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

FIRST NATIONS INPUT SESSION PRINCE GEORGE

BEFORE:

D.M. Morton, Commision Chair/Panel Chair

D.A. Cote, Commissioner

K.A. Keilty, Commissioner

R.I. Mason, Commissioner

VOLUME 5A

SEPTEMBER 23rd, 2017 - Volume 1 Vancouver Community Input Proceedings SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOTTERELL (#0001)............... 6 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCULLOUGH (#0003)........................ 12 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCARTHY (#0006).......................... 20 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRYENTON (#0007)................. 24 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 MR. HAMBERGER (#0016)........... 56 SUBMISSIONS BY MR. AUGUST (#0017)............................ 60 SUBMISSIONS BY MS. PEACOCK (#0018)................. 64 SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MARTZ-OBERLANDER (#0022)..... 77

				PAGE
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	VANDYK (#0025)	. 89
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	PLASHKES (#0026)	. 93
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	DAVIDSON (#0027)	. 95
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	HEWETT (#0028)	. 99
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	WADDINGTON (#0029)	102
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	GRANT (#0030)	106
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	O'KEEFE (#0031)	107
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	ARMSTRONG (#0032)	110
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	ANDREWS (#0033)	114
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	BAK (#0034)	118
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	KULL (#0035)	123
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MS.	PHILLIP (#0036)	124
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	PHILLIP (#0037)	125
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	CHISSON (#0038)	128
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	WATKINS (#0039)	130
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	KROECHER (#0040)	132
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	TUFTS (#0041)	134
		SEPT	TEMBER 24 th , 2017 — Volume 2	
	Kar	nloop	os Community Input Proceedings	
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	MICHELL (#0042) 143, 174,	183
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	BELL (#0043)148,	176
SUBMISSIONS	MR	. MR	. INSELBERG (#0044)	152
SUBMISSIONS	ВҮ	MR.	DODDS (#0045) 155,	179
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	BLAKE (#0046)	157
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	BRUMELL (#0047) 158, 167,	185

				PAGE
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	POCHAY (#0048) 160,	175
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	KENNEY (#0049) 163,	181
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	WESTIE (#0050)	170
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	HALL (#0051)	186
		SEPT	TEMBER 25 th , 2017 - Volume 3	
	Ke	lown	a Community Input Proceedings	
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	PAYNTER (#0052)	194
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	VULCANO (#0053)	197
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	MARSHALL (#0054)	201
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	CAWLEY (#0055)	205
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	PETER KERR (#0056)	208
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	STEVENSON (#0057)	213
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	MICHAEL KERR (#0058)	215
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	NEDELEC (#0059)	218
SUBMISSIONS	ВҮ	MR.	LEINEMANN (#0060)	222
SUBMISSIONS	ВҮ	MR.	KMET (#0061)	223
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	LEERING (#0062)	227
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	MANNING (#0063)	231
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	MICKALUK (#0064)	235
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	NEAVE (#0065)	238
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	DAVENPORT (#0066)	241
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	COOK (#0067)	242
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	OSTERMANN (#0068)	246
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	LUCAS (#0069)	248
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	GORDON SMITH (#0070)	251
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	JOHNSTON (#0071)	255

			<u> </u>	PAGE
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	OOSTENVRINK (#0072)	257
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	NAKA (#0073)	260
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	THIESSEN (#0074)	262
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	JAMES (#0075)	265
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	BUCKNA (#0076)	267
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	STUPKA (#0077)	270
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	KERGAN (#0078)	274
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	SHAW (#0079)	276
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	SHEPHARD (#0080)	279
		SEPT	TEMBER 26 th , 2017 - Volume 4	
	Ne	elso	n Community Input Proceedings	
SUBMISSIONS	ВҮ	MR.	SCARLETT (#0081)	287
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MS.	BRAMSON (#0082)	292
SUBMISSIONS	ВҮ	MR.	CARVER (#0083) 296,	343
SUBMISSIONS	ВҮ	MR.	LOGTENBERG (#0084)	301
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	CHARLESWORTH (#0085)	305
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	WILEY (#0086)	309
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	MacKAY (#0087)	312
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	HARTLINE (#0088)	314
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MS.	LAMB-YORSKI (#0089)	318
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	MILLER (#0090)	321
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	OCKENDEN (#0091)	325
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	CRAIG (#0092)	327
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	BROUGHTON (#0093)	330
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MS.	DONALD (#0094)	335
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	DeKRUIF (#0095)	337

						<u> </u>	PAGE
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	SWITZER	(#0096)		338
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	GRAOVAC	(#0097)	• • • • • • • • •	341
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	RICHER (#0098)			342
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	THOMPSON	(#009	9)		343
		SEPTE	EMBER 29 ^t	^h , 2017	/ - Volu	me 5A	
Prince Geo	orge	Firs	st Natio	ns Inpu	t Proce	edings (af	ternoon
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	CHIE	F WILLSO	N (#01	00)		349
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	CHIE	F TSAKOZ	A (#01	01)		376
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	GAILUS (#0102)			387
SUBMISSIONS	вч	COUN	CILLOR S	OLANAS	(#0103)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	414
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	JONES (#	0104).		• • • • • • • • •	425
		SEPTI	EMBER 29 ^t	^h , 2017	/ - Volu	me 5B	
Prince	Geo	rge (Community	y Input	Proceed	dings (eve	ening)
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	DAVIS (#	0105).	• • • • • • •	• • • • • • • •	459
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	NOWAK (#	0106).	• • • • • • •	• • • • • • • •	461
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	GIESBREC	HT (#0	107)	• • • • • • • •	466
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	WAGNER (#0108)	• • • • • • •	• • • • • • • •	468
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	BACHMEIE	R (#01	09)	• • • • • • • •	470
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	BY M	R. LUNDQ	UIST (#0110)	• • • • • • • •	475
SUBMISSIONS	MR	. WIL	LIAMS (#	0111).	• • • • • • •	• • • • • • • •	479
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	CONNOLLY	(#011	2)	• • • • • • • •	481
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	EWART (#	0113).	• • • • • • •	• • • • • • • •	484
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	WERNER (#0114)	• • • • • • •	• • • • • • • •	488
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	CROWLEY	(#0115			490
SUBMISSIONS				("0113) • • • • • •		
DODITIOND	ВУ	MR.	EGAN (#0				493

				PAGE
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	ALLEN (#0118)	501
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	GREGG (#0119)	504
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	MUTUAL (#0120)	. 507
SUBMISSIONS	MS	. PO	WLOWSKA-MAINVILLE (#0121)	. 509
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	LEE (#0122)	. 516
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MS.	HAVENS (#0123)	. 517
		SEP	TEMBER 30 th , 2017 - Volume 6	
Hu	dso	n's	Hope Community Input Proceeding	s
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	JOHANSSON (#0124) 523,	565
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	POWER (#0125)	. 528
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	METZGER (#0126)	530
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	OKADA (#0127)	533
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	LONDON (#0128)	. 534
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	RHYMER (#0129)	. 537
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	ARMITAGE (#0130)	. 539
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	SYKES (#0131)	542
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	WILSON (#0132)	544
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	ARDILL (#0133)	547
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	BEAM (#0134)	548
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	LINDSAY (#0135)	. 551
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	SUMMER (#0136)	. 552
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	RHYMER (#0137)	. 554
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	SYKES (#0138)	. 556
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	WEDER (#0139)	. 557
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	BOON (#0140)	. 559
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	WEDER (#0141)	. 562

			<u>P</u>	AGE
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	KELLY (#0142)	562
		00	CTOBER 1, 2017 - Volume 7	
Fo	rt	St.	John Community Input Proceedings	
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	BOON (#0140)	575
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	LITTLE (#0143)	580
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	A. HADLAND (#0144)	586
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	T. HADLAND (#0145)	590
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	NEUFELD (#0146)	593
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	DARNALL (#0147)	597
SUBMISSIONS	ву	BY I	MR. MEIERS (#0148)	602
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	KOTTMANN (#0149)	603
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	FEDDERLY (#0150)	605
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	OUELLETTE (#0151)	610
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	ASHDOWN (#0152)	613
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	FOREST (#0153)	614
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	ROBE(#0154)	618
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	R. HADLAND (#0155)	620
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	McDONALD (#0156)	624
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	CULLING (#0157)	628
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	TUPPER (#0158)	630
		00	CTOBER 2, 2017 - Volume 8	
Fo	rt	St.	John Community Input Proceedings	
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	BOON (#0159)	641
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	R. HADLAND (#0155)	643
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	GOODINGS (#0160)	646
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	MORISON (#0161) 651,	713

				PAGE
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	CULLING (#0162) 654,	705
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	KOECHL (#0163)	. 658
SUBMISSIONS	ву	BY I	MR. MEIERS (#0148)	. 663
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	GUNVILLE (#0164)	. 665
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	PASTOOR (#0165)	. 669
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	HOUGHTON (#0166)	672
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	ACKERMAN (#0167)	674
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	JARVIS (#0168)	. 677
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	THORLAKSON (#0169)	. 681
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	MOTT (#0170)	. 683
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	A. HADLAND (#0144)	. 684
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	NAPOLEON (#0171) 687,	706
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	BOUFFIOUX (#0172)	. 693
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	SULLIVAN (#0173)	. 695
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	LONDON (#0128)	. 699
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	LITTLE (#0143)	702
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	BEHNAM (#0174)	710
		00	CTOBER 5, 2017 - Volume 9	
	Van	couv	er Community Input Proceedings	
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	BRYENTON (#0007)	. 718
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	CAVIN (#0175)	722
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	RUSKIN (#0002)	726
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MS.	CAMPBELL (#0176)	730
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	HUNTLEY (#0177)	733
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	STEEVES (#0010)	736
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	WELLS (#0178)	740

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

			<u></u>	PAGE
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	J. NAPOLEON (#0203)	829
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	KER (#0204)	832
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	BURGEL (#0205)	836
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	JONES (#0206)	839
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	DESROCHERS (#0207)	841
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	PERRIN (#0208)	843
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	MASSIE (#0209)	846
		oc	TOBER 6, 2017 - Volume 10	
Va	nco	uver	First Nations Input Proceedings	3
SUBMISSIONS	ву	CHII	EF EDWARDS AND	
COUNCII	LLOI	R THI	EVARGE (#0210 & #0211)	851
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	CORMAN (#0212)	878
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	CHII	EF ENEVOLDSEN (#0213)	892
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	McDONALD (#0156)	894
		OC:	TOBER 10, 2017 - Volume 11	
	Na	naim	o Community Input Proceedings	
SUBMISSIONS	ВҮ	MR.	LOUHIMO (#0214)	915
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	AIKMAN (#0215)	918
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MR.	STEBING (#0216)	922
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	BY I	MR. HATFIELD (#0217)	926
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	DESPREZ (#0218)	927
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	PAUL MANLY (#0219)	931
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	GARTSHORE (#0220)	934
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	RALPHS (#0221)	938
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	JIM MANLY (#0222)	941

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

				PAGE
		OCT	OBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12A	
V	icto	oria	First Nations Input Proceeding	s
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	COUI	NCILLOR WAQUAN (#0248)	1036
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	LEPINE (#0249)	1045
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	TUPPER (#0250)	1051
		OCT	OBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12B	
	Vic	ctor	ia Community Input Proceedings	
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	BOTTERELL (#0001)	1067
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	COSTE (#0241)	1071
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	SIMPSON (#0251)	1074
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	MITCHELL (#0252)	1078
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	GRAY (#0253)	1082
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	DRAPER (#0254)	1086
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	SAYERS (#0255)	1091
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	RUSSOW (#0256)	1094
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	DREW (#0257)	1097
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	SIMEON (#0258)	1100
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	VAN UYTVEN (#0259)	1104
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	PUTT (#0260)	1108
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	MEREDITH (#0261)	1111
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	VAN ENTER (#0262)	1114
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	GORDON (#0263)	1118
SUBMISSIONS	ВҮ	MS.	ROY (#0264)	1123
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	HOLLOWAY (#0265)	1126
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	MARTIN (#0266)	1128
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	MOSS (#0267)	1131
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	THORBURN (#0268)	1133

				PAGE
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MS.	JOHNSTONE (#0269)	1135
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	FIELD (#0270)	1138
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	CAMERON (#0271)	1140
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	NAJARI (#0272)	1143
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	ARNEY (#0273)	1148
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	BALDINI (#0274)	1151
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	THORNBURGH (#0275)	1155
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MS.	GREENLEES (#0276)	1157
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	McGUIRE (#0277)	1159
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	ENNS (#0278)	1163
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	HENDERSON (#0279)	1167
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	SPALTEHOLZ (#0280)	1169
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	STRANG (#0281)	1171
SUBMISSIONS	вч	MR.	SCOTT (#0282)	1173
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	TROTTER (#0283)	1178
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	EVANS (#0284)	1180
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	M. HADLAND (#0285)	1180
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	DELA ROSA (#0286)	1183
SUBMISSIONS	ВҰ	MS.	KEEGAN-HENRY (#0287)	1185
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	NELSON (#0288)	1186
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MS.	TUPPER (#0158)	1190
		OCT	OBER 13 th , 2017 - Volume 13	
	Van	couv	er Technical Input Proceedings	
			AN ENERGY ASSOCIATION OF BC	1195
SUBMISSIONS	ВУ	MR.	ROBERT McCULLOUGH (#0290)	1213
SUBMISSIONS	ву	MR.	MARC ELIESEN (#0291)	1233

	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 14 th , 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

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

PRINCE GEORGE, B.C. September 29th, 2017 2

(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 1:05 P.M.)

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon. Thank you for joining us as we open our first of three scheduled First Nations input sessions this afternoon, here in Prince George.

My name is Dave Morton, and I am the Panel Chair for the Site C Inquiry, and I'm also the Chair of the British Columbia Utilities Commission. today are my fellow Site C Inquiry Panel members. I've got Dennis Cote on my left, Karen Keilty on my right, and Richard Mason on her right.

The First Nations input session is part of the second important phase of the Site C inquiry. you know, we spent the first six weeks of this inquiry collecting data and analysis from many parties interested in, and affected by, BC Hydro's Site C The quality of these submissions was project. commendable. Many people committed a great deal to producing a quality submission within the short time frame that was provided. This affirms what we already know; that there are experts and affected parties who can bring us insight into the many complexities of evaluating the economic impact of the Site C project.

We have the task of making findings of this

inquiry and we recognize that our findings are better with your input.

The provincial government has directed us to examine the economic impact on BC Hydro ratepayers associated with continuing, suspending, or terminating the Site C project. Consequently, the purpose of this First Nations input session is for the Panel to gather feedback on our preliminary report and the questions that were asked in the Order in Council. I would be remiss not to mention that in accordance with the Order in Council, this inquiry is not a reconsideration of decisions made in the environmental assessment process, or by any statutory decision—makers or the courts.

There are copies of the executive summary of our report at the entrance table, and the full report is available on our website or by making a request through our office.

