

BRITISH COLUMBIA UTILITIES COMMISSION
IN THE MATTER OF THE UTILITIES COMMISSION ACT
R.S.B.C. 1996, CHAPTER 473

And

British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority
British Columbia Utilities Commission Inquiry
Respecting Site C

PRINCE GEORGE , B.C.
September 29th, 2017

COMMUNITY INPUT PROCEEDINGS
PRINCE GEORGE

BEFORE:

D.M. Morton,	Commision Chair/Panel Chair
D.A. Cote,	Commissioner
K.A. Keilty,	Commissioner
R.I. Mason,	Commissioner

VOLUME 5B

INDEX

PAGE

SEPTEMBER 23rd, 2017 – Volume 1

Vancouver Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOTTERELL (#0001).....	6
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RUSKIN (#0002).....	8
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCULLOUGH (#0003).....	12
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FINN (#0004).....	15
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HUSBAND (#0005).....	18
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCARTHY (#0006).....	20
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRYENTON (#0007).....	24
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GARDNER (#0008).....	27
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HOLM (#0009).....	30
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEEVES (#0010).....	33
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRANDISON (#0011).....	37
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GIBSON (#0012).....	41
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WONG (#0013).....	44
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SPEAKMAN (#0014).....	48
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CHAPMAN (#0015).....	52
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HAMBERGER (#0016).....	56
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. AUGUST (#0017).....	60
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. PEACOCK (#0018).....	64
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0019).....	68
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GILLING (#0020).....	72
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MILNE (#0021).....	76
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MARTZ-OBERLANDER (#0022).....	77
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SMITH (#0023).....	80
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BLACK (#0024).....	85

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VANDYK (#0025)..... 89
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. PLASHKES (#0026)..... 93
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DAVIDSON (#0027)..... 95
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HEWETT (#0028)..... 99
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WADDINGTON (#0029)..... 102
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GRANT (#0030)..... 106
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. O'KEEFE (#0031)..... 107
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARMSTRONG (#0032)..... 110
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ANDREWS (#0033)..... 114
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BAK (#0034)..... 118
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KULL (#0035)..... 123
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. PHILLIP (#0036)..... 124
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PHILLIP (#0037)..... 125
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CHISSON (#0038)..... 128
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WATKINS (#0039)..... 130
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KROECHER (#0040)..... 132
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUFTS (#0041)..... 134

SEPTEMBER 24th, 2017 – Volume 2

Kamloops Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MICHELL (#0042)..... 143, 174, 183
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BELL (#0043)..... 148, 176
SUBMISSIONS MR. MR. INSELBERG (#0044)..... 152
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DODDS (#0045)..... 155, 179
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BLAKE (#0046)..... 157
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRUMELL (#0047)..... 158, 167, 185

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. POCHAY (#0048)..... 160, 175
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KENNEY (#0049)..... 163, 181
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WESTIE (#0050)..... 170
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HALL (#0051)..... 171, 186

SEPTEMBER 25th, 2017 – Volume 3

Kelowna Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PAYNTER (#0052)..... 194
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VULCANO (#0053)..... 197
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MARSHALL (#0054)..... 201
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAWLEY (#0055)..... 205
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PETER KERR (#0056)..... 208
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEVENSON (#0057)..... 213
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MICHAEL KERR (#0058)..... 215
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NEDELEC (#0059)..... 218
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LEINEMANN (#0060)..... 222
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KMET (#0061)..... 223
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LEERING (#0062)..... 227
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MANNING (#0063)..... 231
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MICKALUK (#0064)..... 235
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NEAVE (#0065)..... 238
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DAVENPORT (#0066)..... 241
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. COOK (#0067)..... 242
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. OSTERMANN (#0068)..... 246
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LUCAS (#0069)..... 248
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GORDON SMITH (#0070)..... 251
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JOHNSTON (#0071)..... 255

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. OOSTENVRINK (#0072)..... 257
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAKA (#0073)..... 260
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THIESSEN (#0074)..... 262
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JAMES (#0075)..... 265
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BUCKNA (#0076)..... 267
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STUPKA (#0077)..... 270
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KERGAN (#0078)..... 274
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SHAW (#0079)..... 276
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SHEPHARD (#0080)..... 279

SEPTEMBER 26th, 2017 – Volume 4

Nelson Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SCARLETT (#0081)..... 287
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BRAMSON (#0082)..... 292
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CARVER (#0083)..... 296, 343
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LOGTENBERG (#0084)..... 301
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CHARLESWORTH (#0085)..... 305
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WILEY (#0086)..... 309
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MacKAY (#0087)..... 312
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARTLINE (#0088)..... 314
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LAMB-YORSKI (#0089)..... 318
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MILLER (#0090)..... 321
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. OCKENDEN (#0091)..... 325
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CRAIG (#0092)..... 327
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BROUGHTON (#0093)..... 330
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DONALD (#0094)..... 335
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DeKRUIF (#0095)..... 337

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SWITZER (#0096)..... 338
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GRAOVAC (#0097)..... 341
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RICHER (#0098)..... 342
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. THOMPSON (#0099)..... 343

SEPTEMBER 29th, 2017 - Volume 5A

Prince George First Nations Input Proceedings (afternoon)

SUBMISSIONS BY CHIEF WILLSON (#0100)..... 349
SUBMISSIONS BY CHIEF TSAKOZA (#0101)..... 376
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GAILUS (#0102)..... 387
SUBMISSIONS BY COUNCILLOR SOLANAS (#0103)..... 414
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0104)..... 425

SEPTEMBER 29th, 2017 - Volume 5B

Prince George Community Input Proceedings (evening)

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DAVIS (#0105)..... 459
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NOWAK (#0106)..... 461
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GIESBRECHT (#0107)..... 466
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WAGNER (#0108)..... 468
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BACHMEIER (#0109)..... 470
SUBMISSIONS BY BY MR. LUNDQUIST (#0110)..... 475
SUBMISSIONS MR. WILLIAMS (#0111)..... 479
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CONNOLLY (#0112)..... 481
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. EWART (#0113)..... 484
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WERNER (#0114)..... 488
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CROWLEY (#0115)..... 490
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. EGAN (#0116)..... 493
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BAUMAN (#0117)..... 497

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ALLEN (#0118).....	501
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GREGG (#0119).....	504
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MUTUAL (#0120).....	507
SUBMISSIONS MS. POWLOWSKA-MAINVILLE (#0121).....	509
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LEE (#0122).....	516
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HAVENS (#0123).....	517

SEPTEMBER 30th, 2017 - Volume 6

Hudson's Hope Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHANSSON (#0124).....	523, 565
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. POWER (#0125).....	528
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. METZGER (#0126).....	530
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. OKADA (#0127).....	533
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LONDON (#0128).....	534
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RHYMER (#0129).....	537
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARMITAGE (#0130).....	539
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SYKES (#0131).....	542
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WILSON (#0132).....	544
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARDILL (#0133).....	547
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BEAM (#0134).....	548
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LINDSAY (#0135).....	551
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SUMMER (#0136).....	552
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. RHYMER (#0137).....	554
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SYKES (#0138).....	556
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WEDER (#0139).....	557
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOON (#0140).....	559
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WEDER (#0141).....	562

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KELLY (#0142)..... 562

OCTOBER 1, 2017 - Volume 7

Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOON (#0140)..... 575

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LITTLE (#0143)..... 580

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. A. HADLAND (#0144)..... 586

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. T. HADLAND (#0145)..... 590

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NEUFELD (#0146)..... 593

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DARNALL (#0147)..... 597

SUBMISSIONS BY BY MR. MEIERS (#0148)..... 602

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KOTTMANN (#0149)..... 603

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FEDDERLY (#0150)..... 605

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. OUELLETTE (#0151)..... 610

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ASHDOWN (#0152)..... 613

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FOREST (#0153)..... 614

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ROBE(#0154)..... 618

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. R. HADLAND (#0155)..... 620

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. McDONALD (#0156)..... 624

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CULLING (#0157)..... 628

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUPPER (#0158)..... 630

OCTOBER 2, 2017 - Volume 8

Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BOON (#0159)..... 641

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. R. HADLAND (#0155)..... 643

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GOODINGS (#0160)..... 646

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MORISON (#0161)..... 651, 713

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CULLING (#0162)..... 654, 705
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KOECHL (#0163)..... 658
SUBMISSIONS BY BY MR. MEIERS (#0148)..... 663
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GUNVILLE (#0164)..... 665
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PASTOOR (#0165)..... 669
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HOUGHTON (#0166)..... 672
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ACKERMAN (#0167)..... 674
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JARVIS (#0168)..... 677
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORLAKSON (#0169)..... 681
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MOTT (#0170)..... 683
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. A. HADLAND (#0144)..... 684
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAPOLEON (#0171)..... 687, 706
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOUFFIOUX (#0172)..... 693
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SULLIVAN (#0173)..... 695
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LONDON (#0128)..... 699
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LITTLE (#0143)..... 702
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BEHNAM (#0174)..... 710

OCTOBER 5, 2017 - Volume 9

Vancouver Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRYENTON (#0007)..... 718
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAVIN (#0175)..... 722
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RUSKIN (#0002)..... 726
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CAMPBELL (#0176)..... 730
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HUNTLEY (#0177) 733
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEEVES (#0010)..... 736
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WELLS (#0178)..... 740

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FOY (#0179).....	743
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. FITZPATRICK (#0180).....	747
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0181).....	750
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CASSELLS (#0182).....	754
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JACKSON (#0183).....	758
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GILDERSLEEVE (#0184).....	763
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PEPPER-SMITH (#0185).....	767
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KEEGAN-HENRY (#0186).....	772
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHANSSON (#0124).....	775
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WILLIS (#0187).....	779
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BASS (#0188).....	782
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. RATCLIFFE (#0189).....	785
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MATTICE (#0190).....	787
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEVES (#0191).....	792
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LAMOUREUX (#0192).....	795
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GUNG (#0193).....	798
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SPROULE (#0194).....	801
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. McINTOSH (#0195).....	803
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRAHAM (#0196).....	807
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THOMAS (#0197).....	809
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TSANG (#0198).....	811
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARRISON (#0199).....	814
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WESTERMAN (#0200).....	817
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FINN (#0004).....	819
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MARTZ-OBERLANDER (#0201).....	823
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BROWN (#0202).....	825

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. J. NAPOLEON (#0203)..... 829
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KER (#0204)..... 832
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BURGEL (#0205)..... 836
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JONES (#0206)..... 839
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DESROCHERS (#0207)..... 841
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. PERRIN (#0208)..... 843
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MASSIE (#0209)..... 846

