

**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**

**Vancouver , B.C.**  
**October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

---

**COMMUNITY INPUT PROCEEDINGS**  
**VANCOUVER**

---

**BEFORE:**

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

**VOLUME 9**

INDEX

PAGE

**SEPTEMBER 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2017 – Volume 1**

**Vancouver Community Input Proceedings**

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

**INDEX**

**PAGE**

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

**SEPTEMBER 24<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – Volume 2**

**Kamloops Community Input Proceedings**

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

**INDEX**

**PAGE**

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

**SEPTEMBER 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – Volume 3**

**Kelowna Community Input Proceedings**

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

**INDEX**

**PAGE**

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

**SEPTEMBER 26<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – Volume 4**

**Nelson Community Input Proceedings**

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

**SEPTEMBER 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017 - Volume 5A**

**Prince George First Nations Input Proceedings (afternoon)**

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

**SEPTEMBER 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017 - Volume 5B**

**Prince George Community Input Proceedings (evening)**

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

**INDEX**

**PAGE**

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

**SEPTEMBER 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017 - Volume 6**

**Hudson's Hope Community Input Proceedings**

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

**OCTOBER 1, 2017 - Volume 7**

**Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**OCTOBER 2, 2017 - Volume 8**

**Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings**

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

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

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

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



**INDEX**

**PAGE**

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

**OCTOBER 5, 2017 - Volume 9**

**Vancouver Community Input Proceedings**

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

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FOY (#0179)..... 743

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. FITZPATRICK (#0180)..... 747

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0181)..... 750

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CASSELLS (#0182)..... 754

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JACKSON (#0183)..... 758

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GILDERSLEEVE (#0184)..... 763

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PEPPER-SMITH (#0185)..... 767

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KEEGAN-HENRY (#0186)..... 772

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHANSSON (#0124)..... 775

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WILLIS (#0187)..... 779

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BASS (#0188)..... 782

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. RATCLIFFE (#0189)..... 785

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MATTICE (#0190)..... 787

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEVES (#0191)..... 792

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LAMOUREUX (#0192)..... 795

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GUNG (#0193)..... 798

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SPROULE (#0194)..... 801

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. McINTOSH (#0195)..... 803

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRAHAM (#0196)..... 807

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THOMAS (#0197)..... 809

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TSANG (#0198)..... 811

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARRISON (#0199)..... 814

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WESTERMAN (#0200)..... 817

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FINN (#0004)..... 819

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MARTZ-OBERLANDER (#0201)..... 823

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BROWN (#0202)..... 825

**INDEX**

**PAGE**

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

**OCTOBER 6, 2017 - Volume 10**

**Vancouver First Nations Input Proceedings**

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

**OCTOBER 10, 2017 - Volume 11**

**Nanaimo Community Input Proceedings**

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

INDEX

PAGE

**OCTOBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12A**

**Victoria First Nations Input Proceedings**

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

**OCTOBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12B**

**Victoria Community Input Proceedings**

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

**INDEX**

**PAGE**

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHNSTONE (#0269)..... 1135

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. FIELD (#0270)..... 1138

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAMERON (#0271)..... 1140

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAJARI (#0272)..... 1143

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARNEY (#0273)..... 1148

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BALDINI (#0274)..... 1151

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORNBURGH (#0275)..... 1155

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GREENLEES (#0276)..... 1157

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McGUIRE (#0277)..... 1159

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ENNS (#0278)..... 1163

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HENDERSON (#0279)..... 1167

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SPALTEHOLZ (#0280)..... 1169

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. STRANG (#0281)..... 1171

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SCOTT (#0282)..... 1173

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. TROTTER (#0283)..... 1178

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. EVANS (#0284)..... 1180

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. M. HADLAND (#0285)..... 1180

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DELA ROSA (#0286)..... 1183

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KEEGAN-HENRY (#0287)..... 1185

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NELSON (#0288)..... 1186

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUPPER (#0158)..... 1190

**OCTOBER 13<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – Volume 13**

**Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings**

SUBMISSIONS BY CLEAN ENERGY ASSOCIATION OF BC  
(CEABC) (#0289)..... 1195

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ROBERT McCULLOUGH (#0290)..... 1213

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MARC ELIESEN (#0291)..... 1233

**INDEX**

**PAGE**

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

**OCTOBER 14<sup>th</sup>, 2017 – Volume 14**

**Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings**

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

**VANCOUVER, B.C.**

**October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

**(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 6:05 P.M.)**

1  
2  
3  
4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening. Thank you for joining us  
5 as we proceed through our two and a half week schedule  
6 of Site C inquiry community input sessions around the  
7 province.

8 My name is Dave Morton, and I'm the Panel  
9 Chair for the Site C inquiry, and I'm also the Chair  
10 and CEO of the British Columbia Utilities Commission.  
11 With me today are my fellow Site C inquiry panel  
12 members, Dennis Cote on my left, Karen Keilty on my  
13 right, Richard Mason on her right.

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

26 We have the task of making findings in this



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

3 Before we begin, I just want to introduce  
4 you to Mr. Bemister. I think you've already met; he  
5 gave you the briefing a few moments ago. He will help  
6 to organize speakers and also with other logistics,  
7 and his team is recording and transcribing these  
8 sessions. They're streaming live audio from our  
9 website at SiteCInquiry.com. And following these  
10 sessions, all presentations will be transcribed and  
11 posted along with the rest of the inquiry documents on  
12 that website.

13 For speakers, there is a list of speakers  
14 on the screen in front of me, and also to your right,  
15 and at the back of the room in two places. When you  
16 find your name appearing within the next two or three  
17 speakers, please move up to the front of the room and  
18 have a seat in the chairs so that you can be ready to  
19 speak. If you're not prepared or in the room at the  
20 time you are called upon, we'll proceed to the next  
21 speaker in line and then we'll return at the end of  
22 the list of the speakers that weren't present when  
23 they were called.

24 Submissions made here today, as well as  
25 those made in writing, that are outside the scope of  
26 our review, won't be considered in our final report to

1 government on November 1<sup>st</sup>.

2 The Panel is aware of the circulation of  
3 the unredacted Deloitte report filed in the first  
4 phase of this inquiry. The information redacted in  
5 that report was done so to ensure that current and  
6 future negotiations between BC Hydro and its suppliers  
7 were not compromised as a result of the information  
8 being publicly available. The Panel still considers  
9 the information confidential, despite its  
10 inappropriate disclosure in the press. The Panel may  
11 redact or refuse submissions that contain a reference  
12 to that confidential information, both here tonight as  
13 well as in written submissions. And the reason is  
14 that that information could ultimately harm ratepayers  
15 because if the negotiations are compromised it could  
16 end up with an impact on people's rates.

17 Speakers will have a maximum of five  
18 minutes. You can see the timer in front, and please  
19 try and take a look at that. I realize it's not that  
20 easy when you're talking to be looking at a timer, but  
21 I'll try to let you know. Maybe I'll just point when  
22 you're running out of time, getting close to the end  
23 of the five minutes, and you can start to sum up your  
24 presentation.

25 Before you begin your presentation, please  
26 state your first name and spell your last name for the

1 transcription record.

2 With that, we are ready to open this  
3 community input session in Vancouver on October the  
4 5<sup>th</sup>, 2017. Our first speaker, please state your name,  
5 spell your last name, and begin your presentation.

6 Thank you, sir.

7 MR. BRYENTON: My name is Roger Bryenton

8 **Proceeding Time 6:09 p.m. T02**

9 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRYENTON (#0007):**

10 MR. BRYENTON: My name is Roger Bryenton, B-R-Y-E-N-T-O-  
11 N. I am a professional engineer with 30 years'  
12 experience in energy, renewable energy in North  
13 America. I'm also a director of BC Hydro Ratepayer's  
14 Association. And my first item would to be  
15 acknowledge that we are on the unceded and traditional  
16 territory of the Musquem, Squamish, and Tsleil-waututh  
17 Nations and thank them for this opportunity.

18 I'd like to thank the BCUC as well for  
19 holding the public inquiry and remind them that they  
20 are the custodians of this, our public utility, and it  
21 is our utility, the people sitting here tonight.

22 I have a number of topics here, one of  
23 which is the cost determination. A significant error,  
24 and I would like the panel members to note that in the  
25 Deloitte report on page 83 the cost determination is  
26 shown as 1.2 billion and it's almost 200 million high.

1 The reason for that is because a 30 percent  
2 contingency was used which is inconsistent with BC  
3 Hydro contingency of 10 percent for the entire  
4 project. So if we take the determination cost of 925  
5 million, add ten percent, we're looking at 1.02  
6 billion not 1.2. So there's 186 million that the  
7 province will benefit from by terminating this early.

8 There is a plausible scenario that we're  
9 looking at. There's a lot of new information has come  
10 to light and the plausible scenario is that we have a  
11 zero net growth over the next twenty to forty years,  
12 and I'll describe why this can happen. We can get  
13 demand side management savings of 14 percent, we can  
14 get Smart meter savings of up to 20 percent, and  
15 disruptive technology which will look like having your  
16 electric vehicle plug in at night and feed back to the  
17 grid when the peak demand comes, that this will be our  
18 power wall on wheels.

19 And the demand for capacity and electricity  
20 will actually shrink at least 1 percent per year. The  
21 future growth will continue to be zero and the  
22 conclusion that we'll start with is that there's no  
23 conceivable scenario in which Site C will be needed  
24 within the next 20 years and possibly beyond.

25 The information to support that is the DSM  
26 potential. BC Hydro has identified five levels of

1 demand side management running from 6,000 to 9,600  
2 gigawatt hours per year at a cost of \$32 to \$49 per  
3 megawatt hour. So these savings are roughly a third  
4 to half the cost of Site C, and are between ten to  
5 more than double the amount of electricity.

6 What has BC Hydro accomplished? In the  
7 2017 conservation report the actual savings were 1750  
8 gigawatt hours at an average cost of \$20 a megawatt  
9 hour, and in their IRP report they were headed for 32.  
10 So they did a really good job at DSM. They've got an  
11 excellent record here.

12 What are other utilities accomplishing?  
13 Well, Massachusetts is saving 3 percent a year. Two  
14 other states have saved over 2 percent a year. Public  
15 Service of Colorado issued an RFP for 50 megawatts of  
16 savings, and they got \$270 per kilowatt of capacity  
17 savings and electricity at 2 and a half cents a  
18 kilowatt hour. BC Hydro's capacity by comparison is  
19 \$8,000 per kilowatt, not 270. So they've got a long  
20 ways to go.

21 What would happen if BC Hydro saved 3  
22 percent in a single year? That would be 1500 gigawatt  
23 hours, roughly a third of the projected output of Site  
24 C. It's a serious and possible goal.

25 In terms of pricing awareness, Carnegie  
26 Mellon study showed that a real time pricing would

1        cause a 1 percent shift in demand and a 4 percent  
2        demand in savings, in cost savings. The time of use  
3        study by the environmental defense fund showed 13 to  
4        15 percent demand savings could be achieved. If that  
5        14 percent savings were in B.C., it would be 1700  
6        megawatts, 50 percent more than Site C.

7                What are aggressive utilities spending? Up  
8        to 4 percent of annual revenue. BC Hydro, by  
9        comparison, is spending less than half that amount.  
10       But they are still saving electricity at 3 cents a  
11       kilowatt hour, not 8 or 10 which Site C would cost us.

12               Their residential savings in 2016 were 35  
13       percent greater than they planned. Their industrial  
14       savings were 27 percent greater than expected. So  
15       they are really doing a good job and I think they need  
16       to keep going with that.

17               We've got some disruptive technology coming  
18       along called net zero buildings, and that's going to  
19       be a building that no longer requires electricity and  
20       heat, that it will be a net provider of energy as a  
21       result of the design and the operation of it.

22               And with Smart meters, there is a  
23       possibility that Smart meters can run things like an  
24       oversized water heater or other such -- an appliance  
25       like a smart dryer, and that will immediately result  
26       in savings up to 18 percent of electricity consumption

1 and demand up to 20 percent.

2 In conclusion, by using conventional and  
3 advanced approaches, B.C. will be able to have an  
4 independent power into the future.

5 Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

7 **Proceeding Time 6:15 p.m. T3**

8 Please go ahead, sir.

9 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAVIN (#0175):**

10 MR. CAVIN: My name is Martin Cavin. That's C-A-V-I-N.  
11 And I'm a power engineer who worked for 24 years at  
12 the Burrard Thermal Generating Station. In 2013 I  
13 retired as the shift supervisor in operations.  
14 Burrard has gas-fired boilers which supply steam  
15 turbines that drive generators producing up to 900  
16 megawatts of reliable power.

