100:16	32.1 13.1	112:10 113:17	82.11 105.24
00.5 man 62:6	101.12 102.16	52.7 + 5.7	114.5 115.0	100.1
	101.13 102.10	51.75 69.75	114.5 115.9	109.7
manage 44:9	103:11, 16	metrics 65:79	mid 105:22	move 15:7
47:4 83:16	104:5, 15 105:2	Metro 14:21	middle 7:20	30:20 40:2
96:18 97:12	106: <i>12</i> 107: <i>1</i> , <i>7</i> ,	75:11	9:7 36:22	63:10 69:5
manageable	15 108:12	Metrolinx 21: <i>14</i> ,	midway 92:7	71:24 114:25
97:13 106:2, 10	109:2, 5 110:20	16, 24	migration	moved 8:16
managed 28:25	111: <i>16</i> , <i>24</i>	Metronet 10:11	114:25	12:11 22:3 26:5
61:6	112:2. 20	11: <i>14</i>	million 14:21	movement 13:6
management	113.14 18 25	Metropolitan	16.9 66.15	moving 8.1
31.15 36.22	115.7 25	31.0	mind 19:25	35.7 39.4 9
76.2 70.21	moaning 34.22		25.2 10 20.17	81· <i>1</i>
10.2 19.21 05:16 20 07:7	means 12:16		20.02 40.14 21	
95.76, 20 97.7		2.9 0.0, 22, 24	30.23 40.14, 21	WISF 60.5
98:24 99:9	33:16 53:10	7:12 9:25 11:4	42:13, 22 43:4	Murray 29:9
110: <i>7</i> , <i>12</i>	56:10 73:10	12:1, 4 13:4	57:10 63:17	38:4 54:18
manager 29:7	meant 23:20	14: <i>10</i> 16: <i>14</i> , 23	75:23, 24 97:10	
36:11 37:19	29:19 46:25	19: <i>1</i> 20: <i>11</i>	101: <i>15</i>	< N >
38:19 67:21	58: <i>8</i>	22:10 23:15	minds 114:2 <i>1</i>	national 11:6
75:19	measure 65:13	24:18,23 25:18	115:3, 8	naturally 72:21
managers 17:23	66:8	26:5 27:15	Minimum 53:24	nature 18:14
34:7 45:25	measured 66:11	28:11 29:5	Minister 85:10	19:2 <i>1</i> 112:8
72:16	measures 62:3	30:2, 5 32:6	minor 86: <i>1</i>	near 39:21 41:5
Manconi 22:18	media 89: <i>9</i> , 25	33:10,24 34:19	105:8	nearest 106:4
24:24 25:6.8.	93:23	35:13 36:7	minute 67:4	necessarily
17 38.20 44.15	meet 22.14	37.4 7 38.4 17	minutes 25.1	17.11 36.8
71.10 103.21	24.24 25.17	39.20 41.18	65.18 67.1 78.6	65.18 69.5
mantra 87.9	71.4	42.19 44.13 16	missed 69:16	needed 11.11
manually 81.20	monting 18.22	45.11 A7.10	missing 23:16	36.8 18.11
22 106.4	40.22 52.20	49.12 40.21	21.1 12 57.2	52.10 60.22
23 100.4 manuala 42:4 2	49.23 55.20	40.13 49.21	100.17	70.1 71.0 16
	55.10, 16 59.12	51.12,24 52.5	109.77	70.7 71.6, 70
56:4, 7, 8, 21	117:10	53:5 55:75	mobile 93:8	80:78 90:24
57:5, 6	meetings 38:12	57:5 58:1 59:4	mode 106:7	101:2
map 30:19 35:8	55:8, 13, 23	60:6, 15 61:17	model 10:24	needs 97:21
March 15:23	59: <i>10</i> , <i>13</i> , <i>19</i>	62:5 64: <i>12</i> , <i>14</i> ,	11:2 21: <i>1</i> 22:3	98:1
mark 33:1 69:2	78:17 80:21	25 65:4, 7 66:7	30:20 110:7	Neesons 112:8
married 101: <i>6</i> ,	82:13 89:5, 6	67: <i>1</i> 3 69: <i>16</i> , 20	Models 21:15	117: <i>18</i>
8, 18, 20	Melbourne 75:5	71:6, 14 72:14	modified 60:3	negligence
marry 100:22	Member 2:3, 4	74:1 75:3	money 8:5	11: <i>11</i>
101:24 102:25	4:3	76:14, 16 78:2,	10:18,24 18:9	negotiate 16:4
master 95:21	memory 32:14.	13 79:2. 11. 22	19:13 20:16	Network 8:14
Matt 38:11	20 53:21 66:14	80:1. 4. 8. 11. 24	21:11 39:11	11:6.8 15:5
54.19	mental 63.16	81.7 82.17	49.17 51.6	new 7.8 13 15
matter 13.2	mentioned	83·12 84·4 10	77·18 21 QA-21	8.21 11.20 24
20.15	18.23 21.10	85.22 Re.16	QQ·1	15.15 16.18
mature /2.15	27.13 29.24	87.22 80.70	month 10.22	24.8 15.11 20
74.0 00.16	27.2 57.2 61.0	01.20 03.2	22.20 26.1 A	27.0 4J.14, 20 51.16 60.10 10
14.3 30.10 07.17	51.5 51.2 04.9 97.10 01.5	JU.1 JI.1, 2J	22.20 30.1, 4	JI.10 00.12, 13
91.17 meture - 04:00	01.19 91:0	93.2 94.4, 20	monuny 55:18	00.1 09:13
maturea 94:23	I	95:15 98:11	I	70:9 71:24

10

83.8 85.13	observe 35.17	Ontario 14.14	61·16 64·20	94.10
86.10 90.25	72.15 104.10 14	18.15 21.13 24	75.2.14 84.19	overnight 68.3
97.6 115.1	observed 20.8	27:16	20 85:24 88:3	oversee 48.11
nice 50.7 77.17	64·11	onen 28.4	4 104.1 24	overseeing
nomenclature	observers 64.15	32.24 39.5	operator 8.9	78·11 79·1
96.3	observing	53.13 67.15 22	9.19 14.17	oversight 14.6
nonsense 66.3	62·11 104·8	23 24 68:10	23.17 35.21	
08·22	obstruction	70·10 81·15	A7:3 75:1 20	overview 6.18
non-	06·14	87.13 90.8	76.8 17 21	owned 17.7
typographical	obstructions	105·21 107·21	0.0, 17, 21 07.10, 21	owner 56.4 7
5.0	105.16	opened 7.8	111.13, 21 111.73 115.10	57.5 11/.23
$n_{n} = 6.14$	obtain 1.0	13.22 24.7	operators 27:1	57.5 114.25
normal 20:0	52:10	13.23 24.7	24.9 0 26.2	- D >
81.21	obvious 13:10	52.22 52.17 67:2 60:13	61.8 61.2	Nm 1:16
04.27	11.10 51.2	71.19 95.0 10	60:0 76:24	116.10
normal/abnormal	14.10 04.0 OC 16:01	11.10 00.9, 10, 17 00.5	09.9 10.24	D2 10.25 14.14
	00 10.21	17 00.0 amon avail 10:5	00.20, 23 93.3	F3 10.20 14.14
84:27	24:75 20:24	open-eyed 48:5	98:3 opinion 70:05	17:5, 12, 10