OCTOBER 6, 2017 - Volume 10

Vancouver First Nations Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY CHIEF EDWARDS AND
COUNCILLOR THEVARGE (#0210 & #0211)..... 851
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CORMAN (#0212)..... 878
SUBMISSIONS BY CHIEF ENEVOLDSEN (#0213)..... 892
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. McDONALD (#0156)..... 894

OCTOBER 10, 2017 - Volume 11

Nanaimo Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LOUHIMO (#0214)..... 915
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. AIKMAN (#0215)..... 918
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEBING (#0216)..... 922
SUBMISSIONS BY BY MR. HATFIELD (#0217)..... 926
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DESPREZ (#0218)..... 927
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PAUL MANLY (#0219)..... 931
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GARTSHORE (#0220)..... 934
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RALPHS (#0221)..... 938
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JIM MANLY (#0222)..... 941

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY BY MS. MANLY (#0223).....	944
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PURDEY (#0224).....	946
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORBURN (#0225).....	949
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LEE (#0226).....	952
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SISSON (#0227).....	954
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ANDERSON (#0228).....	959
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. OAKLEY (#0229).....	962
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CHATWIN (#0230).....	964
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ANDERSEN (#0231).....	968
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LIEM (#0232).....	972
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRICE (#0233).....	975
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NEADS (#0234).....	976
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NICKASON (#0235).....	981
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WHITTAKER (#0236).....	987
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LeBLANC (#0237).....	990
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GRAY (#0238).....	993
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WYTON (#0239).....	997
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COOPER (#0240).....	999
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COSTE (#0241).....	1005
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARRIS (#0242).....	1008
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STIFF (#0243).....	1011
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BERRY (#0244).....	1014
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. REINHART (#0245).....	1018
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SHILLITO (#0246).....	1024
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DUMOULIN (#0247).....	1028

INDEX

PAGE

OCTOBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12A

Victoria First Nations Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY COUNCILLOR WAQUAN (#0248)..... 1036
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LEPINE (#0249)..... 1045
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUPPER (#0250)..... 1051

OCTOBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12B

Victoria Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOTTERELL (#0001)..... 1067
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COSTE (#0241)..... 1071
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SIMPSON (#0251)..... 1074
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MITCHELL (#0252)..... 1078
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRAY (#0253)..... 1082
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DRAPER (#0254)..... 1086
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SAYERS (#0255)..... 1091
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. RUSSOW (#0256)..... 1094
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DREW (#0257)..... 1097
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SIMEON (#0258)..... 1100
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VAN UYTVEN (#0259)..... 1104
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PUTT (#0260)..... 1108
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MEREDITH (#0261)..... 1111
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VAN ENTER (#0262)..... 1114
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GORDON (#0263)..... 1118
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ROY (#0264)..... 1123
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HOLLOWAY (#0265)..... 1126
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MARTIN (#0266)..... 1128
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MOSS (#0267)..... 1131
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. THORBURN (#0268)..... 1133

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHNSTONE (#0269)..... 1135
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. FIELD (#0270)..... 1138
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAMERON (#0271)..... 1140
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAJARI (#0272)..... 1143
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARNEY (#0273)..... 1148
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BALDINI (#0274)..... 1151
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORNBURGH (#0275)..... 1155
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GREENLEES (#0276)..... 1157
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McGUIRE (#0277)..... 1159
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ENNS (#0278)..... 1163
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HENDERSON (#0279)..... 1167
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SPALTEHOLZ (#0280)..... 1169
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. STRANG (#0281)..... 1171
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SCOTT (#0282)..... 1173
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. TROTTER (#0283)..... 1178
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. EVANS (#0284)..... 1180
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. M. HADLAND (#0285)..... 1180
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DELA ROSA (#0286)..... 1183
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KEEGAN-HENRY (#0287)..... 1185
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NELSON (#0288)..... 1186
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUPPER (#0158)..... 1190

OCTOBER 13th, 2017 – Volume 13

Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY CLEAN ENERGY ASSOCIATION OF BC
(CEABC) (#0289)..... 1195
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ROBERT McCULLOUGH (#0290)..... 1213
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MARC ELIESEN (#0291)..... 1233

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY BC PULP AND PAPER COALITION (#0292).....	1251
SUBMISSIONS BY CANADIAN WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION (#0293).....	1260
SUBMISSIONS BY BCOAPO (#0294).....	1278
SUBMISSIONS BY ALLIED HYDRO COUNCIL OF BC (#0295).....	1302
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DAUNCEY (#0296).....	1321
SUBMISSIONS BY ASSOCIATION OF MAJOR POWER CONSUMERS (AMPC) (#0297).....	1344
SUBMISSIONS BY CANADIAN CUENTRE FOR POLICY ALTERNATIVES (#0298).....	1356
SUBMISSIONS BY DR. DAVID SUZUKI (#0299).....	1370

OCTOBER 14th, 2017 – Volume 14

Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SWAIN (#0300).....	1395
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HENDRIKS (#0301).....	1417
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RAPHALS (#0302).....	1439
SUBMISSIONS BY B.C. SUSTAINABLE ENERGY ASSOCIATION (#0303).....	1464
SUBMISSIONS BY CANADIAN GEOTHERMAL ENERGY ASSOCIATION (CanGEA) (#0304).....	1483
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VARDY (#0305).....	1511
SUBMISSIONS BY COMMERCIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION OF B.C. (#0306).....	1538
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ROBERT McCULLOUGH (Continued) (#0290).....	1562
SUBMISSIONS BY BC HYDRO (#0307).....	1581

PRINCE GEORGE, B.C.

September 29th, 2017

(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 6:01 P.M.)

1
2
3
4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening. Thank you for joining
5 us as we proceed through our two and a half week
6 schedule of Site C Inquiry community input sessions
7 around the province. So far we've heard presentations
8 in Vancouver, Kamloops, Kelowna, and Nelson. We also
9 opened our first of three scheduled of First Nations
10 input sessions this afternoon here in Prince George.
11 We are extremely pleased both by the level of public
12 interest and the effort that has gone into the
13 presentations that we have heard in both streams of
14 input sessions.

15 My name is Dave Morton and I'm the Panel
16 Chair for the Site C Inquiry. I'm also the Chair and
17 CEO of the British Columbia Utilities Commission.
18 With me today are my fellow Site C Inquiry Panel
19 members: Dennis Cote on my left, Karen Keilty on my
20 right, and Richard Mason on Karen's right.

21 This community input session is part of the
22 second important phase of the Site C Inquiry. As you
23 know, we spent the first six weeks of this inquiry
24 collecting data and analysis for many parties
25 interested in and affected by BC Hydro's Site C
26 project. The quality of these submissions was

1 commendable. Many people committed a great deal to
2 producing a quality submission within the short time
3 frame that was provided. This affirms what we already
4 know, that there are experts and affected parties who
5 can bring us insight into the many complexities of
6 evaluating the economic impact of the Site C project.
7 We have the task now of making findings in this
8 inquiry, and we recognize that our findings are better
9 with your input.

10 The Order in Council that directed us to
11 inquire into this project specifically requires us to
12 consider the cost implications on BC Hydro ratepayers
13 of three scenarios. One is continuing the project.
14 Second is suspending the project. And finally,
15 terminating the project. My Panel members and I
16 recognize that there are many other implications of
17 the project beyond cost implications. However, those
18 implications are not within the scope of us to inquire
19 into. Considering this, we ask that in the interests
20 of all parties in the room, please keep your
21 submissions within the scope of our inquiry.
22 Submissions made here today, as well as those made in
23 writing, that are outside of the scope of our review
24 cannot be considered in our final report to government
25 on November 1st.

26 There's copies of the executive summary of

1 our preliminary report at the entrance table, and the
2 full report is available on our website or by making a
3 request through our office if you don't have access to
4 the internet.

5 A couple of other housekeeping items.
6 You've just met Mr. Bemister of Allwest Reporting.
7 He's going to help organize speakers. As you can see,
8 there's two lecterns up here, and if you can come up
9 when you see your name getting close to the top, he
10 will help you get ready to make your presentation.
11 His team is here with him and they'll be transcribing
12 these sessions, and they're also streaming the live
13 audio on our website, which is *SiteCInquiry.com*. And
14 at the end of the session the written transcript of
15 the session will be posted on that website.

16 There's some coffee just outside the room
17 if you haven't found it already. Please feel free to
18 help yourself. As Mr. Bemister said, we're not
19 planning to have an organized break, so just feel free
20 to enter and exit the room to get coffee or water as
21 you need.

22 The list of speakers appears on the screen
23 as I indicated, and when your name is at the top then
24 it will be your turn to speak. And when you do speak,
25 we ask that you refrain from including personal and/or
26 confidential information in your talk. This will

1 become a matter of public record because it's
2 transcribed, and we need to be mindful of sharing any
3 confidential or personal information other than your
4 own name. And your own name, we ask you to state your
5 first name for the record and spell your last name for
6 the record before you start to speak, please.

7 You'll have a maximum of five minutes and
8 that's what the timer up front is for. If you look
9 like you're getting close to the end of your five
10 minutes and not getting into a wrap-up period, I'll
11 try to nudge you and remind you to do so.

12 And if you've heard sentiments from prior
13 speakers that are consistent with yours, you may wish
14 to just make a note of that rather than restating it,
15 and then save your speaking time to make any new or
16 additional points that you would like to make.

17 With that we're ready to open this session
18 in Prince George, B.C. on September 29th, and our first
19 speaker, Mr. Davis, is that you? Please go ahead.
20 Please go ahead, sir.

21 **Proceeding Time 6:06 p.m. T37**

22 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DAVIS (#0105):**

23 MR. DAVIS: Thank you very much. My name is Mike Davis,
24 D-A-V-I-S, and I'm just going to sit down. I'm the
25 Regional Vice President for ICBA. We represent over
26 2,000 construction companies across British Columbia,

1 which employ around 50,000 people all over the
2 province.

3 I just want to note a few points from the
4 report that's been issued by the BCUC. First of all,
5 I'm here in support of the project and for the next
6 couple of minutes I can say confidently that 100
7 percent of the speakers are in support for the
8 project. Joys of going first.

9 The preliminary report indicates the
10 project is being well managed by BC Hydro. It's on
11 track to finish ahead of schedule and the contingency
12 has grown to over 1.1 billion. While there is some
13 uncertainty related to estimating the cost of
14 suspension or cancellation, what we do know is that
15 taxpayers will be on the hook for approximately \$4
16 billion with nothing to show for it. No assets.