17 The Liberals, under their *Clean Energy Act*,  
18 forced Hydro to shut down Burrard as a standby plant  
19 in 2016. In its later years Burrard ran occasionally  
20 to meet peak winter loads or provide backup when power  
21 system outages occurred. The Liberals said that  
22 Burrard was old, inefficient, polluting, and hardly  
23 ever ran. But throughout the electrical utility  
24 industry, that is the typical profile of a standby  
25 plant. No utility spends hundreds of millions of  
26 extra dollars to build a state-of-the-art, high

1 efficiency, low emission plant that sits idle 90  
2 percent of the time. A new standby plant typically  
3 has a simple cycle gas turbine that's about 35 percent  
4 efficient, the same as Burrard, and has the same  
5 greenhouse gas emissions per unit output as Burrard.  
6 But such a plant doesn't have Burrard's nitrogen oxide  
7 or NOx reduction equipment, which reduces NOx by 90  
8 percent. If Burrard ran at full output for 10 percent  
9 of the year, its NOx emissions would only be 85 tonnes  
10 out of a Lower Fraser Valley total of 53,000 tonnes  
11 per year. Any utility would consider Burrard to be  
12 the ideal standby plant, especially given its  
13 strategic location in the Lower Mainland.

14 While the Liberals exempted energy-hogging  
15 LNG export terminals with their high greenhouse gas  
16 and NOx emissions from the *Clean Energy Act*, they shut  
17 down Burrard. Is there no balance or perspective when  
18 it comes to the security of the electrical grid versus  
19 the environment? Burrard was the only large  
20 generating plant in the Lower Mainland. Greater  
21 Vancouver is dependent on 500 kV transmission lines  
22 that are hundreds of kilometres long for the bulk of  
23 its power.

24 I was on duty in 2009 when a forest fire  
25 threatened Hydro's Kelly Lake Substation, which is  
26 about 20 kilometres west of Clinton. All of the power



1 from the Peace generating plants, which would include  
2 Site C if built, passes through this sub. The system  
3 control centre asked how soon we could get Burrard's  
4 six units on line if needed. Fortunately the wind  
5 changed direction and the sub was spared. This summer  
6 the Elephant Hill fire forced the evacuation of  
7 Clinton, but luckily the fire did not spread westward  
8 and threaten the sub.

9 In 1972 an ice storm downed 26 of Hydro's  
10 transmission towers near Agassiz in the Fraser Valley.  
11 Both 500 kV lines in the area were lost, and Burrard  
12 had to run flat out for a week. There were also bad  
13 ice storms in this area in 1935 and 1917. Today, four  
14 of the five 500 kV transmission lines feeding Greater  
15 Vancouver pass through this corridor between Harrison  
16 Lake and the Fraser River.

17 In 1998 there was a bad ice storm in  
18 Quebec. Greater Montreal also lacked a large  
19 generating station and was dependent on five  
20 transmission lines. Four of these lines failed and  
21 areas around the city were without power for weeks.  
22 At least 25 people died of hypothermia. The 2009 book  
23 *Leadership and Disaster* by Raymond Murphy details the  
24 horrors that unfolded. Burnaby Public Library has a  
25 copy.

26 B.C. can receive up to 1300 megawatts of

1 capacity and 4500 gigawatt hours per year of energy  
2 under the Columbia River Treaty. That's about the  
3 output of Site C. This clean, dispatcher power  
4 generated with water from B.C. is being sold for about  
5 one-third the cost of Site C's power. The Liberals  
6 won't let Hydro use it because the power plants are  
7 not located in B.C., but that can be changed at the  
8 stroke of a pen. It's been argued that the U.S. may  
9 not be able to supply all of the Columbia capacity  
10 during winter peaks due to transmission line  
11 constraints. Instead of spending hundreds of millions  
12 building a dedicated line, spend the money to  
13 refurbish Burrard instead. It could make up the  
14 shortfall of capacity for the few days of year when  
15 the U.S. can't deliver.

16 Almost 300 million was spent upgrading  
17 Burrard between 1990 and 2005. A 2008 study by ANEC  
18 found the plant to be in good condition. This study  
19 is on the BCUC website. At that time it was estimated  
20 that 400 million was required to keep the plant on  
21 standby for the next 20 years. That's only \$20  
22 million per year. A new study should be conducted to  
23 determine the current cost to refurbish the plant.  
24 The equipment is still there. Shutting the plant down  
25 is a colossal waste of hundreds of millions of  
26 ratepayers' dollars.



1 the last surviving engineer, I guess, that's left of  
2 the 45-man team that built this heritage system.

3 Now, I'm here to talk about alternative  
4 portfolios in the heritage free sources themselves.  
5 First of all, there are six easy portfolios of  
6 alternative generation available, and they aggregate  
7 four times the size of Site C. And I'll go into them  
8 in a minute. And I have a submission that I made that  
9 hasn't yet appeared, but all these submissions are  
10 probably come under F-26, and F-26, 5, 6, 7, and 8  
11 haven't appeared yet because they're pretty busy  
12 typing these things.

13 Anyway, to get back to item 2, the BC Hydro  
14 claims that the lights will go out because their  
15 present hydro capacity, which they say is around  
16 45,500 gigawatt hours, isn't enough after 2025. But  
17 BC Hydro's own figures, which I've shown -- which I've  
18 checked, and they sent to me, show the capacity is  
19 53,000 gigawatt hours. That's 4,700, or rounded to  
20 4,500 gigawatt hours greater than what they claim, and  
21 therefore Site C is not needed.

22 I'm going to go into alternative  
23 portfolios. First of all, we have a lot of water  
24 spilling because there are no generators. Item 1,  
25 Keenleyside was shut down. Keenleyside originally had  
26 no generators, and they had generators built. It was

1 put in. It was a badly-built power house. If you put  
2 a decently-built power house on there, properly built,  
3 you can get 1445 gigawatt hours, which is like 28  
4 percent of Site C. You don't have to build a dam.

5 Duncan has been sitting there for 50 years  
6 without generators, and if you put that in, you get  
7 276 gigawatt hours and about 5 percent of Site C.

8 Now, as far as the resources are concerned,  
9 if you properly use the resources the way they're  
10 meant to be used, you get 4500 more gigawatt hours,  
11 that's 88 percent, just by operating the thing the way  
12 it's supposed to be, and using it to full capacity.  
13 As they explain it, in essence when -- it's like a  
14 good kind mother has given you 53,000 light bulbs  
15 every year, and you're only using 45,800. Now, where  
16 do they get the 48,500? They got them by simply  
17 reading what was generated in 2017. You can't do  
18 that. If you know anything about dispatch, then you  
19 know that what you generate is merely the difference  
20 between IPP, which has to run all the time, and the  
21 load. And you never can foretell. It's like jumping  
22 in your car, planning to go somewhere, and planning to  
23 use the last drop of gasoline in your tank. It's  
24 impossible.

25 So what I'm saying is, simply picking the  
26 generation, which happens to be 48,483 in that year,

1 it's on page 24 of Hydro's annual service report, it  
2 isn't right. What you should do is, you should plan  
3 to use the whole capacity, which is 53,000 megawatt  
4 hours.

5 In essence, if BC Hydro wants to prove to  
6 BCUC that they are correct and they only have 48,483  
7 gigawatt hours capacity, which is a lot less, it's up  
8 to them to supply BCUC or Deloitte with a list of  
9 every heritage plant showing the minimum and the  
10 average energy capacity of every plant. We used to  
11 keep that in dispatch and if not you'll find it in the  
12 archives.

13 Now, we get back to the additional plants.  
14 First of all, as I said, we can use the generators.  
15 That will give us some. And by the way, I put this  
16 into something that will eventually be 26-7, with  
17 tables that are clearer and better than my screech,  
18 with all the numbers. You can get with Williston --  
19 Lake Williston. The fact it has 20 years flow in Lake  
20 Williston, and you don't have to do your planning by  
21 each year. You can do it for the average of -- an  
22 average of moving five years. If you do that, you get  
23 4600 gigawatt hours just by doing that, operating it  
24 the way that it was planned to operate.

25 It's not operated that way because if it  
26 was, then what would happen is, in a year when the

1 flows are low, the Williston generation, some  
2 generation will be up to supplement it in the year  
3 that was high, there's some generation would be down,  
4 and the others -- the other ones would be up. That's  
5 not happening now.

6 So, right now, all that happens is, a lot  
7 of water gets spilled or sold by Powerex.

8 Then I get to the Columbia River Treaty. I  
9 realize that under the *Clean Energy Act* you're not  
10 supposed to use it. But the fact is, the Commission  
11 asked about it in Appendix B and I'd like to answer --  
12 I actually tried to answer that. And I guess I don't  
13 have time to answer it.

14 So you'll find it in 26-5, I believe. 26-5  
15 or 26-6, I'm not sure.

16 Thank you very much.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, sir.

18 **Proceeding Time 6:27 p.m. T05**

19 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CAMPBELL (#0176):**

20 MS. CAMPBELL: My name is Ruth Campbell, C-A-M-P-B-E-L-  
21 L. It's misspelled on the list.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

23 MS. CAMPBELL: I'm a long-time resident of Vancouver and  
24 with a background in law and education, and I'm here  
25 to give reasons why I think Site C dam should be  
26 cancelled.

1                   One, because we don't need the energy, and  
2                   two, because the costs are too high.

3                   Regarding need, Hydro overstated our future  
4                   need for electricity. In fact, a conservation and  
5                   energy efficiency have kept energy demand flat in  
6                   North America for more than a decade. So in 2024 when  
7                   hydro goes on line, it could have to sell 100 percent  
8                   surplus energy at a loss. But the B.C. ratepayers  
9                   will have to pay regardless over the next 70 years,  
10                  which takes us almost into the 22<sup>nd</sup> century.

11                  Businesses in the province are also worried  
12                  that our increasing hydro rates will force them to  
13                  either shut down or to leave British Columbia, taking  
14                  jobs with them.

15                  So, while costs of renewable energy get  
16                  cheaper, Hydro's debts mount. It is \$18 billion in  
17                  debt now through provincial mismanagement, and will  
18                  increase another 50 percent with Site C construction.  
19                  This vast expense is going to lock us out of serious  
20                  investment in renewable energy in the future.

21                  Moody's has warned that the high debt  
22                  levels of BC Hydro and the province could result in a  
23                  lower credit rating, and that would make all  
24                  provincial borrowing more expensive. We have other  
25                  energy resources available now. As has already been  
26                  stated, we have the Burrard Thermal plant which could



1 be recommissioned and under the Columbia River Treaty,  
2 we are entitled to 50 percent of the river's energy  
3 which equals Site C output.

4 All the NDP needs to do is change the  
5 necessary provisions in the *Clean Energy Act*, which  
6 shouldn't be too difficult.

7 Regarding costs, Site C construction is  
8 facing significant rising costs and likely delays.  
9 And there are doubts about Hydro's ability to even  
10 estimate costs. So we don't know what the ultimate  
11 price tag will be. And costs are not all financial,  
12 cannot all be enumerated. There are other  
13 consequences to Site C that have to be taken into  
14 consideration, like the destruction of the environment  
15 and biodiversity, the reduction and endangerment of  
16 migratory birds and songbirds, the destruction of fish  
17 species such as the endangered bull trout. Hydro has  
18 a \$175 million plan to transport trout by truck, but  
19 it won't work for reasons I don't have time to go  
20 into.

21 The dam will poison the Peace River with  
22 mercury, and the reduced water flow could threaten the  
23 Athabaska delta. The flooding will submerge islands  
24 on the Peace that ungulates have used for centuries to  
25 keep and protect their new born. I don't know where  
26 they are supposed to go. And no one even knows about

1 the effects on Grizzly bears.

2 Finally, the building of Site C would be  
3 another step in our ongoing cultural genocide of First  
4 Nations peoples.

5 My view is that it is foolish and  
6 irresponsible to embark on a project that brings so  
7 much expense, destruction and loss of opportunity just  
8 for electricity that Hydro can't even prove that we  
9 need.

10 Thank you. Thank you, ma'am.

11 **Proceeding Time 6:31 p.m. T6**

12 Please go ahead, sir.

13 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HUNTLEY (#0177):**

14 MR. HUNTLEY: My name is David Huntley, H-U-N-T-L-E-Y.  
15 I'm professor emeritus in Department of Physics at  
16 Simon Fraser University. I live in Burnaby.

17 I was at the 1981 B.C. Utilities Commission  
18 hearing on Site C and I made two presentations there.  
19 The chairman of that Commission was Keith Henry. As  
20 it happens, I'm acquainted with both his daughters.  
21 One of them is Kathy Corrigan, who is chair of the  
22 Burnaby School Board and later MLA. The other one is  
23 Jean Keegan-Henry and I knew her because she was a  
24 student in one of my classes and later on she was a  
25 doctor in the Burnaby Hospital taking care of me.  
26 Jean has two daughters, Alie and Morag, and I believe

1 Morag is here tonight and is going to talk to you  
2 later, so she should have some very interesting things  
3 to tell you about her grandfather.

4 Okay, so the reason I'm telling you this is  
5 because it's really all about people. I mean you  
6 people are charged with dollars, right, but it's  
7 really, ultimately it's all about people.

8 Okay, so I've got three things to tell you.  
9 The first one is that the Peace River is a canoeing  
10 river. And I would like you to read into the hearing  
11 record my November 1981 submission co-signed by the  
12 Dogwood Canoe Club. The whole point here is that  
13 wilderness canoe trips are the best holidays for  
14 forgetting everything at home. You leave all your  
15 troubles and stresses behind. They're also very low  
16 impact. If we lose this part of the Peace River,  
17 we're losing a part of such a wilderness trip. That's  
18 a cost which I would like you to bring into the -- put  
19 in your report.