normally 12:20	27:2, 23 29:8	opening 24:5	opinion 76:25	18:14, 17 19:4,
17:19 30:5, 19	30:8 36:18, 21	35:25 42:24, 25	94:14 99:19	7 20:12 21:12,
32:4, 5, 6 50:15	37:19 46:5	49:22 50:20	109:4	18, 23 22:1
84:24	52:7, 13, 22	67:5 94:19	opportunity 5:5	24:15 25:14
North 10:8	62:7 70:18	96:14	opposed 32:24	26:13 27:21
Northern 7:23	71:4 72:11, 13,	operable 32:1	42:21 104:2	35:1 51:21, 22
noted 3:7	15 73:16, 21, 25	49:2 57:11, 17	106:14	52:13 58:8, 11
notes 45:3, 15,	76:4, 18 80:14	operate 11:21	options 34:16	76:5 77:16, 19
18 46:7, 17	93:6 96:18, 25	25:14 30:23	order 4:19	78:15 89:5, 18
47:3, 15, 18	97:4 99:11, 22	32:17 33:5	114:2	90:20, 21 92:12
56:21 57:6	106: <i>17</i>	35:23 65:24	orders 85:20	97:17 100:5
117: <i>13</i>	occasion 72:17	73:4 87:16, 17	organization	P3s 9:24 15:6
number 11:7	occasionally	93: <i>11</i> , <i>15</i> 94:7	31:15 43:11	17:10 21:7
21:12, 21 26:25	29:8	97:23 102:24	75:8, 14 76:8	27:16 59:21
30:8, 9 46:18	occurred 94:18	Operating 8:18,	82:21	76:7
80:15 90:15	o'clock 105: <i>17</i> ,	24 9:10, 14, 22	organizations	PA 32:1 48:8
91:23 94:22	20	27:14 45:5	10:25 11:22	49:13 50:23
97:14 106:1, 11	office 35:7	53:25 55:24	20:14 59:18	51: <i>1</i> , 5 54:11
114: <i>19</i> , <i>21</i> , 23,	Officer 8:18, 25	60: <i>4</i> , <i>9</i> , <i>12</i> 67: <i>8</i> ,	original 54:10	90:25
24 115:2, 9	9:10, 14, 22 29:6	20 105:25	OTTAWA 1:6	pages 3:8
numbers 71:21	offices 26:23	operation 14:4	4: <i>4</i> 12: <i>13</i> , 25	paid 8:5 10:21
108:7	64:2 <i>1</i>	16:17 26:18	14: <i>8</i> , <i>1</i> 2 16: <i>16</i> ,	18:9 19:6 90:22
NYCT 8:22	old 12:25 27:7	69:1 75: <i>5</i> , 21,	<i>18</i> 18:23 19: <i>1</i> ,	pain 22:6
	114:25	24 79:16, 18	17, 19 22:14, 21,	pair 101:22
<0>	oldest 14:20	82:1	24 24:10 31:16	pairs 71:9, 16
O&M 9:17	OLRT 22:8	operational	39:18 42:8, 16	101:18, 20
23:23 24:16	113: <i>1</i> , <i>2</i> , <i>1</i> 3	28:14 29:21	43:22 53:3	102:25
57:5	OLRT-1 24:22	43:6, 7 57:13	90:8 104: <i>19</i>	PALMER 1:7
object 6:1	86: <i>15</i> 91: <i>14</i>	62:4, 16 63:4	111:6	2:9 4:3 6:3, 6,
objected 5:13	OLRT-C 33:11	75:18 93:1	Ottawa's 6:20	16, 17, 22, 24
objectives 7:19	46:25	114: <i>18</i> , <i>1</i> 9	outline 62:3	7:12 9:25 11:4
obligated 47:8.	one-car 63:3	operationally	outside 63:22	12: <i>1</i> , 4 13:4
9, 11	ones 54:14	27:12	112:25	14:10 16:14
obligation 98:1	103:24	operations 9:17.	outstanding	19: <i>1</i> , 25 20: <i>4</i> .
observation	one-stop	21 24:17 25:9	28:25 53:6	11 22:7.10
104:17	115:10.11	29:18 30:7	Overall 9:1	23:6. 11. 13. 15
observations	one-third 17.8	31:4 35:15	overhead 43.16	24:18 23 25:18
88:16		36:24 38:9		26:5 27:15

11

				L -
28:11 29:5	64: <i>15</i> , 22 65: <i>11</i>	20:6 22:7 23: <i>1</i> ,	people's 73: <i>6</i> ,	pieces 92:4
30:2, 5 32:6	69: <i>10</i> , <i>17</i> 70: <i>15</i>	12 24:16, 19	13	94: <i>15</i> , <i>17</i>
33:10,24 34:19	80:22 82:23	25:16 26:3	percent 44:1, 2,	pillars 17:25
35:13 36:7	88:17.18 90:24	27:13 28:8	5 65:12.15.21	pilots 95:21
37.4 7 38.4 17	101.19 104.16	29.3 24 30.3	66:3 70:10	ping-pong 28.5
30.20 41.18	107:22	32.3 33.6 21	74.12 13	o p
12.10 11.10	nartially 76.20	34.17 35.11	101.21 106.21	
42.19 44.13	partially 70.20	34.17 35.11	104.27 100.24	10:00 00:0
45:11 47:10	100:27	36:5, 23 37:6	108:70 110:73	13:22 30:6
48:13 49:21	participants	38:2, 14 39:17	percentage	44:11 74:10
51:12, 24 52:5	1:15 2:7 5:2, 8	41:16 42:7, 15	43:24 65:11	97:18 117:6
53:5 55:15	participate	44:10 45:8	percentile 63:6	placing 109:25
57:5 58:1, 23	104: <i>11</i>	47:5 48:10	perception	plagued 94:25
59:4 60:6, 15	participating	49: <i>19</i> 51: <i>9</i> , 22,	88:24	plan 6:7 44: <i>11</i>
61: <i>1</i> 7 62:5	103: <i>17</i>	25 53:2 55:12	perfect 18:1	60: <i>12</i> 62: <i>4</i>
64: <i>12, 14, 25</i>	participation	57:2, 23 58:18	114: <i>10</i>	planning 31:3, 8
65: <i>4</i> , 7 66:7	104:22	59:1 60:2, 9	perfectly 68:25	plans 60:4, 10
67:13 69:16, 20	particular 38:23	61: <i>15</i> 62:2	101:23	plants 9:2
71:6, 14 72:14	43:14 47:1	64:9, 13, 23	performance	platform 72:1
74:1 75:3	61:21 64:6	65:1.5 66:5	15:22 36:21	80:12.15 81:13
76:14.16 78:2.	73:11 76:1	67:10 69:11.18	66:8.23 68:23	106:5. 7
13 79.2 11 22	90.14 96.2	70.17.22 71.1	period 58.6	play 30.8.25
80.1 4 8 11 24	particularly	72.10 73.23	78.24 84.19 25	players 26.24
81.7 82.17	44·9 57·8	74.25 76.11 15	85.1 86.19 23	30.8 13 18 61.1
83·12 8/·/ 10	102:10	77.2/ 78.7 10	02.8 11 05.1	nlaver's 34.5
85.22 86.16	nartice 83.6 7	77.24 $70.7, 70, 70, 75$	102.12 104.6	players 04.0
03.22 00.70	0 00.15	20 $19.7, 20, 2300.2$ 7 10 22	102.12 104.0	pluggod 24:12