I'd like to address a couple of housekeeping items. I was going to introduce you to Mr. Bemister; he is -- you've already met him, I'm sure. He's at the back, of Allwest Reporting. He will help with the logistics of this session and the presentation, while his team will be recording and transcribing these sessions. There is live audio being streamed from our website at SiteCInquiry.com

and following this session the transcription will be 1 posted along with the rest of the inquiry documents on 2 that website. 3 There is some tea and coffee just outside 4 the room; please help yourself as you need to. We're 5 not intending to take a break during the session, so 6 if anyone wants to come in and out and get coffee, 7 please feel free to. 8 With that, we're ready to open this First 9 Nations input session in Prince George, B.C., and 10 please go ahead. Thank you. 11 SUBMISSIONS BY CHIEF WILLSON (#0100): 12 CHIEF WILLSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With me -- I'm 13 Chief Roland Willson of West Moberly First Nations. 14 To my right is Chief Lynette Tsakoza from Profit 15 River, and our legal counsel, John Gailus is here. 16 I want to start off by thanking the Dene 17 for allowing us to be on their traditional territory, 18 for this monumentous occasion. This is the second 19 time I've had an opportunity to present to the BCUC. 20 The first time was on a power line transmission. 21 believe it was the DCAT project. 22 It was, sir. I was there. THE CHAIRPERSON: 23 CHIEF WILLSON: Yes. Yes. So -- I just went blank. 24 Sorry. 25

We have a slide presentation, "As Long As

Rivers Flow". The title of the presentation is rather specific because it's part of the treaty. As long as the rivers flow, the grass grows, and sun shines is the caption for the Treaty 8 document, you know. So this is — what you have on the screen right now is the look — looking downriver from the Peace Canyon dam, standing on the bridge. And this is to show that fluctuation in the river that happens when they're holding water back, and when they're releasing water to generate power.

Now, first off, we have been very clear that we are not opposed to the creation of energy. What we're opposed to is the destruction of this valley. We feel that there is absolutely no reason to destroy this valley, the last 20 percent of this valley, in order to create this energy. We have written many letters, tried to have many conversations with the government and BC Hydro on the alternatives. We were one of the first supporters of wind. We have -- well, now we have four large-scale wind power projects in our territory. The first one that was commissioned was Dokie Wind, which is right in our back yard. A pretty massive -- it wasn't the first one built.

Proceeding Time 1:11 p.m. T2

Bear Mountain was the first one built, but

Dokie Wind was the first one that was commissioned, the first one that got approval in B.C.

Just to show, I'm not sure if you're familiar, but we just won a pretty exciting case where that's the Treaty 8 territory as it was presented in 1899 by the federal government to the First Nations that were in part of that. We are actually -- I'm not sure this is going to work, but can you see that little red -- that's the Peace River right there. Well, that's the Finlay River, that's the Parsnip River and this the Peace that flows over there to Lake Athabasca.

It's the only spot in the whole Rocky
Mountain trench where the waters from the west side of
the Rocky Mountains flow through to the east side of
the Rocky Mountains. It's rather special. It brings
all the warm air from the west coast through the
mountains. That's why there is prickly pear cactus
growing on the south banks. It's a pretty unique
climate up there for that.

This is the oral promise of the commissioner that was made to the First Nations to entice them into the treaty, the signing treaty. And I'll quickly read it out:

"Our chief difficulty was the apprehension that hunting and fishing privileges were to

23

24

25

be curtailed, and the provisions in the 1 treaty under which ammunition and twine is 2 to be furnished went far in the directions 3 of quieting the fears of the Indians for 4 they admitted that it would unreasonable to 5 furnish the means of hunting and fishing if 6 laws were to be enacted which would make 7 hunting and fishing so restricted as to 8 render it impossible to make a livelihood by 9 such pursuance. But over and above those 10 provisions, we had to solemnly assure them 11 that only such laws as to hunting and 12 fishing as were in the interests of the 13 Indians and were found necessary in order to 14 protect the fish and fur bearing animals 15 would be made, and they would be as free to 16 hunt and fish after the treaty as if they 17 had never entered into it. We assured them 18 that the treaty would not lead to any forced 19 interference with their mode of life." 20 That was -- the oral promises have been directed by 21

the Supreme Court of Canada to be included as interpretations of treaty now. This is what enticed the First Nations to sign on, in here. West Moberly adhered in 1914. I'm not sure when your dates were? It's was like '18 something.

CHIEF WILLSON: So the water is vitally important to the First Nations. Moberly Lake First Nations, or the West Moberly First Nations were located on the west end of Moberly Lake. Prophet River, Blueberry River, Halfway River, Doig River. Fort Nelson is located right on the Fort Nelson River. So water is a key element of survival for us.

This is an image -- on the left of the screen is the image of West Moberly, our community back in the early 30s there. Archeological evidence shows us being on the lake for over 400 years.

The image on the right -- I'm not sure if you guys are familiar with the book, Crooked River Rats. It was a book done about the Hudson's Bay Company and the trading and stuff like that. Well, my uncles were the riverboat men, the bowmen on those riverboats moving those supplies through the Finlay River, the Parsnip and the Peace River. That's one of my uncles there with the -- on one of the freight boats moving through Deserter's Canyon up on the Finlay River, which is now underwater because of the Williston Reservoir.

Part of the presentation that we did back during the joint review panel, the David Suzuki Foundation in conjunction with Global Forest Watch put together all the existing information on cumulative

effects. It's probably the only cumulative effects address that has ever been done in northeastern B.C. B.C. has not done one.

The BCUC -- not BCUC, the JFP, sorry, admitted that there is no information out there on cumulative effects and there needs to be some.

They've also addressed the fact that what they know of the cumulative effects, there's already too much happening.

What you have is, on the left, an image of existing human footprint, oil and gas pipelines, roads, stuff like that. On the right-hand side is the same image with the 500 metre buffer applied to it, which is a common practice done. You're not allowed to hunt within certain number metres from certain areas. If there's a person out there or a dwelling, you've got to stay anywhere between 400 metres to a quarter of a kilometre away for discharging firearms and stuff like that, so.

It shows you the intensity of what's going on up in northeastern B.C. that's never been addressed. It's the heart of the -- well, it's the breadbasket for B.C. All the oil and gas come out of -- primarily out of northeastern B.C. Coal. There's a couple million cubic metres of timber, lumber that's developed up there.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Proceeding Time 1:16 p.m. T3

Now we're the home of wind. Right there in that little open spot is where Moberly Lake is. So you can see what's left. Prophet River is north of this map up here.

Currently on the Williston reservoir, B.C. quite often -- and BC Hydro quite often tout Williston as being a recreational lake. It's a reservoir, not a lake. A lake is something that the Creator has made. This is manmade. And every spring this is what happens down at the dam, the Peace Reach. The debris that is still in the bottom of the reservoir and that drops in from the sloughing from the banks, because it's called a rinsing effect. Every time they raise and lower the waters it washes the banks of the reservoir and it continues to grow. It hasn't reached its maximum and it's still doing that. So you can imagine trying to swim or boat out there in this.

And the imagine on the right is actually my son and a friend of his back in 2007. We went up there and it was a hot day and they wanted to go swimming, so they crawled out over the logs and got into the water and were swimming, and the winds — because it comes through the Rocky Mountains, the winds came up real fast and they wound up being stuck out in that with waves and the trees were crashing

around. It became a pretty serious situation. We had to get them out of there real quick. And it was evident that it's not even close to being a recreational body of water. They have to dump fish in it to keep it alive.

about, the rinsing effect. That cabin is now not there any more. It fell in. But all along the sides of the banks it's -- they call it unconsolidated soils. It's just silt and just washes into it. When BC Hydro draws -- it's got a call for power and they draw down on the reservoir, these beaches appear. They can be a couple kilometres long and the dust storms that come up, they've had to move the Tsay Keh, not -- yeah, Tsay Keh Dene Nation about three times now because of the dust storms up there at the north end of the reservoir.

This is one of the big issues of the valley is that the soil moves, the land moves all the time. They're constantly having to redo the roads up there because of the sliding of the roads. The bank, just above the Halfway River — this is the Halfway that comes in right here. Right above the Halfway River, we're looking downstream, this whole bank dropped into the river and it changed the actual channel of the river

now. And it's an ongoing thing that's happening.

Right at the site, at the Site C construction site

they have two stress factors that have happened and

they've had multiple slides that have happened right

on site. This will, if it's flooded, the valley is

flooded, it's going to continue to happen. It's going

to intensify.

So there's nothing clean or green about large-scale hydrologic reservoirs. They are renewable but -- to an extent, but they're not clean or green.

What we have is an image on the left is bow trout spawning in one of the tributaries on the Peace River. I believe this is Carbon Creek. And my son, that's his first fish. That's my son sitting in the back over here. That was one of his first fish he caught. It was a seven pound Dolly Varden. We couldn't eat him. We would have let it go but he snagged it so much hard on the hook that it damaged his jaw so we had to keep it. But, you know, that was my first — his first fishing experience was having to throw a fish back, right? You know, typically in our culture we would take that back and feed the family, but in this situation we threw it in the garbage, right, because we don't want to eat it because of the mercury issue that's happening up there.

And part of that was this study that we

did. There has been no study from the B.C. government or BC Hydro up until recently on mercury contamination in the fish. What they do have is this is a caption out of the British Columbia Fish and Wildlife Regulations. And it's in there today still. Mercury 1, mercury levels in the lake trout, bow trout, Dolly Varden, from the Williston Lake and its tributaries and in lake trout from Pinchi Lake may be high.

Normal consumption is not a significant hazard to human health but high consumption may be. So they recognize that there is an issue with the mercury in the fish, which is in the Williston reservoir.

We did a study a number of years ago and have identified these red lines are all the tributaries that are connected to the Williston reservoir where fish, where they stock is a natural barrier. There's a waterfall or something that they can't get beyond.

Proceeding Time 1:22 p.m. T04

So those, that's the level of exposure that we have to fish. And down here at the end, this is the Peace Canyon, W.A.C. Bennett Dam. So that theoretically is the stop point. But whatever goes through the dam then goes into the Dinosaur Reservoir, and then the fish in the Dinosaur Reservoir eat those. We've never done a study on the Peace River. We

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

haven't done it. That's our -- we're hoping to do it. And the reason why this is important is because this is my family. This is our family, and we've done an annual fish count for over 50 years on the Crooked River, which is a tributary that goes into the Parsnip River.

And we were sitting around discussing the mercury levels in the fish in the Williston Reservoir, and one of the elders that was sitting there said, "Well, this river connects to the Williston Reservoir. So the fish that we're catching here, are coming from the Williston Reservoir, aren't they?" And nobody thought about that. And we thought, well, that's probably it, because these big fish follow the -they're called -- we call them "shiners". little fish. They spawn and these ones follow them up, and we catch these ones there. That fish, that's That will -- you know, we'll can a cousin of mine. That probably went on the barbeque it, we'll dry it. out there at camp and fed everybody out there at the camp. We would have ate probably a dozen of them out there, you know.

So, what do you consider normal levels of consumption, and what do you consider high levels of consumption?

No one has ever sent us a notice or

anything to the Nations about the issuance of the warning of mercury. There's never been a discussion with us on it. We've had to dig all this information up ourselves out there.

So our study, this shows you where this is -- this is the Williston Reservoir, that's the Peace arm. W.A.C. Bennett Dam is here. And this is the Crooked River down here. So we -- this is the picture that I just showed you of the camp; that's one spot, and this is the second spot on the Crooked River.

So we applied for funding, we got some funding to do a study. And our study showed we caught 65 fish. And of the 65 fish, all but one, two, three, four -- four of them -- oh, five. Fell underneath this 0.2. Now there's two levels here that are identified. 0.2 is personal consumption, and 0.5 is the commercial consumption. I don't know why there's a difference; why there would be a difference between somebody -- me eating the fish, or me selling the fish to somebody. I don't understand that.

But this is where -- in front of you, I handed out two Hershey Kisses. So 0.2 somewhat represents these two little Hershey Kisses of consumption. A woman of child-bearing age, or young children, should not ingest more than that level. That's what our treaty right has been reduced to

already, in the Williston Reservoir. No forced interference, we were promised.

Some of these levels -- and these, you'll hear from certain scientists that only the big fish have the mercury. They argue -- BC Hydro argues that the mercury levels should be diminishing in the Williston Reservoir. But this study shows that they aren't. All the fish that we tested had mercury in them, not just the big ones. The little ones even had mercury in them. So their numbers, or their facts, are a little askew.

And it's BC Hydro, in light of what we did, in response to what we did here, ran their own study out there, and they hired their own fisheries biologist. And we're just -- I think we're just getting the results of that now. So, again, this is my son. I use him as a guinea pig.

This was our first fly fishing experience with him. We were out on the Sukunka River. It's away from where Site C is, and W.A.C. Bennett Dam is, and we thought we were pretty safe. And so he caught a little rainbow and a northern pike on a fly rod. And we showed him how to get it.

Proceeding Time 1:11 p.m. T2

I showed him how to take care of it and when we went to leave I drove across the bridge and

turned around and on the backside of a tree there was a sign hanging there, and it just caught me out of curiousity. Why would somebody hammer a sign on the backside of a tree in a pullout. You'd want it on the inside.

So I went over to take a look at it and this sign was there. You know, "The concentration of selenium in the waters of Blind Creek is above the Canadian drinking water guidelines." What does that mean? Is it safe right?

So we had no idea. This is a notice from one of the coal mines that's operating there and the runoff from the coal mines is selenium and it goes into the river. You know, it's called solution by dilution. They dump it into the river and get rid of it.

Moberly Lake. We are under, actually, conservation.
Only a couple of things that interfere with treaty
rights and our ability to harvest. Conservation is
one of them, and safety is one of the other ones. So
when a species get to a point where they have to
actually intervene and put in conservation measures,
we have to then abide by it. So right now, the lake
that we've lived on for over 400 years, we are not
supposed to be fishing the lake trout out of it.

Now, the lake trout are the preferred fish. They are like -- we're not a salmon culture. We don't have salmon in the Arctic watershed where we are. But the bow trout, the Dolly Varden and the lake trout, are comparable to salmon. They are large, there's a lot of fat in them, they're good to eat. And a big fish will feed a family for quite a while.

Grizzly bear, buffalo, mountain sheep, goats, they are all on their way to being threatened. Or they are probably listed now on the south Peace. The lake trout are being extirpated. B.C. -- we found out why they are being extirpated is that B.C. ran a commercial fishery off of Moberly Lake and Guillam Lake in the early '50s to help with the war effort during World War II, to feed the troops overseas.

Oil and gas has polluted the water and contaminated moose. That was another study that we had. Edible plants, medicinal plants, constantly being sprayed by BC Hydro, Canfor, oil and gas. Ecosystem based study that we did on the upper Moberly watershed that the upper Moberly watershed is no longer culturally sustainable up there.

So everything in the news today is about caribou. So, in -- when did they go to full pool?

1969? They went to full pool on the Williston

Reservoir.

1 MR. GAILUS: '67.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

2 CHIEF WILLSON: '67?

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, what --

The full pool on Williston Reservoir. CHIEF WILLSON: when they flooded Williston Reservoir it fragmented the caribou migration pattern up there, and this is documented by the province and biologists. It created a northern population and a southern population of Now, we did another study called, "I want to caribou. eat caribou before I die", and we talked about how we used caribou in our culture, and they were one of the primary staples of our diet. They were like the fish in the rivers. They were a convenient food. you needed food, if you couldn't find your preferred food, like moose, you can always go to the mountain and you can always get caribou. You can always go to the river and you can always catch fish. They were always there, you can always depend on them.