20 The second item I want to bring up is  
21 Treaty 8. There's a wonderful book called *Maps and*  
22 *Dreams* by Hugh Brody, a sociologist. I'm hoping  
23 you've all read it. If you haven't, for heaven's  
24 sakes please do. What he tells you in this book is  
25 the effect of the white man on the Treaty 8 country  
26 where the Peace River is. And you know, if you read

1       this you realize there's something seriously wrong,  
2       and people have later on tried to understand what it  
3       was that the Natives understood when they signed the  
4       treaty.

5               The treaty should be declared void for two  
6       reasons. One is it's a completely unfair contract.  
7       If you haven't read it, for heaven's sakes please do.  
8       And secondly because the understanding of what the  
9       treaty meant was wildly different between the natives  
10      and the white people.

11              There's a lot of talk about reconciliation.  
12      What is the meaning of that word? Okay, the best  
13      definition I've heard of it is that we have their  
14      backs and they have our backs. Here is an opportunity  
15      to show that we mean it.

16              Okay, the third point I want to make is as  
17      follows. One of my neighbours came up to me not long  
18      ago and said, "I got an electricity bill. It was over  
19      \$1500." That's 30 times my electricity bill. And as  
20      I'm sure you all know, all the electricity we use,  
21      almost all of it -- not all of it, almost all of it  
22      ends up heating the environment. In other words it's  
23      wasted. Okay, so what are we going to do about this  
24      neighbour of mine and how is this relevant to BC  
25      Hydro? Well, the culprit in this case of course is  
26      that she put electric heating in her house and it's

1 not well insulated. Her use is about 34,000 kilowatt  
2 hours per year. I think we could reduce it to 4,000  
3 kilowatt hours per year -- that's double mine -- by  
4 suitably insulating the house and putting in a heat  
5 pump, thus saving 30,000 kilowatt hours per year.

6 The figures for Site C are 4600 kilowatt  
7 hours per year for 9 gigadollars. You may quarrel  
8 with those numbers a little bit but not much. At this  
9 rate, 30,000 kilowatt hours per year isn't \$59,000. I  
10 think we could insulate, or she could or BC Hydro  
11 could insulate her house and put in a heat pump or  
12 whatever is necessary for less than \$59,000. In other  
13 words this is a cost that could -- you know, BC Hydro  
14 could spend instead of Site C. Actually, if they  
15 spent that money, \$59,000 or less, it would free up  
16 30,000 kilowatt hours per year for other people to  
17 use.

18 Okay, thank you very much.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

20 **Proceeding Time 6:36 p.m. T07**

21 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEEVES (#0010):**

22 MR. STEEVES: Hello. My name is Keith Steeves, spelled  
23 S-T-E-E-V-E-S. I represent my company, Apps Inc., and  
24 I am here to basically clarify some misunderstandings  
25 or misperceptions.

26 Now, I understand my application is not

1           being considered because it's outside the terms of  
2           reference given to you by the provincial government.

3                       First of all, in the last hearing that was  
4           held here in Vancouver, at the end of the meeting  
5           there was a couple of comments saying that there was a  
6           white elephant. Well, I said that we're the white  
7           elephant -- not the white elephant. But we're an  
8           elephant, but we're a green elephant, very green, and  
9           we have a little black bowtie.

10                      And we're saying that there are other  
11           things that have to be considered. That is, our  
12           elephant is very curious. He's a very fine fellow,  
13           and he stands firm, and he's dependable. And in the  
14           handout I gave you, there is an article saying that  
15           the nuclear reactors down in Florida when hurricane  
16           Irma came through, they stood -- they withstood the  
17           hurricane and they kept the power on. So that's a  
18           very fine attributes for nuclear power.

19                      Also, other misunderstandings is that  
20           Fukushima -- in Fukushima, the cause of the bad  
21           accident has to be attributed to the fossil fuel  
22           diesel oils, the storage tanks and the equipment.  
23           Those were destroyed in the tsunami, whereas the  
24           nuclear power plant itself per se, withstood the  
25           earthquake and the tsunami. There was nothing wrong  
26           with the nuclear reactor.

1                   And in regards to environmental concerns,  
2                   if we were to put a nuclear power reactor in the -- at  
3                   the Site C dam site, it would have a smaller  
4                   footprint, and it would be much more environmentally  
5                   sound and friendly. There would be no impacts on the  
6                   upstream stream, and there would be no downstream  
7                   impacts as well.

8                   And hence if you consider nuclear power,  
9                   the environmentalists would have no gripes, legitimate  
10                  gripes, to stand on.

11                  Now, you may have heard I have recommended  
12                  in my submission to the Panel that I recommended a --  
13                  that is a Westinghouse nuclear AP 1000 reactor. And  
14                  this company has gone into what they call Chapter 11  
15                  receivership, because of a whole host of problems.  
16                  These problems are having to do with the supply chain,  
17                  which, because it was a new reactor, they had a whole  
18                  host of problems and in the literature that I gave to  
19                  you and the information packet, it describes all the  
20                  reasons that caused the delay in the construction of  
21                  the reactors in South Carolina and Georgia, as well as  
22                  the reactors over in China.

23                  But I'd like to stress that the one of the  
24                  reactors down in Georgia has been put into -- not in  
25                  operation, but they're going ahead with it, they're  
26                  not cancelling it, and secondly over in China they're

1 going ahead. They had a three-year delay in their  
2 construction but they're still going ahead. They're  
3 going to build another six reactors the same type and  
4 you can bet your bottom dollar with the manufacturing  
5 prowess that has been developed in China that those  
6 future reactors will be built on time to the  
7 specifications that were specified on budget to yield  
8 the results that they want.

9 So, there's a thing in the nuclear -- not  
10 the -- the public utility industry, that nobody wants  
11 to be first. And BC Hydro would not be first by going  
12 with a nuclear reactor because we have these public  
13 utilities down there that have gone ahead already.  
14 They bit the bullet, and this type of reactor could be  
15 put in place.

16 I see I'm running out of time. I have a  
17 couple of items, but I'll have to let you go on this.  
18 Twenty-five seconds -- BC Hydro said in the -- their  
19 presentation that they had a seven-year construction,  
20 which they're compressing into a six-year  
21 construction. In my submission, I put a five-year  
22 construction design for comparison purposes. BC Hydro  
23 says by reducing it by one year they save \$630  
24 million. We may not be able to save that, but with  
25 time and money, we can have a considerable amount of  
26 savings as well. And be a better option than Site C.



1 Thank you. My time has run out. Bye.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

3 **Proceeding Time 6:41 p.m. T08**

4 Please go ahead, sir.

5 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WELLS (#0178):**

6 MR. WELLS: Thank you. My name is Ralph Wells,  
7 W-E-L-L-S. While I'm here as a citizen, I want to  
8 note that I work as an energy manager in a local  
9 government role and my responsibilities include  
10 development and implementation of new green building  
11 standards for energy, expansion of electric vehicle  
12 charging infrastructure and consideration of future  
13 climate on building design.

14 Again, I'm here as a private citizen but  
15 know my professional background as it prepares me to  
16 speak from a position of knowledge.

17 Section 3(c) of your terms of reference  
18 require you to use estimates of peak capacity and  
19 energy demand from 2016, but also to consider  
20 developments since that forecast and other factors  
21 that might influence future demand. It's these latter  
22 terms that I wish to speak to today.

23 I'm personally involved in the  
24 implementation of the new B.C. Energy step code which  
25 will help transition British Columbia to a net zero  
26 ready housing by 2032. I also note that the cities of

1 Vancouver and Victoria have committed to a hundred  
2 percent renewable cities by 2050. Why one would  
3 understandably expect that this should lead to  
4 reductions in energy consumption, and it will to total  
5 energy consumption, but in fact, renewable strategies  
6 for buildings are also based in part on the transition  
7 to electrical energy for heating and hot water supply  
8 using technologies such as the heat pumps that the  
9 previous speaker had mentioned.

10 For example, the City of Vancouver expects  
11 electricity demand to increase as they implement the  
12 renewable city strategy even as they reduce overall  
13 energy demand. Further, warming climates are  
14 expected to lead to significant increase in air  
15 conditioning needs. And I've been personally involved  
16 in studies that certainly I think we'll see that is in  
17 fact going to be found to be quite significant.

18 Further, building codes in many British  
19 Columbia cities require or will soon require EV  
20 charging infrastructure, and investment in public  
21 charging infrastructure is growing rapidly.  
22 Statistics collected by Fleet Karma show that electric  
23 vehicles recently hit 4 percent of new passenger car  
24 sales in B.C and the upward trend is steep.

25 Recent news reports have seen commitments  
26 to ban internal combustion engine in France, UK and

1 India, and General Motors, just yesterday, committed  
2 to a fully electric vehicle company.

3 All of this to say it is reasonable to  
4 contemplate an accelerating transition to electrical  
5 vehicle use in B.C. and elsewhere is happening.

6 Finally, as BC Hydro is aware, warming  
7 climates will impact water flows and reduce system  
8 capacity even as demand grows, and as noted in August  
9 3<sup>rd</sup> op ed in the *Vancouver Sun* by Mark Jaccard, a well-  
10 known SFU energy economist and past chair of the  
11 Commission, increases in variable sources such as  
12 solar, PV and wind can actually increase demand for  
13 dispatchable base load such as that provided by hydro  
14 electricities.

15 Are these transitions going to happen?  
16 Well, they are being implemented to reduce greenhouse  
17 emissions and adapt to future climates. So consider  
18 this: This past summer saw record-breaking fires in  
19 British Columbia, but also in Washington, Oregon and  
20 California. That is the entire west coast of North  
21 America was burning. We are still very much in the  
22 shallow part of the predicted future changes; the  
23 steep part of the curve is ahead of us. If climate  
24 impacts accelerate as expected, the urgency to  
25 implement measures and associated increases and demand  
26 for electricity will increase considerably. That

1 demand will also increase in neighbouring  
2 jurisdictions who may wish to increase imports of our  
3 renewable power.

4 So I'm not here to say whether or not we  
5 need Site C. I don't know the answer to that  
6 question, and that's your difficult challenge. I am  
7 here to say, though, that I believe that we are in  
8 fact very much -- that the overwhelming evidence is  
9 that we are on the thin edge of the wedge of  
10 increasing climate change impacts, and the imperative  
11 to narrow that wedge as much as possible, and we're  
12 not going to stop it, is going to increase in the  
13 future.

14 And further, reliable baseload electricity  
15 on a continental basis is going to be critical to that  
16 end. So as such, I ask the Commission to take these  
17 considerations into account as you prepare your  
18 recommendations for government on the Site C  
19 development.

20 Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

22 **Proceeding Time 6:45 p.m. T09**

23 Good evening, sir.

24 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FOY (#0179):**

25 MR. FOY: Good evening. My name is Joe Foy, that's F-O-  
26 Y. I am the national campaign director for the

1 Wilderness Committee. Our organization has been  
2 actively campaigning against the Site C dam since  
3 2010.

4 I want to acknowledge that I stand on the  
5 unceded Coast Salish territory, and look forward to  
6 the day that the UN Declaration on Indigenous Rights  
7 will be incorporated into our province and nation's  
8 laws and regulations.

9 I want to thank the B.C. Utilities  
10 Commission for your work in considering the costs  
11 involved with continuing, pausing, or cancelling the  
12 Site C dam project. Our organization strongly  
13 supports cancelling the Site C dam project, and  
14 ensuring that the Peace River Valley is never  
15 threatened with flooding again.

16 The points I want to make in my five minute  
17 allocation may be a bit surprising. They relate to  
18 saving money for B.C. ratepayers and taxpayers by  
19 cancelling the Site C dam project, but I want to talk  
20 not just about saving money but by spending money in  
21 order to do this in a just and fair way.

22 We view the Site C dam project as a  
23 financial disaster, caused by the previous Liberal  
24 provincial government. And this disaster was made  
25 possible by the provincial government preventing you,  
26 the B.C. Utilities Commission, from reviewing the Site

1 C dam project before construction was allowed to  
2 proceed. We believe that, had the BCUC reviewed the  
3 Site C dam project prior to construction, it would  
4 never have started.

5 When considering the costs associated with  
6 cancelling the Site C dam project now, we ask that you  
7 fully factor in the cost of compensating the victims.  
8 The cost of tracking down and bringing to justice any  
9 wrongdoers that may have been involved in this multi-  
10 billion dollar movement of public funds into private  
11 pockets. The cost in determining how some of the lost  
12 monies may be recouped. And the cost of repairing the  
13 lands and waterways damaged as a result of the Site C  
14 construction activities.

15 With regard to the victims. We ask that  
16 you put your mind towards compensation for workers  
17 who, through no fault of their own, may have moved to  
18 the Peace River Valley, bought homes, made long-term  
19 plans, all based on promises about the Site C dam that  
20 were not based on real information.