01.23 00.14,22	9 00.10	00.3, 7, 10, 22		piuggeu 24.75
89:2 90:7 91:7,	partly 45:76	81:5 82:75	peripheral 9.72	20:1 21:11
23 93:2 94:4,	56:18 63:15	83:4 84:2, 6	perjury 5:22	Plus 55:7
20 95:9, 15	party 31:18	85:15 86:12	permanently	point 6:4 17:24
98:11 99:8	pass 36:15	87:19 88:7,24	103:1	26:9 32:10
100:1, 19	62:23 64:17	90:2 91: <i>5</i> , <i>8</i> , <i>15</i> ,	permits 4:13	34:5 35:3, 4
101:17 102:22	73:9	17, 19 92:22	person 5:18	39:7 41: <i>4</i>
103: <i>14</i> , <i>19</i>	passed 57:20	93:25 94:17	9:8 29:13	51:17 63:10, 23
104: <i>9</i> , <i>18</i> 105:7	73:11 93:10	95:7	38:10 48:1	81:20 84:12
106: <i>16</i> 107: <i>4</i> ,	passenger	people 9:11	51:16 53:10, 12	87:1 106:19
<i>14</i> , <i>20</i> 108: <i>20</i> ,	62: <i>18</i> 105: <i>16</i>	14:22 15: <i>1</i> 2	72:18	111: <i>15</i> 112: <i>1</i>
24 109:9 111:3,	passengers	17:3 21: <i>17</i> , 21	person's 73:7	points 113:4, 11,
11, 19, 23, 25	85:1,4	22:25 23:23	perspective	15, 20, 23
112: <i>5, 10, 13, 24</i>	passing 93:9	25:7 27:12	20:2, 4, 5 33:13	Police 31:9
113:17 114:2, 5	Pasture 105:12	28:13, 18, 20	ph 100:22	pool 35:17
115:9	Pastures 109:17	29:11, 15 30:14,	Phil 21: <i>14</i>	64:15, 18 104:9,
panel 95:22, 23	Pate 38:6.7	16 35:8. 17	phone 36:17	12
papers 87:14	path 85:5	36:9. 17. 18	, physically	poor 15:22
Parliament 41:6	pause 6:5	37:18.25 46:18	104: <i>14</i>	46:10.24
Parsons 9.16	pay 52.24.25	48.20 50.16 17	Piccadilly 10.9	populate 55.19
21.23 22.10	91· <i>4</i>	53.13 22 54.24	nick 81.20	nonun 112.15
23.1 9 38.14	navments 19.10	55.2 60.20	nicked 26.16	nortion 48.12
48.25 78.25	neak 105.24	64.5 67.7	nicking 13.0	nosition 12.12
90.20 10.20	106.13	70·11 12 72·21		105.10
	nedantic 55.4	75.8 76.10	$\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$	nosted 1.21
AN 1.7 2.0	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pedalle} 00.4 \\ \textbf{Doddle} 0.4 \\ \textbf{A} 0 \\$	70.17 01.70	$\frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000$	notential 100.20
min 1.7 2.9	6.7 10 00 0.00	13.11 34.1	52.1 61.1	potential 109.20
part 1/:/0	0.7, 13, 23 9:23	104.10, 12	52.1 01.4	potentially 96:76
26:13 28:22	11:2, 23 12:2	105:75 106:3	89:70 90:25	power 37:12
35:1 48:14		109:24 115:3,	94:12 97:6, 22	38:24 40:7
55:7 56:5 62:1	16: <i>11</i> 19: <i>19</i>	22, 23, 24	I	I

11.11 50.2	86.1 02.21	11.21 17.12	Public 4.5 10	aujek 18.21
41.14 50.5	$00.4 \ 92.24$	44.21 41.12	FUDIIC 4.5, 70,	
72:24	prioritize 11:17	48:12 49:11	18, 22 5:12	82:18 98:4
PPP 10:5	private 11:21	52:13, 23 53:1	11:22 43:11	114: <i>1</i>
PPPs 10:3	privatized 11:7	54:6 56:3, 16	69: <i>19</i> 71:5	quiet 92:8
practice 47:14	privy 52:9	62:7 67: <i>18</i>	85:17 89:12	quite 20:15
48:6 52:20	89:17	69: <i>10</i> 71:6, <i>14</i>	92:24 94:19	31:20 59:6
68:7 76:9	proactively 64:7	75:2, 20 76: <i>13</i> ,	105:6	68:9 100: <i>1</i>
85:12 97:2	problem 41:19	<i>19</i> 79: <i>18</i> 81: <i>1</i>	published 42:25	101: <i>12</i> 108: <i>4</i>
98:25 100: <i>11</i>	101:7	86:21 88:10, 25	97:4	
114:23. 24	problems 73:5	90:5. 19 92:6	pull 20:23	< R >
prefer 112:5	86:14 93:20	93:1 98:21	punchlist 55:17	radar 82:13
preference	100.4	99.22 100.10	punctuality	radio 72.1
112.3	procedural 4.19	101.12 103.23	65.17 66.24	102.12
nremise 13.5 13	53·23	104:20 106:17	$\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$	RΔII 1.6 4.5
Prendergast	nrocedures	113.1 2 6 16	32.22 25 51.4	6·20 8·0 11 11
25.2 20.20	$97 \cdot 11$ $92 \cdot 15$ 91	113.7, 2, 0, 70	52.22, 25 54.4	0.20 0.3 , 11 , 14
20.2 30.20	21.14 20.10,21	$p_1 o_2 c_1 s = 0.9, 11, 12, 0.22, 10, 17$	03.73 91.73 Durauant 5:11	9.7 11.0, 0
prepared 00.22	29.10, 21 32.12 CO.E. 10. 21	12 9.23 10.17	Pursuant 5.77	14.0 10.20
112:23, 25	60.5, <i>10</i> , <i>21</i>	11:24 14:9	pusn 55:3	
113:7, 10, 12	proceedings	40:24 69:8, 11	60:78	14 21:18 27:5,
114:7	5:17, 21 117:5	77:10 86:12, 14	pushed 82:10	11, 24 29:12
prescriptive	process 26: <i>8</i> ,	87:20 113:6, 16	put 12: <i>10</i>	34:7, 8, 9 35:3
60:17	14 29:4 33:22	114: <i>17</i> 115:2 <i>1</i>	16:22 17: <i>1</i>	36:12 44:20
PRESENT 2:16	34:18 53:9	project's 35:4	19:7 23:6 39:8	46:6 52:13, 14,
presentation	54:16 62:12	prompted 115:5	46: <i>16</i> 54: <i>9</i>	22 54:21 62:7
111:20 112: <i>11</i> ,	68:9 84:11	pronounce	58:25 74:2	76: <i>19</i> 81: <i>1</i>
25 113:8 114:7	87:24 106:10	37:10 59:9	103:2 105:9	82:25 103:23
presented 88:22	107:23	proof 42:1	107:13 117:7	railcars 8:25
presenters	processes	properly 59:9	putting 44:3	9:3
117:9	60:21 86:3	property 83:19	62:1 63:11	railroad 106:17