17 There have been numerous independent
18 studies reviewed 29 months, provincially, federally,
19 that conclude that Site C compared to all other
20 sources of alternative energy is the cheapest and most
21 effective way to generate clean energy for the next
22 hundred years. And important to note that with the
23 increase of electricity demand of over 40 percent over
24 the next 20 years, this is a real strategic way to
25 transition from fossil fuels to clean energy for the
26 future.

1 and gas roads and crossed over the W.A.C. Bennett Dam
2 in Treaty 8 territory. I've got friends and
3 colleagues that call this place home. I've seen the
4 scale of development that already exists within this
5 territory and is intense. I have deep concerns about
6 the social, cultural and environmental impacts of Site
7 C. However, I understand the parameters of this
8 review. And they are also of concern to me as a low
9 income young person and also because I see the
10 economic case, or lack thereof, for Site C as an issue
11 of social justice for all British Columbians.

12 In reviewing the preliminary report and
13 other submissions I am left with four key questions.
14 Number one, why is BC Hydro projecting an increase in
15 energy demand, yet over the past ten years energy
16 demand has been flat and is expected to continue to be
17 so? BC Hydro states that this is because of a
18 greening of electrification of our economy and
19 vehicles and population growth, and perhaps proposed
20 LNG proposals that currently don't have a market. But
21 given that we have several dams in this province, as
22 well as the potential for Canadian entitlement to the
23 Columbia River Treaty, why does BC Hydro keep telling
24 us that we need Site C? We are currently exporting 90
25 percent of the amount of power that Site C is expected
26 to produce. Why wouldn't we use more of this power

1 and not build Site C, which is about three times as
2 expensive? This makes no sense. There is no proven
3 case to necessitate Site C and the costs that come
4 with it.

5 My second question: Have we thoroughly and
6 adequately considered what we could do to reduce
7 energy demand through conservation or demand-side
8 management? And what other renewable energy sources
9 such as wind, solar, or geothermal could meet any
10 potential future energy demands if they do in fact
11 transpire, and would these options be more affordable?
12 Instead of doing this, BC Hydro is reducing focus on
13 its demand-side management initiatives, dismissing
14 alternative renewable energy sources, and ignoring
15 other energy sources that are within their own
16 portfolio.

17 My third question is: What will the
18 impact to other job-providing industries in the
19 province be if their energy rates go up? I am
20 thinking of energy-intensive industries such as
21 forestry, but also small businesses who make up a
22 large portion of the economy in B.C. The Association
23 of Major Power Producers in their submission to your
24 review have warned us that an increase of more than
25 2.6 percent in energy costs will run the risk of some
26 users no longer being able to afford to operate in

1 British Columbia. I understand that northern B.C.
2 residents need jobs, and I implore us to think about
3 how we can create sustainable long-term jobs. I ask
4 that you do a thorough analysis of the jobs that Site
5 C provides and the jobs that it puts at risk. My
6 fourth and last question is: Can you tell me what my
7 hydro rates will be if Site C proceeds? There are a
8 few factors to this, notably whether the project will
9 remain on budget, and if the energy is surplus to
10 demand and will end up being sold at a loss. There is
11 considerable reason to think that Site C will further
12 experience cost overruns. Already the main civil
13 works contract was **[Redacted per Order of BCUC]** over
14 budget and two months behind schedule at the get-go,
15 and already **[Redacted per Order of BCUC]** of its share
16 of the contingency budget has been eaten up with only
17 **[Redacted per Order of BCUC]** of the work done. This
18 is information that's been redacted from the Deloitte
19 report that has been hidden from the public, and that
20 being redacted has been supported by --

21 MR. MILLER: Mr. Chair, if I may interrupt, you clearly
22 warned the presenters not to get into confidential
23 information, and this presenter has just done that.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Would you please avoid having to --

25 MS. NOWAK: Sure, yeah, no problem. I just -- my only
26 question about it is why is that information being

1 kept secret and being hid from the public on a project
2 that we are paying for? That's a question I have.

3 Further, there is evidence of cost overruns
4 being somewhat typical for major dam projects, yet BC
5 Hydro claims that they will remain on budget. This
6 despite their own Northwest transmission line having a
7 cost overrun of almost double from 400 million to 730
8 million. And BC Hydro is already in debt, partly due
9 to signing contracts with IPPs where they are buying
10 power at a loss. This is serious mismanagement of
11 public money. How much will my hydro rates go up to
12 compensate for their debt, potential cost overruns,
13 and having to sell the power below cost given the lack
14 of energy demand?

15 Based on these unanswered questions, it is
16 clear that this dam is not worth the damage it will
17 cause to Treaty 8 territory and to our pocketbooks. I
18 appreciate your time and review of this now. However,
19 this review should have been done long before the
20 existing costs of the dam have been incurred by B.C.
21 taxpayers and the environmental damages to First
22 Nations and landowners of the Peace. I implore you to
23 recommend the cancellation of Site C and the
24 reclamation of the site, and to provide clear answers
25 to the questions that I've outlined as part of that
26 recommendation. Let's invest our money in ways that

1 will create long-term sustainability for northern B.C.
2 communities that will honour our end of Treaty 8 and
3 that will truly fulfil our responsibilities for
4 reconciliation with indigenous peoples.

5 Thanks for your time and energy on this
6 very important decision.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms. Nowak.

8 **Proceeding Time 6:18 p.m. T39**

9 Please go ahead.

10 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GIESBRECHT (#0107):**

11 MS. GIESBRECHT: Thank you. My name is Lori, L-O-R-I, my
12 last name is Giesbrecht, G-I-E-S-B-R-E-C-H-T.

13 First off I'd like to say thank you to the
14 B.C. Utilities Commission for undertaking this long-
15 awaited review of Site C. Will you please do your
16 very best to ensure BC Hydro provides you with the
17 required information in a timely fashion. Exactly how
18 many jobs is C Site providing? And of those jobs,
19 what percentage of those employed are British
20 Columbians? What percentage are British -- are
21 Canadians, I'm sorry, from other provinces? And what
22 percentage are foreign workers from other countries?

23 My next thing is, if BC Hydro is currently
24 exporting 90 percent of the amount of power that Site
25 C is expected to produce, then why wouldn't we use
26 more of it, this power ourselves and not build Site C

1 which is three times the cost? With combined costs in
2 the billions of dollars, why were both Site C and
3 other megaproject even permitted to start without
4 reviews? These are two projects that have been
5 undertaken since 2011, and CC Site and another one did
6 not have a review and I was just curious to know why.

7 I would like to see somebody take some time
8 to explore the merging options of geothermal, wind,
9 and solar energy that are currently on track to
10 replace all installed global energy generation by
11 2030. Those alternatives alone will save ratepayers
12 money. Given that we already have several dams in
13 this province, as well as the potential for the
14 Canadian entitlement to the British Columbia River
15 Treaty, Burrard Thermal, and the Northwest Electrical
16 Grid, why does BC Hydro keep telling us we need C Site
17 for backup power? It is essentially a large run-of-
18 the-river project, isn't it?

19 The era of construction of large
20 hydroelectric dams is coming to an end, so let's cut
21 our losses now while we can, and transition B.C. C
22 Site employees into jobs in solar, wind, and
23 geothermal power. Then we can move B.C. forward
24 adding new jobs in this sector around the province as
25 the need grows, and bring British Columbia to a
26 cheaper, more climate friendly, happier environment,

1 with a stronger economy.

2 We have the power to meet our future energy
3 needs at a lower cost to ratepayers with the power
4 that's available under the B.C. Columbia River Treaty.
5 Now that's a better B.C. Thank you so much.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

7 **Proceeding Time 6:18 p.m. T40**

8 Please go ahead, sir.

9 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WAGNER (#0108):**

10 MR. WAGNER: Hello. My name is Chris Wagner. That's W-
11 A-G-N-E-R. I'm here as an independent citizen and
12 taxpayer and ratepayer.

13 Back in 2005 I was at the Super 8 Motel
14 during the BC Hydro long-term acquisition planning and
15 independent -- or basically the long-term energy
16 forecasting process. At that point they told us that
17 Site C would cost about 3.3 billion. I'll round it up
18 to 4 billion to make the math a little bit easier. So
19 at that point they said that they were considering
20 four different alternatives. Three of them included
21 Site C. One of them did not. One of them was green
22 certified. The green certified option cost about 5
23 percent more than the least expensive option.

24 So assuming that the difference in cost
25 could be attributed solely to the electricity
26 generated by Site C, that would mean that the cost at

1 that point would have been 4.2 billion for that
2 alternative plan which Hydro had on the books.

3 Now, Site C's estimate has increased to 8.3
4 billion. That's more than a hundred percent increase
5 in the last 12 years. So that would mean then that if
6 we'd have gone for that green option at that point, we
7 would be saving \$4.1 billion compared to building Site
8 C. Now, I hate spending money and getting nothing for
9 it, absolutely detest it. But I also hate throwing
10 good money after bad. And in this case I have to
11 assume that what we've already spent is bad money, and
12 that pursuing this project further is just wasting
13 money on a bad idea, just to prove ourselves right.

14 Now, this also doesn't factor in some of
15 the other costs that come from building Site C. The
16 fact that it's destroying agricultural land in the
17 Peace River Valley, creating more dependency in that
18 area on foreign agriculture, on agriculture that has
19 to be trucked in, agriculture that requires greater
20 use of fossil fuels to transport it. Of course the
21 rest of us in the province don't have to bear that
22 expense. It's only the people in the Peace that have
23 to bear it.

24 It also doesn't consider that if we've sunk
25 so much money into Site C, we'll have less money
26 available to distribute power to outlying communities

1 that are currently on diesel generation, thus
2 increasing our reliance on diesel generation to
3 provide electricity to remote communities like Fort
4 Nelson, like the Bella Coola Valley, like on Haida
5 Gwaii.

6 So I'm really not sold that this is a good
7 idea, that this is an effective use of my money, and
8 that my electricity company, Hydro, should be spending
9 their money on it. Thank you.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

11 **Proceeding Time 6:21 p.m. T41**

12 Please go ahead, ma'am.

13 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BACHMEIER (#0109):**

14 MS. BACHMEIER: Hi. My name is Barbara Bachmeier, B-A-C-
15 H-M-E-I-E-R. I'm a citizen of British Columbia and
16 for anyone in the room that isn't aware, I am for Site
17 C.

18 Past, present and future, let's take
19 cashiers for an example of where we've been. In the
20 early sixties when you went to the grocery store, the
21 cashier typed in each individual item and the price
22 came up in glass in front of the customer and on the
23 other side for the cashier to see. These were high
24 paying jobs because the cashier had to remember all
25 the prices for each item. In the mid-sixties when the
26 W.A.C. Bennett Dam came on stream, cash registers

1 became electric. However, the cashiers still had to
2 remember the prices, so cashiers were still paid well.
3 The new capacity of this dam gave us enough
4 electricity to advance new technology for cash
5 registers.