21 The farmers and landowners who incurred  
22 legal costs defending their lands in court against a  
23 Site C dam project are victims of the previous  
24 government as well, and deserve some measure of  
25 compensation.

26 First Nations in the valley incurred costs

1       defending their land rights in court and deserve  
2       compensation. And furthermore, they have to shoulder  
3       their own costs to defend their inherent rights.  
4       There should be a legal defense -- a package set aside  
5       in that valley for future incursions on their rights.  
6       They should not have to reach into their pockets to  
7       defend the rights which they have inside them.

8               With regard to any wrongdoers who may have  
9       broken laws, money should be set aside to conduct a  
10      full investigation into how the Site C dam project --  
11      that was and is described as the largest public  
12      project in our history -- was commenced without any  
13      independent oversight by the BCUC, resulting in the  
14      looting of public funds. If individuals have broken  
15      laws, they need to be found out, and they need to be  
16      found accountable.

17             We need to repair those damaged lands, and  
18      finally in other areas, including the \$50 billion  
19      worth of contracts that were given to private power  
20      producers, any areas where the B.C. Utilities  
21      Commission was prevented from doing due oversight  
22      should be examined, and that's where we need to get  
23      our money back to help pay for justice for the victims  
24      of this terrible attack on public funds.

25             Thanks for allowing me to go over time.  
26      Appreciate it.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

2 **Proceeding Time 6:51 p.m. T10**

3 MS. FITZPATRICK: Good evening.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening.

5 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. FITZPATRICK (#0180):**

6 MS. FITZPATRICK: My name is Brenda Fitzpatrick, that's  
7 F-I-T-Z-P-A-T-R-I-C-K. I'm a PhD candidate in  
8 anthropology at UBC and my dissertation research  
9 focuses on the Site C controversy. As part of that  
10 research I spent more than a year in Fort St. John  
11 speaking to people who were both for and against Site  
12 C and attended the joint review panel hearings.

13 One of the pro Site C arguments that I  
14 frequently heard is that the project will provide jobs  
15 and grow the economy. This is an issue that concerns  
16 us all, of course. I am not going to comment on the  
17 economic growth aspect of it except to say that the  
18 more we hear the less and less I'm convinced that this  
19 project would be positive for the economy.

20 I also believe that there are many ways we  
21 could generate more and more stable jobs at a lower  
22 public cost, and I fully support a fair transition for  
23 current Site C workers into other more sustainable  
24 jobs.

25 A healthy economy is not an end in itself.  
26 It should be a proxy for public wellbeing and in that



1           sense I do not believe that Site C is in the public  
2           interest for many reasons and I will only briefly  
3           touch on a few of them.

4                       I am not a member of any First Nations and  
5           I don't mean to speak for anyone except for myself,  
6           but at the JRP hearings over and over I heard members  
7           speaking of their fear of what the dam would do to  
8           their livelihoods and the way that because of the  
9           intensity of the industrial development in the Peace  
10          region there aren't many places left where they can  
11          exercise these rights. And I heard people, First  
12          Nations and non-First Nations over and over speaking  
13          of how the industrial development was just feeling  
14          like out of control. I felt a sense of desperation  
15          and panic from people about the way things were going.

16                      And First Nations members often spoke about  
17          how, as industry increases, they said it's more and  
18          more difficult for them to find healthy animals and  
19          fish to feed themselves and this means no only  
20          economic hardship but also cultural loss. People ask  
21          how they could teach their children to hunt moose and  
22          gather medicinal plants if there are no moose and  
23          there are no medicinal plants. They spoke of their  
24          hearts breaking and they spoke of cultural genocide.

25                      Furthermore, as the economy booms, the cost  
26          of living goes up, leaving anyone at the bottom of the

1 economic ladder vulnerable. As Amnesty International  
2 has documented, First Nations women in particular are  
3 already feeling the impacts of the oil and gas economy  
4 in the form of gender and racialized violence. And at  
5 the JRP hearings both First Nations and local  
6 governments expressed their fear that Site C would  
7 only worsen poverty, domestic violence, drug use and  
8 criminal activity and further stretch social services.

9 So on the one hand I heard people talking  
10 about how this project was destroying their children's  
11 future. On the other hand I heard BC Hydro say, "But  
12 we generated a series of alternative portfolios and we  
13 ran them through our system optimizer and this is the  
14 one that came out as the best."

15 We need a decision-making system that  
16 accounts for human costs and respects treaties and  
17 First Nations rights.

18 My second point, I often hear that we  
19 should build Site C because we will eventually need  
20 the power, even if not right away. And that hydro  
21 power is a low greenhouse gas way to generate it.

22 First of all, it's not clear to me that  
23 building new hydro power produces lower greenhouse gas  
24 emissions than other forms of power; and second, I  
25 don't think we should solve one problem by creating  
26 another. Climate change, as serious as it is, is one

1 aspect of a much larger problem, namely the  
2 overconsumption of resources world-wide. Flooding  
3 the Peace valley would reduce important wildlife  
4 habitat and eliminate high-quality agricultural land  
5 that will become all the more important as the climate  
6 changes. To avert a climate crisis, only to starve  
7 for lack of farmland, doesn't seem like much of an  
8 improvement.

9 We will always need more power, just like  
10 we always need more money. Yet at some point, we have  
11 to accept that we only have so much money and no more.  
12 In the same way, we have ecological limits. We need  
13 to keep our power consumption within those limits to  
14 adjust our "ecological spending", in quotes, to our  
15 budget and not the other way around.

16 For these and many other reasons I support  
17 cutting our losses and cancelling Site C.

18 **Proceeding Time 6:56 p.m. T11**

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

20 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0181):**

21 MR. JONES: My name is David Jones. I live in  
22 Tsawwassen. I recommend termination of the project  
23 immediately. It's not needed now, nor it will be  
24 needed in the foreseeable future, because the  
25 consumption of electricity is going down not up. I  
26 remember when Gordon Shrum was in charge of BC Hydro

1 or B.C. Electric and there was a 7 percent increase  
2 every year, for years. Lots of things were going up 7  
3 percent a year. And I think BC Hydro is still stuck  
4 in that time warp. Those times are long gone. For  
5 the past 15 years the power consumption in B.C. is  
6 basically flat, probably even down, and there's a good  
7 reason for that.

8 I'm sure you've read the Backer report.  
9 It's a wonderful report. And they discuss in there  
10 the issue of elasticity which you've heard about, in  
11 fact you've talked about it yourself. BC Hydro's  
12 assumptions about elasticity, which is the amount by  
13 which demand goes down when prices go up, is .05. I'm  
14 not sure how the units work out, but I think what's  
15 important here is that other experts say the  
16 elasticity factor is much higher, probably an order of  
17 magnitude higher. In the Backer report they show the  
18 long-term elasticity factor to be about .4. What that  
19 means is, of course, as the price goes up, people use  
20 less electricity. The gentleman who spoke about the  
21 friend of his whose bill was \$1500, what was the  
22 response to reducing the electricity consumption is to  
23 put in more insulation. You repeat that story over  
24 and over again. Look what's happened to cars.  
25 They've become more gas efficient.

26 So this explains why consumption of

1 electricity has been flat at best for several years,  
2 while prices have been steadily rising. They've  
3 roughly doubled in just the last few years and it  
4 means the future consumption is going to be even less.  
5 Ontario Hydro has seen it already.

6 I'd like to talk about this termination  
7 cost. BC Hydro claimed it to be about \$3 billion, but  
8 this is patently false. It's probably less than one  
9 billion, almost certainly, and it may be as low as  
10 zero when you take into account other factors such as  
11 Joe Foy talked about, and also the agricultural  
12 production from the valley. Wendy Holmes has  
13 calculated that the total amount of farmland could be  
14 made available and the likely production for that  
15 farmland, it works out about 65 million a year, and  
16 over 20 years that easily takes into account any  
17 possible cost of termination.

18 The only real termination costs that BC  
19 Hydro has, apart from the so-called sunk costs, which  
20 certainly can't be taken into account, the only real  
21 costs are the remediation, about 700 million according  
22 to their estimate, but this is almost certainly  
23 exaggerated, and the termination of the construction,  
24 that is the contractors and labour, about 300 million.  
25 Even these estimates appear to be inflated, especially  
26 remediation, as BC Hydro obviously had a vested

1 interest in inflating this number because they wanted  
2 the project to go ahead. Does anybody believe they  
3 made this estimate in good faith? What's worse is the  
4 estimate came from Himeria. Himeria is the in-house  
5 consultant, and they expect to get all the work for  
6 the remediation, and most of it is monitoring work.  
7 Ten years' worth of monitoring.

8 So my instinct as a long-term consultant  
9 myself is that this remediation work has been grossly  
10 overestimated by at least a factor of 2, though I know  
11 nothing about the details of the work. So a total  
12 cost of these two factors, construction, termination  
13 and remediation, were probably less than 500 million.  
14 And if you take into account the benefits to be  
15 obtained by not building it, and all the other things  
16 you've heard about, the net cost to the province,  
17 perhaps not to ratepayers but the net cost to the  
18 province is probably zero or even positive.

19 And this so-called clean energy that is so  
20 much touted as a reason for Site C, it's hardly that.  
21 It's nothing of the sort. How can damming a river be  
22 called clean energy?

23 Thank you very much.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

25 **Proceeding Time 7:01 p.m. T12**

26 Please go ahead, ma'am.

1 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CASSELLS (#0182):**

2 MS. CASSELLS: Thank you. My name is Roslyn Cassells. I  
3 would first like to acknowledge I am on Coast Salish  
4 territory, unceded Coast Salish territory. And I am  
5 going to talk about triple bottom line accounting  
6 regarding the Site C dam.

7 I'm the founder of the Stop Site C Dam  
8 group, which has over 1200 members. I am also a  
9 member of the BC Hydro Ratepayers Group. I am a  
10 former Vancouver Park Board Commissioner and Canada's  
11 first elected Green.

12 First point I'd like -- I'm also a teacher  
13 and an advocate for the rights of all, especially the  
14 voiceless: the furred, the feathered, and our scaly  
15 relations.

16 Your terms of reference are too narrow. So  
17 I'm going to couch my comments regarding wildlife  
18 under the triple bottom line accounting aspect of  
19 economy, environment and society. The effects on  
20 society will be -- has been dealt with in large part  
21 by the members of the First Nations people who are  
22 most greatly affected: the Prophet River First  
23 Nation, the Blueberry First Nation, and West Moberly  
24 First Nations.

25 I would also like to acknowledge the work  
26 of the Peace Valley Environmental Association, the

1 Rocky Mountain Fort Camp participants, who froze their  
2 asses off, and the Peace Valley Land Owners'  
3 Association, and the various environmental legal  
4 defense groups who tried to protect the rights of the  
5 animals in Site C.

6 Berda Kassa is a Lanka woman who was  
7 assassinated for her fight against a dam in her  
8 territory in Honduras in 2016, said, "Mother Earth,  
9 militarized, fenced in, poisoned, a place where basic  
10 rights are systematically violated, demands we take  
11 action."

12 Since I wrote this report about wildlife of  
13 the Peace River Valley endangered by Site C dam, there  
14 have been many more species added to the list,  
15 including species new to science. But as of when I  
16 wrote the report, I will read this to you.

17 There are at least 63 endangered, red-  
18 listed, blue-listed, and at-risk, threatened, and of  
19 special concern species of animals who make Site C in  
20 the Peace River Valley their home. 30 species of  
21 migratory birds, 23 species of invertebrates, six  
22 species of mammals, two species of raptors, and one  
23 amphibian species from this list, who will be killed  
24 due to drowning, electrocution, starvation, loss of  
25 habitat, or physical impacts causing injury.  
26 Thousands of other species will also suffer and die



1 due to Site C dam. Wildlife will suffer great and  
2 irreparable harm and the protection that they are  
3 entitled to under B.C., Canadian, and international  
4 law are not being enforced. The provincial wildlife  
5 -- *B.C. Wildlife Act*, *B.C.'s At Risk Act*, the  
6 Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife's  
7 recommendations, Kosewica federal. And the *Migratory*  
8 *Birds Convention Act*, which is an international act  
9 Canada is signatory to, are being blatantly ignored as  
10 politicians pursue their political ambitions with  
11 complete disregard to these and other laws, and to  
12 their duties to Canadians, Treaty 8 First Nations, and  
13 our precious and vulnerable wildlife.

14 Site C dam is also home to many rare and  
15 unique plants. The Peace daisy and persistent sepal  
16 yellowgrass are found only in the Peace River Valley,  
17 and they would be extinguished by Site C dam according  
18 to our own B.C. Ministry of Forests, Lands, and  
19 Natural Resources. Herriot's Sage and Old Man's  
20 Whiskers are also only found in the Peace Region.  
21 They are imperilled.

22 The panel which examined Site C dam  
23 projects stated it would cause significant adverse  
24 effects on rare plants and noted BC Hydro made no  
25 attempt to assess traditional medicinal plants used by  
26 First Nations. It also stated ecosystems would be

1 entirely lost to the project, including riparian and  
2 flood plain forests, tupa seeps and mari fens, which  
3 cannot ever be recreated. Their loss complete,  
4 permanent and irreversible. And that some ecological  
5 communities, including wetlands, would see their  
6 status become more precarious.