President 8.21	produce 96.17	proportionately	97.24 115.20	RailTerm 27.8
pressure 46.16	produced 3.2 7	69 [.] 6	01127 110120	railway 29.22
presumably	53·17	prosecution	< 0 >	30.23 A7.4
17.15	producing 70.12	5.22	auad 55:18	52.16 55.5
protty 28.0	production	J.22 prospective	quality 17:25	56.10 11 72.25
26.10 12.12	72.25		19:2 6 10	77.0 02.10
30.19 43.12	72.20 productive 01:2	31.12 protoctod 11:20	10.2, 0, 10	11.0 93.10
prevalent 19.76	productive 91.3	protected 11.20	50.25 114.77	raise 55.75
prevent 110:22	products 49:8	proved 84:78	quarter 38:79	101:14 111:13
prevented	professional	proven 24:2	39:1	raised 53:10
110:4, 11	6:19 100:6	70:14	Quebec 27:8	/3:15
previous 6:22	progress 43:13	provide 56:23	question 5:14	raising 53:14
15:21 28:17	project 7: <i>18</i> , <i>21</i> ,	101: <i>10</i>	6: <i>1</i> 18:22	111: <i>14</i>
39:15 63:18	22 8: <i>10</i> 10: <i>9</i> ,	provided 26:24	19:24 23: <i>10</i>	ramps 82:6
86:12 87:20	<i>10</i> 12:5 14:8,	31:22 50:6	42:14 49:5	ran 7:17 9:5
108: <i>9</i>	13 16:2, 13, 20	66: <i>10</i> 71:8	60:7 69:17	26:22 31:20
previously	17:2, 23, 25	99:5 113:23	70:25 86:18	37:4 75:18
23:24 66:11	18: <i>1, 4</i> , 6, 7, 8,	provider 14:18	88:21, 23 91:13	88:1,2
price 19:8, 11	18, 23 19:2, 3	providers 27:22	93:14 98:4, 13	Rapid 13:25
nrimacy 39.24	. ,	- manavialinar 20.1	107.13 100.6	rapport 99.15
	20:2, 7, 19 22:8.	proviaina 32:7	107.75 109.0	
42:5	20:2, 7, 19 22:8, 16, 22 23:2	47:8 113:20	114:6. 9. 15	rarely 74:14
42:5 primarily 33:8	20:2, 7, 19 22:8, 16, 22 23:2 24:22 27:25	47:8 113:20 proving 35:15	114:6, 9, <i>15</i> 115:5	rarely 74:14
42:5 primarily 33:8, 10 37:2	20:2, 7, 19 22:8, 16, 22 23:2 24:22 27:25 29:12 30:6	47:8 113:20 proving 35:15 62:8 84:15 16	114:6, 9, 15 115:5 questions 4:13	rarely 74:14 rate 43:13 reaction 109:6
42:5 primarily 33:8, 10 37:2 primary 32:22	20:2, 7, 19 22:8, 16, 22 23:2 24:22 27:25 29:12 30:6 32:4 8 33:23	47:8 113:20 proving 35:15 62:8 84:15, 16 85:23	114:6, 9, 15 115:5 questions 4:13, 14 20:1 23:6	rarely 74:14 rate 43:13 reaction 109:6
42:5 primarily 33:8, 10 37:2 primary 32:22 Prime 85:10	20:2, 7, 19 22:8, 16, 22 23:2 24:22 27:25 29:12 30:6 32:4, 8 33:23, 25 35:12 38:15	47:8 113:20 proving 35:15 62:8 84:15, 16 85:23 provision 34:15	107.73 109.0 114:6, 9, 15 115:5 questions 4:13, 14 20:1 23:6	rarely 74:14 rate 43:13 reaction 109:6 reactionary
42:5 primarily 33:8, 10 37:2 primary 32:22 Prime 85:10 Prior 25:10	20:2, 7, 19 22:8, 16, 22 23:2 24:22 27:25 29:12 30:6 32:4, 8 33:23, 25 35:12 38:15 30:24 40:21	47:8 113:20 proving 35:15 62:8 84:15, 16 85:23 provision 34:15 psoudo 76:2	107:73 109:0 114:6, 9, 15 115:5 questions 4:13, 14 20:1 23:6 95:9 112:4 114:1 116:2 4 7	rarely 74:14 rate 43:13 reaction 109:6 reactionary 108:5

read 36.15	15 112.17 21	roliability-wiso	responded	A1·11
48·2 60·16	23 116.8	101·10	61·14 85·10	riso 20.0
89·25 114·11	recorded 117.11	reliable 43.17	response 49.10	risk 10:18 23
readiness 39.10	recording 6.5	74.5 93.18	50.22 85.20	11·5 17·13
42.18 43.6 7	recruited 7.9 12	99:3 101:21	114·10	18.16 17 19 24
62:4 65:5	recruitment	102.10 108.6	responses 46.13	25 19:5 21:16
78.12 84.1	78·19	reliably 100.23	responsibilities	21 25 72 21.10
92.25 93.5	red 12.7 47.24	107.25	24·20 26·4	27.21 58.12 13
ready 39.21	73.15	remember	responsibility	road 20:23
41.22 44.7	reduce 94.22	37.21 38.18	97.17.20	rocket 66.15
72.7 81.11	reduced 35.13	Remote 82.1	responsible	Rockets 66.13
82.10 87.2 93.3	69.14.19 108.7	90.8	10.7 14.3	69·22
real 56:18	reduction 108:3	remotely 1:15	responsive	role 20:2 24:22
realistic 66:6	redundancy 8:5	22:20 40:25	83:10	30:8.25 55:1
68:14	referred 98:8	64:21	rest 24:9.14	56:22 57:7
reality 76:19	referring 18:24	remove 54:7	89:13	104:7
really 6:13	refreshing 92:14	renewals 14:18	restarted 88:3	roles 63:18
10:18.23 14:11	regard 109:4	repeated 54:23	restricted 106:7	rollina 29:13
15:16 18:15	regarding 42:9.	repeating 42:13	restriction	37:13 38:25
19:4 20:1	17	rephrase 60:8	47:23 61:16	66:12 68:16
23:16 26:10.17	regional 8:13	91:15 107:15	restrictions	room 112:13.16
27:4, 6 35:21	regrets 107:18	replace 114:13	48:4 61:23	rooms 41:24
36:21 37:18	regular 12:14	report 12:17	result 34:13	112:7
38:10 40:19.23	103:4	37:24	91: <i>10</i>	rounds 53:7
42:6 44:8	regulated 52:14	reported 13:17	results 34:24	roundtable
56:24, 25 58:24	regulation 52:15	37:16	87:25	62:11
61:11, 12 64:3	regulations	Reporter 7:10	RESUMING	RPR 117:3, 19
67:14 68:17	24:11	70:20 71:12	78:9 112:19	RTC 103:21
72:18 73:17	regulator 52:18	112:15 117:4	retrain 61:8	RTG 33:12