6 Today, cash registers are electronic and
7 have scanners that read the schemes on each item so
8 that the cashiers only have to remember a few prices
9 for specific items like tomatoes, since you can have
10 roma tomatoes, field tomatoes, hothouse tomatoes and
11 even organic tomatoes. However, after the fires this
12 year when everyone was evacuated from Williams Lake
13 and 100 Mile House, many did not return to places like
14 Save On Foods. I was shocked and appalled to learn
15 the reason why was because they are barely paid above
16 minimum wage. I could see why they had not returned.
17 Hopefully they found better jobs elsewhere.

18 Tomorrow, the future. I see there will be
19 no cashiers because everything will be electronic. A
20 shopper goes into the store, scans the prices into the
21 electronic device, which then deducts the cost out of
22 their bank account or they just order online and the
23 items are delivered.

24 Dam issues. This dam will flood about 800
25 hectares of land. This province burnt one million
26 hectares this year alone, along with countless numbers

1 of jobs that go along with that burnt land: timber,
2 range land, all burnt. 800 hectares is 1/1000th of
3 that amount of land, 1/1000th. This particular 800
4 hectares is for the most part either hay fields or
5 unused land. Up on the benches of the Peace River
6 they grow canola, grains and hay along with cattle and
7 other animals. There's plenty of remaining land in
8 the Peace River area. Some say some animals will
9 drown. I doubt that very much as the water will rise
10 over a period of decades. Fish ladders will be
11 installed for the fish and there is a mitigation
12 process to move fish in the meantime.

13 Two homes will be impacted apparently.
14 They are supposed to be moved. One was built by
15 someone's grandfather and the family has an emotional
16 attachment to it. I get that. However, when the
17 grandfather's home was built I can pretty much
18 guarantee that it is not up to today's current, more
19 stringent building code. And further to that is the
20 fact that apparently the new *B.C. Building Code* will
21 require that all new detached homes will have charging
22 station plug-ins for electric vehicles. This will not
23 be 110 for regular household use. This will not be
24 220 for drivers or stoves. It will be 330 amps and
25 correct me if I'm wrong in the terminology. I'm not
26 an electrician.

1 First Nations people, forgive me if I sound
2 disrespectful in any way here, as that is not my
3 intention. I have worked alongside some First Nations
4 people at Site C. They are very good, qualified and
5 knowledgeable people. They are very hard workers. I
6 believe working on this hydro project gives them hope
7 for the future, their children's future, and their
8 families' future. This can build their culture and
9 remove poverty at the same time. How many First
10 Nations in this country have this opportunity to build
11 a better future on their own land? I hear too many
12 stories and rampant poverty and hopelessness on
13 reserves. Children taking their own lives. This is
14 so totally heartbreaking and unnecessary.

15 Some are saying we should be installing
16 wind capacity or solar capacity instead of
17 hydroelectricity. I heard that Germany is shutting
18 down their wind turbine program by 2019 as it is too
19 expensive and does not create the capacity that is
20 needed. In my own opinion, we should install wind
21 turbines on every high-rise in Vancouver.

22 As far as the solar farms are concerned,
23 where would you plan to put those? In the north where
24 they will be covered by snow for six to eight months
25 of the year? Think of the energy that we would need
26 to keep them clear of snow. Maybe on the roofs in

1 Vancouver. Hmm, rains most of the time there. Maybe
2 we can install generators instead like on Haida Gwaii.
3 Let's go backwards.

4 The future. My understanding is that the
5 BCUC told the B.C. Liberals that we would need the
6 capacity from Site C in ten years. Why are we wasting
7 time and money on this review? In order for our
8 economy to move forward, we are going to need more
9 hydroelectricity capacity. The only way to get that
10 is to build Site C now, not in ten years. Hydro is
11 reliable power. It is there when we need it. We can
12 refurbish our current hydroelectric dams but that will
13 not create more capacity.

14 I foresee everyone having electric vehicles
15 in 10 to 20 years. We need to electrical capacity for
16 that. I foresee Highway 37 to Dease Lake having a new
17 electrical grid so that new mines that will supply
18 metals and minerals for cell phones and batteries and
19 health technology and any number of other items coming
20 in the future, we'll need electricity for that. BC
21 Hydro is planning on putting new hydro lines into
22 Wells and Barkerville in order for Barkerville Gold
23 Mines to be on the grid instead of using diesel
24 generators. Gregor Robertson is in fact wanting to
25 get rid of natural gas in Vancouver, so what are we
26 going to replace it with? I would suggest clean

1 energy hydroelectricity.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ma'am, I just want to remind you of the
3 time. I wonder if you could start on a wrap-up.

4 MS. BACHMEIER: I have two more, couple more.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, okay.

6 MS. BACHMEIER: Okay, so I see an underwater hydro line
7 going to Haida Gwaii to help them with their problems
8 and get them off of diesel generators. Amazon is
9 looking to build an HQ2 in this country or North
10 America. Let's just see that they -- you know, we
11 could build that in Prince George as a matter of fact.
12 We've got the land. We just don't have the energy
13 capacity.

14 Getting back to my cashier story, someone
15 had to build new cash registers. The new technology
16 was developed that could have given people a decent
17 living wage. This is where we are today.

18 Thank you and I hope you build Site C.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, ma'am.

20 **Proceeding Time 6:28 p.m. T42**

21 Gerald Lundquist? Thank you. Mr.

22 Lundquist, please go ahead.

23 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LUNDQUIST (#0110):**

24 MR. LUNDQUIST: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My
25 name is Gerry Lundquist and this will be a personal
26 presentation. I represent no specific group and thank

1 you for listening.

2 My experience includes my 28-year
3 employment with B.C. Rail as an account manager, where
4 my portfolio included business development. Operation
5 and economics were crucial and B.C. Rail was one of
6 the top performing railways when it was sold in 2004.

7 Site C, a vision. B.C.'s economy and
8 social well-being is very closely linked to the
9 availability of inexpensive, clean hydroelectricity.
10 I would like you to consider British Columbia's
11 economy had the former governments waited until we had
12 a desperate need for electricity before pressing
13 through the many objections. How many dams would be
14 built and how would our positive economy look today?

15 I would like you to consider in the
16 economic review the following: (1) the return of tax
17 dollars from wages earned; (2) the potential for
18 industrial development; and (3) the potential peak
19 demand failures.

20 Number one, the return of tax dollars.
21 Much of the \$8 billion invested will find its way back
22 to governments via taxes, both personal and corporate.
23 The Fraser Institute estimates that 43 percent of
24 average Canadian earnings are returned to the
25 government in the form of taxes. Estimating that 50
26 percent of the \$8 billion investment is paid out in

1 wages, either directly or through those employed in
2 other areas like transportation, hotels, restaurants,
3 and offsite production, offsite production being a
4 very big item. At 50 percent and at 43 percent of
5 that going back in taxes, \$2 billion would be
6 distributed back to taxes over the life of
7 construction. Returning government tax revenues
8 should be considered in your analysis.

9 Number two, the potential for industrial
10 development. Industrial development is related to
11 energy availability. The LNG industry has invested
12 \$20 billion in B.C. in recent years, and although a
13 number of LNG proposals have been cancelled, it is
14 reasonable to expect that one or two of the initial 16
15 ventures will move forward. The power required for
16 LNG production will be better supplied from clean
17 hydroelectricity rather than burning valuable natural
18 gas, natural gas that could provide an extended
19 lifetime for the business case for an LNG venture.

20 I suggest to the Commission that the
21 cancellation of Site C would be a self-fulfilling
22 prophecy in that no LNG business will develop and
23 other industries will look at B.C. and say B.C. is
24 closed for business. Yes, we might then correctly say
25 we don't need Site C, but can we afford that?

26 Alberta has made the commitment to purchase

1 5,000 gigawatts of clean energy by 2030. Alberta is a
2 potential alternate customer for BC Hydro should B.C.
3 enjoy the availability of surplus electricity in 2024.

4 Number three, peak or potential peak power
5 demand failures. In the Deloitte report it is noticed
6 that B.C.'s population is expected to continue to
7 grow, and it is expected that soon 30 percent of B.C.
8 vehicles will be electric. Last winter BC Hydro
9 experienced the highest electrical demand ever, while
10 cold weather covered British Columbia. Consider what
11 might happen in the winter and cold when numerous
12 Vancouver residents return to their homes in their
13 Teslas between 5:30 and 7:00 p.m. and plug the cars in
14 to charge. Combined with the peak dinner hour demand
15 and the demand for heat throughout B.C., will we have
16 enough power? At that same time, somewhere in the
17 cold interior, Fortis Energy has a problem with
18 natural gas supply and people switch on their ovens
19 for heat. Wind energy is limited because of the low
20 wind speed, and solar energy is limited by short days
21 and low sun intensity. Only good old reliable hydro
22 power is available. Will we have enough?

23 The cost and potential loss of life if we
24 lost either natural gas or electricity at a cold time
25 would be substantial. I doubt anyone would take
26 comfort in knowing that on an annual average we have

1 sufficient electricity. We need to ensure we can meet
2 our peak power demand.

3 In conclusion, how would B.C.'s economy and
4 related job market look today if previous governments
5 stood still until they were pushed into action? Where
6 there is energy there's the potential for industry and
7 a good economy. With Site C we are preparing for the
8 future, whether it be 2024 or 2030. Without Site C we
9 will later wallow in the apprehension of today.

10 Thank you.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

12 **Proceeding Time 6:34 p.m. T43**

13 Please go ahead, sir.

14 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WILLIAMS (#0111):**

15 MR. WILLIAMS: Hello. My name is Don Williams, W-I-L-L-
16 I-A-M-S. I'm the Prince George division manager of
17 All North Consultants Limited. I'm also an owner, and
18 I'm an engineer. Thanks for the opportunity to speak
19 on what the Site C project means to myself and the
20 company I represent. We are in favour of Site C.

21 All North is an employee-owned consulting
22 engineering company which provides engineering and
23 technical services to the public and private sectors.
24 All North started business in Prince George in 1978
25 and has grown to a staff of 400 people, spread over 14
26 locations around Canada and the U.S. We employ 65

1 staff in our Prince George office, which is our
2 largest office in our company.