7 Site C would result in the extirpation of  
8 three species of fish which the First Nations depend  
9 upon. A reduction in fish health and survival -- I'm  
10 sorry. But it's more than dollars and cents. It's  
11 lives, it's species, it's cultures that we will lose  
12 forever if you put Site C -- and if you don't stop  
13 Site C.

14 Site C is a biodiversity hot spot. It's a  
15 vital east/west passage to the Rocky Mountains and the  
16 only one below a thousand meters in the Yukon to  
17 Yellowstone wildlife corridor. It's essential, life  
18 or death, to species migration, large mammal movement,  
19 and biodiversity. It's a conservation priority and  
20 core wildlife habitat it's our duty to protect.  
21 Environment Canada noted three-quarters of B.C.'s 247  
22 bird species use the Peace region, without even  
23 considering migratory and wintering species. The  
24 panel scientists stated Site C dam project would cause  
25 significant adverse effects on migratory birds which  
26 cannot be mitigated.



1                   I would like to thank the panel for the  
2 work on this issue. I realize it's a very rushed  
3 process, but we are trusting you to do an open and  
4 honest assessment of the project and evaluate it with  
5 the long-term benefits of the citizens of B.C. as the  
6 prime concern.

7                   About a year and a half ago I started  
8 educating myself about this project. The more I  
9 learned the worse it gets. There are many reasons why  
10 I'm opposed to this project but I'm going to focus on  
11 the lack of ability to accurately forecast the need  
12 for the power from the grid and the factors that will  
13 affect the need.

14                  This does not discount the fact that the  
15 costs of this dam are not just monetary. It is  
16 becoming clear that it is not possible to forecast the  
17 future need for power accurately. The demand for  
18 power in B.C. has been essentially flat for the last  
19 ten years. That was not forecasted. BC Hydro  
20 themselves have said we won't need the power from this  
21 dam for ten years after the dam is built. Will we  
22 need it then? They haven't been accurate so far.

23                  If we can't accurately forecast demand,  
24 then why would a hugely expensive and destructive  
25 mega-dam project that takes ten plus years to build be  
26 even considered? Especially in light of the fact that

1 alternative energy projects can be built much quicker.  
2 These alternative energy project give much greater  
3 flexibility in providing power as it is needed. It  
4 would reduce the cost, because you would only be  
5 building them for power that is actually needed. It  
6 also spreads out the jobs to many other communities  
7 and over many more years.

8 Wind, solar, and geothermal technology is  
9 only going to continue to improve dramatically in the  
10 coming years, so why would we chain ourselves to the  
11 cumbersome, expensive, outdated technology and  
12 destruction of big hydro dams. Not to forget that  
13 many of these technologies can already be supplied at  
14 an equal or lower cost. I do not accept that we need  
15 to build this dam because we might need the power  
16 years into the future, when we have more flexible  
17 options that will only continue to become cheaper.

18 The transition of the world to a fossil-  
19 fuel free future leads some people to believe that  
20 it's going to be a huge increase in the demand for  
21 electricity on the part of big hydro grids. I would  
22 not be too sure about that. The increase in energy  
23 demand will not be as great as people expect, and the  
24 energy required likely will not all come from the big  
25 grid.

26 I find the possibilities of increasing

1 efficiencies, better building techniques and local  
2 distributed grids very exciting. The passive house  
3 construction standards, where building will require  
4 very little energy to operate, to net-zero building  
5 that may be net producers of energy is starting to  
6 become much more common.

7 Two high rises are being proposed in  
8 Vancouver at Alberni and Nicola to be built to the  
9 German passive house standard. As more buildings are  
10 built to this standard, less energy will be required.  
11 A change in the B.C. building codes could lead to  
12 province-wide implementation of these standards. The  
13 European union is working toward a member-wide  
14 standard in energy efficiency construction by 2020.  
15 The factor 4 program at BCIT is an innovative program  
16 that can lead the way to amazing reductions in energy  
17 use and commercial operations, often with simple  
18 inexpensive changes in the way things are done.

19 Broad scale implementation could have a  
20 huge impact on energy requirements.

21 Another area that has a lot of promise is  
22 community-based energy production with local grids, as  
23 is being done in Germany. This increases energy  
24 resiliency by distributing power production and  
25 decreases the need of energy from the big utility  
26 grids. For homeowners, Elon Musk of Tesla fame, has

1 developed solar roofs that would replace regular  
2 roofing with solar shingles that also provide  
3 homeowners with electricity. The costs are only going  
4 to come down putting them in the reach of more and  
5 more people.

6 Another area that people say will increase  
7 the requirement for electricity is electric cars.  
8 Yes, they will increase electricity consumption, but  
9 not necessarily from the big grids. Elon Musk has  
10 said that almost all of his superchargers will get  
11 their energy from solar panels and battery storage and  
12 be disconnected from the energy grid. I can see that  
13 happening to other commercial car charge stations as  
14 well.

15 Don't you think more people and companies  
16 would increase efficiencies and look at providing their  
17 own power, rather than buy power from BC Hydro if it  
18 was cheaper? I would. Companies certainly would. A  
19 solar installation company in Burnaby has put solar  
20 panels on the roof of their business to supply their  
21 energy needs, including their electric cars. It is  
22 cost effective for them now, and if hydro rates  
23 escalate to the extent that would be expected if Site  
24 C dam is built, more and more businesses would do the  
25 same thing.

26 In the U.S. companies like Target, Walmart

1 and Coscto are doing so. Target alone had 147  
2 megawatt of solar capacity already installed on its  
3 stores in 2016. I think there will be a snowball  
4 effect with many of these things. As people and  
5 companies see it can be done, and that it will save  
6 them money, more will do it. As you have fewer  
7 customers, the costs of power for those who are left  
8 will increase and then even more customers would drop  
9 off.

10 So, since it doesn't seem possible to  
11 accurate predict the energy demand required by our  
12 utility grid, especially in the light of all of the  
13 new innovations that are being developed, we should  
14 focus on alternative energy sources that can be built  
15 as needed in relatively short time frames and likely  
16 far more inexpensively.

17 Thank you very much.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

19 **Proceeding Time 19:13 p.m. T14**

20 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GILDERSLEEVE (#0184):**

21 MR. GILDERSLEEVE: Good evening. It's Mike Gildersleeve,  
22 spelled G-I-L-D-E-R-S-L-E-E-V-E. I'd like to  
23 acknowledge that I'm also on unceded territory of the  
24 Coast Salish First Nation including Squamish, Tsleil-  
25 waututh and Musqueam First Nation. I appreciate the  
26 opportunity and I also want to say I appreciate the



1 work that you're doing moving around the province.  
2 It's something we've been waiting and unbelievable  
3 that it's happening now, and do appreciate the work  
4 you're doing and the opportunity to finally have a say  
5 on this project, on this what I would say -- the point  
6 that I would want to make is that really to start off,  
7 it's the largest infraction and infringement on  
8 indigenous sovereignty that we have seen, and this is  
9 -- obviously there are others over the years, but this  
10 now in 2017 is something that is really reprehensible.

11 And so for me, that was an area of extreme  
12 distress, and if you want to, you know, to add in just  
13 the -- when we look at the Joint Review Panel report,  
14 I also understand that just the Joint Review Panel  
15 themselves were underfunded at the time. But in the  
16 time they were working on this they provided some very  
17 good information. So this was the highest number of  
18 significant adverse environmental impacts on any  
19 environmental assessment ever done. And as we know as  
20 well, the permanent and unmitigable impacts on First  
21 Nations, Treaty 8 First Nation of the area.

22 You know, how do you begin to mitigate the  
23 loss of constitutionally enshrined rights of Treaty 8  
24 First Nations? And what we're talking about is  
25 eliminating those rights by approving this project.  
26 And by doing that, we are also acknowledging that

1 we're eliminating a way of life and a way of living  
2 that has been going on for thousands of years. And  
3 for me, that is enough, that is a cost, that's a true  
4 cost that we're seeing, and it's unacceptable. So for  
5 that alone this project should be terminated  
6 immediately.

7 We've heard a lot about how we mitigate,  
8 you know, we're learning about the environmental  
9 assessment process that we have available to us now,  
10 and clearly there's some major shortcomings. And you  
11 have a -- when you have a report that identifies these  
12 significant adverse impacts and that there are  
13 politicians of the day can turn a blind eye to  
14 essentially, is again unacceptable. We've also we've  
15 heard tonight as well that, you know, the Joint Review  
16 Panel did make that recommendation that this project  
17 be referred to the BCUC, as I refer tonight. They  
18 also highlighted that BC Hydro had failed to  
19 demonstrate the need for this power, that there was  
20 actually the need for this power. They'd also failed  
21 to explore all the relevant alternative sources of  
22 energy such as geothermal, solar, wind, and which are,  
23 as we know, you know, some of you -- as we know now,  
24 we are in the middle of an energy revolution and time  
25 is fast changing where our energy sources are totally  
26 being turned upside down and we're seeing with the

1           unfortunate repercussion of proving a project like  
2           Site C does not leave any room for resources or funds  
3           to pursue these alternative renewable energies.

4                       And so we see -- we saw soon after the  
5           approval that the Wind Energy Association of Canada I  
6           think it was, left -- they moved their office from  
7           B.C. Basically we're way behind the curve in terms of  
8           where we need to be with our research and development.  
9           There's huge economic opportunities. We know that the  
10          job opportunities alone in renewable energies are  
11          hugely more than what might come from oil and gas or,  
12          you know. This project was termed -- oh, five  
13          minutes? This is not -- also clean energy. We've  
14          heard it was labelled Site C Clean Energy Project.  
15          It's far from it. It's going to leave a reservoir  
16          with methylmercury contaminated that the fish will,  
17          you know -- totally damaging. I'm sorry for going  
18          over time.

19                      There's only one choice here. We really  
20          must terminate this project. We want to show, one  
21          that we are active on reconciliation and that we  
22          actually want to save, develop a much better climate.

23                      Thank you.

24          THE CHAIRPERSON:    Thank you, sir.

25    **Proceeding Time 7:19 p.m. T15**

26    Good evening. Please go ahead.

1 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PEPPER-SMITH (#0185):**

2 MR. PEPPER-SMITH: Good evening, panel members. My name  
3 is Kegan Pepper-Smith, P-E-P-P-E-R, hyphen S-M-I-T-H.  
4 And as many of the presenters before me, I'd like to  
5 start by acknowledging the unceded ancestral territory  
6 that we are now standing on, with the Musqueam,  
7 Squamish, Slewateuth Nations. And on that point, I  
8 would just speculate out loud whether an invite should  
9 have been extended to these nations to support our  
10 presence on their territory. And if not this time,  
11 then perhaps next time the panel has a hearing on  
12 their territory.

13 So, just to start, I'm a lawyer at  
14 Ecojustice Canada and counsel for Sierra Club B.C. for  
15 the purposes of this inquiry. I'd like to start by  
16 thanking the Panel for the commendable work that's  
17 been done thus far, especially under the significant  
18 time constraints that you've been faced with.

19 A couple of housekeeping matters before I  
20 get going. I first of notice that my time is not  
21 running yet. I'm totally fine with that.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

23 MR. PEPPER-SMITH: But if you aren't --

24 Yes. So to start, it's my understanding  
25 that in the course of these hearings you've heard from  
26 many representatives of Sierra Club B.C. and as well

1 as rate-paying members of that organization. They are  
2 a member-based organization with several thousand  
3 rate-paying members and they've made submissions to  
4 the Commission on multiple occasions in the past. So  
5 I suspect that the Commission will give full regard to  
6 their submissions.

7 So I'm here to speak just into a particular  
8 point that I suspect has not been given quite a bit of  
9 airtime throughout the Commission's hearing. That is,  
10 how you Panel members are expected to carry out your  
11 inquiry.

12 You are a creature of statute and a  
13 creature of the OIC, governed by the terms of  
14 reference, and I want to focus tonight on -- in  
15 particular on terms of reference, section 3(b),  
16 subsection (4).

17 As I'm sure you are quite well aware now,  
18 this subsection requires the Panel to respond to the  
19 question of whether there are alternative profiles --  
20 or portfolios of commercially feasible generating  
21 projects and demand-side initiatives that could  
22 provide similar benefits to ratepayers at a similar or  
23 lower unit energy cost as the Site C project.

24 It is abundantly clear from the submissions  
25 that you've received here today, and posted on your  
26 website, that you have had significant input from

1 experts on this point. And I suspect that you will  
2 consider all of those submissions when you draft your  
3 final report.

4 That said, in our review of the submissions  
5 and our attendance at these hearings, we have had --  
6 we are of the opinion that the preface of this  
7 question has not been given significant consideration,  
8 if any consideration whatsoever.