74:9 76:8	related 111:6	REPORTER'S	retrospectively	34:25 38:10
79:16 82:8	relates 6:19	117: <i>1</i>	33:12 51:7	44:20 46:16, 25
84:16 89:13	relation 76:4	representing	99:11 100:12	47:6 48:21, 22
90:1, 18 95:2, 3,	relationship	90: <i>19</i>	return 10:23	49:3 51:17, 24
4 96:11 104:25	14:12 15:11	reps 115:19	110: <i>19</i>	52:24 55:24
108: <i>4</i> 115:3	16:12, 15 19:22	required 5:24	returned 16:23	57:3 58: <i>18</i> , 24,
realtime 70:12	20:10 40:5	53:25 65:11	returning 39:6	25 59:2, 13
real-time 70:6	46:25 88: <i>9</i> , 14	70:19 71:4 98:8	revenue 10:18	88: <i>9</i> , <i>18</i> 89: <i>1</i> ,
reason 86:16	89: <i>1</i> , 7 103: <i>10</i>	requirement	38:15 65:6	15 98:20 99:12
114:5	release 45: <i>3</i> , <i>15</i> ,	67:17	67:11 69:15	103: <i>13</i> , <i>14</i> , <i>21</i>
reasonably 30:6	17 46:7 56:21	re-rail 109:17	83: <i>4</i> , <i>1</i> 7 84: <i>8</i> ,	RTM 26:13
77:17	59:2 115:2 <i>4</i>	reserves 16:5, 9	12 86:4 87:1	29:9, 11 30:8
reasons 29:2	released 58: <i>10</i> ,	resignalling	101: <i>16</i>	35:24 37:25
32:9 58:1 116:2	20	7:22 10:9 12:5	review 5:6 39:2	38:2, 9 47: <i>4</i> , 6
recall 59:11	releasing 46:22	15: <i>19</i> 21: <i>1</i>	revisions 26:15	54:18 68:17
67:10 74:15	47:2, 7, 15	77:10	Richard 22:14,	69:3 74: <i>19</i>
106: <i>19</i>	relevant 9:20	resolve 28:5	17 23:22 24:23	78:2 <i>0</i> , 22 79:12,
receivable 5:19	13:23 107:5	34:14	25:25 37:3, 4,	19 81:2 83:23
RECESS 78:8	111: <i>4</i> 113: <i>15</i>	resort 16:7	15, 16, 17 48:14	86:5 93:4
112:18	reliability 18:18	21:4	55:15 89:19, 23	103:13, 14 106:3
recommendation	65:12, 13, 15, 22	respect 23:6	Richard's 48:19	RTO 82:1
110:25	66:19 70:5, 12	103:11 104:5	55:22	rules 24:11
recommendation	/2:4 85:8 94:5	105:2 106:12	Rideau 39:22	28:15, 21 114:13
s 110:21, 25	95:3 101:15	respond 83:11	41:4 78:14	run 7:3 8:14,
record 24:2	102:23 105:5	86:5	right-of-way	22 9:21 14:5,
78:6 111: <i>12, 14,</i> 1	106:23		l l	24 16:21 24:12

neesonsreporting.com 416.413.7755

24.7 17 10		oorioo 11.0	chart tarm	aimilar 15,10
31.7, 77, 78	scale 19:9	series 11:9	snort-term	Similar 15:79
32:2 33:11, 19	85:23	51:19 89:10	96:17, 21 97:12	73:2 113:6
54:1 62:6	Scarborough	server 53:20	98:6	simple 12:13
66:14 68:12	13:24	service 7:3	shotgun 105:20	simply 68:8
70:2 75:4, 7	scenario 30:18,	32:2 38:15	should've 67:4	simulation
103:12 106:13,	21 31:2	63:24 65:6, 24	show 47:1 50:7	103:25
24 107:17	scenarios 30:9,	66:2 <i>3</i> , 25 67:11,	showed 104:12	singing 102:14
running 10:12	10, 11, 24 31:2	12, 16, 22 68:5,	shown 78: <i>18</i>	single 8: <i>13</i>
29:23 35:16, 17	84:2 <i>0</i> , 22	6 69:14, 15, 19,	89:16 98:12	59:11 71:16
44:6 62:8, 9, 10,	schedule 15:15	23 70:2, 8 71:5,	sic 114:8	100: <i>18</i>
13 64:11, 16	66:10 73:24	9, 17, 18, 19, 20	side 11:5 25:7	sinkhole 39:22
70:14 74:2	85: <i>13</i> 114: <i>1</i>	72:8 73:3	27:3 43:5	sit 49:1 57:16
75:13 84:15, 19,	scheduled 85:5	80: <i>14</i> 81: <i>12</i> , <i>16</i> ,	48:14 89:12, 25	site 7:25
24 85:2, 3, 16,	scope 91:1	22 82:4, 6, 7, 8	93: <i>1</i> 102: <i>14</i>	sites 39:25
24 86:19, 23	scratch 70:5	83:5, 16, 17	sides 15:8	sitting 63:6
87:11 88:4	scripts 64:16	84: <i>8, 13,</i> 25	28:6 89:11	72:8
95: <i>1</i> 101: <i>3</i> , <i>11</i> ,	scroll 96:11	85: <i>8</i> , <i>13</i> , <i>17</i>	90:23 92:16	skill 73:7
18 104:1, 6, 12	seated 63:5	86:4, 13 87:1	102: <i>1</i>	skills 14:25
108: <i>9</i>	Secondary	89:2 <i>1</i> 92:25	sideways 63:7	27:2 28:17
rush 82:11	114:20	94:13, 14, 19	sight 52:18	30:22 50:12
Russell 2:11	seconds 12:18	96:16 97:12	sighting 62:15	68:7 77:3
6: <i>10</i> 19:23	Section 5:11, 24	101: <i>16</i> , <i>21</i>	101: <i>1</i>	93:16 98:16
23:4 42:11	6:1 7:7, 8	105: <i>3, 5, 8, 24</i>	sign 48:2 63:3,	SkyTrain 14:1
58:22 70:22, 24	62:11 69:25	106: <i>18</i> , <i>20</i> , 23	4, 8, 11 75:22	Slade 38:11
78:5 88:12	sector 11:22	108: <i>1</i> 110: <i>19</i>	signage 26: <i>12</i> ,	slide 114: <i>12</i>
91:11, 16, 18	Sel 13: <i>19</i>	session 114:1	16, 18 57:16	slightly 10: <i>14</i>
107:12 108:22	selected 15:3	sessions 91:24	62:15, 16, 18, 20	16:9 21: <i>15</i>
109:3 111:9, 22	selecting 17:15	set 30:20	101: <i>1</i> , <i>4</i>	31: <i>16</i>
112:12, 22	SelTrac 13:21	31:11 43:3	signal 12:9	slip 20:20
113: <i>19</i> , 22 116:6	14:2, 5	86:24 117:6	62:23 102:2	slipping 16:8
	S-E-L-T-R-A-C	sexy 56:13	signaled 27:8	slower 106:3
< S >	13: <i>19</i>	shadow 75:1, 4,	signalling 7:25	slowing 33:25
safe 21:14	Seltrac40 12:12,	7, 13 76:4, 7, 17	8: <i>1</i> , 7 10:20	small 14:5
29:22 32:1	17, 24 13:18	share 22:5	12:6 13:14	26:24 37:15