2014 -- I believe it was 2008 we went to court with First Coal and the province on trying to protect the Burnt Pine Caribou herd. Out of that we got this information. The population status in 2014 was 425 caribou in the south Peace. Now, after the court case we entered negotiations with the province and brought in the federal government and we're still currently talking with them about implementing terms

of SARA, the Species at Risk Act.

These caribou are identified as they were upgraded from threatened to the next level up. To being extirpated. We went from 2014 from being 425 to 2017 down to 207. This is after B.C. is supposed to have been implementing safety conservation measures on the caribou.

Proceeding Time 1:32 p.m. T06

There were seven herds in 2014. We're down to five herds in 2015. The Burnt Pine caribou have been extirpated. That's the one that we went to court over, trying to protect. We won the court case; we should have been able to protect them, but it was too little, too late for them.

The numbers on the Kinse-Za and Scott herd, they used to be two different herds, but they've combined them now because their numbers were so low. We actually started the penning program on the Kinse-Za/Scott herd. We went from -- I believe it was 13 up to 74, the last count this year there's been 74. We've been running a penning program for the last three years on them, and they have -- they're doing well. They're not out of the woods.

In order to have a sustainable harvest of caribou for every member of our community, and taking just a ballpark number of a family of five to harvest

one caribou to feed -- and caribou are very small. They're not very big. They're a little -- about the size of a deer. For a family of five -- we have 300 members in our community, so that's 50 caribou. The provincial biologist has told us that in order have a sustainable harvest of 50 caribou, we have to have over 3,000 caribou on the ground to sustain that. That's West Moberley.

Our next door neighbour, Sto:Lo First
Nations, they've got 1500 people. Profit River -CHIEF TSAKOZA: 287 people.

CHIEF WILLSON: Yeah. So that's what we are forced to deal with now. We have on our own decided we're not hunting caribou any more until we can recover them. So our communities have decided that they're protected right now.

Ongoing effects. The top image, and I apologize, these are a little graphic. The top image is a female cow moose. She was found at a sour gas well dead. She had been there for a week, and no animals touched it. Crows didn't touch it, coyotes never touched it. She just laid there. We got an autopsy done, and they couldn't determine what caused her to die. She was by all accounts a healthy moose.

Sour gas is one of those -- it's called a silent killer. One part per billion will knock you

down on the ground. And it does not -- it dissipates in the body tissue, it doesn't hang around. So if you walk into a site that has a leak -- and we can't prove that that's what it was, but we have no other explanation of why that moose just fell over and died.

The image on the bottom left is a cow moose -- a cow moose. A cow bison of the Fontas herd. The Fontas herd are protected caribou -- geeze -- protected bison up north of Dog River. This female got into a well site and got her head stuck under the pipes in a well site, and they couldn't get her out, so they had to put her down. This is an ongoing thing that happens.

The bottom right-hand picture is a young bull caribou that fell off the edge of the sample pit, the bulk sample pit, at First Coal coal mine, and died. There was only two left when this happened, and there was — the female that was left, left the area and moved. So that herd has now, according to the province, has been extirpated out of there.

This image -- the reason why I have this image up here is, we were in a long discussion with B.C. and the coal mine. And the coal mine hired a biologist, and a consultant, and he stood up in a public meeting telling everybody that these caribou need this coal mine in order to survive. He made a

public announcement about that. You know? And B.C.'s own caribou specialist argued to say that this mine would be detrimental to this caribou, and B.C. ignored him and listened to the coal mine company instead, right?

And we're not -- I'm not trying to argue that coal is bad. There is a place, I believe, for coal. But it has to be done in a way that's sustainable. You can't put a coal mine in the middle of a herd that's supposed to be protected. B.C. was breaking its own rules.

Our past and our future are all tied to our spirituality. Water is the lifeblood of every living thing. The Peace River is the main artery in B.C., in our area, that flows through there. All the other tributaries dump into the Peace River.

Proceeding Time 1:37 p.m. T7

Eighty-five percent -- 80 to 85 percent of the Peace is already taken out with W.A.C. Bennett and Peace Canyon. We are learning to live with those impacts. They're ongoing impacts. Continuously every year something is going on up there.

What you see here is an image of us looking upriver from the Peace towards those two mountains at the back. Those two mountains are the Twin Sisters.

Now, during the NDP's last term they created what was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

called the LRMP process, Land Resource Management And the Twin Sisters have been identified in that Dawson Creek LRMP as protected, spiritually I believe it's the only ones that have protected. been identified in any of the LRMPs as spiritually protected for First Nations. That's the headwaters for us. There's prophesies around the mountains. know, so it's like the blood flowing through your If you poison that blood you'll eventually die. You'll get sick. And if we're not careful with the water in our area, through shale gas, through mining -- we're already seeing the effects of it with methylmercury, with the caribou, the low moose populations that are out there. Because we can't hunt the caribou we have to depend more on the other species, what takes a significant toll on them. these fires that happened this year, all the people in those areas that hunt aren't hunting there. coming to our area and they're hunting. So there's even more of a toll on those things.

Findings of the Joint Review Panel,
cumulative effects were not properly addressed. The
JRP talked about that. The Panel's view that with or
without Site C cumulative effects, significant -effects significant and cannot be mitigated. Adverse
impacts to Treaty 8 hunting, fishing and trapping and

other rights as well as cultural heritage are significant and cannot be mitigated. Three species of fish that the First Nations rely upon will be extirpated. Those are the ones I was talking about: Kokanee -- not Kokanee. Bow trout, Dolly Varden. Arctic grayling is another one. And BC Hydro and B.C.'s solution to that is to dump Kokanee in there. Now, Kokanee are not an arctic watershed fish. You know, that's an introduction of a foreign species into our ecosystem up there.

Fish that remain will be contaminated in methylmercury for at least 20 years. That's from Site C. That's not talking about the ongoing 50 years of impact that we're having from W.A.C. Bennett and Peace Canyon. Now, they had said that in the Williston Reservoir that after 20 years the level should be diminishing. We're showing that we're not from the evidence that we have found. So, I mean if Site C is anything like the other reservoirs, I imagine it's going to be 50 years for them as well.

The other issue of this is it introduces mercury contaminated fish into Moberly Lake. The reservoir will flood the natural barrier that's in place. There's a set of falls there. And the fish in the Williston Reservoir -- or in the Site C Reservoir will then have access into Moberly Lake. So it will

have direct connection to the lake now. 1 The Moberly River? THE CHAIRPERSON: 2 CHIEF WILLSON: The Moberly River. What did I say? 3 THE CHAIRPERSON: No, no, just to confirm it's the 4 Moberly River. 5 CHIEF WILLSON: The Moberly River. And in the Halfway. 6 Found significant adverse effects on the 7 following valued ecosystem components: fish and fish 8 habitat, vegetation, ecological communities, wetlands, 9 rare plants, species at risk, migratory birds, 10 heritage and resources. We have a gravesite and a 11 sweat lodge located at Bear Flats. Bear Flats has 12 been a gathering spot for the Dene Tha people for a 13 thousand years. There's archaeological evidence in 14 place out there right now. 15 We're in a fight right now with BC Hydro on 16 road realignment. You know, right at Bear Flats. 17 their infinite wisdom they decide to put the road 18 right through the middle of the gravesites, right 19 through the sweat lodge, and right through everybody's 20 house that's in Bear Flats, the non-native ranchers 21 that are living there. You know, and that was 22 deliberate in my point of view. There was no reason 23 for them to put that there other than to get us out of 24 the valley. It gets the ranchers out of the valley 25 and it gets us out of the valley. So one of the last 26

spots that we have to use is we have to negotiate an agreement with the ranchers so that we can continue to access land that we have had for over a thousand years.

Proceeding Time 1:11 p.m. T8

Costs of Site C fall largely on the First Nations. Our ability to exercise our constitutionally protected treaty rights are irreparably harmed by the existing dams and will be of Site C. 85 percent of the Peace River in B.C. is taken up already by dams and reservoirs. Can't fish from the shore. There's signs up all over the place, "Destabilized banks", you know "Be careful, the river could rise at any time without warning." Fish are being extirpated or contaminated, caribou and other ungulates are being extirpated or displaced.

First Nations were unanimously against Site C at the issuance, before the issuance of the Environmental Certificate that was put out. After that, some of the First Nations figured they need to try and get what they can out of this because they thought it was a done deal.

We didn't -- nobody was in favour. Not one of the First Nations that have signed right now in our area have said "We're in favour of Site C." Signing an impact benefit agreement to try and recover

something does not mean that they are in favour of it.

You know, West Moberly and Prophet River, we were steadfast against it. There's absolutely no reason to destroy that valley in order to create the energy that they need. Right now, existing, there are two SOP projects that are approved for geothermal. One in Valemount and one in Pemberton. Between the two of them, if they were allowed to go their maximum ability, there's over 407 megawatts of power there, sitting there. That's almost half of what Site C could produce at a fraction of the cost and a fraction of the footprint of what Site C is. We could build ten geothermal plants in B.C. at a fraction of what Site C will cost.

Wind farms. Solar. You know, smaller scale run-of-the-river projects on Site C where you are not actually impounding water and blocking the river off.

We were never allowed to discuss any of that. B.C. made a decision to move forward with Site C and then they came and told us about it. There was no consultation. Consultation, in our belief, is the dialogue that happens between the two parties to get to a decision. You don't make the decision and come and tell us what you're doing. That's then called a mitigation program, not a consultation program.

The Crown promises no forced interference with our usual locations of hunting, fishing and trapping. The Crown has repeatedly breached those promises. Terminating the project provides an opportunity for reconciliation. This is the big argument right now. What happens when you shut this down? Well, what are we going to do?

Well, right now, all the work that any of the First Nations got is done. They got all the upfront clear-cutting, individual ground words, you know bulldozering and stuff like that. The majority of the First Nations are done now. They are off site.

If this project gets turned around, we're in a prime position to get back in there and help reclaim the thing and put it back to bed. So there would be a significant increase into the population. Not population, but the benefits to the First Nations on it.

First Nations are willing to partner in alternatives. We have agreements in place with wind farm companies in our area. We are talking with geothermal companies, we are talking with solar companies about opportunities. We've even entertained gas-fired power plants.

Every company that's operating in northeastern B.C., every oil and gas company is

burning natural gas right now, but they are exempt from the Clean Energy Act, and they are not recognized as greenhouse gas producers up there. And they are continuing to do so. There's applications right now in place to apply new gas-fired power plants. If they are allowed to do it, why isn't B.C. allowed to do it. Use it as a bridge until a new technology comes along.

Proceeding Time 1:47 p.m. T09

Use it as a backup in case -- when wind isn't producing, and fire it up. There's enough power at the Burrard Thermal Plant, if they refurbished that for a billion dollars, there's more than enough energy there. And they could run that as backup to everything else.

Okay, I think I'm done. [non-English language]

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

CHIEF WILLSON: There was a -- during one of the court cases, one of the judges had said, "Why is Profit River in this?" They're located way up there. Quite a ways away. And that was insulting, basically. Our communities come together, you know. Before we had cars, we walked. It was a way of life. They would walk from Profit River, we would come from Moberley to Bear Flats, and we would gather there, and we would gather in all kinds of spots along the Halfway, and

other areas. That was the way of life. That's how we moved around. And we got horses, and we rode them. People still to this day from Profit River are coming down and fishing at the Halfway River. Now we have a vehicle, we can drive down there.

SUBMISSIONS BY CHIEF TSAKOZA (#0101):

CHIEF TSAKOZA: Yeah, it was just like -- I was astounded when that judge actually said that. I was, like, wow. So, like, you've got to think, like, back then, like, how did they look at us Indians, did we just stayed on the rez, and stuff like that. You know, you need other community members and stuff like that to grow. So we had the family to grow and stuff like that, right? And there -- I remember when I used to take my grandma and them, my grandma used to pack her horses and stuff like that, and they -- she'd be like, why, I've got to -- we're going to go visit family and stuff. They would -- she would go all the way to Halfway and stuff like that, and a bunch of us would go with them.

But I mean, like, it's just -- that actually really was like -- I was really astounded, like, he actually said that. Like how do you actually look at us First Nations and stuff like that? Like, you know?

It's just like, you know, like modern-day

things. If we need to go somewhere and stuff like that, we're going to plan to have a flight, or a car. We're going to drive. We're going to get there one way or another. It don't matter. So, like, when we have family and stuff like that, we will make it. Like, we'll walk if we have to, or we will ride our horses and stuff like that. Back then and stuff -- I mean, I was just -- that actually kind of really hurted me that he would ever say something like that, you know? It's just like, okay.

So I actually wanted to stand up and ask them, like, well, how did you get there? Can you explain that to me? Like, so where do you actually live, and stuff? Like, you know, and I'm, like -- it just -- when we want to go somewhere and see someone, especially family, because family is, like, number one thing, right? And that's all we got is family.

So, I mean, that makes us, you know, want to see them and stuff like that. We all want to see our family. And one way or another, we're going to get there and stuff, you know? But that's how I see things and stuff like that. Like, it just — hunting, you know? We'll go hunting, take our horses and stuff like that. Now, nowadays, everyone's all modernized, right? They have quads or whatever, and stuff like that. But you know, it's the same thing. You want to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

26

-- you want food? We're going to go get it. to go and get it, actually, because no one's not going to bring it to you. So, I mean, the door swings both ways, and stuff like that, right? But I just -- I was just astounded, like, he actually said that. I was like, wow. But here's one of the -- one of our elders, her name is Mary McKanachaa. She's a member of the Prophet River First Nations, and she described traveling from Prophet -- Prophet River Reserve, south of the Fort Nelson, south and then west of -- through the mountains, then further west of -- past Arctic/Pacific divide. She said she marked all the trails known to and used by other people on the map.

Proceeding Time 1:52 p.m. T10

21 CHIEF WILLSON: Delineating.

deleting --

CHIEF TSAKOZA: I can't see it, sorry. And claimed in the western boundary of the treaty 8, being the Arctic/Pacific divide, she answered, "there was no red line on the ground over which she had travelled."

So basically what she was saying, and

It was looked -- it would look like a spider web.

would be like -- yeah. When it was pointed out to her

about that route as she marked and crossed a red line

stuff like that, how people try to put us as boundaries. My grandma used to always tell me, she'd say, "There is no boundaries." You know, she said, "It is not just Halfway, it's just not Blueberry, West Mo," and stuff like that. She'd say, "We have family everywhere." She was like, "There's no lines or anything." She'd say, "This is our home." And she would say, "You know," she'd say, "We walk over there. We don't ever ask permission, say, like 'Well, hey, Chief of West Mo, can we come visit you and stuff? We're going to come fishing.' No, we're all family." And stuff like that. One way or another and stuff like that, right? I mean, like, there is just no lines and stuff like that.

It drives me crazy when people say, "Oh, this is the Prophet River," or "the Prophet boundary." No, it's not. It's like -- can you tell me where is that line? Because I want to see it. We have never put lines on our treaty territory ever. You know, we're all family one way or another. We all got family. That's what I tell my kids. I'm like, "You got family in Blueberry, you got family in Doig and West Mo, Halfway." You know? And I say, "Through marriage," and stuff like that but it's just like -- yeah.