3 We've been involved in the Site C project
4 since 2014. We've worked on many aspects of the
5 project, both directly for BC Hydro and also for
6 various contractors that are working on it. Some
7 projects of note within the project that we've worked
8 on, worked on the construction bridge that accesses
9 both sides of the river, south bank and north bank for
10 engineering and material testing services. The main
11 civil works, which is ongoing right now, both
12 environmental engineering and material testing on the
13 left bank of the project. There's a slurry wall that
14 we've been involved in. And there's a Portage
15 Mountain rock source that we've been involved in
16 engineering for that.

17 To date, All North spent over 40,000 man-
18 hours on the project, which resulted in a revenue for
19 our company of about \$4.6 million. We're projecting a
20 future revenue over the life of the project, if it
21 continues on, of an additional \$10 million or 87,000
22 man-hours. For us, that's a huge impact for our
23 company. It's a very small part of the project
24 overall, though.

25 It's been a considerable portion of our
26 business and it's a direct contributor to our ability

1 to retain and employ staff not only in our Prince
2 George office, but also in other supporting divisions
3 across B.C. It's provided long-term stability that is
4 welcomed by our staff and their families, as it
5 provides comfort that there is employment
6 opportunities for the foreseeable future.

7 Also provides All North with the
8 opportunity to be able to give back to the community
9 as we have been able to direct some of the revenue we
10 have gained into worthy local causes. An example, we
11 support the Prince George Relay for Life, which we've
12 been an event sponsor for the last three years.

13 In addition to the direct economic impact
14 of the Site C project has had on our company, we
15 believe that the project is in the best interests of
16 the province of British Columbia, as it will provide
17 clean energy for future generations. I hope my
18 comments provide assistance for your inquiry.

19 Thank you.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

21 **Proceeding Time 6:37 p.m. T44**

22 Ms. Connolly.

23 MS. CONNOLLY: My last name is Connolly.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

25 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CONNOLLY (#0112):**

26 MS. CONNOLLY: C-O-N-N-O-L-L-Y. Thank you to the Panel

1 for hosting this input session on your preliminary
2 report. You've been asked to advise the Lieutenant
3 Governor and Council on some options on how the Site C
4 dam project should proceed, so I would like to make
5 two points about the true costs of this project and
6 why those costs prevent it from being justified.

7 My first point is about demand-side
8 management. As I understand, BC Hydro has been
9 reducing its efforts to address the consumption of
10 electricity it produces through programs like
11 PowerSmart. This is a big problem. We need to be
12 placing more emphasis on managing the demand for
13 energy by households, institutions, and industry
14 before we consider spending money on power projects
15 that have massive ecological footprints like Site C.
16 And this includes other types of projects considered
17 green as well. This is the simplest and most obvious
18 way to minimize costs to B.C. ratepayers.

19 My second point is about the valuation of
20 ecosystem services. As much as I bristle at the idea
21 of placing a monetary value on nature and its
22 processes, it's warranted here because the other
23 material costs of this project have been quantified
24 and articulated by BC Hydro and others. By not
25 placing a cost on the loss of flood plain forests,
26 food production, carbon storage, and other ecological

1 assets and functions in the area, we place their value
2 at effectively zero. This is bad accounting. If we
3 properly ascribed value to what would be lost, with
4 the completion of this project, we might find that
5 terminating it would be the most cost-effective
6 option.

7 The money that has been spent on this
8 project so far is money that will never go towards
9 fixing schools, assisting our health-care system, or
10 helping us conserve threatened natural ecosystems, for
11 example. In Oregon and California state officials
12 have recently signed agreements for the removal of
13 four hydroelectric dams, and over a thousand dams in
14 the U.S. have been decommissioned since 2015.

15 So like Lori mentioned earlier, dams are
16 not a thing of the future, they're a thing of the
17 past.

18 Perhaps the two tension cracks that have
19 opened up in the cleared Peace River banks should be
20 telling us something.

21 The construction of a project that should
22 have been put under your scrutiny a long time ago has
23 already begun, and I know this complicates the
24 calculations you have to make about what to recommend.
25 But this is an opportunity to avoid the inevitable
26 costs this project will incur if it's completed.

1 Thank you very much.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

3 **Proceeding Time 6:40 p.m. T45**

4 MR. EWART: Good evening.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening.

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. EWART (#0113):**

7 MR. EWART: My name is Peter Ewart, and I'm a columnist
8 and retired college instructor living in Prince
9 George. My last name is spelled E-W-A-R-T.

10 Thank you for providing me the opportunity
11 to speak today regarding the economic viability of the
12 Site C dam project. To begin, the Site C project
13 constitutes the largest public works expenditure in
14 B.C. history, with an estimated cost of 8.8 billion,
15 and possibly billions more, depending on a number of
16 factors. Indeed, at current estimates, one prediction
17 puts the cost at about \$5,000 per B.C. household.

18 As such, the project deserves the most
19 rigorous scrutiny on the economic front, as well as
20 other fronts. But a number of alarm bells are ringing
21 loudly not to go ahead with this huge project. But
22 although it will benefit some big construction
23 companies, banks, and lending institutions, as well as
24 oil and gas corporations, it will not benefit British
25 Columbians as a whole. Far from it. It promises to
26 be a huge white elephant.

1 What are some of these alarm bells? The
2 first one rang loud and clear back in the 1980s when
3 BC Hydro put forward a proposal to build the Site C
4 dam. It was rejected by the B.C. Utilities Commission
5 of that time on the grounds that it was not needed and
6 that BC Hydro's forecasting of electricity demand was
7 faulty. The second alarm was in the late 1980s when
8 the proposal was revived. However, by 1993 even the
9 head of BC Hydro at that time, Marc Eliesen, declared
10 that the Site C project was dead because the fiscal
11 exposure was too great, the dam too costly, and the
12 environmental impact unacceptable.

13 Despite the earlier turn-downs and to the
14 surprise of many, the B.C. Liberal government in 2010
15 put the Site C project back on the table, which since
16 then has set off a chorus of alarm bells. In 2013, a
17 federal and provincial joint review panel ruled that
18 BC Hydro had not fully demonstrated the need for the
19 project on the timetable set forth, and recommended
20 that the project demand estimate and other aspects be
21 referred to the B.C. Utility Commission for review.
22 Since then, Harry Swain, former chair of the joint
23 review panel, has warned that the electrical power for
24 the dam will not be needed, and that British
25 Columbians will end up paying for a huge stranded
26 asset for years to come.

1 In 2013, energy expert Robert McCullough
2 and economist Dr. Murray Shaffer issued a report that
3 concluded there is not a need and justification for
4 Site C as proposed by BC Hydro, and that there were
5 far cheaper energy alternatives.

6 And in 2017, researchers with UBC's program
7 on water governance called for a suspension of the
8 Site C project on the grounds that the business case
9 for the dam project is weak, as a result of "a
10 dramatic decline in projected energy needs, and that
11 the economic risks will likely only magnify as time
12 goes on."

13 These are loud bells that are ringing, but
14 they are not all of them. For example, some sections
15 of the corporate establishment in the province,
16 especially in the forestry and other resource sectors,
17 have also raised the alarm bell about Site C. Richard
18 Stout, the then-executive director of the Association
19 of Major Power Customers of B.C., stated in 2014 that
20 the original load forecasts put forward by BC Hydro
21 are going to be wrong, and that it is not the right
22 project right now.

23 Another former executive director of the
24 association, Dan Parks, argues that the huge cost of
25 Site C will rob the province of valuable resources
26 that could be used to deliver other needed government

1 services as well as burden the B.C. economy with debt
2 and high electrical power rates. David Austin, a
3 lawyer on energy issues, discovered in the cross-
4 examination of BC Hydro executives in 2016 that the
5 Site C project will not be paid off until 70 years
6 after it is completed.

7 Most recently, Deloitte, the consulting
8 firm hired to look at BC Hydro's numbers, has cast
9 doubt on both BC Hydro's estimates as well as its
10 scheduling for the project.

11 But perhaps the biggest alarm bell of all
12 is the fact that the former B.C. Liberal government
13 chose to bypass your organization, the B.C. Utilities
14 Commission, and push through the Site C project
15 without receiving your regulatory approval of
16 recommendations. Why would it do such a high-handed
17 anti-democratic thing? This has raised serious
18 questions about the B.C. Liberal government's motives
19 from day 1. Indeed, it is only because a new
20 government has been elected that you now have an
21 opportunity to review the project, albeit in a limited
22 way.

23 It also raises the issue that we need
24 better decision-making processes, democratic ones that
25 put important economic decisions into the hands of
26 British Columbians, not manipulative politicians or

1 powerful corporate interests.

2 There are more alarm bells, but I will stop
3 there. The question before you today is, given that
4 all of these alarm bells are ringing so loudly and
5 persistently, will they be ignored or will they be
6 heeded? In my opinion, in the interests of all the
7 people of British Columbia, these alarms should be
8 heeded and the Site C project cancelled.

9 Thank you.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

11 **Proceeding Time 6:45 p.m. T46**

12 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WERNER (#0114):**

13 MR. WERNER: Hi, my name is Jeff Werner, last name W-E-R-
14 N-E-R. It occurs to me this is a very important
15 process, and thank you for this opportunity to talk,
16 and to host this.

17 I'm a biologist, so a lot of my concerns
18 are outside the scope of what you're concerned with
19 today. But notwithstanding the environmental forfeits
20 associated with Site C, I think there are two issues
21 pertinent to this consultation process which you have
22 heard already, and you will hear many times over. For
23 my own benefit, I'd like to frame them as two very
24 simple questions.

25 The first question, the most obvious one,
26 can we justify the need for this massive project?

1 This is best considered by projecting future demand
2 for energy.

3 The second question, can we justify the
4 costs? These are costs to the rate user, to the
5 taxpayer.

6 Looking at this first question, I'd like to
7 make the observation that the demand for electricity
8 has been relatively flat now for almost a decade and a
9 half, despite the fact that the number of BC Hydro
10 customers has increased by half a million. We're told
11 also that our economy has increased by 50 percent.

12 It's my understanding that BC Hydro
13 currently has enough surplus energy to sell to the
14 United States every year an amount of which roughly
15 adds up to the proposed amount to be produced by the
16 Site C dam itself. From a demand perspective, and
17 from a supply perspective, B.C. doesn't need Site C.

18 In terms of our second question, can we
19 justify the costs, the cost to the rate user, I would
20 argue that first of all given the fact that it does
21 not appear that we need this energy, any increased
22 costs to domestic users is strong grounds for
23 dismissing this project.

24 I'd like to just frame this in one very
25 simple question that it occurred to me on the drive
26 over, really sums up what I think a lot of us feel.