73:8, 20 93:11	SEMP 31:18	45:2 112:23	15:22 29:14	smaller 28:17
sately 30:23	34:25	113:8, 10	39:1 40:6, 13,	smoothly 93:21
33:19 35:23	S-E-M-P 31:18	shared 5:1, /	14 41:9, 10	snapshot 73:7
54:1 62:17	send 28:1,2	15:9 22:4	43:9, 15 45:4,	SNC-Lavalin
97:22	36:13, 14 50:16	112:24	14 46:19 47:15	20:13 26:22
Safety 29:5	63:23	sharing 21:15	54:21 55:9	SNC-Lavalin's
31:19 33:13	sending 13:10	58:14 116:1	57:14 59:12, 20	21:18
34:25 41:25	senior 62:12	sneer 43:13	68:17, 25 69:25	software 45:4,
61:20 64:24	103:15, 22 104:2	97:14	70:3 71:25	15, 17 46:8
110:6	sense 15:8	shelf //:22	76:23 81:9	47:2, 15 48:3
salient 25:13	33:25 36:2	sneiving 96:23	83:21 90:16	50:2 56:20
Santini 2:11	61:3 76:3	Sneppard 9:8	102:77 105:73	61:22 66:20
Sat 02.10	00.12 90.24	Shift 70.70	114.0 cignolo 0:2	Sole 40.77
Satisfied 53.12	separate 83:3	shit 87:4	signals 9:2	solution 21:9
00.0 01:13	separation	shope 0:1 2	12.7 49:0 94:11	
Saves 33.1	13.10 Sontombor	SIIUPS 3.1, 3	SIGNED 10.24	30.0 Solvo 07.0
25 50.6 55.0	3 - 12 - 24	311011 03.10 02.11 07.0	11.14 11.23 86·11	Somehody
20 00.0 00.9	22.12,24	32.11 31.3 shortage 60.22	significant 06.14	30111CDUUY
10.23 10.10 05.17 08.10	sergeant's 21.12	Shorthand	signing 62.14	01.11, 10 40.21 10.2 55.1
99.12	Sergeant's ST. 10	117.4 13	Jigiiiig 02.13	82.19 84.22
		· · · · · , · 🗸		J

soon 20:22 72:2 102:10 sooner 68:14 SOP 26:8, 14 29:16 54:2, 4, 16, 23 SOPs 26:13 27:14, 18, 22	69:9 102:8 squeezing 36:24 stack 96:10 staff 11:19 37:8 47:22 72:11, 13, 15 73:16, 21, 25 74:19, 23 93:8	state 65:22 80:19 84:1 stated 98:20 statement 47:23 51:17, 18 96:5 98:18 statements 117:9	Street 39:22 63:21 streetcar 9:11 stretch 26:25 108:11 strong 112:2 struggle 72:21 101:20	suitable 22:5 31:22 sum 10:21 summer 32:20 supervisor 62:17 supervisors 74:24 93:8
28:12, 25 29:4,	107:25	States 16:25	struggling	Supervisory
14 32:14 53:5, 7 54:12 20	Stage 6:20	17:4 station 12:21	100:22 stuck 96:24	49:25 supplier 56:22
60:16 24 61:3	30.12 32.9	40.20 41.19 20	87·21	59.12 89.15
78:16	39:12, 13 59:7,	47:22 57:15	stuff 10:23	suppliers 68:17
Sorry 17:22	11, 16, 18 79:13	61:24 63: <i>17</i> , 2 <i>1</i> ,	42:2 45:23	69:3
19:23 23:4	82:7 83:16	22 72:24 94:24	51:8 55:25	support 56:15
37:6, 21 41:16	91:6, 9, 10, 21,	95:18	56:23 57:9	surprise 42:23
42:11 58:22	22, 25 92:1, 13,	stations 10:20	62:23 72:15	surprised 109:9,
61:19 69:16	15 100:2, 3, 4, 5	24:8 40:17, 19	74:15	10, 12, 23 110:3, 17
80:17 88:12 01:11	108:75 109:23	50:3 63:74 85:14	subcontracted	17 surprising 05.6
sort 62.23	110.22 113.7, 13 115· <i>4</i>	5.14 status 30.10	78.22 83.23	suspect 96.20
65:24	stages 33:17	53:17	subcontractors	suspended 88:3
sorts 45:4	35:14 53:6	steady 65:22	93:5	sweep 105:10
sounds 17:18	staging 81:23	steep 93:19	subject 29:15	Swiss 110:7, 8
62:24 102:16	stake 39:8	stelar 36:21	116:3	switch 94:12
Spadina 24:6	stalemate 54:7	Stenographer/Tra	subsequently	109:25
spare 71:16	stance 20:15	nscriptionist	39:12	switches 13:6
spares 42:2	stand 35:22	2:18	substantial 65:2	94:11 C udencus 7 5:5 44
56:4, 0 83:15	82:70 Standard 12:20	stenographically	Substantively	Sydney 75:5, 11 sympathy 59:11
88.11 111.7	27.11 50.20	ston 32:16	9.73 subtly 68.22	syndicate 58:13
speaking 23.25	53.24 97.1 3 5	35.16	subway 8.23	115.12
113: <i>12</i>	7 98:8. 19. 21.	steps 52:2	9:5. 21 14:24	System 6:21
special 115:20,	25 99:10 100:7	Steve 16:22, 23	15: <i>4</i> 103: <i>1</i>	10:21 12:12
21	standards	22:15, 17 44:16	successful	13: <i>16, 18</i> 15:2 <i>1</i>
specific 38:2	49: <i>14</i> , <i>15</i> 50: <i>9</i> ,	stick 39:8	17:16 94:14	25:13 33:9, 13
110:24 113:13	11, 25 51:20	87:25	successfully	35:5, 10, 15, 23
specifically	52:20 53:25	stock 29:14	15:12	39:19 43:16
91: <i>14</i>	76:2 98:13, 16 100:9 0 15	37:13 38:25	SUCCESSION	45:7,23 46:2,
spectrum 77.27	100.0, 9, 75 stands 13:20	00.12 00.10 stop 12:0	109.70 Successor 37.22	19 49.1, 24 50:1 10 57:11
75·25	start 6.17	stop 12.3 stopped 53.21	suddenly 67.22	16 18 62·8
spend 23:17	19:12 30:16.24	stopping 46:15	sued 11:11	65:16 66:20
90:11	42:8, 16 58:3	69: <i>1</i>	suffering 61:21	68:25 70:14
spending 49:17	69:19 72:2	stops 12:7	sufficient 83:14,	74:5, 8 83:8
spent 28:20	73:3 94:13	storage 79:24	15	84:7, 15, 16
splash 77:18	started 8:6	80:2, 5	sufficiently 86:4	85:17,23 86:22
spoke 22:13	22:8, 19 23:9	strategic 104:4	suggest 76:15,	87:2, 6, 17
25:0°	40:7 45:1 48:3	strategies 89:18	17 108:17 111:1	90:16 93:12,20
Spoken 52:2	00.20 starting 25.25	Strategy 80.18	suggested 99:24	94.0 95.17 96.18 98.10 12