9 As you know, that question is prefaced  
10 with, "Given the objectives of the *Clean Energy Act*".  
11 Now, I want to pause here and say that we do have some  
12 issues with the *Clean Energy Act*, as other  
13 participants have aired here tonight. But if we focus  
14 on the *Clean Energy Act* objectives, we say that this  
15 requires them to -- this Panel to assess them before  
16 issuing its final report. We say that the  
17 consideration of these statutory objectives requires  
18 the Panel to invoke the legislative and Supreme Court  
19 of Canada recognized tools of statutory interpretation  
20 as you are a creature of statute.

21 So there are several interpretive tools  
22 that we would have touched on in our original  
23 submissions in August, the August 30 submissions, that  
24 we will follow up with on October 11<sup>th</sup>. But for the  
25 purposes of this oral submission I want to focus on  
26 one of those statutory tools of interpretation, and

1           that is the Section 7(2) of the *B.C. Interpretation*  
2           *Act*.

3                         This legislative provision requires that  
4           all other legislative provisions and those found in  
5           the Orders in Council, that are expressed in present  
6           tense apply to the circumstances as they arise. So it  
7           is our submission that the Panel must consider the *CEA*  
8           objectives which are expressed in the present tense in  
9           the circumstances that are before it, not when this  
10          project was initially proposed, and not when this  
11          project was initially approved.

12                        This means considering the alternative  
13          portfolios in light of the rapidly-shifting landscape  
14          of alternative lower-impact, cleaner energy sources.  
15          In particular, we would say wind and solar. And this  
16          means continuing to do what the panel has done in its  
17          preliminary report. That it is refusing to accept BC  
18          Hydro's submissions that are unsubstantiated, their  
19          assumptions that are unsubstantiated, and their  
20          conclusions that are unsubstantiated. We suspect that  
21          BC Hydro, being an outspoken proponent of the project,  
22          would back up its assumptions and conclusions with  
23          data and information that is up to date and properly  
24          reflects expert predictions of energy development  
25          going into the future.

26                        Now, tying this back briefly to the *CEA*

1 objectives, BC Hydro's argument is that Site C is the  
2 only project that satisfies the objective (f) that we  
3 find at CEA; that is, ensuring rates remain among the  
4 most competitive of the rates charged by any public  
5 utility in North America. And we see this reiterated  
6 in their most recent answers to your questions.

7 But we hope that this Commission continues  
8 to not blindly accept this assertion. We are not  
9 experts in energy economics. We suspect that you have  
10 plenty of those before you, and we expect that you  
11 will give fair regard for all of the evidence.

12 But we would ask you to consider also the  
13 other CEA objectives that speak to the circumstances  
14 that have arisen since this project was proposed and  
15 approved; that is, among them, objective (1) which  
16 focuses on fostering the development of First Nations  
17 and rural communities through the use and development  
18 of clean and renewable resources. These are  
19 objectives that apply through the statute that is  
20 before you, and they are just as important as ensuring  
21 that the lowest rates are received by the ratepayers.

22 Subject to any questions by the Panel,  
23 those are our submissions.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

25 **Proceeding Time 7:25 p.m. T16**

26 Good evening.



1 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KEEGAN-HENRY (#0186):**

2 MS. KEEGAN-HENRY: Good evening. My name is Morag  
3 Keegan-Henry, K-E-E-G-A-N hyphen H-E-N-R-Y, and I also  
4 want to acknowledge that we are unceded Coast Salish  
5 territory.

6 I learned last week that the reason I live  
7 on unceded Coast Salish territory is that my  
8 grandfather moved my family to British Columbia so  
9 that he could participate in building the W.A.C.  
10 Bennett dam. I feel that I, therefore, and my family  
11 are complicit in the harms to indigenous peoples that  
12 came about because of the building of the W.A.C.  
13 Bennett dam. I don't want to be complicit in the  
14 harms to indigenous peoples that will come about  
15 because of the building of the Site C dam.

16 My grandfather was mentioned earlier. His  
17 name was Keith Henry, and nobody would have described  
18 him as an environmentalist. But he was the chair of  
19 the B.C. Utilities panel that reviewed the Site C dam  
20 in the early 1980s. And in preparing for tonight, I  
21 took the opportunity to read through some of his old  
22 papers, some of the transcripts and some of the notes  
23 that the Commission had from the 1980s hearings. I  
24 hope that you also have had the opportunity to review  
25 those, because I found them very illuminating and to  
26 give a lot of context to the submissions that you will

1 have received from BC Hydro this time around.

2 In the final report from the Commission in  
3 1983, there were two conditions that the placed upon  
4 an energy certificate being issued for the Site C dam  
5 that I want to read to you tonight.

6 The first is that Site C should not built  
7 until an acceptable forecast demonstrates the  
8 construction must begin immediately in order to avoid  
9 supply deficiencies. The second, that a comparison of  
10 alternative feasible system plan demonstrates from a  
11 social benefit/cost point of view, that Site C is the  
12 best project to meet the anticipated supply  
13 deficiency. I think both of those are relevant to the  
14 questions that you are faced with today.

15 First of all, the term "acceptable",  
16 acceptable forecast. Why did they put that in there?  
17 The Commission in 1983 was not convinced by BC Hydro's  
18 submissions about load forecasts. In fact, they were  
19 right, demand hasn't materialized, we didn't need Site  
20 C, and at the time, if read if you the cross-  
21 examinations, and if you read the documents that were  
22 being brought forward, they questioned a lot of BC  
23 Hydro's assumptions, just as people here tonight have  
24 been urging you to do.

25 So what I am asking is that you stand up  
26 for British Columbians, just like the BCUC did in

1 1983, and you find out for us, what is a realistic  
2 forecast. Is BC Hydro telling us the truth? Do we  
3 really need the power from Site C? Because a lot of  
4 experts are saying that we don't.

5 The second thing that I think is relevant  
6 here is the statement that we need to consider  
7 alternative system plans. And what they meant by that  
8 in 1983 is perhaps not quite what we brought forward  
9 today. The alternatives we are talking about now are  
10 different, more technologically advanced. Certainly  
11 solar and wind have come a long way since then. But  
12 even then the BCUC was saying that we should look at  
13 geothermal a lot more than BC Hydro had looked at it.

14 Your September 20<sup>th</sup> report showed that you  
15 are questioning how much BC Hydro had looked at  
16 alternatives. I trust that you will continue to do  
17 so, that you will continue to look at alternative  
18 portfolios that could meet demand if demand  
19 materializes without the cost of Site C.

20 And that brings me to the third and final  
21 point. Social benefit/cost analysis. Like I said, my  
22 grandpa wasn't an environmentalist and First Nations  
23 right, well, nobody would have called him a First  
24 Nations right advocate at that point in his life. But  
25 he saw that the costs of Site C were so huge, the  
26 environmental costs, the costs to the people of the

1 Peace valley, the cost to local indigenous peoples,  
2 these costs are so high that the economics would have  
3 to be really really good to justify them, and those  
4 economics just aren't there.

5 You have a really hard job in front of you.  
6 And I appreciate and I know a lot of the other people  
7 here tonight have really appreciated feeling that  
8 you're really listening to us. We know you're doing  
9 your very best and we really feel heard and we thank  
10 you for that, and for all of the time you spent going  
11 to hearings across this province. We are counting on  
12 you guys.

13 There is a lot of information coming out  
14 that we would never have known if not for this review.  
15 Even just today the report saying that we're going to  
16 be a year behind schedule, we're going to miss that  
17 crucial river diversion and we're going to be \$600  
18 million over budget. None of that would have come out  
19 if not for this review, and so we're counting on you.

20 Thank you so much.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

22 **Proceeding Time 7:30 p.m. T17**

23 Good evening.

24 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHANSSON (#0124):**

25 MS. JOHANSSON: Thank you. My name is Gwen Johansson, J-  
26 O-H-A-N-S-S-O-N, and I'd like to acknowledge that we

1 stand on the unceded territory of the Coast Salish  
2 people.

3 I own land and live in the flood zone of  
4 what would be the Site C reservoir and have lived  
5 there since 1975. In those 42 years I've tried to  
6 come to understand the Site C issue, and so I've been  
7 part of many groups and committees and boards dealing  
8 with electricity as I've tried to come to some  
9 understanding, and those included the B.C. Energy  
10 Council, the BC Hydro 2005 Integrated Resource  
11 Planning Committee, and the BC Hydro Board of  
12 Directors. And to me it seems clear that we are now  
13 in a time of fundamental change in energy supply and  
14 in use, not just in B.C. or in North America, but  
15 worldwide.

16 On September the 18<sup>th</sup> Mr. Couillard, premier  
17 of Quebec, participated in a panel discussion at  
18 Climate Week in New York City. He said that the era  
19 of large hydro dam construction is over. The English  
20 translation of *La Presse* quotes him as saying, "It is  
21 not the big dams that will take us over the next 20 to  
22 25 years," and he went on to describe a true  
23 revolution centred on decentralized generation in  
24 homes and businesses, intelligent power grids and  
25 storage. And he said that Hydro Quebec wants to go in  
26 the direction of solar power, as is happening in

1 Europe, in various U.S. states, especially Vermont,  
2 and I might add, in little Hudson's Hope which we  
3 visited last Saturday.

4 In B.C. we have everything needed to be  
5 part of and indeed to be a leader in the new  
6 electricity reality. We have good utility scale wind  
7 potential in northeastern B.C., Haida Gwaii, and  
8 northern Vancouver Island. We have good solar  
9 potential, particularly in the interior. Both wind  
10 and solar use assembly line production processes, an  
11 advantage over the large dams where each one requires  
12 unique one-of designs and construction processes. We  
13 have the expertise, although our policies have largely  
14 driven the renewable associations out of B.C., but  
15 they operate elsewhere.

16 On September the 29<sup>th</sup>, *Energy News Data*  
17 reported that two Canadian companies, one based in  
18 Vancouver, the other in Edmonton, are constructing  
19 wind installations in Wyoming and Oregon. We have  
20 storage in the Williston and Kinbasket reservoirs,  
21 Williston providing multi-year capability. And  
22 battery storage is evolving. Duke Energy has 36  
23 megawatts of storage at its wind farm in Texas now,  
24 and on September the 18<sup>th</sup> Duke Energy announced two  
25 more utility scale storage systems, one of 9 megawatts  
26 and the other of 4 megawatts.

1                   And so they're small scale now, but as a  
2 Duke spokesman said, "Battery technology has matured.  
3 We can go to regulators now and say, 'This makes  
4 sense.'" So small scale, yes, but rapidly evolving.

5                   I believe it's clear that the electricity  
6 revolution is well underway. I also believe that Site  
7 C is not needed in the new electricity reality. Site  
8 C has always been considered in just the electricity  
9 framework, and it shouldn't be. This is a land use  
10 issue, it's not just an electricity issue. There is a  
11 valley. What should it be used for? We've never  
12 considered Site C in that context where it is balanced  
13 against all of the other items and the other values.

14                   What should we use it for? So if it's to  
15 be used as a giant tub to hold water for electricity  
16 generation, then it's relegated to a single use  
17 basically, because most of the other uses would be  
18 eliminated. If the valley is left extant, it has  
19 multiple uses. Agriculture, well, less habitat.  
20 First Nations cultural activities. Heritage. It's a  
21 site of great biodiversity. Tourism and just a good  
22 place to live. So its highest and best use, I  
23 believe, is in allowing it to be left unflooded and  
24 its multiplicity of values developed.

25                   In the 1980s, the BCUC recommended that  
26 Site C not be granted an energy certificate because it

1 had not been shown that the electricity was needed, or  
2 if the electricity were needed that Site C was the  
3 best place to give it. The case against building Site  
4 C is even stronger today than it was in the 1980s. I  
5 believe that the best course today is cancellation of  
6 Site C and allowing the valley to be developed for its  
7 many other values. And further, I believe that BC  
8 Hydro should be freed from the restrictions of the  
9 *Clean Energy Act* so that the Crown corporation can  
10 fully participate in the new electricity reality in  
11 B.C.

12 And I'd like to thank you again for holding  
13 these hearings in both Vancouver and in the rest of  
14 the province. We appreciate it very much.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

16 **Proceeding Time 7:36 p.m. T18**

17 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WILLIS (#0187):**

18 MR. WILLIS: Paul Willis, W-I-L-L-I-S. In this inquiry  
19 there has been a lot of discussion about load  
20 forecasting. And in your September 30<sup>th</sup> preliminary  
21 report, you have mentioned the importance of load  
22 forecasting, and the difficulty in doing it  
23 accurately. But you also mentioned that it's  
24 important to do it as accurately as possible, because  
25 it means a lot to the ratepayers and to the people of  
26 B.C.



1                   My main reason for being here tonight is to  
2 suggest to you that in your final recommendations you  
3 recommend to the government, and to BC Hydro, that  
4 their forecasting methodology be enhanced and  
5 improved, and make use of the data that they now have,  
6 and the data analytical tools that we now have.

7                   In the reference to -- BC Hydro reference  
8 for the load forecast that was part of the 2017-2019  
9 revenue requirement application, BC Hydro indicated  
10 that they were using methods that they've been using  
11 for many years. Well, that's a problem. We now have  
12 data, SmartMeter data, for example, and data  
13 analytical tools that we did not have before. And we  
14 should be using those tools to do a much better job of  
15 forecasting than we are doing -- a more accurate job.