1 Why should I be paying more for the electricity I now
2 use to pay for the production of electricity I do not
3 need, so it can be sold at a loss on the U.S. market?
4 Is this in your best interests? Is this in mine? I
5 don't suspect so.

6 Thank you.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

8 **Proceeding Time 6:49 p.m. T47**

9 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CROWLEY (#0115):**

10 MS. CROWLEY: My name is Hilary Crowley, C-R-O-W-L-E-Y.
11 I live at Summit Lake. Thank you for this opportunity
12 to contribute to the Site C B.C. Utility Commission
13 hearings. I want to be clear that I am opposed to the
14 building of Site C, and this is on many grounds:
15 indigenous rights, environmental factors, food
16 security, and economics.

17 The UBC report gave evidence that it would
18 be in our financial best interests to stop
19 construction of the dam now. The jobs which would be
20 impacted can be transferred to remediation in the
21 short term, and to renewable energy projects in the
22 long term.

23 The B.C. Utilities Commission interim
24 report on the economic viability of Site C raises many
25 unanswered questions. Furthermore, it has found that
26 BC Hydro failed to assess geothermal, biomass, solar,

1 and battery storage alternatives to Site C before it
2 went ahead with the project. Nearly half of its
3 contingency funds have also already been used, only
4 two years into the eight-year project. These are all
5 alarming facts.

6 The projected costs of the project are more
7 than B.C. taxpayers or ratepayers should be saddled
8 with for generations to come. The land around Halfway
9 River and Bear Flats on the Peace River is of utmost
10 importance to the West Moberly First Nations. When
11 Chief Roland Willson and his brother, Councillor
12 Clarence Willson, first heard of the resurrection of
13 this project, they were stunned and became very
14 emotional and close to tears. The land is of utmost
15 cultural importance to them.

16 Since our commitment to the actions of the
17 Truth and Reconciliation Commission, we should be
18 abandoning the Site C if only to show our respect for
19 First Nations' rights. It was extraordinary that
20 alternative energy sources such as wind, solar,
21 geothermal, and biomass weren't even considered by BC
22 Hydro. Because of the B.C. government's commitment to
23 the Site C mega-dam project, a large wind energy
24 project on Vancouver Island was cancelled last year
25 and moved elsewhere. This is unfortunate, as these
26 other alternative energy sources are far more

1 environmentally friendly, at a fraction of the cost of
2 a mega-dam. Hudson Hope itself, the closest community
3 to Site C, has recently gone totally solar. It shows
4 how, when a government embraces a new concept, it can
5 be done efficiently and help B.C. to embrace the 21st
6 Century rather than be stuck in the past using old
7 technologies.

8 LNG is obviously a twilight industry and if
9 this was considered the main reason for the need for
10 Site C, it was obviously a big mistake.

11 The Peace River Valley is a prime
12 agricultural land. Food and water are the main
13 necessities of life. It makes much more sense to grow
14 food locally rather than rely on long-distance
15 shipping of produce from areas that are threatened by
16 drought, such as California. As the climate warms,
17 more variety of produce will be able to be grown in
18 the north to supply areas in the south which might be
19 suffering droughts.

20 Building dams for energy is outdated. The
21 cost of renewable energy sources like wind and solar
22 have decreased substantially in the last few years,
23 and building another dam over the Peace River does not
24 make sense.

25 The B.C. government gives BC Hydro
26 preferential treatment for Site C by not requiring

1 annual dividends and by forgiving charges that were
2 eliminated from the Site C budget. This amounts to a
3 subsidy which makes it more difficult for alternative
4 energy technologies to compete with BC Hydro, as with
5 the U.S. investment for wind energy on Vancouver
6 Island which was driven away last year.

7 We haven't even talked about the wildlife.
8 This valley is prime habitat for many species of large
9 mammals. Disturbance of this habitat through
10 construction, depletion of forage, and destruction of
11 migration routes, could seriously threaten our
12 wildlife, many species of which are already declining.

13 I urge the B.C. Utilities Commission to
14 seriously consider all these values in their decision-
15 making, and not just the bottom line. The social,
16 environmental, and economic costs are all of equal
17 importance. I believe that construction of Site C is
18 not needed, will be a huge burden to the taxpayers and
19 ratepayers, and is socially, environmentally, and
20 economically not justified. I ask for cancellation of
21 this project.

22 Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

24 **Proceeding Time 6:54 p.m. T48**

25 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. EGAN (#0116):**

26 MR. EGAN: Hi, my name's Patrick Egan, E-G-A-N. I'm a

1 professional civil engineer. I'm not a hydro expert.

2 I have lived in Prince George for over 30
3 years, and I've worked in the north for over 35 years.
4 And I actually started my career on the Revelstoke
5 project. And one word I remember from that one is
6 wobbles [*sic*]. It's amazing the things that will
7 drive up the price of these projects, so.

8 I am opposed to the project, along with my
9 good wife, for varying reasons.

10 This site was chosen in the 70s, and that's
11 40 years ago. And I'm wondering, is that still
12 relevant? The one thing that really I question is,
13 with all the technical advantages -- technical
14 advances, that we do not look at the other sites --
15 Site A, Site B, maybe A-minus or B-plus. We're giving
16 up 85 kilometers of river and I'm questioning whether
17 that is going to be a good decision or not.

18 It seemed very apparent to me in the
19 Commission's preliminary report from Hydro that this
20 was an LNG-driven project, and we all know that that's
21 not going as expected. We'll be lucky if we get two
22 plants. It looks like the one in Squamish is going to
23 be successful. And hopefully with all the money that
24 we have expended in the northwest of the province, the
25 second one will show up there some day.

26 I've been looking at the Canada census. We

1 now have growth for B.C., 5.6 percent in the five-year
2 period from 2011 to 2016. That's a little over 1
3 percent annually. I think that's -- to me I would
4 recommend that that's probably a good figure for the
5 Utility Commission to use for what kind of demand we
6 might see. But we'll hardly be able to hold on to
7 their part of that power production if our rates keep
8 climbing, based on the cost of this project. And we
9 all know that this project is going to go up.

10 We're at 9 million now, that doesn't --
11 sorry. Yeah, 9 million, and that doesn't include the
12 transmission lines which is another million, moving
13 Highway 29 figures in there too. So we're at \$10
14 billion, sorry. And if I was going to take a good
15 guess, it's going to be \$11 billion by the time it's
16 said and done.

17 There was -- the Utility Commission has
18 picked up on a lot of things that they're alternatives
19 to supplying this power that Site C is going to -- but
20 one I think that we've missed, and that is that Rio
21 Tinto now has Phase 2 of the Kemano project in the
22 works. And I think BC Hydro is going to have some
23 competition to who's going to supply the power to the
24 LNG plant in the north. I have actually had the
25 pleasure of standing in the power plant at Kemano, and
26 it's big. And they are going to be able to do things

1 with that.

2 So, when I asked why we needed that
3 reservoir, I've asked a few of my fellow engineers,
4 I've never really got a good answer. Hydro's the
5 expert, so -- but why is Hydro the expert? This is
6 the first dam that they've built in a country like the
7 Peace, and the Peace, let me tell you, is a tough
8 place to build. And we have a country there that is
9 moving, the ground is moving in that area. We have no
10 materials, like granular materials and rock. Hydro is
11 probably going to be hauling rock over 100-plus
12 kilometers, and what that's going to do to road
13 structures and everything else.

14 And then the last thing in the Peace is a
15 very short construction season. When it gets wet,
16 come about now, October/September, it doesn't dry out.
17 And that's hard work to construct. The costs are
18 going to go up. I noticed on CBC news today that the
19 Construction Association says there's a construction
20 boom in B.C. right now. Right now, there's a 15,000
21 worker shortage, they say. So I can see where these
22 workers are going to go.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sir, if you could -- we're running out
24 of time, so if you could start to wrap up, that would
25 be great.

26 MR. EGAN: Yeah. And then I -- just my last comment. I

1 noticed 600 million for remediation, and all I can say
2 is, that's a Cadillac remediation, so I hope the
3 Commission looks into what's involved in that.

4 Thank you very much.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

6 **Proceeding Time 6:59 p.m. T49**

7 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BAUMAN (#0117):**

8 MS. BAUMAN: My name is Erin Bauman. I'm a resident of
9 Prince George. My last name is spelled B-A-U-M-A-N.
10 And I'm here today to address the members of the B.C.
11 Utilities Commission Site C review panel on behalf of
12 a local volunteer organization, Sea to Sand. We have
13 a membership of approximately 1,000 people and our aim
14 is to inform residents about industrial developments
15 that pose risks to the environmental, social,
16 cultural, and economic sustainability of northern B.C.
17 communities.

18 We acknowledge that we are meeting today on
19 the unceded territories of the [*non-English*].

20 As an organization, we are deeply concerned
21 about the impacts of the Site C hydroelectric dam on
22 First Nations who have not consented to the
23 construction of this mega-project on their
24 territories, and who are still living with and
25 experiencing the profound and deeply harmful impacts
26 of the flooding of the Williston Reservoir during the

1 construction of the W.A.C. Bennett Dam on the Peace
2 River.

3 Because the Utilities Commission review is
4 narrowly focused on economic viability of Site C, I
5 will speak to that, while also noting that our
6 concerns and those of many indigenous and settler
7 communities also include the social, cultural, and
8 environmental impacts of Site C.

9 Overall, we feel that the Site C dam is not
10 an economically sound project and will not contribute
11 to long-term economic well-being in northern
12 communities or the province as a whole. We feel it
13 should therefore be cancelled and the site reclaimed.

14 With regards to the B.C. provincial energy
15 demand, a report released in April, 2017 by a group of
16 UBC researchers led by Dr. Karen Bakker identified
17 that energy demand in B.C. became flat in 2005.
18 Despite the fact that B.C.'s population increased by
19 540,000 and its economy grew by 47 percent between
20 2001 and 2017.

21 It further identified that BC Hydro has
22 over-predicted energy demand in the past. For
23 example, we have not reached the energy demand levels
24 that BC Hydro first predicted when the dam was
25 proposed in the 1990s. Based on the UBC analysis, it
26 is predicted that energy generated by the dam will be

1 100 percent surplus to B.C. energy needs. BC Hydro's
2 stated need for Site C is anchored in its forecast
3 that B.C.'s demand for electricity will increase by 30
4 to 40 percent over the next 20 years. This is based
5 on its econometric model showing continued GDP and
6 population growth, LNG projects coming on line,
7 greater and greener electrification of the economy,
8 and the advent of electric rather than oil-based
9 transportation.

10 We are concerned about the accuracy of
11 these projections, and lack of analysis on energy
12 conservation, and the potential for alternate
13 renewable resources, such as solar, wind, geothermal,
14 et cetera, to meet increased demand, if it does not in
15 fact transpire.