squashed 58.6	67·11 70·4	95.12 96.18 21	111·25	99·25 101·15
squeeze 69:7	starts 20:19	25 99:9. 20	suggestions	105:6. 13 107:10
squeezed 36:20	66: <i>19</i>	100:20 101:5, 10 114:25	99:5	systemic 87:5

aveterna 11:24	technically	45.40.00.04		15:12 20:10
systems 11:24	technically	45:19, 20, 21	timing 33:7	15:73 30:79
22:15 24:3	60:17 103:10	50:2 51:20	107:2 116:2	40:5 56:9
37:5 40:1, 7, 10,	Technician 2:19	55:9, 20 58:9	tin 84:17	57:14 66:9
11, 16 42:5	technology	63:16 72:3	title 54:1, 2, 5, 9,	69:1 70:11
43:5, 14, 18	12:23 13:2	77:15 80:25	10 61:18 112:10	72:1 74: <i>4</i> , 5
48:15, 21, 23, 24	18: <i>18</i>	86:22 89: <i>8</i> , <i>9</i>	toast 95:25	78:22 80:13
49:1. 4. 11. 18	tells 107:21	92:8 99:19	TOCC 45:14.24	81: <i>11. 13. 14. 19</i>
50.16 51.25	tend 5:15 16	107.8	today 91.13	82.1 3 83.3 24
53.24 54.14	54.13 94.25	thinks 108.24	108.19 112.3	84.23 101.2 3
57.12 58.2	tendered 78.21	third 31:18	11/1.2 116.5	25 102: <i>A</i> 11
68:15 69:0	tenuereu 70.27	60·25	today's 4.8	106.4 108.17
70.21 01.22	77.25	thought 52:2		100:12 16 18
19.21 94.22	11.20 torm 65:12	00.22 114.6		110:1 12 112:5
102.3 100.70		99.23 114.0	tollet 95.24	110.7, 73 113.0
	02.3 90.4 97.9	three-minute-22		trained 63.74
<1>	terminal 50:78	68:4	54:4 T	trainer 56:9, 10
table 30:19	terminated	three-sided	Iom 25:2 38:6,	57:6
65:9 103:15, 16,	15:21	103:20	7, 20	training 42:1
20	termini 105:22	three-way 14:11	tone 96:2	56:9, 11 57:6
tabletop 31:23	terms 14:6	16: <i>12, 15</i> 40:5	tones 96:2	61: <i>10</i> 68: <i>8</i>
62:6 103:12	18: <i>18</i> 19:24	three-week 85:1	toolbox 60:24	72:12 73:24
tabletopped	24:14 42:18	threshold 73:11	top 52:22 99:22	74:2, 3, 9 115: <i>14</i>
62:9	44:21 68:22	74:18 93:9, 10	topics 108:16	trains 7:1, 15,
tabletops 72:15	84:11 89:13, 20	thresholds	tops 65:9	<i>1</i> 9 10:21 13:6
takes 30:6	test 32:13 40:3	50:25	Toronto 8:17	27:9 43:15,22
68:6 69:2	46:18 73:9	threw 85:4	9:6 13:24 15:4.	49:7 56:2 67:1.
Talia 2:19	84:7 87:11	throw 106:3	20 16:24 17:3	3. 16. 17. 19
talk 36.16 38.1	93.10	thrown 76.6	22.20 24.4 5 6	68.5 16 69.21
50·7 72·10	tested 55:10	Thursday 45:12	38.6 43.3	23 70.2 72.3
talkod /8:23	86.3	16.1A	47.16 64.21	71.3 81.8 82.8
talking 55:25	tosting 20:22	time 1:12 8:20	66.12 60.21 22	10 92.15 19 10
CO.20 61.19	22:0 24:10	16:0 17:25	00.13 $09.21, 22,$	$10 \ 03.13, 10, 19$
00.20 01.70	33.9 34.10	10.0 17.23	24 15.11 05.1	64.5 65.3, <i>14</i>
66:22 80:4	40:70 41:9	18:1, 15 19:9	87:10 90:9	86:7 90:75
100:25	45:14, 21, 25	21:70 23:7	totally 70:6	101:4, 5 102:7,
tangibly 35:5	46:5, 6, 15 63:2	26:4 28:20	touched 88:7	9 103:1, 6, 8
target 65:21	68:15, 21 75:15	29:6 33:2	tour 40:18	105:8, <i>9</i> , <i>10</i> , <i>16</i> ,
66:3, 6 71:10	81:9 85: <i>15</i>	34:13 38:13	trac 13:19	<i>19, 21, 24</i> 106: <i>1</i> ,
task 28:12 55:6	87:2 <i>0</i> 100: <i>17</i> ,	39: <i>11</i> 41: <i>16</i>	traceability	<i>11, 13</i> 107: <i>18</i> ,
Team 4: <i>4</i> 7: <i>13</i> ,	24 115:14	47:2 51:16	61: <i>13</i>	24 108:2
<i>1</i> 9 16:21, 24	tests 64:16	52: <i>11</i> 61: <i>1</i>	traceable 54:10	tram 8:12
23:23 24:14, 15,	Thales 8:2, 7, 8	65: <i>1</i> 7 66: <i>9</i>	track 9:2 12:16	transcribed 4:16
24 25:11, 25	12:25 45:17	67:7 69:2	13: <i>8, 14</i> 24:2	transcript 4:17,
27:17 28:17	47:19 59:12, 13	74:13, 16 84:1	33:3 40:6, 11	21, 25 5:6, 7, 10
29:8 31: <i>4</i> , 5	61:21 81:19	88:10, 11 90:11	41:11, 13 53:21	117: <i>1</i> 3
32:11 37:15	their's 16:5	92:18 94:6	57:15 62:21	transfer 18:16
40:2, 22 48:15	theory 25:22	98:19 99:1,2	69: <i>1</i> 102: <i>4</i>	27:21
55:7. 8. 13. 16.	thing 15:6 39:3	101:18 104:21	105:14 110:13	transferred
22 64:3.22	42:22.25 56:15	107:5 109:12	track-circuited	11:20 18:20
69:9 75:18	68:11 76.2	111:15 113:19	105:14	61:20
76·4 104·17	83.22 88.1	114.17 117.6 7	tracking 46.1	Transit 4.5
115.13 17 18	92.17 99.20	10	tracks 10.20	6.20 8.17
teams 40.11	101.22	timely 46.23	tradere 18.18	13·25 1 <i>1</i> ·8
63.10 68.8	things 10.2	times 75.1	traffic 72.1	78.14 80.02
technical 20.10	25.12 26.6 7 0	80.15 100.11	train 0.0 10	translated 60.12
57.0 61.1	20.10 20.0, 1, 9, 11 20.22 20.00	time wise 20.20	10.7 0 0 10 17	Transmission
01.9 01.4	11 20.22 30.20	ume-wise 20:20	12.7, 0, 9, 12, 17,	0.1
04.12 100.13	30.0, 10 41.1	I	19 13.9, 13, 10 '	0.1

transmission-	tune 40.13	understandable	variation 75.18	wave 20.21
based 12:11	tune +0.75			Mays 20.21
				44.14 05.14
Transpo 16:27	tunnel 37:12	Understandably	venicie 13:12	108:8
24:15 26:24	56:1 57:15	69: <i>4</i>	40:14 41:14	website 4:22
27:2 29:8	61:6 63:12, 13	understanding	83:3	week 22: <i>16</i>