16                   Other businesses are doing that, are using  
17 big data. If you think of Walmart and Starbucks and  
18 Apple, they're using big data from their sales revenue  
19 to accurately forecast what their sales will be doing  
20 in the future. If they used the procedure that BC  
21 Hydro uses to do their forecasting, they would be  
22 broke. Maybe that is what happened to Sears, I don't  
23 know.

24                   It is also important to note, as other  
25 people have noted, that our energy situation is  
26 changing. Our consumption patterns are changing. A

1 lot of people have mentioned energy efficiency, and at  
2 the home level, but we forget that we are recycling,  
3 and re-use habits have also had an impact, a  
4 tremendous impact. We now recycle most of our  
5 aluminum. We recycle most of our glass. We recycle  
6 our paper. And we don't use as much paper. All these  
7 products are very energy-intensive projects and that is  
8 good news. It means that our energy consumption  
9 growth is being separated from our economic growth.  
10 We can grow economically without using more energy,  
11 which is good. And in fact, this has happened. You  
12 in your report have looked at what's happened to  
13 energy consumption in B.C. by looking at BC Hydro's  
14 annual report. I have done that. And in 2006, if you  
15 look at what BC Hydro sold in 2006, what they sold in  
16 2016 from their annual report, it's almost flat.  
17 Essentially a flat.

18 And this indicates that there is something  
19 happening to our consumption pattern, which is good.  
20 But it's important that we analyze that properly and  
21 we understand it, so that we don't build  
22 infrastructure that we do not need. Because that's  
23 going to cost us a lot of money, both the ratepayers  
24 and for the government.

25 So, in conclusion, my recommendation to you  
26 is that you encourage the government and BC Hydro to

1 implement a much more sophisticated load forecasting  
2 methodology which uses the data that they now have  
3 available through SmartMeters, and analytical tools,  
4 to do a much better job of analyzing the trend.  
5 What's happening to efficiency? How fast is LED  
6 technology being adopted? How fast are electric cars  
7 coming into place?

8 All of these things can be monitored much  
9 more closely than the current forecasting approach  
10 it's using.

11 Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

13 **Proceeding Time 7:40 p.m. T19**

14 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BASS (#0188):**

15 MR. BASS: Commissioners, my name is Fred Bass, B-A-S-S.  
16 Thank you for the opportunity to present my views and  
17 thank you for the enormous effort you are making to  
18 process this information and to arrive at findings.

19 My background is that of a physician who  
20 trained in preventive medicine in epidemiology. I  
21 came to Vancouver in 1975, where for three decades I  
22 worked in tobacco control at the community and  
23 clinical levels. In 1990 I served on Vancouver's  
24 Clouds of Change Global Warming Task Force and also  
25 from 1999 to 2005 I served on Vancouver City Council.

26 This is a time of unprecedented ecological

1 threat and economic uncertainty. Our species consumes  
2 too much, too much, including too much energy. This  
3 is not only best, it is a matter of survival. The  
4 future is very uncertain, so small projects are wiser  
5 than giant ones. I will recommend that Site C project  
6 be terminated and that BC Hydro transform itself into  
7 the B.C. Energy Conservation Authority.

8 My responses to your questions. Question  
9 A, a project on time and budget. On time and within  
10 budget. Since this project has not faced the  
11 discipline of a full BCUC review, problems may exist  
12 that such a review might have uncovered. Regarding  
13 budget, if the contingency budget is representative of  
14 planning accuracy, 45 percent consumed in two years  
15 projects to 180 percent in eight years, which is 80  
16 percent over projected cost. If we apply that to the  
17 whole Site C project – admittedly this is rhetorical –  
18 the tab comes to \$15 billion.

19 Skipping to (c) cost of terminating the  
20 project. If terminating the project leads to a major  
21 change in the way B.C. deals with energy conservation,  
22 whether termination costs 1 billion or 3 billion, it  
23 would be a victory. Even without such change, I  
24 believe the termination is the least cost option for  
25 ratepayers.

26 (d) what portfolio of generating projects

1 and demand side management. The demand side  
2 management performance of BC Hydro has been dismal.  
3 The amount invested in demand side management has been  
4 less than the average utility of the American Council  
5 for an energy efficient economy. And it has not been  
6 among the leaders in that body.

7 The DSM budget for 2017 to '19 compared to  
8 2014 to '16, the previous three years, shows decreases  
9 of 25 to 33 percent. Solar, photovoltaic, and  
10 residential heat and hot water, which are both  
11 vulnerable to demand side management, were not even  
12 modelled. Of 14 DSM strategies noted by the American  
13 Council for Energy Efficient Economy, B.C. has done  
14 one, partially done five, and not done eight. Given  
15 the province of B.C.'s energy objective quotes (b) "to  
16 take demand side measures and to conserve energy,"  
17 close quotes, this performance represents  
18 institutional failure.

19 I think the needed portfolio that you are  
20 asking for might follow a name change from BC Hydro to  
21 BC Energy Conservation Authority and a restructuring  
22 of the organization.

23 (e) Peak capacity and energy demands. The  
24 further into the future BC Hydro's estimates of  
25 demand, the more likely BC Hydro has been to  
26 overestimate actual demand. Twelve percent for ten

1           years into the future, 31 percent for twenty years  
2           into the future. Given the flat demand following  
3           2007, given the change we've heard about the  
4           environment, in which the world is addressing energy,  
5           and given the possibility of another financial crises,  
6           BC Hydro's estimates for future demand seem  
7           unreasonably rosy.

8                         In conclusion, -- oh, I'm over. In  
9           conclusion, given our time of unprecedented ecological  
10          threat and economic uncertainty, I recommend that the  
11          Site C project be terminated and further that BC Hydro  
12          be transformed into the BC Energy Conservation  
13          Authority.

14                         Thank you very much.

15   THE CHAIRPERSON:     Thank you, sir.

16   **Proceeding Time 7:46 p.m. T20**

17   THE CHAIRPERSON:     Let's just listen to Ms. Ratcliffe, and  
18          then we're going to take a short break after that.

19                         Please go ahead.

20   **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. RATCLIFFE (#0189):**

21   MS. RATCLIFFE:     Hello. My name is Julia Ratcliffe,  
22          that's R-A-T-C-L-I-F-F-E. I am here tonight on this  
23          unceded land that Vancouver is on because the Site C  
24          dam's so-called clean energy project should be halted  
25          and cancelled immediately.

26                         I am not an expert in energy production or

1 cost analysis. But I have worked hard to inform  
2 myself on this issue, and its many impacts, in order  
3 to enable myself to speak with hundreds of citizens  
4 around Vancouver.

5 All of that work was to see these hearings  
6 take place. So, I thank you for being the faces of  
7 what is a very important step in this public utility's  
8 project, a step that obviously was skipped by the  
9 province's previous leadership. We must hope that the  
10 hard work of both yourselves and the many British  
11 Columbians involved will ensure that this review is  
12 not too little too late.

13 I feel it is important that the attitudes  
14 of BC Hydro and the B.C. Liberal government not be  
15 forgotten in this review. The "past the point of no  
16 return" mantra that accompanied support of the dam's  
17 construction demonstrates perfectly the lack of effort  
18 made to ensure due process is followed and budgets are  
19 used responsibly. A project that relies on spending  
20 all of its funds in order to justify its existence  
21 really causes more problems than it solves.

22 The social, environmental and financial  
23 losses a dam such as this would cause are almost  
24 countless. Yet in the general public scope, they're  
25 almost hidden. I personally feel that they have not  
26 gone unnoticed, but rather they have been kept out of

1           conversations on purpose in order to spit-shine  
2           something that is not so appealing when you see it for  
3           what it is.

4                       Now is the time for the realities of this  
5           dam to be seen by yourselves and all British  
6           Columbians, so that we can make properly informed  
7           decisions regarding the investments and debts of  
8           generations to come, before we are past the point of  
9           no return in a direction that we don't want to go.

10                      Thank you.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON:    Thank you, ma'am.

12                      We're going to take a short break. We'll  
13           be back in about five minutes. Thank you.

14 **(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 7:48 P.M.)**

15 **(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 8:00 P.M.)**                      **T21**

16 THE CHAIRPERSON:    Is Russell Kerr here, please?

17                      Sir, why don't you go ahead, please.

18 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MATTICE (#0190):**

19 MR. MATTICE:       Hello. My name is Johnny. My last name  
20           Mattice. It's spelled M-A-T-T-I-C-E. I'm from  
21           Williams Lake, the Anaham reserve, and I'm here for  
22           the -- I guess the voice and the reason and hopefully  
23           some understanding about the Site C dam. I also  
24           represent the Local 97 Iron Workers here out of  
25           Burnaby B.C. So they've asked me both to attend.

26                      So in regards to the Site C dam, you know,



1 the numbers came out that it's supposed to be like an  
2 \$8.3 billion project, and me, being a steelworker,  
3 I've worked on the Port Mann Bridge, I worked on the  
4 Kelowna Bridge, and any kind of project, mega-project,  
5 like you're calling the Site C dam, it's going to go  
6 over cost. Straight out, it's going to be go over  
7 cost. And I'm not going to lie about it.

8 We did the Port Mann Bridge, and if you  
9 recall, there was a million dollar wall that was seven  
10 feet long -- or seventy feet or a hundred feet long,  
11 and it was missed -- somehow it was overlooked by the  
12 inspectors, and they call it a million dollar wall to  
13 this day. So you're going to go over cost.

14 And if you look at today there's a pipeline  
15 that was revoked because of the cost. And it's on the  
16 radio, it's all over.

17 Do we need that Site C dam? No, we don't  
18 need that Site C dam. It's going to affect our  
19 nations, it's going to affect the farmers, it's going  
20 to affect people's families. So.

21 Can we turn around and the -- the main  
22 excuse they say we have to go forward because we're in  
23 debt to it. You're not in debt to it. Just like me,  
24 I can go buy a \$30,000 truck or I can buy an \$80,000  
25 truck and the second year into my payments I go, "I'm  
26 sure glad I didn't buy the \$80,000 truck." You've got

1 to take what you got, cut the costs and walk away from  
2 it. That's what it comes down to. So.

3 I mean we're here on a board. I've sat on  
4 a lot of boards for both an Aboriginal person but also  
5 for the sites for people for -- where I've sat with  
6 violent offenders board, where I've been there  
7 supporting them, and not supporting them, and you get  
8 respect by getting people's opinion and I hope  
9 everything that's brought out today, that you guys do  
10 take into account, and not just go with one of the  
11 premiers said, "We're doing it anyways." Take into  
12 account you're affecting the animals, you're affecting  
13 the First Nations people, you're affecting the  
14 farmers. That money can be spent on mental health, it  
15 can be spent on other things. It could be spent on so  
16 much stuff and we don't need that Site C dam, that's  
17 what it comes down to.

18 For me as a steelworker, I would love it  
19 because it would give me work. It would give me out-  
20 of-town work, but am I going to do it and go against  
21 my grandchildren that are growing up, their  
22 grandchildren? You're going to offer these people,  
23 farmers, landowners -- you know what? There's a  
24 treaty in there, and I forget what the treaty is, but  
25 I think it's Treaty 8 and it was signed in 1989 by  
26 Queen Victoria. So.

1                   And it's stated that for as long as the sun  
2 shines, and the grass grows, the river will flow.  
3 Putting that Site C dam stops that river from flowing.  
4 So.

5                   I'm not the greatest every education. I  
6 got my grade 12 but you got to look at all the  
7 negatives and positives. It's like with me, I've been  
8 25 years sober. One of the reasons why is because I  
9 look at the negatives and the positives, and there's a  
10 lot more negatives from drinking and being a  
11 peckerhead and you know, going against people. I was  
12 never raised on a reserve, I was raised on the Gang  
13 Ranch up in (inaudible) with foster parents and they  
14 taught me to speak from the heart.

15                   So if you go with the Site C dam and you  
16 put the costs of whatever it is, what's the next time  
17 you're going to put some big project up there. What's  
18 the cost going to be next time. You're taking  
19 people's lives away. You're taking people's animals  
20 and their part away. I'm not a person that sits here  
21 with a hand out and says, "I want my land back." I  
22 just put it out there that we have to go forward to  
23 cancel this.

24                   And yeah, there's going to be a little  
25 deficit, but guess what? You'd rather it be a little  
26 one than 8.3 billion and more, which it will be more.

1           Because I know from working on the Port Mann, I've  
2           working on the Kelowna Bridge, we always ran into  
3           obstacles, and on the land for the Site C dam you're  
4           going to run into problems with the sand, you're going  
5           to run into problems, a lot of problems, and the  
6           biggest thing, I've been up to Hudson Hope, the Dawson  
7           Creek in winter, you're going to fight Mother Nature's  
8           weather. So if you say it's going to be a five-year  
9           plan, it won't be a five-year plan, I guarantee you  
10          that.

11                       And with the years come more money. It  
12          will not be a five, it will not be a ten-year plan, I  
13          guarantee that. I bet my house on it. It won't be  
14          that way. So.