16 With regards to the projected budget for
17 the dam, it is well known that dams typically overrun
18 projected budgets. A study from Oxford University
19 that considered 245 large hydroelectric projects in 65
20 countries around the world found that on average the
21 cost to build the dams were 90 percent higher than
22 what was originally predicted.

23 BC Hydro originally estimated that Site C
24 would cost approximately \$5.8 billion to construct.
25 That prediction has now increased to \$9 billion. Some
26 analysts predict that the cost of the dam would

1 escalate to upwards of \$12 billion. These costs would
2 be borne by BC Hydro ratepayers. For this reason the
3 Site C dam should be cancelled, as it is an unneeded
4 expensive project that we will have to pay for
5 collectively.

6 We are also very concerned about the
7 implications of both the lack of energy demand and the
8 expected cost overruns for BC Hydro ratepayers. Given
9 that there is no demand for the electricity in B.C.,
10 it will be exported at prices that are lower than what
11 the energy cost to produce.

12 As identified by the former chair of the
13 Site C joint review panel, Harry Swain, this could
14 lead to \$7 billion of the predicted \$9 billion in
15 construction costs never being returned. This \$7
16 billion would be paid for by BC Hydro ratepayers. For
17 this reason, Swain recommends that if the project
18 costs more than \$2 billion to construct, it should be
19 cancelled. Already, lower-income individuals
20 experience energy poverty as a result of current
21 energy prices. Increased hydro rates will only
22 further marginalize lower-income households.

23 In conclusion, I want to again stress that
24 Sea to Sand has serious concerns about the social and
25 cultural impacts of this project, with its
26 immeasurable impacts to the farming, recreation,

1 sustenance, tourism, and well-being embedded in the
2 Peace River Valley, and with any government or
3 government agency willing to approve development on
4 indigenous territories without the free, prior, and
5 informed consent of indigenous nations.

6 Thank you for your time and consideration
7 of our submission on this very important matter.

8 **Proceeding Time 7:04 p.m. T50**

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

10 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ALLEN (#0118):**

11 MR. ALLEN: Hi, my name is Eric Allen, Prince George.
12 Citizen at large, I guess.

13 I want to touch on a number of things. The
14 first thing I'd like to get out is the proposed LNG
15 plants in British Columbia. There's about ten big
16 ones, but specifically the two, one in Kitimat, one in
17 Prince Rupert, Port Edward.

18 There's a sense out there that these LNG
19 plants are going to use electricity from BC Hydro.
20 That's not true. The contract between BC Hydro and
21 the LNG plants is that they'll use BC Hydro power for
22 their auxiliary needs. They'll actually use their own
23 natural gas to run the turbines to generate the
24 electricity to freeze the natural gas so they can ship
25 it.

26 So we should keep that in mind, because

1 these LNG plants do a lot of polluting. Okay? Having
2 said that, I think in order to resolve this situation
3 we're going to have to accept some polluting. It
4 can't be black or white. Eh?

5 Now, study cast doubts about environmental
6 benefits of LNG export industry. That's basically
7 what I just touched on. News release, LNG Canada, and
8 it goes into detail about the agreements between BC
9 Hydro and the LNG plants. That's just another one,
10 the same way. BC LNG proposals and greenhouse gas
11 emissions. There's huge emissions involved here. An
12 estimate of 24 million tonnes of LNG per year,
13 equivalent to the initial phases of Petronus and Shell
14 proposals would produce 21 million tonnes of GHGs per
15 year, equivalent to 44 percent of the province's total
16 targeted emissions for 2020.

17 So, then we get to power demand is flat,
18 not growing in B.C. Well, we know that. We never
19 seem to be able to put our finger on why. Very simply
20 put, it's because a large number of industries in
21 British Columbia shut down since 2001, when Watson
22 Island shut down the pulp mill, then Eurocan Pulp and
23 Paper, then Abitibi Paper and Mackenzie. We have 70
24 mills in British Columbia shut down, I don't know how
25 many other pulp mills. That power is not -- that was
26 being used, it's no longer being used. So it filters

1 over to people and houses, or whatever. And we have a
2 net -- or at least we don't have a gain in the amount
3 of power being used.

4 That's where the power is coming from, in
5 my opinion. The lack of industry using it. So the
6 solution, Alberta's got it. It's called the Shepherd
7 Energy system in Alberta. They built an LNG plant,
8 generates 800 megawatts of capacity. It's attached
9 right to the city of Calgary, supplies over 50 percent
10 of their needs. It gets its water from its waste
11 water system. It was built in four years. It was
12 built for something like \$1.5 billion. They have
13 another one in the future planned for Edmonton. This
14 is what we need here. We need to forget about Site C,
15 we need to build a plant, a gas -- a natural gas plant
16 that will take us the next 10 or 15 years into the
17 future, and look after our needs, and during that time
18 we can continue to find other means of electricity.

19 Now, with the natural gas, if we have to
20 shut it down because we've got another way of getting
21 electricity, yeah, we shut it down. That won't happen
22 with Site C.

23 And just a few more little things here. I
24 won't get into the population part of it. This is
25 back in 2013. B.C. energy reduced -- they're not
26 ruling out use of gas-fired power plants. They were

1 thinking about it back then. Hydroelectric power's
2 dirty secret revealed. Now we're talking about
3 greenhouse gas emissions from dams, very bad stuff.
4 They're just getting into it. Hydroelectric dams
5 increase methane emissions, says German study.

6 Inland waters account for nearly 18 percent
7 of global methane emissions, okay? Methane emissions
8 may swell from behind dams. So, it looks like dam
9 power is not clean power. That's terminology we use
10 to describe it, but we're getting more and more
11 evidence indicating it's not clean at all. In fact,
12 it may be a worse polluter than coal or natural gas.

13 So we have a dilemma there, and I think the
14 solution, very simply, is for the people,
15 environmentalists, bite the bullet on their little bit
16 of gas -- you know, like electric car doesn't care if
17 it comes from Site C or if it comes from a natural gas
18 plant. It just plugs in and away it goes.

19 I think we ought to re-think the situation.
20 Thank you very much.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

22 **Proceeding Time 7:09 p.m. T51**

23 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GREGG (#0119):**

24 MR. GREGG: I'd like to thank the B.C. Utility Commission
25 for undertaking this review of Site C, for being my
26 audience here today, and for asking BC Hydro to be

1 more forthcoming with information regarding this
2 project.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Excuse me, sir. Could you please state
4 your first name and spell your last name?

5 MR. GREGG: Absolutely.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

7 MR. GREGG: My first name is Ian. My last name is Gregg,
8 G-R-E-G-G.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

10 MR. GREGG: I'm here as a ratepayer, as well as a
11 taxpayer. And I'd like to imagine a future where we
12 do not rely on dams or fossil fuels for our energy at
13 all.

14 But yes, we are a long way from this.
15 However, given the staggering costs of this project,
16 BC Hydro's current deferred debt of about \$6 billion,
17 Site C's limited ability to produce peak-period
18 energy, and the archaic method of electrical
19 generation of a dam of this size presents, I am not
20 convinced that benefits of this project outweigh the
21 costs.

22 I encourage the BCUC to devote significant
23 effort to finding alternative portfolios. I am so
24 embittered at the prospect of losing a significant
25 amount of arable and agricultural land to a project
26 that my children and our children are going to be

1 expected to pay off. I have more respect for future
2 generations than that, and I invite you to think of
3 them as well as we move forward.

4 With the advent of climate change, we can
5 expect improved growing conditions to shift northward
6 as historic centres of agriculture, i.e., California,
7 dry up and become unusable and unproductive. As we
8 look at this project, do not underestimate the Peace
9 Valley's potential for agricultural, food sovereignty,
10 and economic prosperity. The previous Liberal
11 government convinced many of us that mega-projects and
12 fossil fuels were the only way to get people working
13 and to build a future in British Columbia. Let's look
14 at the alternatives, please.

15 I'm beginning to think I know what the
16 1950s were like. Let's not repeat the same mistakes.
17 At the very least, be aware that B.C. exports a lot of
18 electricity to the USA. How much? An amount that
19 would equal about 90 percent of what Site C is
20 expected to produce. If we truly are interested in
21 producing more instead of re-directing this power, I
22 am happy to provide alternatives. Give us a chance to
23 propose them, please.

24 On the aspect of creating jobs for British
25 Columbians, I would like to be informed on just how
26 many jobs are going to British Columbians, Canadians,

1 and foreign workers respectively, and at what cost? I
2 would like to know how many fracking and LNG projects
3 would no longer be able to go through, due to
4 decreased riverbank stability. And how many of B.C.'s
5 jobs are associated with that.

6 As well, I'd like to know what industrial
7 possibilities are created due to the construction of
8 this dam, and how the natural gas and mining
9 industries stand to benefit from the construction of
10 this dam. I have yet to see a good reason for the
11 construction of this dam, and I am led to presume that
12 someone stands to benefit. And I'd like to know who.
13 It's not the river, it's not the fish, it's not the
14 forest. And it's certainly not me. And to the human
15 beings who depend on the Peace River for their
16 livelihood and survival, and those upstream who came
17 before them, the Site C dam is just utterly
18 disrespectful.

19 Thank you.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

21 **Proceeding Time 7:14 p.m. T52**

22 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MUTUAL (#0120):**

23 MS. MUTUAL: My name's Alycia, and I'm just here as a
24 taxpaying citizen and as a ratepayer. My last name is
25 Mutual, spelled M-U-T-U-A-L, just like mutual funds.

26 I just have a couple of short things to

1 say. To start, I just don't see why we're flooding
2 more arable land in the North when we know that our
3 climate is changing. Food security, which is already
4 an issue in the north, will become even more of a
5 challenge in the future, and I think we will regret
6 losing so much arable land, especially if we consider
7 the recent droughts in California. Good farmable land
8 is moving north.

9 Secondly, I don't really buy the argument
10 that building a new large mega-project is a well-
11 thought-out plan. New sources of electricity should
12 be localized as much as possible, in preparation for
13 moving Canadian society away from a grid-like power
14 structure. Building new mega-projects is the opposite
15 of innovative. It is archaic, and B.C. will get left
16 behind if it does not start thinking differently about
17 the future.

18 As a millennial, it seems obvious to me
19 that the world is going to be a very different place
20 in the next 20 or 30 years. And if I'm willing to
21 think ahead and prepare for this, I sure hope that BC
22 Hydro and the provincial government are too.