So there's no lines there and stuff like 1 And we walked -- or we rode our horses and 2 stuff like that to West Mo or whatever community that 3 we're visiting and stuff like that. 4 I do remember when I was a kid, my grandma 5 did -- she was packing her horses and stuff like that. 6 She said she was going to go and visit, make her way 7 down to Halfway and stuff like that. And yeah. 8 So thank you. But -- yes. 9 CHIEF WILLSON: That was a caption out of the Western 10 Boundary court case that just happened. 11 McKanachaa was, called them a lay presenter. 12 what it is? 13 MR. GAILUS: Lay witness. 14 CHIEF WILLSON: Lay witness. 15 MR. GAILUS: Paragraph 165. 16 COMMISSIONER COTE: Could I ask a question. Hopefully 17 you can education me. Increasingly as we've gone 18 through this period of listening to presentations, 19 this issue of the mercury has come up, and can you 20 explain to me -- my understanding is it's coming from 21 vegetation in the Williston reservoir. Particularly 22 what vegetation is it? Is it the trees that were just 23 Is that what's causing it? cut and laid out. 24 CHIEF WILLSON: There is lots of speculation on what's 25 causing it. Some of it is natural, that's in the 26

ground. But the problem is is that this particular body is now sitting on top of it and it's moving it around.

I know I used to have a -- I was in the forest business, logging, and if you cut aspen down -- and this is why pulp mills have to contain all their water. If you cut aspen down, lay it on the ground, it then starts to decompose and in the decomposing of that methylmercury is released in between the cambium layers, and that site actually becomes contaminated. So anywhere that they're using -- in the pulp mill that they're using deciduous wood, that's an issue. They have to contain all the water so it doesn't get off site. And then you have to reclaim it afterwards.

So there is millions of cubic metres of aspen in the valley, and there is new vegetation that's getting dumped in through the rinsing effect of the whole thing. So it's a combination of existing, that's already there, introduction of what's in the trees that's being released, and the weight of the reservoir itself. There could be a deposit of methylmercury somewhere. There's an enormous amount of weight pushing down and it moves stuff around underneath and it could be -- we don't know. You know. But what we do know, is that it's not diminishing. It's not going down, it's still high

after 50 years. You know. 1 Proceeding Time 1:57 p.m. T11 2 COMMISSIONER COTE: In the case of Site C, relative to 3 the vegetation part, are you aware of anything that's 4 been done different with Site C that was not done in 5 the case of the Williston Reservoir? In other words, 6 is there a difference what they've done? Are they 7 clearcutting, removing it all, or you know? 8 What their plan is to I guess log the CHIEF WILLSON: 9 whole valley out. That's the difference that they're 10 doing this time, is to log the whole valley out. 11 that still begs the argument why -- why large-scale 12 hydroelectric? I mean we're in a new age. You know, 13 we have new technology. Site C should be the last 14 thing we look at, not the first thing. If after we've 15 exhausted geothermal and we've exhausted wind and 16 exhausted all this new technology, every day is coming 17 out with new stuff, you know, that's viable; then 18 let's have a talk about Site C. Let's not jump off 19 the bridge immediately on Site C. I mean that's --20 all around the world they're taking large 21 hydroelectric dams down, you know, and here we are 22 talking about putting them up. It doesn't make any 23 sense. 24 We see what's going on in Muskrat Falls. 25 It's just, it's outdated technology. We should be 26

beyond that. Canada is supposed to be a world leader 1 in technology. We invested the Space Arm, you know. 2 We invented the polio vaccine. Things like that. 3 Geothermal is -- Alberta is talking about building 4 geothermal. You know, they're the most ungreen 5 province out there and they're pulling in, you know, 6 they're kind of embracing this new technology. 7 here we are running around like cavemen on this. Ιt 8 just doesn't make sense. 9 I would gladly cut the ribbon on a 10 geothermal plant to save that valley. 11 ridiculous. 12 Just to follow up on Dennis's THE CHAIRPERSON: 13 questions, the mercury studies that you were showing, 14 those were studies that you've conducted or were 15 conducted on behalf --16 CHIEF WILLSON: Yes. 17 And how recent were they? THE CHAIRPERSON: 18 Two thousand and -- 2012, I think. CHIEF WILLSON: 19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right, and does that show the mercury 20 levels in the water or is that --21 In the fish tissue. CHIEF WILLSON: 22 In the fish tissue. THE CHAIRPERSON: 23 CHIEF WILLSON: Yeah. Yeah, we were -- we don't -- we 24 eat fish. 25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right, yeah. 26

CHIEF WILLSON: Yeah, so we were trying to understand, is 1 the levels going down, or like where are the levels? 2 Is there an issue with this fish? 3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. 4 Right? So that was the study that we CHIEF WILLSON: 5 did. We want to follow it up. 6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. 7 CHIEF WILLSON: But once we did our study then our 8 funding agency kind of dried up on us. 9 Right, and there's no provincial THE CHAIRPERSON: 10 government studies? 11 CHIEF WILLSON: Well, BC Hydro commissioned their own 12 study right after us. 13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right. 14 CHIEF WILLSON: So I'm not sure. I think they're done 15 now with -- I haven't seen the report. 16 THE CHAIRPERSON: You haven't seen the results, okay. 17 CHIEF WILLSON: Yeah, so. 18 Also you mentioned, when you were THE CHAIRPERSON: 19 talking about alternative energy potential, you 20 mentioned Site C run-of-river. Is that something that 21 you or someone you know has looked into that? 22 assume what you mean is you still have a powerhouse 23 there and you wouldn't have the dam. Is that --24 CHIEF WILLSON: There were other alternatives that were 25 presented during -- that were eliminated out of the 26

discussion because of the dynamics of what Site C --1 they had to maximize the head of the river. 2 everything that they did, because of that decision, 3 said they had to do Site C in order to maximize the 4 head of the river. 5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right. 6 There was Site 7 --CHIEF WILLSON: 7 THE CHAIRPERSON: 7B? 8 CHIEF WILLSON: 7B. There was a number of cascading ones 9 right at Site C site that they talked about doing a 10 series of cascading. 11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right. 12 It wasn't 1100 megawatts. CHIEF WILLSON: 13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. 14 CHIEF WILLSON: But it still allowed the river -- there 15 was no impoundment of water. It was kind of a true 16 run-of-the-river on it. 17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right. 18 There was a number of other ones that CHIEF WILLSON: 19 were out there that they weren't allowed to discuss 20 because of that dynamics. 21 THE CHAIRPERSON: I mean 7B was a more Yeah. 22 conventional dam, but it was upstream from Halfway and 23 West and the Moberly River, you know, smaller in terms 24 of height and I think about a quarter of the power. 25 Right. 26

CHIEF WILLSON: We never had the opportunity to discuss 1 them. 2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right. 3 Right. They were just taken right off CHIEF WILLSON: 4 the table, saying they're not viable. 5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right. Right. A few nights ago I 6 heard someone -- at least I thought I heard them say 7 that the Williston Reservoir fluctuates up to 3 metres 8 up and down twice a day. Does that sound like --9 CHIEF WILLSON: It can. 10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, yeah. 11 Yeah, overnight it can go from being --CHIEF WILLSON: 12 well, 3 metres isn't -- yeah, it'll drop by that quite 13 often. 14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah. 15 CHIEF WILLSON: And it all depends. Right now, for the 16 last week, we can't understand why but the river is 17 extremely high right now. They're releasing a lot of 18 water and I don't understand. There's no call for 19 power, there's no demand right now, but there's a lot 20 of water being flown -- flooded out of the reservoir, 21 so I don't know what's going on. Like that's a lot of 22 resources being wasted, right? 23 Proceeding Time 2:02 p.m. T12 24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. 25 CHIEF WILLSON: The reservoir might be full, and they 26

have to -- instead of spilling, they might have to just have water go, right? But, yeah. And there is no warning to that, right? Like somebody in Vancouver decides to release water, and they flip a switch, and turbines kick in, water's flowing. You're standing on the shore up to your knees in water. You then figure it's time to go.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Right. Right. Okay.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GAILUS (#0102):

MR. GAILUS: My name is John Gailus. I'm a lawyer for the First Nations. I've been -- I think I've been on the Site C file since about 2011, 2012, or thereabouts. And I wanted to recognize the Tseh Kay Dene territory that we're here on today. I want to thank Chiefs Willson and Tsakoza for their presentation.

To give you a sense of the costs that the First Nations have had to bear from choices that were made by BC Hydro in the 60s and 70s, and now most recently on Site C. I'm going to summarize a bit of the material that we sent in to the Commission. I've only got a few slides. But I want to start with a quote, and I think it's in our submission. It says:

"The Commission therefore concludes that an energy project certificate for Site C should not be issued until an acceptable forecast

demonstrates that construction must begin immediately in order to avoid supply deficiencies and, two, a comparison of alternative feasible systems plans demonstrates from a social benefit cost point of view that Site C is the best project to meet the anticipated supply deficiency."

That probably sounds familiar to some of you. That's from 1983, the decision that you made. And I think that's -- you find yourselves in the same position now, although you're not making a recommendation to issue a certificate. But the same issues have arisen, in terms of your terms of reference.

This is what the joint review panel report said. Harry Swain was the chair, and there were two others, and I know you've got a submission from Dr. Swain on that. They weren't able to determine cost or need, and they said the proponent has not fully demonstrated the need for the project on the timetable set forth.

And so the timetable set forth was a 20-year time horizon, or 19 years. I think it was 2033 was the end of it. And then we said this about justification. Now, justification -- this was

justification in the context of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, 2012. But very similar to a justification decision that the Utilities

Commission would be called on to make. And he said:

"Justification must rest on an unambiguous need for the power and analyses showing its financial cost being sufficiently attractive as to make tolerable the bearing of substantial environmental, social, and other costs."

Now, we say, and in the PVLA court case, the federal court case, the Peace Valley land owners brought, the judge in that case made a finding that the panel had said the project couldn't be justified. Now, somehow he managed still to stay that the decision of the Governor in Council, the federal government, was reasonable in the circumstances.

But I haven't seen anything from either the federal government or the provincial government actually doing that analysis. They're saying that the joint review panel got it wrong.

They also made a number of other findings. There was insufficient review of alternatives to the project. This statement is always trotted out. "The project is the least expensive alternative." But that was based on a \$7.9 billion budget and a different

model. So in terms of the amount of the debt and equity, I think it was 70/30 or 80/20. And by the time the final investment decision came out, it was 100 percent financed by the government. And the project cost had ballooned to \$8.8 billion.

Chief Willson spoke about the serious adverse effects that can't be mitigated. And they recommended independent review by the Utilities Commission on the economic issues, something we're doing now.

And then finally, relying on export markets is expensive. I think we know this. The power may not be needed in B.C. until at least 2028, that's what -- that was on a low LNG scenario.

Proceeding Time 2:07 p.m. T13

So the environment approvals were made. We know this. But I think the fundamental issue that you're faced with is: Do we need this project? And the JRP is a good place to start.

And so under the low LNG scenario, they said, "You're not going to need any power until 2033."
But they were constrained. They couldn't consider existing resources. They couldn't consider the Columbia River Treaty, they couldn't consider Burrard Thermal in making that calculation. And we put this in our submission. You know, when you -- I'm a

lawyer, I'm not an economist or an energy expert, but you know, 1300 plus 900 makes 2200. Well, that seems like two Site Cs to me.

Things have changed. We've got a 2016 load forecast that's more pessimistic than the one that was put forward to the JRP, and Deloitte's review, even more so. It's our view, and I think this is shared by many of the interested parties, the project is not needed anytime in the foreseeable future.

Now, the province, the former government put forward a whole number of proposals, said, "Well, we're going to need it for LNG. We're going to sell it to Alberta. We're going to electrify the gas fields." And the latest one was, "All those electric cars that are going to be running around Vancouver."

I just want to address the one that's obviously the most important to the First Nations, is the electrification of the gas fields. Well, that means more impacts, more fracking, more contamination of the water, more GHG emissions, more transmission lines and further cumulative effects than treaty breaches.

So, if you can get past that question, "Do we need the project at all," then you can turn to costs, and I know that there's been a lot of submissions on that by a number of folks, but the cost

at the FID without a shovel being put in the ground went up 900 billion -- 900 million. 900 billion, god. Without a shovel being put in the ground.

Now, that was never disclosed to the First Nations at any point, any time. I'm not going to relitigate the court cases, but I think that's an important point, was they, even after the AC was issued, the Nations continued to consult with BC Hydro on alternatives. They said, "Well, what about this? What about that?" And it was always, "No, the project cost is 7.9 billion."

Deloitte's report which you have in front of you says somewhere between 1 and 2 billion increase if the River diversion date is missed. I chose the high-end numbers. And I think it's extremely likely as the contractor says they can't meet the target, and I read in the newspaper yesterday that they are shutting down their operations for the winter and laying off 200 people.

Can we get the cost recovery back? No.

You know, it's either going to have to be through
rates or through export. That was the *Times Colonist*,
so I don't know in terms of whether that's the best
source.

The project is 100 percent debt financed, no return on investment for 70 years. I think was an

issue that came up in one of the Utility Commission hearings. One of the witnesses for BC Hydro confirmed that.

There's a huge impact on alternative energy. The sources are price competitive and given the project's revised budget, they are less expensive and provide more benefits. KPMG did a report. I think they've actually done two reports for Clean Energy B.C. Deloitte's -- I think Deloitte did a very good job in terms of their alternatives review. And of course the UBC study that addressed this, and said the terms of the price of wind going down, that is about a billion dollars cheaper.

Clearly it limits the development of alternative energy sources: wind, solar, geothermal, run-of-the-river, biomass. We've got gas that exists to deal with peak capacity load issues and it doesn't make any sense to sort of have Site C sitting there as a backup for those times, for those occasions.

Now, one of the things that the First
Nations put forward was the Columbia River Treaty.
Well, why not use the Columbia River Treaty
entitlement? And in our submission we attached a copy
of a letter -- unfortunately mine doesn't have a date
on it. It was sent December of 2014. It was a letter
from the Treaty 8 Tribal Association to Ministers

Bennett and De Jong. This was just before the final investment decision. And I would recommend this letter to the Commissioners to read because I think that it answers some of the questions that come out of the interim report.

Proceeding Time 2:13 p.m. T14

And so, you know, we put this forward to BC Hydro. And certainly on a reading of the *Clean Energy* Act, the energy isn't produced in B.C. so therefore it wouldn't fall within that 93 percent.

And of course the current approach is they just sell it back to the U.S. I say 25 to 30 dollars a megawatt. I'm not sure what it is currently. I'm sure probably the commissioners have those numbers at your fingertips. Site C with a new budget, \$100 plus a megawatt. So why not repatriate that power?

The response was, "Well..." -- from B.C.

Hydro is, "Well, we can't look at it and, well, you know, the U.S could terminate." Well, it's ten years' notice to terminate the Columbia River Treaty. And while as Chief Willson said some dams are being taken out. I don't think the Grand Coulee Dam is going anywhere anytime soon. U.S. needs that power and certainly, you know, in Seattle and Portland and other places like that.