37:19 52:7, 13,	Tunney's	70:18 71:3	vehicles 70:18	24:25 31: <i>1</i>
14 62:7 70:18	105:12 109:16	72:6 81:17	71: <i>4</i> , 8 102:7	47:18 87:15
71:4 72:11, 13	turn 60:18 95:7	106: <i>16</i>	vendor 97:5	95: <i>4</i> 101:3
73:25 76:4.18	turned 9:7	understood	ventilation	weekly 17:4
93.6	25.1.24	20:3 48:4	37.12 50.3	55.16
Transport 6.25	two-car 63.2	91.13 115.25	56.1 57.15	weeks 8.6 17.3
8.20 31.10	101.2 3 4 9 11	undertaken 3.1	61.6 63.13	22.20 38.8 85.9
transportations	102:15	30.11	verbal 80.22	weird 26.17
36·24	two-thirds 17.7		VERITEXT	101.22
traveled 100:10		2.5		West 11:10
travelling 17:2	1100 45.8	0.0	117.70 Version 12:14	wheel 100:15
	type 45.23	unial 90.2		wheel 109.75,
90:8, 11	61:2 86:70	unfortunate 42:6	13:3 51:76	17,20
IRCC 36:11	113:6		verster 21:14	wheels 110:7
61:23	types 75:9	//:6	versus 114:20	white 59:22
treat 102:17	typical 28:9	unique 102:17	Videoconferenci	wholly 57:18
Tremblay 41:15	69:8 92:6	unit 109: <i>11</i>	ng 1: <i>14</i>	widespread
tremendous	typically 19:11	units 63:3	videos 41:2	16:2 <i>4</i>
41:23	39:23 42:3	100: <i>18</i> 101: <i>11</i>	view 16: <i>13</i>	widget 60:18
trial 5:20 35:15,	112: <i>15</i>	universities 39:6	26:9 28:13	willing 21:21
16, 17 62:8, 9,	typos 5:6	university 14:23	34:6 35: <i>3</i> , <i>4</i>	Willowglen 50:5,
10, 13 64:10, 15,	TYSSE 24:6	43:22	42:9, 17 51:18	9 51:10 98:17
20 70:14 84:14.	43:3	unpack 115:7	66:5 82:9	winning 114:21
19 20 24 85.2		unreasonable	92 [.] 25 105 [.] 4	115.3.8
16 24 86.19 23	<u.s.< td=""><td>22.1</td><td>107.1 4</td><td>wins 18.7</td></u.s.<>	22.1	107.1 4	wins 18.7
88·3 / 10/·1 6		22.7	viewed 26.20	wires 01.11
$11 \ 21$	U.S 30.77	01.15 101.9 0	viewpoint 09:22	wich 11:17 17:1
11,24	Uhm hmm 20:2	94.70 101.0, 9	Vinci 50:23	WISH 11.17 41.1
		unusual 31.77	VINCI 59.6	wished 21.7
114:77 (rists 07:0	UIIP 82:3, 15	updating 20:12		witness 5:72,
tricks 67:9	UK 8:9, 15	uptront 115:23	VISIDIIITY 44:17,	15, 18 113:9
tricky 54:14	10:1, 25 11:3	upgraded 10:19	18 84:2 92:21	won 9:13
Trillium 21:19	15:7 17:5	84:21	vision 63:8	wonder 112:8
27:7 30:12	19: <i>18</i> 31: <i>15</i> , <i>19</i>	upgrades 10:19	visit 40:18	113: <i>18</i>
trope 24:4	36:13 52:16	Urbalis 15:21	visualize 63:24	won't 92: <i>19</i>
trouble 46:21	ultimately 97:19	75:9	vital 13: <i>14</i>	word 11: <i>16</i>
Troy 25:9	uncoupled	U-R-B-A-L-I-S	voice 77:1, 2	65:7 100:6
37:22, 23 72:17	103: <i>4</i>	75:10	void 77:6	words 18:4
Trudeau 85:10	underground	useful 35:2	voluntary 8:4	83:7
true 17:18, 19	7:4, 7 8:4 10:4,	user 75:19	-	work 6:19 9:11
trying 22:11	<i>14</i> 11:25 14: <i>16</i> ,	users 114:22	< W >	20:17 21:6
28:4, 11 36:9	20, 23 75:17, 21	usual 32:25	wait 111:22	27:18 32:12, 16
45:6 74:24	87:9		112:13	35:11.21 37:24
76:20 90:15	underneath 54:9	< V >	walk 63:21	38:1. 15 39:25
99:11 106:24	understand	valid 19:14	68:11	42:8, 16, 61:25
TTC 8 19 9 10	23:1 25:12 17	27:1 47:2 55:3	walked 45.13	63:20 71.22
15 22 14.4	34.23 57.10	validated 115.12	walking 62.12	73.3 74.24
15.2 16.1	60.7 64.5	Vancouver 14.1	wanted 54.2	78.16 70.27
Tube 10.6 10	73.23 78.10	27·10	60·A 71·1 11	80.23 82.0
13 10 11.11	83.5 01.7 02.5	vanguard 20.11	73.10 76.01	85.20 QQ.11
10, 13 11.14	101.7 9 111.01	115.12	10.13 10.21 Wanting 05.10	$00.20 \ 00.11$
14.77	104.7,0 111.24	110.75	watching 77.44	91.1, 9 92.4, 0 05.10 07.0
I	113.11, 14	I	watching 11:14	90.10 91.9

101.22 100.10	VOOR0 7.10 9.0	l		1
101.23 108.78	years 7.70 0.0			
109.0, 0 111.2	9.14 10.22			
115:70	14:4, 22 15:1,			
workarounds	25 10:2 18:72			
45:27	21:2 23:2 28:6			
worked 6:25	52:25 65:22, 23			
8:3, 8, 10, 11	77:8 90:10 95:5			
9:4, 24 10:6	yellow 47:24			
14:9 25:7, 11	yesterday 22:13			
38:3, 21 45:16	YORK 8:27 24:6			
46:14 56:16	-			
69:12 90:9	<2>			
WORKERS 96:22	zone 13:72			
WORKING 22:19	Zoom 1:14			
23:2 24:14				
39:13 40:15, 24				
70:7 71:25				
12:22 88:10,23				
102:23 104:20				
WOIKS 10:8				
21:23 38:3				
$00.20 \ 02.22$				
workshop or.//				
WUTU 11.22				
14.2, 21 10.7				
02.22 worrigd 72:14				
write 26:12				
WILE 20.73				
21.10, 22 20.11 56:15 06:25				
115.12				
writing 54.18				
113.21 24				
written 47.13				
53.0 61.7				
79·16 99·10				
wrong 54.1				
76.20				
wrote 10.1				
54:20 97:3 98:7				
0				
< Y >				
Yard 37:25				
41:7 50:8 55:8				
68:20 72:9				
78:18, 19 80:17				
81: <i>10</i> , <i>12</i> , <i>18</i>				
82:8 105: <i>11</i>				
106: <i>8</i>				
yardstick 87:15				
Yeah 12:4 13:4				
25:21 27:15				
51:24 102:22				
104: <i>18</i>				
year 65:23 77:9				