23 Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

25 **Proceeding Time 7:15 p.m. T53**

26 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is Rosemary Stephen here? Rosemary

1 Stephen? No. Agnes -- I'm sorry about this --
2 Powlowska. Sorry, Powlowska-Mainville, my apologies.

3 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. POWLOWSKA-MAINVILLE (#0121):**

4 MS. POWLOWSKA-MAINVILLE: Good evening, dear
5 Commissioners. Thank you so much for reviewing the
6 Site C project. It has been a long time coming.

7 I come to you as an individual, first and
8 foremost, as someone who has examined hydro
9 development for over a decade, both here and abroad,
10 and in Manitoba. I worked for Hydro myself. I have
11 worked for a First Nations negotiating team, so I know
12 how incessant the company works -- how incessant the
13 company is. And I worked as an executive lead in the
14 Manitoba Clean Environment Commission.

15 I'm also an assistant professor at UNBC.
16 However, I come here today as an executive director of
17 the Northern B.C. Public Interest Research Group. We
18 are a group of scholars, academics, grass-roots
19 people, organizations, First Nations, and communities
20 across Canada who are working together for a better
21 north, and better and more responsible development. We
22 also presented a submission on your website, so I will
23 try not to overlap.

24 To begin with, with great respect to BC
25 Hydro and any supporters, it is the position of the
26 Northern B.C. Public Interest Research Group that Site

1 C should not be built. NBCPIRC is not against
2 development, but it is against irresponsible and
3 unnecessary development. Site C is expensive,
4 incomplete, and heavily flawed, as you can see in the
5 EA documentation, environmental assessment. It is
6 destructive to the environment, to local livelihoods,
7 to cultural heritage. It is unwanted and unnecessary
8 as you can see by the applause. And of course it has
9 alternatives.

10 Site C explicitly affects local residents
11 and indigenous communities, causing local harm that is
12 not compensated, disrupting traditional livelihoods,
13 limiting local participation in decision-making,
14 failing to foster dynamic capacity-building, and limit
15 economic arrangements in the project. Some of them I
16 will address.

17 Yes, economic growth is often seen as a
18 means to development. But in the case of Site C,
19 economic growth is presented as an end in itself. By
20 increasing consumption levels, creating short-term
21 jobs only, and has the appearance of an economic
22 development in the north. But it is going to cost us
23 currently \$8.3 billion. However, having worked for
24 Hydro, I know that this is only the cost of the dam.
25 It does not include transmission lines, converter
26 stations, ground stations, access roads, logging,

1 parking, power station, ground electro site,
2 excavation site, rock quarries, deposit sites, burrow
3 deposits, construction camp sites, corridors,
4 campouts, start-up campsites, quarries, stock piles,
5 equipment holding sites, pipelines, lagoons, transfer
6 station, gathering stations, et cetera, et cetera.

7 Since the numerous scholarly documentation
8 can show us a variety of ways in which indigenous and
9 non-indigenous communities have been negatively
10 affected by the dam, and other dams across Canada and
11 abroad. Negative impacts in the social, economic, and
12 environmental realms are documented. I do not need to
13 state them here. It is noted, however, that negative
14 consequences tend to persist for generations. These
15 costs -- these are costs accrued to the dam that are
16 not foreseen. Alcoholism, trauma, suicide, loss, loss
17 of traditional livelihoods, hopelessness, problems,
18 floating human remains, all added to the cost of Site
19 C that is not in the environmental assessment.

20 We ask you therefore that you consider
21 canceling the project and I will provide you with some
22 reasons. Taken directly through the environmental
23 assessment which we have reviewed, actually, for the
24 purpose of this presentation, Site C should be
25 cancelled because, first of all, it will disrupt land-
26 based livelihood and farmers, local growers, and

1 indigenous harvesters. We are flooding an economy
2 that we have no idea how much it's contributing to
3 B.C. The adverse effects agreements associated with
4 Site C problems do not include clear explanations as
5 to replacement of some of these livelihoods. What is
6 the compensation? For example, volume 5 states that
7 work, for example, with aboriginal groups to identify
8 potential sites for relocation of medicinal and food
9 plants to compensate for areas that will be inundated.
10 That is a very interesting, if untested, idea to
11 relocate plants.

12 Can BC Hydro provide evidence if that this
13 type of system has worked elsewhere? Please, I'd like
14 to see that.

15 The second reason being, Site C will not
16 provide employment opportunities as predicted. Given
17 the scarcity of economic opportunities in the north,
18 hydroelectric development can be seen by some as a
19 rare economic opportunity that these communities
20 should take advantage of. However, most employment
21 resulting from the Site C project will be short-term,
22 employment generation will be associated largely with
23 labour-intensive construction phase. This boom and
24 bust nature of employment is known to be damaging for
25 individuals and communities, because after
26 construction ends, all these skilled workers that they

1 trained have nothing to do, and they are going to
2 leave. This is called severe social integration.

3 Number three, Site C environmental
4 assessment is severely flawed, and it should be
5 revisited. For example, in June, 2017, just this
6 year, the federal government is launching a government
7 discussion paper on the changes that are needed for
8 the EIA, because it's been so severely flawed. This
9 process is currently undergoing. Given today's
10 context regarding aboriginal rights, post *Tsilhqot'in*,
11 policies and current legal environments post-
12 reconciliation, you will see that if this was re-
13 written it would be a completely different document
14 and a completely different process.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Mainville, I just want to remind
16 you that the time -- the clock's reset itself now to
17 five. So, if we could get to a wrap-up, that would be
18 good, thanks.

19 MS. POWLOWSKA-MAINVILLE: Oh. Yes.

20 The Site C does not have any monitoring and
21 mitigation plans set up, and that costs us for money
22 that we do not know.

23 Fourthly, the Site C does not discuss any
24 intangible cultural heritage of the potential and
25 aboriginal right. The heritage report has no mention
26 of intangible cultural heritage and yes, treaty rights

1 are site-specific. But aboriginal rights are also
2 extending to cultures, practices, and customs that
3 have not been explored. Specifically to water.
4 Aboriginal rights are also on water, not just on land.

5 Finally, this is where I will conclude,
6 Site C is not based on best practices and continues a
7 disrespectful relationship with First Nations. For
8 example, the impacts benefits agreement in volume 5,
9 section 34, BC Hydro will offer to enter into initial
10 discussions toward an IBA. The offer lump-sum cash
11 payments, cash equivalents, special purpose funds, and
12 others. Why not revenue-sharing? Because of heritage
13 assets? Why? Is the heritage a river? It's not.
14 Why not? Maybe we should make it. How about rentals
15 on the river? Subsidized hydro. Provide free
16 electricity for First Nations and the local
17 communities. Do we even -- resource revenue sharing.
18 Devote a percentage of time for engineering and
19 construction companies to build up community
20 infrastructure, such as roads, communities, housing,
21 public facilities, water, and sewage. Have an annual
22 income assistance program for fishers and trappers.
23 Funding for land-based local language. Basically have
24 best practices. Even the Keeyask project in Manitoba
25 offers community a partnership percentage, which is
26 not the case here.

1 I basically just wanted to finish by giving
2 just a few recommendations, really short, I promise.
3 First of all, have a complete cumulative regional
4 social, environmental and economic assessment done
5 prior to any flooding, if it must be done.

6 Number two, as Michelle Connelly has
7 stated, a thorough study examining the economic
8 benefits of the region as is. If we're going to flood
9 it, we might as well know how much we're flooding.

10 Number three, if this dam is going to
11 build, we recommend to establish an independent and
12 multi-stakeholder committee that should be established
13 to conduct relevant environmental and socioeconomic
14 research that is at arm's length from Hydro. This is
15 needed before any documentation is signed and the
16 project goes through.

17 Finally, develop convincing mitigation and
18 remediation plans to minimize disruption. They should
19 be written, finalized and set up, not possibly will be
20 negotiated as is currently stated in the EA.

21 And finally, in an area of post-*Tsilhqot'in*
22 and reconciliation, First Nations and indigenous
23 communities must understand that they truly should
24 have a veto over the Site C project. Essentially the
25 damage that Hydro will do as past experience has
26 clearly shown will far outweigh the deeper benefits if

1 any that it may provide to the north. Perhaps these
2 are lessons to be learned today so that our children
3 can thank us tomorrow. Terminating this project is
4 the right thing to do.

5 Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

7 **Proceeding Time 7:24 p.m. T54**

8 We are at the end of our speaker list. But
9 we've got a little bit of time that we -- if there is
10 anyone else that wished to speak. Sir?

11 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LEE (#0122):**

12 MR. LEE: Thank you. My name is Norm Lee, last name Lee,
13 L-E-E. I'd just like to address the issue of whether
14 the dam is needed or not. I know in the news almost
15 every day now we hear more and more about electric
16 vehicles. Volvo and other companies making more and
17 more electric vehicles. And countries setting goals
18 and standards.

19 Well, in B.C., if we were to achieve 35
20 percent of our cars electric vehicles, that would
21 consume the entire power produced by Site C. And if
22 we were 100 percent electric vehicles in B.C., then
23 we'd need 2.8 Site C dam equivalents.

24 My second point, we often hear we should
25 use wind or solar and sure, that's a good idea. But I
26 didn't do the calculation myself, but I have read that

1 to produce an equivalent amount of power, you need
2 more land than Site C uses, for both wind and solar
3 equivalent.

4 Thank you very much.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir. Ma'am?

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HAVENS (#0123):**

7 MS. HAVENS: My name is Doramy Havens, D-O-R-A-M-Y, H-A-
8 V-E-N-S.

9 While perhaps currently outside your direct
10 mandate, I would request that this panel also consider
11 and analyze the ecological impact of the whole back of
12 water to fill the reservoir proposed behind the Site C
13 dam, on the major delta at the confluence of where the
14 Peace River flows into Lake Athabasca. This was one
15 of the major deltas of the world.

16 It affects Lake Athabasca and the Slave
17 River. This area was heavily impacted by the creation
18 of the Bennett Dam. And the people and the ecology
19 downstream were heavily impacted. And a further
20 holdback of water will virtually destroy this huge
21 delta.

22 Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

24 Okay. Anyone else? Well, I'd like to
25 thank everyone very much for coming out tonight, and
26 thank you for your thoughts and presentations.

1 They're very helpful to all of us on the panel. We
2 especially appreciate you coming out on a Friday
3 evening, on a rainy Friday evening. And we -- again,
4 we really appreciate it. So I hope you all have a
5 great evening and a really good weekend.

6 Thanks for coming.

7 **(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 7:30 P.M.)**

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FORGOING
is a true and accurate transcript
of the proceedings herein, to the
best of my skill and ability.



A.B. Lanigan, Court Reporter

September 30th, 2017