So I think the letter, the December 2014

letter goes through -- and I think in quite a lot of 1 I note that Chief Tsakoza and Willson are the 2 authors of that letter, but I thank they had a lot of 3 help in writing it from our consultants. But it goes 4 through and systematically pulls apart the argument 5 for Site C. And I think it's just as relevant and 6 even more relevant in terms of what we've seen happen 7 sine 2014. 8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is that part of your exhibit in this 9 proceeding? 10 MR. GAILUS: It's part of the submission. I'm not sure 11 which tab it was in in terms of our submission, but 12 it's definitely in there. 13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Thank you. 14 20-page letter. Now, I know that we're not MR. GAILUS: 15 here to relitigate the court challenges, but I notice 16 in going through BC Hydro's submissions they basically 17 said, "It's all good. Court cases have been 18 Supreme Court of Canada is not going to dismissed. 19 hear it. Don't worry about it. Nothing to see here." 20 So, I think it's worthwhile to tell you 21 exactly what happened, having been counsel on it. 22 the First Nations filed judicial review applications, 23 so administrative law proceedings in the B.C. Supreme 24 Court and in the Federal Court. It's a quirk of our 25 federation that if you want to challenge a federal 26

decision you have to go to the Federal Court, and if you want to challenge a provincial decision you've got to go to B.C. Supreme Court.

But they made essentially the same arguments. The decision infringes their treaty rights. The Minister has never considered whether or by by issuing this approval they'd be breaching their treaty promises. We said the decision was unreasonable based on the information available. In the provincial sphere we said that the fix was in. Like it was a fait accompli as Chief Willson said. The decision had already been made when Gordon Campbell flew up to Hudson's Hope to make the announcement and that the consultation and accommodation were inadequate.

Those applications were dismissed. And they said the Ministers weren't required to determine if their treaty rights were infringed, and that if the First Nations wanted to bring forth those claims they should be brought in a civil action. So a full blown trial. And we've seen how long that can take on — you know, frankly, on the western boundary, that took twelve years, and the only issue in that case is where is the line? So this would be a much more complicated case.

They also said that these are polycentric

decisions. We hear this a lot in environmental assessment. You know, the Ministers have to take into account all kinds of considerations, so deference is required. And they said that the province made good faith efforts to consult and accommodate. The appeal courts agree. But they went a little bit further, they said the Crown has no jurisdiction to determine infringement. And, again, you have to bring an action for infringement. And they said the consultations was adequate in the circumstances.

So the process that the First Nations got, the court said, yeah, that's adequate. The Crown fulfilled its duty to consult in those circumstances. Crown doesn't need to look at infringement. You want to go talk about infringement? Go bring a claim.

Proceeding Time 2:17 p.m. T15

Supreme Court of Canada dismissed the leave to appeal applications, but the infringement claims that the Crown breached the treaty remain unaddressed. None of the cases every addressed that. They basically said, "Go bring an action."

If the project is completed, I mean, we say the alternative energy sector is dead. Hydro rates will go up substantially. B.C.'s credit rating suffers. The surplus will be exported at a huge loss to B.C. Windfall to California and possibly Alberta,

and there won't be any reconciliation of the treaty rights of the First Nations with the Crown.

I want to make also the Panel aware that there's also costs of continuing litigation.

Blueberry River has a cumulative effects case that includes Site C that will be going to trial in March of 2018. Now, they tried to get an injunction against industrial activity in areas of critical interest to them. Areas that are also critical to these First Nations as well, and others. They all use the valley extensively and intensively for the exercise of their rights.

The interesting thing that the court did there is they said that the First Nation had established irreparable harm, and for the lawyers in the room, they all know what that is. That basically means you can't compensate in damages, but they didn't give the injunction because they said, "Well, we're not going to shut down all these developments because the trial is imminent. So take it to trial and then maybe you'll get your injunction. Maybe you'll get, you know, billions of dollars in damages." That case is out there.

We have the Western Boundary decision.

Chief Willson referenced the lines on the map. Now conveniently, B.C.'s position was that the line was

much further to the east and didn't include -- I don't think it included even the Dinosaur Reservoir. I think it was even further. So none of the dams, none of the reservoirs were included as part of Treaty 8.

Now, I drove from West Moberly's reserve to the Peace Canyon, down the bridge by the Peace Canyon. It's about a twenty-minute drive. I was speeding, mind you, but you know, say twenty to thirty minutes. Not part of Treaty 8 apparently.

Well, the court has now said, no, that's ridiculous, that the Treaty includes Williston

Reservoir, W.A.C. Bennett dam and as well as Dinosaur and Peace Canyon. Well, there's now a massive compensation claim for infringement and nuisance that the First Nations potentially have against BC Hydro.

The Site C court case has only addressed the duty to consult, and the First Nations were directed to bring an infringement action, and that action is ready to be filed, and it is the taxpayers who will be on the hook for legal costs and damages. And I think this needs to be part of the consideration in terms of the report you make to the government, in terms of the risks associated with going forward go beyond simply, "Well, we're going to have a cost overrun here because the river diversion isn't going to be made." And these are all important

considerations, I think, that the government is going 1 to need to grapple with. 2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sir, before you -- could I --3 I think I'm done anyway. MR. GAILUS: 4 Before we move to the next, can we go THE CHAIRPERSON: 5 back to that previous slide, please. 6 Conclusions or --MR. GAILUS: 7 No, the next one after. THE CHAIRPERSON: That one. 8 That's fine. MR. GAILUS: 9 So you said taxpayers on the hook for THE CHAIRPERSON: 10 legal costs and damages. Is that for all three of 11 your bullet points? Because I thought you said that 12 the middle bullet -- was it the middle bullet that was 13 BC Hydro? 14 MR. GAILUS: Pardon me? 15 THE CHAIRPERSON: So, are all three of these against the 16 provincial government or are some against Hydro? 17 So in the case of Blueberry -- Blueberry's MR. GAILUS: 18 case is against the provincial government and the 19 province has gone out and hired outside lawyers to 20 defend that case. Western Boundary would be against 21 And then Site C would be a case B.C. and Canada. 22 against B.C. -- I guess we bring Canada into that one 23 too, and probably BC Hydro. So, three sets of lawyers 24 on the other side, and then you know, damages if we be 25 successful on that. 26

Proceeding Time 2:22 p.m. T16

CHIEF WILLSON: One thing that -- for me, it doesn't make any sense, is no injunction, because trial is imminent. We argued right from the beginning, once we filed our court case, is that they should put tools down and stop. Right? Because the more they do, and if it actually stops, the more it's going to cost. Like, if Site C gets shelved, you know, that's an expense.

But they don't have to stop. They continue to -- right now, they're still up there working, right? And they're still incurring costs up there. And then they get to turn around and argue, well, it costs too much, you can't shut us down. And we don't get to argue that, well, you should have shut it down, you know, and saved the money on it. You know? It's an unfair argument that's out there on this.

And as of right now, there is no legal mechanism to protect the treaty, these treaties. They're pretty much useless. The promises that were made, no forced interference. If every company is allowed to go forward, and all we get to do is sue for damages, they can destroy what the treaty means, and all we get is some cash. You know, our way of life, our culture, you know, our spirituality, gets flushed down the toilet.

You know, I made this mention in one of the JFP hearings. If all it was was the right to fish, and not actually be able to go and, you know, teach my son the values of catching a fish, feeding the family, the spiritualness of being out there, the prayers that happen, that kind of stuff, I could sit in my house and fish out of the toilet bowl. Whether I catch a fish or not is obviously irrelevant. Whether there is any Dene-Za meaning to that doesn't matter to anybody. We just fade off into the distance like caribou. You know? We'll be images on the wall in some museum. Oh, you remember who these people were? You know?

And like it just -- it's that -- it's mind-boggling. Like, why did we sign the treaty? You know? We're the only ones trying to live up to the treaty. And it's not just about the First Nations. The treaty belongs to everybody. There was promises made. The honour of the Crown is at stake. Nobody seems to care on this. You know, we were trying to find reasonable alternatives so that B.C. could meet its obligation for power demand.

We were told to shut up and get out of the way. You're irrelevant. We're like lint in the pocket. Something to throw away in the garbage, you know? Oh, if there's an issue, sue us. That costs money. You know? Where are we supposed to get that

money? How are we supposed to get that money? B.C. and BC Hydro have big pockets, you know? They had no problem putting 25 lawyers in the JRP. They had three tables of people sitting in the JRP, just sitting there. Two of them were sleeping. They had pictures of it in the newspaper. You know? Nodding off.

The amount of resources that they dumped into this thing to fight us was unbelievable, you know? We're set on pop bottles and beer cans trying to raise money to do this, you know? And not grind this thing to a halt and tell people to go away, but to say, "Let's sit down together and find a solution to this." And the answer was "No."

We're the voices of "No." That's who we are, you know.

It's frustrating. It's hard, you know. I have elders that have passed away now, in this fight. I have elders right to this day that have to drive from Hudson's Hope to Fort St. John, because that's the business centre. That's where all the shopping malls are. And they have to drive through that valley and look at everything that's been done there. Every day. They have to watch that, you know. And that tells them that they're worthless. They don't mean anything. When their grandchild is saying, "What's going on here, grandpa? Why are they doing this?"

Proceeding Time 2:26 p.m. T17 1 Because we want to supply jobs to What do they do? 2 Alberta? 95 percent of the people that were working 3 out of there are from Alberta. The prime contract 4 that was issued for that, that person lived in Alberta 5 the year before that. He opened up an office in Fort 6 St. John and he became a B.C. resident. We lived 7 there for a thousand years. Time immemorial. 8 thousand years. Charlie Lake Hayes is sitting there, 9 have evidence of us being there ten thousand years 10 ago. And we're irrelevant. 11 So thank you for your time. You can eat 12 these now. 13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Not yet. 14 COMMISSIONER COTE: I think we're up for one question 15 again, to my own education. Correct me if I'm wrong, 16 Chief Willson, but I believe you made a comment in 17 your presentation earlier with respect to if this 18 project Site C were to be cancelled it would go a long 19 way to reconciliation. Is that pretty much what you 20 said? I'm sorry, it was a ways back. 21 CHIEF WILLSON: Yes. 22 Could you explain what that means in COMMISSIONER COTE: 23 real terms? 24 CHIEF WILLSON: Well, what is reconciliation? 25 actually haven't had anything to reconcile yet. 26

W.A.C. Bennett and Peace Canyon are an issue that we 1 have to deal with sooner or later. Site C, you know, 2 as an accommodation measure, we present it as an 3 accommodation measure. Let's let at alternatives to 4 this thing. And they said no. You know, so would it 5 be considered reconciliation? Yeah, I would think so. 6 Like, why wouldn't it? There's irreparable harm. 7 They've cut old growth forest in the Upper Moberly 8 They've just clearcut Eagle Island. watershed. There 9 was three to seven eagle nests on that island. Wiped 10 them out, completely gone. The wood is all piled up 11 on the island right now. How do we reconcile that? 12 What do you put a value to that? 13 The David Suzuki Foundation put out a 14 report. Frizel Moolan, Dr. Frizel Moolan made mention 15 of it during the Joint Review Panel. He couldn't 16 present it because he hadn't got the final numbers. 17 But he put together a value. He says in here: 18 "Over a 50-year period the central net 19 present value, NPV, was estimated at \$204 20 billion as that valley stands today..." 21 That's what the value of that is. 22 "...with a range from 83.7 billion all the way 23 to \$333.7 billion." 24 No one's ever looked at what the value of a 25

tree is standing. When you look at a tree you look at

the lumber value out of it. How many 2 by 4s can I cut out of that tree? Nobody looks at the fact that that tree is part of the ecosystem that is a carbon sink. It pulls carbon out of the atmosphere. You know. This was part of the Peace dividend piece. I believe they submitted, the Suzuki Foundation has submitted this into this process here. But it was one of those things of talking about.

What is the value of a moose? We know what the value of a cow is. You take a cow to slaughter, it's 85 cents per pound plus, you know, for butchering and \$1.00 per pound per weight for the animal that exists. So you put a dollar value on that, well, that's the value of a cow. Well, what's the value of a fish and medicinal plants? Rare medicinal plants that you can only find in this valley. You know. How do you reconcile that? I don't think that's an easy question. I don't know, did I even answer your question?

MR. GAILUS: Maybe just to pick up on Chief Willson's point, I think, you know, and it was on his last slide and I think it is important to point out that, you know, if we're talking about termination and remediation and as he said, the First Nations are well placed both in terms of the companies that they've got -- I think all of the First Nations have companies or

contractors who, you know, plant trees, move dirt around, but also have that traditional knowledge in terms also in terms of plants. You know, what's going to grow well here? What's going to grow well there? And those medicinal plants and traditional plants you harvest. That's not something you're going to get from one of the big firms in Vancouver or something like that, big environmental firms.

So, you know, terminating the project, remediating it, becoming engaged in a conversation about alternatives I think is where you're going in terms of reconciliation, you know, those three pieces.

Proceeding Time 2:30 p.m. T18

CHIEF WILKSON: Yeah, we have the new liberal federal government in place that have just stood up and said that they are going to fully implement UNDRIP. You know, FPIC, Free Prior Informed Consent. We've got the new NDP government and have just stated that they have full intention of implementing free prior informed consent and United Nations declaration on indigenous people, UNDRIP. And we, right from the very beginning, stated they do not have free prior informed consent from us to do this on that.

So part of if this thing gets shelved, I would imagine we would sit down and have those discussions about what is that.

I don't know if that answered --1 COMMISSIONER COTE: Between the two of you, you have. 2 Thank you. 3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Gailus, I wonder if we could go 4 back to the last slide again, please. I still have 5 another question. 6 So looking, for example, at the first 7 bullet point, do I understand you correctly that 8 that's a litigation that could be brought against the 9 province and if it is brought against the province, 10 there could be a request for an injunction on Site C. 11 Is that --12 No, no. So the first bullet, this is MR. GAILUS: 13 ongoing litigation. There have been two injunction 14 applications that Blueberry First Nation have brought, 15 and as I say, the first one was -- I think we were 16 trying to stop B.C. Timber sales from selling some cut 17 They said, "You need blocks. That was unsuccessful. 18 to.... The judge basically said, "Well, bring another 19 injunction that's a little broader, and so they did, 20 and then in that decision, the judge went through it 21 and said, "Well, you have actually established that 22 there's irreparable harm here, but I'm not going to 23 give your injunction based upon what's called the 24 balance of convenience. I'm not going to shut down 25 all industrial activity in this area because there's 26

going to be a trial that's going to start in March of 1 2018." 2 But that case, that case includes Site C, 3 So they've claimed, in terms of infringements 4 -- like when you're making an argument for a treaty 5 right, or an infringe -- you have to show particular 6 infringements of that. And so there is W.A.C. 7 Bennett, there is Peace Canyon, there is Site C, there 8 is a number of gas wells that have been developed. 9 There's a fairly extensive list. 10 So that case is much far advanced in terms 11 of moving forward next year. 12 THE CHAIRPERSON: The last bullet point, that 13 infringement action has not been brought yet. 14 could be brought and an injunction could be applied 15 for there, is that correct? 16 Yes. Yes, that would be an option. MR. GAILUS: 17 interesting. The judge in the Federal Court said, 18 "Well, you could just go get an injunction," and we 19 said, "Well, it's a little more difficult than that in 20 the First Nations context." He was a patent lawyer in 21 his previous job. 22 We made the infringement argument in the 23 context of the judicial reviews. We didn't want to 24 get a situation where -- there's this concept in law 25

called collateral attack. You actually have to attack

the underlying decision, you can't just go at it 1 sideways. So that's why the infringement action 2 wasn't brought in the first instance. We said, "In 3 our view, you could bring it in the context of the 4 judicial reviews." The courts have told us otherwise, 5 so you know, that's what we're dealing with now. 6 CHIEF WILLSON: You can't sue to stop an infringement. 7 You can only sue after you've been infringed. 8 the problem right now, that there's no mechanism to 9 stop them from destroying something, right? We can 10 only sue for damages afterwards. 11 But you can bring -- you could request THE CHAIRPERSON: 12 the injunction at the time that you bring that case 13 should you do so. Is that correct? 14 Yes. Yes, we could. MR. GAILUS: 15 CHIEF WILLSON: So after they flood the river and 16 destroy the valley, then what do you -- that's the 17 option right now. 18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Would you have to wait that long or is 19 it --20 CHIEF WILLSON: Well, that's what it seems like, yeah. 21 So the Upper Moberly watershed, that was one of the 22 injunctions was to stop them from logging the old-23 growth forest there. And the old-growth forest, once 24 you cut it down, it's gone. You can't replant it. 25 Like new trees will grow back -- oops, sorry. New 26

trees will grow back but it's not going to be oldgrowth forest anymore and whatever is in the oldgrowth forest, that ecosystem is gone. It's gone
forever. It's changed on that. So that's gone now.

That would -- I don't know, considered to be irreparable harm. That's one small thing. But you know, at the stage of they go ahead and flood the whole valley and destroy the whole valley. How are you going to reclaim the Williston reservoir? You can't reclaim that. And that's gone forever, that. You know?

Proceeding Time 2:37 p.m. T19

So what we're trying to do is find an alternative to not make that mistake again, you know?

I remember stories from Tsay Keh. We have friends in Tsay Keh and our friends in Suracha, and they remember waking up, and the water's at the door of their cabin, you know? So they moved up. They thought it was spring freshet, the spring floods, and they moved up, you know. They just packed up and moved their camp up a little farther. And they were waiting for the spring run-off to end, and they never did. The water never did recede, you know? That's —they even moved their communities. They've moved three times because of the ongoing impacts there. They've sued and filed. Inside of treaty — a hundred

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

percent inside of Treaty 8 territory, they sued BC

Hydro and them (inaudible) have got a settlement out

of it, on them. Right? You know, and that seems to

be -- BC Hydro told us, well, if you think there's

impacts, prove it. You know? So, we've got to go and

show that there's impacts to Treaty 8 territory on

that, and then put all that stuff together.

We're trying to avoid that with Site C. You know? That's the part that doesn't make any There's absolutely no reason for a large-scale hydroelectric reservoir on the Peace River. viable, more cost-effective options in front of us. In 1980, the BCUC told BC Hydro to go and investigate geothermal. They have steam vents, right? At W.A.C. Bennett Dam, you know. They've got a -- it's in the Hudson's Hope thing. It's a tourist thing. You can go there in the middle of winter, and, you know, boil water on these steam vents, right at the dam. know that there's geothermal capacity there. the wells that they drill in northeastern B.C., some 35,000 wells, northeastern B.C., they have downhole information on every single well. They know how hot it is down there, you know?

They have to worry that when they puncture into a certain zone, that the water down there that's boiling, with the steam vapour comes flying up out of

1	the hole, and does a blow-out on them. They have to
2	worry about that. They know that that information is
3	there, they know it's there.
4	They know that there's geothermal down in
5	Vancouver. Viable, really viable geothermal. Why are
6	we so resistant? I don't understand.
7	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir. Thank you. Does
8	anyone else have any more no, good. Is there
9	anything else that you'd like to
10	Well, we'd like to thank you very much. It
11	was a very interesting presentation, and we really
12	appreciate you taking the time to come and give it to
13	us. And, thank you. Appreciate it.
14	We'll take a few minutes break now. We'll
14 15	We'll take a few minutes break now. We'll come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come
15	come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come
15 16	come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come back at ten to.
15 16 17	come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come back at ten to. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:42 P.M.)
15 16 17 18	come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come back at ten to. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:42 P.M.) (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 3:00 P.M.) T20
15 16 17 18 19	come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come back at ten to. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:42 P.M.) (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 3:00 P.M.) THE CHAIRPERSON: Shall we continue, please?
15 16 17 18 19 20	come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come back at ten to. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:42 P.M.) (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 3:00 P.M.) THE CHAIRPERSON: Shall we continue, please? MR. JONES: Certainly.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come back at ten to. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:42 P.M.) (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 3:00 P.M.) THE CHAIRPERSON: Shall we continue, please? MR. JONES: Certainly. THE CHAIRPERSON: Or start our second speaker?
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come back at ten to. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:42 P.M.) (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 3:00 P.M.) THE CHAIRPERSON: Shall we continue, please? MR. JONES: Certainly. THE CHAIRPERSON: Or start our second speaker? MR. JONES: Yes. My name is Sean Jones. I'm a lawyer
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	come back in a few minutes. So it's 2:40. We'll come back at ten to. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 2:42 P.M.) (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 3:00 P.M.) T20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Shall we continue, please? MR. JONES: Certainly. THE CHAIRPERSON: Or start our second speaker? MR. JONES: Yes. My name is Sean Jones. I'm a lawyer here on behalf of McLeod Lake Indian Band. And beside

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

the traditional territory of the Tseh Kay Dene people.

In a moment I'm going to ask Verne to make some opening remarks and to provide some context around the agreements that McLeod Lake Indian Band came to with BC Hydro and the province with respect to Site C, but also to explain that these agreements weren't just with respect to Site C. The process of consultation that happened with McLeod Lake Indian Band addressed previous impacts both to the relationship between McLeod Lake, Crown, and BC Hydro regarding the development of previous BC Hydro infrastructure in the territory as well as the impacts to that territory, and the difficulty that would transpire if Site C were cancelled or suspended in unraveling that relationship that has grown and moved reconciliation forward between McLeod Lake and BC Hydro, and by extension, the provincial Crown.

So with that context I'd like to ask

Councillor Solonas to say a few words and provide us

his insight and his context on those impacts as

someone who lived through them.

SUBMISSIONS BY COUNCILLOR SOLANAS (#0103):

COUNCILLOR SOLONAS: Thank you, Sean. I'd also like to thank the Commission for providing us the opportunity to present today. Sean is the lawyer, I'm the councillor.

McLeod Lake actually is within the
Williston Lake watershed and my first recollection of
that area was in 1961 and '67. Our parents traveled
from McLeod Lake to the trap line every year. And we
had a cabin on the Kutlam Creek which intersects,
flows into Parsnip River a mile from the Nation River,
were the Nation river flows into the Parsnip River as
well.

And my first recollection was in 1961 and we were at the cabin. And I leave the cabin and I walk out to the fire. Mom's got a fire outside the cabin and it's maybe 30 feet from the front door to the cabin. And I hear a strange noise across the river. It's getting kind of dark, it's summertime, June. Late -- mid, late June. And a strange noise in the bush. And I asked my mother, of course, "What is that noise?" And she says, "Timber Wolf." And of course I'm five years old and never heard a Timber Wolf before and I said, "Well, what is a Timber Wolf?" And of course my sister voluntarily described it as a big -- like a big wild dog that eats bad kids. Of course, I think that was reference -- some reference to me perhaps.

Proceeding Time 3:06 p.m. T21

And I watched my mother, who was kneeling down cooking bannock at the fire, and she doesn't

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

appear too concerned. So at that point, I thought, "Okay, if she's not concerned then it must be okay."

And she also mentioned that dad was going to be home soon anyway, so not to worry about things.

My dad would take the boat, our boat, out onto the river. We had a boat and outboard motor, and his favourite thing was going out early in the morning, like, when I say early I mean 7:00 a.m., and go out hunting. And if he had to check traps, that's when he would do it. You know, so evenings spent a lot of time on the river. And that year, in 1961, my mom came to me and she said, "Oh, dad wants to start teaching you and your brother how to trap." brother being my younger brother, Richard, who was four years old. And his favourite thing was, when dad would go out in the morning in the boat, we'd see who'd wake up and whoever got to wake up got to go with him out in the boat. And if we were out in the boat for a full day, usually, so he had a history of making me sleep in every morning. So that way he got to go with dad.

But in any event, my dad took me -- when he -- it was my turn to start teaching me how to trap, and we found a location south of our cabin, maybe three or four miles up-river. And we picked the location, and he showed me how to set a trap. First

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

of all we had to look for beaver sign. Beaver sign basically is markings on the bank indicating beavers in the area. And we were taught how to spot beaver sign.

And I thought we picked the wrong location, because I didn't see any beaver sign. But I think dad chose that area because it was easy to land. Normally the banks are pretty steep and I think he had a concern that the banks were always clay, and if you slipped on that steep clay bank, you'd go right down to the bottom of the river and that's it. So I think he was concerned about it. So we picked a low-land We went in there and he showed me how to set the trap to catch the beaver, and then the next thing is, we had to cover up the trap with the leaves. then we had this red beaver caster all around to cover our smell. And so my brother Aaron always would remind me that he caught a beaver and I didn't. that was my experience setting traps with dad, and learning how to trap.

In 1967, we went back again. We were there in 1960 and 1961 again, and again in 1967. It's a big thing for the families. My dad had to land the boat in 1967. He didn't have a boat, so he borrowed Harry Tupperwait's boat. Harry Tupperwait owned a store and gas station, a café and gas station at McLeod Lake.

And it was a lot of preparation, a month of collecting goods, like sugar, tea, flour, rice, stuff that would last when you're on the trap line. Because once you go in there, you'd be gone for two months and the only way we could get to the trap line in 1960, '61, '67, was -- 1960 and '61 was by boat.

In 1967 things were beginning to change dramatically already. We could actually drive right to the cabin and we drove that -- the first time we went to the cabin, mom said, "Well, oh, we're going to borrow Max's car." And I said, "For what?" And she said, "Well, we're going to drive to the cabin." And I said, "There's no road to the cabin." And she said, "Yeah, there is now."

Proceeding Time 3:11 p.m. T22

So, I mean, there was a road right to our cabin in -- and I remember I feel asleep, I was 11 years old, 1967, and we get to the cabin, and car stops and I'd wake up and I jump out. And I was just absolutely amazed because I never knew there was a hill behind our cabin. There was so much trees all around our cabin and my dad, I guess he used to go strike out on his own, go for a walk behind the cabin. What I didn't know was there was a huge hill he had to climb to get to leave the basin and to -- when he was heading east, and I never knew that hill was there

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

until we got there in 1967 and all the trees were cut down all around our cabin. And all the trees were cut down everywhere you look in 1967, and it was -- yeah, it was completely different from what I remember as a child.

In 1967 my dad and my uncle worked for BC Hydro on the Nation River and they were felling trees prior to -- they were trying to -- government and the company were trying to get all the trees out before So Mom and all us kids and our auntie we the flood. stayed at the cabin, and my dad and my uncle camped up on the Nation River and every morning they would get up and they'd go to work, and Mom and us we would hang around the cabin. And on one occasion our oldest brother, he was 15 and I was 11, my brother Richard was 10 and our other brother he was 8, and we took our dad's boat upriver for the day and we went fishing. And at the end when we came home we had over 20 fish in the boat, a lot of Arctic grayling and some trout and some dollies. Mostly trout and Arctic grayling. Tonnes of Arctic grayling. And I thought, oh great, we're going to feed the family for three or four days now, and here when we got home Mom and auntie had shot a bear and auntie showed my mom how to make a bear That's where you cook -- you boil a bear -a moose intestine in bear fat and then you pull that

out of the pot and then you hang it over the fire and the smoke to dry, and that's got to be the tastiest thing I ever tasted was that bear sausage. And auntie is really super old school and she knows a lot of stuff and she showed my mom -- my mom was originally from Fort St. James and Nakasli showed my mom how to make bear sausage.

So we had a lot of food, do really well.

Never -- you bring the flour and with flour and some rice you can live the whole summer and we always had ducks and beaver, fish, moose, bear, whatever we wanted, like right there. That's the only thing we ever ate.

And so in '67 we left there and the next year I was at residential school and in April, and my -- I just came back from a walk on a Saturday, and I remember my cousin Gracie, who is older than I, she was standing next to the fire escape and called me over, so I walked over there. And she said she just got a letter from back home and her mom said that they couldn't -- so she said that they couldn't go out to the trap line any more.

Proceeding Time 3:15 p.m. T23

So that was the last time we went out there, and she said that her mom said that everything was flooded.

What mom told us later was that dad had received something like \$1200 from BC Hydro or the government in compensation, and so I always wondered like how come they compensated the parents but they didn't compensate the kids, and we couldn't go back there after that. That was the end of that.

A lot of the families in McLeod Lake area would continue trapping but by the '70s -- in 1975 I actually got a job in Mackenzie at BCFT and a lot of the young guys used to get their own jobs. The only they ever got a job was hitchhiking down the road, and none of the young guys ever ever trapped. We all got jobs in the mills and of course, our mode of transportation was now the car. And trucks. Prior to that, the only mode of transportation is by boat and up and down the rivers.

any of the Williston reservoir any more because that was all under water. And the mills had come in and completely changed the whole environment. There was a town in Mackenzie. I remember in '71 when I came home from residential school and mom said, "Well, we're going to Mackenzie and we're going to go...." When we were coming back in '67 from the trapline by boat, we got almost to Tuya Lake which is like ten miles from McLeod Lake by river and that — and there was a

bridge over the river which wasn't there when we went out to the trapline earlier in the summer. So we stopped at the bridge and dad started walking through the bush, and I thought, is he crazy? Like where is going to? And I asked mom and she said, "He's going to the Mackenzie townsite." And I said, "There's a town here? Like in the middle of nowhere? Like are these people crazy? Or what's going on here?"

So it was the first time I'd ever found out that there was a town called Mackenzie out in the middle of nowhere. And what I didn't know was, that country was all changing. There was roads. You could drive down the backroads. You could go out to the trapline and then there was a town in the middle of nowhere.

So by the '75, '76 all the young guys worked in the mills and none of the guys ever used boats. All the old people, the only thing they ever did was they used boats to get in and out of their traplines and hunt and fish, and the 1960s, 1960, '61 through the late '60s, by '68 it was changing like completely.

And all the kids that came out of residential school, not one of them went trapping. And we all went to work in the mills.

So my dad continued to trap even into the

1980s and I always sort of suspected the reason he trapped was because, first of all, that was the only thing he knew, but he really super enjoyed it. Like when he's out there, when we were out in the boat or down the river or up the lake, my dad always like going down the river in the boat and we'd go fishing and he'd just sit in the waterhole and just fish and that was his thing.

And then up the lake he'd be hunting, and so through the 1980s that's what why -- he kept up that lifestyle because he enjoyed it so much. And I always thought that the reasons that -- I always thought that my parents were the happiest when we were on the trapline. Like they were at their best and they fed us off the land. There was no stores around. And even in '67 there was a camp a mile up the river but there was no store.

Proceeding Time 3:21 p.m. T24

So we ate good because of the toil of my parents, my mom and dad. Even auntie. Auntie and mom shooting the bear and making bear sausage.

I came home in '71. '72 we moved to Prince George and mom and dad didn't work any more, and the only means they were able to feed us was through going through the welfare office, completely different. And I just thought, you know, I don't know why we left

that lifestyle because I always thought that was where they were happiest was when they out on a trap line an at McLeod Lake. Prince George was a complete different scene and they didn't have the education to get good jobs in the city.

But my dad moved back to McLeod Lake in the '80s and he lived there until he died seven years ago, and he continued to trap well into his sixties. And I always thought the reason he continued, he didn't — and he was a World War II veteran, he got two pensions, an Old Age Pension and also from the army. I always suspected the reason he went out trapping was because that's where he enjoyed it the most. That was where he was most happy. And that Williston Reservoir, 1967, that just totally ruined that whole northern country. That's the way the old people grew up. That's where they grew up and that's where they made their living, and after that nobody went up there any more. Nobody went up north of Mackenzie any more after '68, '67, '68.

And the only thing I have to say is -- the only thing I have to say in closing is really appreciate the time that the Commission has provided us to make this submission. And I know Sean is probably going to talk really a lot there, so let him go and --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

My position on the original Williston Reservoir and up, Site C is an extension of that. see the two as one and the same. Some people argue, no, those are two different projects. And I always said that no, they're the same project. And I know that things have changed dramatically for our First Nation, McLeod Lake Indian Band. We're very progressive and we do a lot of business with companies and governments in British Columbia. I just wish that there was a cleaner way to do things, where we could do things safely and we leave things intact as the way it should be. And that's the way it was. Otherwise we end up benefiting one group of people to the exclusion of the other group of people. And other than that, I'd just like to thank the Commission for allowing this opportunity and also recognizing that we're on the traditional territory of Thank you very much. Tseh Kay Dene. Proceeding Time 3:25 p.m. T25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir. Thank you. SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0104): Thank you very much, Councillor Solanas. MR. JONES: I think it's important to put Councillor Solonas' story in context and think about how the

of a community being displaced from its traditional

events that he described transpired. He tells a story

ways, from its traditional lifestyles. And through that displacement being unable to support itself economically, unable to support -- people were unable to support their families and there was a great deal of pain and hardship. And a great deal of that hardship came because there was no effort to reconcile the efforts of the Crown with the interests of the communities that were there.

And Councilor Solonas tells a story of the hardship they endured in the McLeod Lake community for a very long time with respect to the difficulties and the displacement that was caused by the development of BC Hydro infrastructure. But Site C, regardless of the impacts that it may create on the land and to the communities, provided a different opportunity, a different opportunity for McLeod Lake to work with BC Hydro.

And that's why today McLeod Lake is here to -- excuse me. McLeod Lake is here to confirm that it supports the continuation of Site C based on the agreements that have been put in place between McLeod Lake, BC Hydro and the provincial Crown.

And perhaps, the most important aspect of those agreements is that those agreements acknowledge the impacts that were created by the Williston Reservoir and past BC Hydro infrastructure

development. In that respect, Site C provided a turning point in the relationship between McLeod Lake, BC Hydro and the provincial Crown. And that terminating or suspending Site C at this point in time would unravel not just those agreements that I know that you have access to, the IBA, the contracting agreement and the tripartite land agreement, but would also unravel that renewed relationship between McLeod Lake and BC Hydro. And in that respect, would set back reconciliation between the McLeod Lake community and McLeod Lake Nation and BC Hydro.

That's McLeod Lake's first reason for supporting the continuation of the Site C project. The second reasons is that discontinuing it or suspending it at this point in time would be an economic catastrophe for the community. We have a community that's building capacity, that has been displaced from its traditional ways and it is finding ways to move forward, both by reviving and retaining its traditional ways, but moving forward with new economic opportunities. Site C provides that opportunity and McLeod Lake has entered into agreements with that respect to the Site C Project.

So continuing -- McLeod Lake comes out in support of continuing the project and wants to note that suspending it or discontinuing it, terminating

it, would unravel that process of reconciliation.

And it wants to note specifically -- I'll provide some key messages that I'll get into in more detail as we go through the presentation, that by reviewing the project, and assessing the implications of continuing, suspending or terminating the project triggers the duty to consult, and that thus far there has been no consultation between BC Hydro or the provincial Crown and McLeod Lake.

As I'm sure the Commission is well aware, that it doesn't have the power to effect that consultation. It lacks the remedial powers necessary and the order-in-council mandating it to conduct this inquiry didn't provide the panel with those powers. But the Commission can play an important role in that process by reporting that the Crown needs to consult McLeod Lake about this decision.

And when it makes its report, that the Commission must not just consider the financial impacts of the project but must consider how those financial impacts bear on McLeod Lake's aboriginal title, aboriginal rights, and treaty rights.

Proceeding Time 3:32 p.m. T26

And whatever decision the Lieutenant

Governor in Council makes, it cannot rely on after the fact consultation. That consultation needs to occur

beforehand. And particularly in decisions like this, where there is the Crown exercising discretion with respect to a decision. The Crown needs to consider how the exercise of that discretion will move reconciliation forward, or how it will move it backwards; whether it will advance it or whether it will impair it.

But most importantly, with respect to any decision to suspend or terminate, the Crown in making that decision can't leave McLeod Lake Indian Band worse off than it is now with respect to the agreements that it has negotiated in good faith and fulfilling the honour of the Crown with respect to Site C. Not just because those agreements pertain to the impacts of Site C, but because they're a part of the package that provided redress for the historical impacts that Councillor Solanas spoke of.

And with that, the Commission needs to note that when the Crown consults with McLeod Lake, and reaches an accommodation for any suspension or termination, that it needs to provide benefits greater or equal than the Site C agreements with respect to the monetary benefits, with contracting opportunities, and that any transfer of the land that's already been agreed to must also be fulfilled.

And with respect to termination in

particular, the Crown could find itself in the position of having excess and surplus fee simple lands now at its disposal. McLeod Lake Indian Band would expect that the Crown would honour its duty to consult with it regarding any potential disposition of those lands, in order to fulfill past claims.

That is -- those are the key messages that McLeod Lake would like to deliver today. I'd like to go through those messages in greater detail. I've provided two books to you. One is a rather thick book of legal authorities. I'll begin by going through some of the legal arguments around the duty to consult, just to flesh them out a bit. But I'm sure that the panel members are all very familiar with them. And I don't plan on taking the Commission, or the panel, through those legal arguments or those authorities in any detailed way unless there is questions about them.

The other document is an affidavit that's been sworn and provided by Chief Harley Chingee of the McLeod Lake Indian Band, who's not here with us today. But he speaks around the band's position and the impacts that have occurred, as well as the process for negotiating the agreements that the Crown came to with McLeod Lake with respect to Site C, and the historical redress for previous BC Hydro infrastructure.

So I'm going to start by talking about the duty to consult as it applies here. And then go on and talk about the impacts to the renewal agreement that BC Hydro entered into with McLeod Lake Indian Band before then continuing to talk about briefly the impacts that would flow from the IBA, the contracting agreement, the tripartite land agreement, as well as the impacts to the band itself and the territory.

Proceeding Time 3:37 p.m. T27

So, as I've mentioned, McLeod Lake supports the continuation of Site C. And that's primarily for the fact that it provided a key moment in the history of BC Hydro, the provincial Crown, and McLeod Lake Band.

McLeod Lake can't say that BC Hydro did everything perfectly with respect to Site C or that it's doing everything right. But it can say that Site C provided the opportunity to move forward and do things better. And it provided compensation in a way for McLeod Lake to be involved in economic development and move the community forward, and it did so in respect of McLeod Lake Indian Band's treaty rights, aboriginal title, and aboriginal rights. So now, any decision that could adversely impact those agreements and those accommodations that were provided because of those rights through those Crown agreements triggers

the duty to consult.

Furthermore, as the Commission is well aware, the Commission itself is not able to discharge that duty, and the Crown must provide other avenues for consultation. Regulatory processes can be relied on by the Crown, and we appreciate that the Panel is taking this time to gather this information and present that to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, and we would appreciate very much the Commission taking that contact, that information and that context forward to the Crown so that it can consult with McLeod Lake with respect to this decision. We ask that the Commission report that consultation thus far has been inadequate. The Commission certainly has within its powers to assess and report on the adequacy of consultation.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Excuse me, sir. Do you mean the adequacy of consultation within this process or are you speaking of the adequacy of consultation prior to this process?

MR. JONES: Yes, that's a good question and I'm happy you asked that. Certainly I'm not saying that the Commission in any way should assess the consultation that was taken up previously with respect to the decision to proceed with Site C. I'm saying that this process here, to review the Site C particularly with

the implications of Site C and to report on the -- a decision, to report on the implications of continuing, suspending, et cetera, that certainly in that process you would have -- you have the ability to report to the Lieutenant Governor in Council that if it were to make a decision with respect to your findings or respect to suspend or terminate at this point in time, that the consultation about that decision has not been adequate.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for clarifying.

MR. JONES: Yeah. Sorry, I should have been clearer on that point.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MR. JONES: It's important to note that the Crown, the case law has decided many times that the Crown cannot contract out of the duty to consult. That the Crown's constitutional always applies independently and regardless of the express or implied intention of the parties. And I think that's very important to have in mind with respect to the implications of the IBA, the contracting agreement, and the tripartite land agreement. Those agreements provide that Hydro or the Crown, within its discretion, could suspend or terminate Site C, and that if it did suspend or terminate those agreements, that that would mean that no further payments were due under those agreements.

And McLeod Lake accepts that but notes that that does not mean that those agreements fairly would constitute all the accommodation required at that point in time.

Proceeding Time 3:42 p.m. T28

But instead, what the meaning of those termination provisions is that the agreement between the Crown and McLeod Lake at that point in time needs to be re-evaluated and that there needs to be further consultation because the common-law duty to consult under the constitution prevails.

To make sure that that consultation is effective, the Crown must, at this time, make sure that it consults and uses the power that it has to ensure that McLeod Lake Indian Band is adequately accommodated with respect to any decision that could be made.

I'd like to, with that kind of overview of the duty to consult, and McLeod Lake's position on how it applies here, now turn our attention a little bit back to that history that Councillor Solonas was speaking of, and the role that that history played in coming to these agreements with BC Hydro and specifically talk about the renewal agreement between BC Hydro and McLeod Lake Indian Band.

I'm going to turn briefly to the affidavit that Chief Harley Chingee has provided. As I'm sure

you are well aware, McLeod Lake and BC Hydro had a very fractious relationship that was unbefitting the honour of the Crown for many years. Councillor Solonas spoke about how the development of infrastructure in the territory occurred without its consultation and consent or accommodation and the devastating impact that it had.

If you turn to paragraph 7 and 8 in the affidavit, Chief Chingee speaks about that. At paragraph 7 he says: Starting in the 1950s, BC Hydro began developing its core infrastructure in the McLeod Lake Band territory without consultation and without McLeod Lake Band's consent.

That infrastructure included dams, reservoirs, generating stations, transmission lines that forever changed the McLeod Lake Indian Band territory and McLeod Lake Band's ability to exercise its Aboriginal title and rights within it.

BC Hydro's infrastructure in the McLeod
Lake Band territory continues to have profound effects
on the community and its members including the ways in
which McLeod Lake Indian Band and its members exercise
their Aboriginal title and rights over their lands and
resources and their connections to their neighbouring
communities. Those impacts had a devastating effect
on the McLeod Lake Indian Band community and its

members, and the most enormous impact was that of the 1 Williston reservoir. 2 In paragraphs 10 and 11, Chief Chingee 3 speaks specifically about the Williston Reservoir. 4 "Williston Reservoir and other BC Hydro 5 infrastructure created profound pain and 6 hardship for McLeod Lake and in its 7 members." 8 And I think we saw Councillor Solonas communicate that 9 pain earlier today. 10 "Members were displaced from their 11 traditional hunting, trapping, and fishing 12 Trapping, hunting, and fishing in 13 areas like Cutham Creek could no longer be 14 The Parsnip drainage system practiced. 15 could no longer be used. Species like the 16 Arctic grayling and the caribou herds were 17 severely impacted. Moose were also affected 18 and became scarce. 19 Members could not trap, hunt, or fish 20 like they used to. Members lost the ability 21 to provide for themselves and the ability to 22 pass those traditional skills onto their 23 children. By the 1980s almost all members 24 had abandoned trapping. It was no longer 25

viable as a way to feed yourself, your

family, or as a way to make money. Families left McLeod Lake and moved to centres like Prince George.

The displacement from their homes and their livelihoods meant that McLeod members had to go on social assistance."

There is a profound history, a profoundly painful history between the Band and BC Hydro. The renewal agreement that McLeod Lake negotiated with BC Hydro with respect to development of Site C and with respect to these historical impacts, address this and try to reset that relationship.

Proceeding Time 3:47 p.m. T29

If you could please turn to Exhibit B of the affidavit, I'd just like to take you to that renewal agreement briefly so that you're familiar with it.

The agreement is dated for reference on March 30th, 2016. That happens, not coincidentally, to be the same day that the IBA with respect to Site C is dated. And the reason for that is because what I will call the Site C agreements, the IBA, the contract agreement, and the tripartite land agreement, were presented to McLeod Lake Band as a package. But before I get to that package I'd like to just set a little bit of context by taking you through a bit of

the renewal agreement. 1 If you go to the third paragraph, about 2 halfway through, the BC Hydro starts to acknowledge --3 COMMISSIONER COTE: Page 1? 4 MR. JONES: Sorry. You're on tab B. 5 COMMISSIONER COTE: What's that, what page? 6 2 in Exhibit B. MR. JONES: 7 COMMISSIONER COTE: I'm sorry. Okay. 8 Yeah, sorry. And it's paragraph 3 or MR. JONES: 9 paragraph 2 under the header "Purpose of the Renewal 10 Moving Forward from a Shared Past." Agreement: 11 third line, there's a sentence that starts: 12 "BC Hydro has listened to these experiences 13 and acknowledges that this historical 14 development had and continues to have a 15 profound effect on the community of McLeod 16 In particular, BC Hydro has heard 17 from McLeod Lake elders, leaders, and 18 members the ways in which their lands and 19 resources and their connections to 20 neighbouring aboriginal communities have 21 forever been changed by the development of 22 the Williston Reservoir." 23 BC Hydro goes on to acknowledge that it wants to 24 change that. 25 "BC Hydro deeply regrets these impacts. 26

will not repeat the mistakes of the past.

It is time to turn the page and start a new chapter in our shared history. Hearing these stories has fortified BC Hydro's resolve to forge a renewed and everlasting relationship with McLeod Lake that is collaborative and mutually beneficial.

The agreement is rooted in the joint vision that a successful future together will be shaped by doing business in a transparent, open, and integrative way that respects the distinct cultural values of McLeod Lake and promotes an economically thriving community."

With the renewal agreement BC Hydro acknowledged that it needed to do things differently. And it acknowledged that it needed to restore its relationship and "turn the page or start a new chapter" in the words of the agreement, with McLeod Lake. And this came at the moment that it was negotiating the Site C agreements. And it connected with those agreements.

If you go down to the bottom of the page, please, the third line from the bottom. There's a sentence that begins to explain -- it begins, "If McLeod Lake..." but that sentence starts to explain the

conditions on which BC Hydro will enter into the renewal agreement:

"If McLeod Lake has duly authorized, signed, and delivered the impact benefits agreement between BC Hydro, McLeod Lake for the Site C project, and the associated tripartite land agreement and contracting agreement, and BC Hydro has received evidence from McLeod Lake to BC Hydro's reasonable satisfaction that such agreements were the subject of a positive community ratification vote on or before July 31st, 2016, this one-time lump sum will be paid by BC Hydro within seven days after the execution of the renewal agreement."

It's clear that the renewal agreement makes the approval of the Site C package part -- makes it a requirement for BC Hydro to enter into the renewal agreement and provide the compensation under it.

The renewal agreement also takes about contracting opportunities. If you turn to what is page 4 of the renewal agreement, page 5 of the Exhibit, heading number 3 is "Contracting opportunities".

Proceeding Time 3:53 p.m. T30

And it explains in that paragraph that BC Hydro knows

that McLeod Lake has aspirations to continue to grow its business opportunities and agrees to provide contracting opportunities as part of this renewed relationship. And it specifically lists contracting opportunities in Appendix A.

If you turn to the last page of the renewal agreement, Appendix A, under paragraph (b), the last item specifically lists Site C.

So it's important to understand in this context that the honour of the Crown here is engaged in a much larger sense than just specific to the Site C agreements. But to the entire historical relationship between BC Hydro and the steps that have been recently taken to reset that agreement, and that suspending or terminating the project would unravel that progress.

coming to the renewal agreement was not easy for McLeod Lake, and I'd like to take you back to the affidavit for a moment or two, to paragraph 15, so that we can hear a little bit more about that process and the difficulties that it created for the band.

Paragraph 15:

"Approving the renewal agreement was difficult for McLeod Lake Indian Band. The first time the renewal agreement had to be put to the community, it was rejected. It

was only after negotiations for other agreements associated with Site C had advanced that McLeod Lake Indian Band was able to put the renewal agreement before the members again."

Paragraph 16, the Chief goes on to explain that, as the renewal agreement required McLeod Lake Indian Band to approve and execute the IBA, the contracting agreement and the tripartite land agreement, McLeod Lake Indian Band considered all those agreements during the community ratification process. The McLeod Lake Indian Band, the renewal agreement and the Site C agreements are a package of accommodation intended to address past impacts and in particular the impact of the Williston Reservoir as well as the impacts that would be created by Site C.

In determining if the renewal agreement was acceptable, McLeod Lake Indian Band weighed not just the benefit of the combination measures contained within it, but also the aggregate of the benefit and accommodation measures in the Site C agreements.

McLeod Lake would not have entered into the renewal agreement if the associated benefits created by the Site C agreement were not part of the package.

McLeod Lake Indian Band considers the renewal agreements accommodation for past impacts and

infringements of aboriginal title and rights insufficient in isolation from the other Site C agreements.

McLeod Lake appreciates the opportunity to put this information before the Commission, so that it has that context. Because it's important for the Commission to know that it would not be consistent with the honour of the Crown for BC Hydro to now suspend or terminate the agreement without consulting with McLeod Lake about how the effects of that suspension or termination would affect the package of benefits that were integral to the McLeod Lake community.

It was important for McLeod Lake that BC Hydro recognized that Williston forever changed McLeod Lake's connection with its territory, and created profound hardships. But it was also important that it committed not to repeat that mistake, and that it provided those opportunities for McLeod Lake to move forward. That was the purpose of not just the renewal agreement but the other Site C agreements.

And when considering any suspension or termination the Crown needs to consider how it will fulfill the purpose of those promises. Because the honour of the Crown is at stake any time it deals with First Nations and makes such promises with respect to

their title and rights.

I'd like to move on now from the renewal agreement now that it's set that context, and discuss very briefly the IBA, moving into the contracting agreement and then the tripartite land agreement. In the IBA, BC Hydro agreed to provide McLeod Lake Indian Band with two one-time payments and a stream of payments to be paid annually for 70 years.

Proceeding Time 3:58 p.m. T31

I believe that that information is public. I won't get into the numbers because that information is confidential.

Only one of those payments has been received. Those payments, however, were to accommodate impacts caused by Site C and to address those impacts mentioned by the renewal agreement. And that's not unusual for these types of agreements between the Crown and First Nations for payments to be distributed over the life of the project. But it's also not unusual for those impacts to be front-loaded, and that is the case with Site C.

Construction from Site C has already caused impacts on McLeod Lake's title and rights, but only a very small portion of the accommodation for those impacts has been provided. If Site C were suspended or terminated then the Crown would need to consult

with the impacts that have been endured. In that regard the Crown must know that the benefits provided in the IBA should not represent a maximum level of accommodation. If Site C is suspended or terminated the Crown will need to address new circumstances and address the circumstances that are on the ground at the time and the impacts to McLeod Lakes' rights and title.

The same very much applies to the contracting agreement. The contracting agreement most specifically, and those contracting arrangements are mentioned in the renewal agreement. They flow not just from Site C, but a renewed relationship between McLeod Lake and BC Hydro.

Chief Chingee, at paragraph 28 of the affidavit, has said that the suspension or termination of Site C would result in an economic catastrophe for the Band.

I'll take you to paragraph 28 just so that we can hear the Chief's words for themselves:

"If Site C is suspended or terminated, it will be an economic catastrophe for McLeod Lake Indian Band. McLeod Lake Indian Band businesses have made themselves available for pending Site C opportunities. Those McLeod Lake Indian Band businesses have

incurred expenses such as preparing for bids, hiring staff and purchasing equipment. All those expenditures were financed based on at least six to eight years of contracting opportunities."

We're only two years into those six to eight years. The suspension or termination of Site C would mean the end of McLeod Lake's construction business. What was supposed to be an opportunity to build capacity and revitalize McLeod Lake Band would have the opposite effect. Companies and jobs would be lost and people would likely have to leave McLeod Lake territory to pursue other opportunities if it's suspended or terminated.

This is exactly what happened with the Williston Reservoir and it's exactly the type of mistake that BC Hydro promised not to repeat in the renewal agreement. Instead, the renewal agreement promises to help McLeod Lake meet its aspirations to become an economically thriving community. If Site C were suspended or terminated, those promises need to be fulfilled. They can't be taken off the table. Terminating, if consultation and accommodation is not done properly, could have the opposite effect. It could end up repeating those mistakes and leaving McLeod Lake worse off than it was.

If the Crown considers or decides to suspend or terminate the project, then the honour of the Crown requires that BC Hydro consult with McLeod Lake before it makes that decision. It also requires accommodation. As part of that consultation and accommodation, BC Hydro needs to discuss what contracting opportunities it would make available for McLeod Lake. McLeod Lake wants to ensure that it's involved in any remediation if such a decision were taken. It needs to be involved not only just for its economic viability, but to undertake and discharge its responsibility as stewards of this territory. It needs to be intimately involved.

If Site C is suspended or terminated, there will be profound impacts to the territory. I'd like to discuss them briefly in context of the tripartite land agreement.

The tripartite land agreement recognized that there has been impacts and it aimed to provide some restitution. A land base to help restore McLeod Lake's territory.

Proceeding Time 4:04 p.m. T32

Of course, the 2500 acres that were promised is only a small portion of that territory. But they would have been lands that McLeod Lake would have had control over and could have exercised their aboriginal title

and aboriginal rights to. Any decision with respect to that agreement most certainly triggers the duty to consult, and McLeod Lake would expect that because that is there not just for the Site C project but for historical redress, that those lands need to be transferred whatever the decision is with regards to Site C.

Furthermore, if the decision were made to suspend or terminate the project such that the Crown found itself with fee simple lands that were in surplus that have now come back into its hands, the case law is clear that McLeod Lake would need to be consulted on that.

If the project were suspended or terminated, Chief Chingee in his affidavit at paragraph 33 describes the territory will be left looking like a moonscape. Large sections will have been deforested. Many slopes will need to be stabilized to prevent erosion. As he states in the affidavit at paragraph 35:

"Construction activities for Site C have already begun in the McLeod Lake Band territory. Impacts have already occurred. Those impacts need to be remediated. Some may not be able to ever be remediated to McLeod Lake Indian Band's satisfaction. For

those impacts McLeod Lake Indian Band will bear the full brunt of the impacts as if Site C had been constructed, but McLeod Lake Band will not have received the full payments, contracting opportunities, and land that the Crown has promised in accommodation for those impacts."

So, if Site C is expanded or terminated, the Crown must consult with McLeod Lake Indian Band. It must do that now before any decision is made. McLeod Lake Indian Band would expect that it will be awarded direct award contracts to remediate the territory and would be accommodated in an amount equal or greater to the package that has already been offered to it, agreed to by the Crown, and which were dutifully entered into.

I think it's very important to note that although many First Nations cannot support Site C, and McLeod Lake did struggle with that, McLeod Lake has now come through BC Hydro's efforts to take this as a turning point in the relationship. It doesn't want to unravel that relationship and it doesn't want any decision with respect to Site C to have that potential to move reconciliation backwards. That's why it asks the Commission to make sure that when it reports to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, that it carries

forward the message that consultation thus far has not been adequate and that it needs to consult with McLeod Lake Band on this decision.

Thank you very much for taking the opportunity to hear us today.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER COTE: Just one question. I know Councillor Solanas outlined where the McLeod Lake -- you know, what the territory is. Could you repeat that? I didn't quite pick it up. It's my understanding it's pretty much in and around the area of the Williston Reservoir. Is that a fair statement?

Proceeding Time 4:04 p.m. T33

in '67 was all the way from Chu-lay-a, all the way up to Finlay Forks. That was the area that our people mostly used when it comes to trapping.

Historically and prior to that, it was even further east, all the way into Alberta border, as Harley's dad Harry, who is today 95 years old, he was born in 1922. What he said was, shortly after contact, around the time of contact, the natives in McLeod Lake would hunt in that Peace River area, and that would take them well into Alberta. And there was a reason for that. Now, that reason escapes me at this point, but we used that area extensively along

the Parsnip River system. 1 The Parsnip River flowed north to and would 2 meet Finlay Forks -- meet the Finlay River at Finlay 3 Forks, and together would form the Peace River, which 4 then flowed east. And there's a lot of history too, 5 evidence indicating that our people were quite active 6 in that area. 7 Does that answer your question? 8 COMMISSIONER COTE: It does. And it leads to another. 9 You spoke of impacts --10 MR. JONES: Sorry, can I just --11 COMMISSIONER COTE: I'm sorry? 12 I'll just clarify as well. In the affidavit, MR. JONES: 13 Chief Chingee does describe the territory in more 14 detail. And Appendix A of the affidavit --15 COMMISSIONER COTE: I was looking at that. 16 -- includes a map which is actually appended MR. JONES: 17 to Treaty number 8, for McLeod Lake's adhesion in 18 2000, and it provides a more visual description of the 19 territory. 20 COMMISSIONER COTE: Terrific, thank you. I'll make sure 21 I familiarize myself. 22 I didn't take you through that, but I'm happy MR. JONES: 23 to provide that. 24 COMMISSIONER COTE: Okay. You mentioned there were 25 impacts of Site C that you've already felt. In what 26

-- specific as to what they were. Could you maybe outline them for me?

MR. JONES: Well, my understanding is that there has been a great deal of deforestation. There has been linear impacts. Certainly because McLeod Lake today, its purpose was to carry forward the message around the agreement and the need for consultation. We haven't prepared a detailed analysis of all those impacts. But particularly around the main area, there's been deforestation, there's been destabilization of slopes, that would need to be, you know, prepared with riprap if it was suspended for a long period of time, or would need to be restabilized. There are certain -- I believe that there's been already diversion of streams and those sort of things that are impacting the community.

With any large infrastructure project, most of the impacts are going to occur through construction, and that initial disruption of the territory, and what that means to the ecosystem and the wildlife, et cetera. Whatever the diverse views in the community may be around those impacts, McLeod Lake Band made peace with that, and has entered into the renewal agreement, and is willing for the project to go forward. It's concerned in particular that if the project were suspended or terminated, that those

impacts would endure. And what was agreed to in terms 1 of accommodation, or how we can live with those 2 impacts, would then -- could potentially be taken 3 away. And that would certainly turn the page 4 backwards to the time of the late 60s and the early 5 70s, and unravel that process of consultation or 6 reconciliation. 7 COMMISSIONER COTE: I understand, thank you. 8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Just a question about the tripartite 9 I don't need you to go into a lot of land agreement. 10 detail, but just generally speaking, it's -- the 11 McLeod Lake Indian Band had land that it essentially 12 traded with the Crown? Is that the idea, fee-simple 13 land? And that land is where the dam is being 14 constructed? Do I understand that correctly? 15 MR. JONES: Yeah. I wouldn't say necessarily traded, but 16 as part of the package of accommodation, the 17 tripartite land agreement, which was Exhibit C to the 18 affidavit, provided that the Crown would transfer 19 2,500 acres -- I can discuss this agreement more 20 fully, because it is public. It's not confidential. 21 That agreed to a transfer of 2,500 acres as 22 part of the package of accommodation. 23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Right. 24 And it was to be for the use and control by MR. JONES: 25 McLeod Lake, so that it could do as it sees fit. 26

Proceeding Time 4:14 p.m. T34

Now, the implementation of that agreement has not, to my understanding, advanced very far. They are still in the process of selecting the lands and there is some negotiation around that, which is what the agreement called for.

The termination provisions in that are somewhat interesting. You know, at 3.2 (a) talks about if the project is delayed or suspended, then the transfer can be delayed or suspended. But if the project is terminated, this agreement is terminated, but there is nothing about the requirement to continue to transfer the lands.

THE CHAIRPERSON: And is there a transfer of land from McLeod Lake to BC Hydro also?

16 MR. JONES: No.

THE CHAIRPERSON: There isn't? It's just a one-way transfer.

MR. JONES: So as part of that, the package of the IBA, the two payments, the stream of payments over 70 years, the contracting opportunities and land in recognition of impacts to the territory. And I believe that that -- well, the quantum and the amount of land to be transferred may differ from First Nation to First Nation. That's kind of the broad overview of the package that most First Nations entered into.

1	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
2	MR. JONES: You're welcome.
3	THE CHAIRPERSON: If there's no more questions, then
4	we'd like to thank you very much for joining us here.
5	We're very interested in what we've heard and we
6	appreciate you bringing these issues forward for us.
7	MS. JONES: Thank you very much. We appreciate the
8	opportunity to make the submission.
9	THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. So we are hereby
10	adjourned, dismissed.
11	MR. JONES: Thank you.
12	THE CHAIRPERSON: Terminated.
13	(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 4:15 P.M.)
14	
15	
16	
17	I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FORGOING
18	is a true and accurate transcript of the proceedings herein, to the
19	best of my skill and ability.
20	
21	a. D. Langan
22	
23	A.B. Lanigan, Court Reporter
24	September 30 th , 2017
25	
26	