15                       And in boards, you want respect? Take  
16          people's opinion to the heart. Give feedback. You  
17          know, but we are here for also want your guys's  
18          knowledge too, but want you guys to support our  
19          decisions. And one of the decisions is that we speak  
20          from the heart. I can sit here and read all my stuff.  
21          But guess what? I'm speaking from the heart, we don't  
22          need it. So it's effecting people.

23                       I'm probably going to get in trouble from  
24          my union for speaking for the heart, because they want  
25          me to say, "Hey, Johnnie, we need that work." And we  
26          do need that work, but not at other people's cost.

1 Not at the land's.

2 That all I can say so, you know, thanks for  
3 allowing me to speak. Remember that I'm here from the  
4 Williams Lake Indian Band, Anaham, and you know, we're  
5 going to be around and I'm just one of the voices from  
6 them. And you guys know our chief Joel Fonce, he  
7 speaks well, but he also has an arrogant attitude and  
8 I try to avoid that, so. So all I can say I'm a  
9 relation, so.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

11 **Proceeding Time 8:06 p.m. T22**

12 Please go ahead, sir.

13 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEVES (#0191):**

14 MR. STEVES: Okay. I'm Harold Steves, S-T-E-V-E-S, an  
15 agroecologist, a city councillor in Richmond, and a  
16 member of the Metro Vancouver Board of Directors.

17 At Metro Vancouver, we asked the question,  
18 can B.C.'s farmers feed our growing population? And  
19 the answer is no. B.C.'s food self-reliance report, a  
20 2006 report by the B.C. Ministry of Agriculture and  
21 Lands says to do so, "farmland with access to  
22 irrigation will have to increase by 92,000 hectares or  
23 by 49 percent over 2005 levels." Only 1.1 percent of  
24 British Columbia is irrigated farm land fertile enough  
25 to grow vegetables. It's mostly in the Fraser Valley,  
26 South Vancouver Island, both threatened by urban

1 development, and the Peace River, threatened by the  
2 Site C dam.

3 In 1973, we produced 86 percent of our  
4 vegetables. Today only 43 percent. The fertile,  
5 irrigable Peace River farmlands are essential to help  
6 provide the 92,000 hectares necessary to feed our  
7 growing population in a time of climate change, food  
8 scarcity, and food uncertainty.

9 Then there's the forested land of Site C.  
10 It plays a major role of storing carbon and the  
11 agricultural land is also a potential carbon sink.  
12 Using BC Hydro estimates, forested and agricultural  
13 lands are capable of sequestering 70,000 tonnes of  
14 carbon dioxide per year. If the dam proceeds, the  
15 carbon stored for centuries will also be continuously  
16 released at a rate of about 75,000 tonnes per year.  
17 Instead of offsetting fossil fuel use, development of  
18 Site C will set back the development of solar and  
19 other clean energy alternatives.

20 The highest and best use for Site C is  
21 agriculture and forestry.

22 The city of Richmond's community energy and  
23 emissions plan of 2014 outlines plans to provide  
24 community energy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.  
25 Richmond plans to reduce GHG emissions by 25 percent  
26 below 2007 levels, and energy use by 11 percent below

1       2007 levels, by 2041. To do so, district energy in  
2       Richmond is being developed by the Lulu Island  
3       District Energy - I am a member of the board - a  
4       municipally owned energy utility. The Alexander DEU  
5       began operating in 2012 to service 3,000 residents and  
6       3.9 million square feet of residential, commercial,  
7       office, and institutional space. It is a geoexchange  
8       system providing heating, cooling, and hot water. We  
9       have added the oval DEU, which provides the same type  
10      of development for 2.7 million square feet of space,  
11      and we're considering the north of Richmond and the  
12      centre of Richmond for another 16 million square feet  
13      of residential and commercial space.

14                 Richmond Community Energy and Conservation  
15      utilizes local energy sources rather than electricity,  
16      natural gas, and vehicles using power from far away.

17                 We are studying the effectiveness of solar  
18      systems in single-family and multiple homes, solar  
19      heating, and solar ventilation. An improved B.C.  
20      Building Code by the B.C. government has established  
21      targets for net zero energy by 2032, and we hope to  
22      reach those by 2025.

23                 In Metro Vancouver, community energy can  
24      provide twice the power of the Site C dam, and we have  
25      a study done by Dr. Steven Shepherd of UBC's group of  
26      scientists, and they put out a paper called "The

1 illustrated guide to community energy" and they have  
2 analyzed that, with rooftop solar, we can generate  
3 enough power for 900,000 households in Metro  
4 Vancouver. Run-of-the-river, 7500 households.  
5 Industrial heat recovery, 7500. Livestock biomass,  
6 17,000 households. Forest biomass, 26,000. Existing  
7 metro waste or energy, 16,000. And the Richmond  
8 geothermal right now, 12,000 households. For a total  
9 energy production in Metro Vancouver of enough power  
10 for 986,000 households, two times as much as the  
11 production of the Site C dam.

12 It is time to embrace the future and leave  
13 outmoded mega-projects of the past far behind us.  
14 Site C is not the power of the future. In Metro  
15 Vancouver, we can produce our own power. We need Site  
16 C for food. That is what we can't produce.

17 So, refurbish Burrard Thermal, as someone  
18 has suggested, and remediate Site C by pulling stumps  
19 and planting vegetables. Thank you very much.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

21 **Proceeding Time 8:12 p.m. T23**

22 Please go ahead. Thank you.

23 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LAMOUREUX (#0192):**

24 MS. LAMOUREUX: Hello, my name is Heather Lamoureux, L-A-  
25 M-O-U-R-E-U-X, and I live and work here on the unceded  
26 land of the Musquem, Tsleil-waututh, and Squamish



1       peoples.

2                   Thank you to the Commission for undertaking  
3 the review and to all those who have worked so hard to  
4 get us here. I come here today as a concerned  
5 citizen, as an artist and arts presenter. I work to  
6 cultivate and present art work that's speaks to  
7 protecting our environment. That includes the First  
8 Nations peoples who steward the land and all other  
9 humans that live on it, as we too, are part of the  
10 natural ecosystem.

11                   No matter how much concrete we lay, or dams  
12 we attempt to build, we still need the oxygen from the  
13 trees and the food from the earth, something it seems  
14 that big money often forgets. We need to prioritize  
15 giving as well as taking and moving forward with  
16 reciprocity. It is unfortunate that the cost of  
17 devastating wildlife habitat and farmable land is not  
18 accounted for in the economics.

19                   I also work in suicide prevention and  
20 mental health and I am really worried that if Site C  
21 dam is built that even more people will be displaced  
22 from their culture, their land and their sense of  
23 belonging. We do not need to unnecessarily cause more  
24 emotional and psychological pain and trauma or do we  
25 need to continue Canada's history of genocide.

26                   It does cost us money in hospital bills, in

1 ambulance check-ups during suicide attempts or  
2 threats, in volunteer hours, in harm reduction, in  
3 research and family members not being able to work.  
4 This does affect our economy.

5 For me, as a settler of mixed European  
6 ancestry, I am committed to listening to indigenous  
7 peoples and standing in solidarity, just as our  
8 federal and provincial government committed to by  
9 upholding UNDRIP and treaty rights.

10 At the last hearing Grand Chief Stewart  
11 Philip said that we should make the right and proper  
12 decision and reject the stupid idea known as the Site  
13 C dam proposal once and for all. That, and the words  
14 of rejection from many Treaty 8 peoples, in my mind,  
15 should be the last word.

16 From a more economical viewpoint, costs  
17 that have already been spent are sunk costs and if we  
18 consider moving forward it will cost 1.1 million to  
19 terminate and 8.8 billion to go forward. So stopping  
20 the monstrosity now saves us 8 billion. Then we can  
21 look at the many opportunity costs that the land  
22 offers, approximately 8 billion as estimated value of  
23 ecological services provided by the David Suzuki  
24 Foundation, as well as the possibility of feeding a  
25 million people a year instead of importing our produce  
26 from California as Wendy Holmes stated.



1 Burnaby.

2 In addition to all that is said, I would  
3 like to mention a larger problem of the Site C  
4 construction and the like, that we haven't clearly  
5 brought up, and which is which project.

6 While I would like to see the Site C  
7 resources redirected to solve our province's problems,  
8 to give the poor -- supposed to be the customer base.  
9 Some breathing room.

10 Looking into the report that states the  
11 panel's duties to do a fair deal for all, I neither  
12 see any compelling reason for the project to go ahead  
13 above all else. Although the past years and -- all  
14 through the past years and billions of dollars pouring  
15 into it previously, it feels -- confounded that the  
16 panel couldn't get enough information for decision-  
17 making, revealing a strong example of unconcern about  
18 doing so with the government, that have left ordinary  
19 citizens frustrated, hopeless, weak, and angry.

20 There are many examples for this through  
21 all levels of the government, including the Surrey  
22 parks bylaw problems. There has been an ungraceful  
23 saying which states that there is probably -- where  
24 there is a problem in human society, there is  
25 business. And people can all see the government has  
26 abandoned its mandate to keep the society in order and

1 balanced, in following the developers' desires that do  
2 not care about helping our troubled society return to  
3 health, or do not know how to -- and given up.

4 The Burrard bridge I explored this time is  
5 one of the abominable examples that the human troubles  
6 have given an inappropriate chance for the ignorant  
7 developers to get into. They have  
8 deconstruct/reconstruct businesses, creating havoc to  
9 the pedestrians and the traffic as a -- for so long.  
10 Yet I don't see how the problem can be solved. The  
11 cost of doing the bridge could have been used to solve  
12 the real human problems involving the bridge,  
13 including mental health, not transferring more wealth  
14 to the wealthy.

15 Please help stop the Site C project, which  
16 it will also destroy our vast farm land along with the  
17 ecosystem, hurting the First Nations' way of life  
18 alongside. But look into the real problem areas  
19 instead.

20 Today, I brought a copy of a free meal  
21 information in Downtown East Side. Please take the  
22 public transit, walk around, enjoying the free meals,  
23 for a few days. A few things. To explore the area,  
24 and its residents. How miserable, and getting worse,  
25 the situation has been, the first-hand. And I am sure  
26 that such an experience would move everyone's mind,

1 including the stakeholders, to understand that it  
2 doesn't need to be that way, and go forward towards  
3 different way. Especially when encountering the  
4 harrowing circumstances of young people. One cannot  
5 help by -- but do something about it. That's why I'm  
6 here tonight. It is my -- our hope that the  
7 government will stop and listens to ordinary people.

8 Thank you again for this opportunity to  
9 speak with you.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

11 MS. GUNG: Thank you.

12 **Proceeding Time 8:21 p.m. T25**

13 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SPROULE (#0194):**

14 MR. SPROULE: My name is Brian Sproule. Sproule is  
15 spelled S-P-R-O-U-L-E. My basic submission to the  
16 panel consists of one sentence, but I have a few other  
17 words I want to say.

18 This pay-the-rich, make-a-project  
19 boondoggle should be stopped immediately and  
20 restoration work undertaking to repair as much of the  
21 damage that has already been done, as much damage as  
22 -- remediated as possible.

23 Various other speakers have made very  
24 cogent points why this project should be stopped and  
25 I'm not simply going to repeat them, I'm going to step  
26 outside the terms of reference and raise a political

1 issue. The political issue that should be addressed  
2 with these mega-projects such as Site C dam and Kinder  
3 Morgan and so on, is who decides. Decisions are made  
4 in secret and announced as done deals. Meaningless  
5 consultations and hearings may be held but these are  
6 usually mere window dressings. I hope this is not the  
7 case with this panel.

8 Our system of representative democracy is a  
9 relic of the 19<sup>th</sup> century which is completely  
10 inappropriate for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Citizens' only  
11 political role under this political process is to vote  
12 in elections which feature high-pressure advertising  
13 centred around personalities and issues concocted by  
14 the monopoly media. The concerns of the elected  
15 politicians who formed the governing party claimed  
16 that they have a mandate from the people to do as they  
17 please. The concerns of the people are ignored for  
18 the most part.

19 To change this situation, so that people  
20 are no longer in a defensive and reactive position,  
21 requires organizing for empowerment and democratic  
22 renewal so that the people become the decision makers  
23 rather than this or that cartel, political party.

24 Thank you.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

26 **Proceeding Time 8:22 p.m. T26**

1 MS. McINTOSH: Good evening.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening.

3 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. McINTOSH (#0195):**

4 MS. McINTOSH: My name is Janette McIntosh, M-C-capital-  
5 I-N-T-O-S-H. I live and work here on the unceded  
6 lands of the Musqueam, Tsleil-waututh and Squamish  
7 Nations, and I acknowledge and say thank you.

8 I am a mother of two young adults, married  
9 and engaged in community life as educator, researcher,  
10 and community organizer, mostly with KAIROS, Canadian  
11 Ecumenical Justice Initiatives. Living faith in  
12 action is my inspiration, in right relationship with  
13 one another and this earth. As KAIROS, a Greek word  
14 for a critical moment in time, holds me to this  
15 relationship through its local, regional and national  
16 networks of long-time commitment to indigenous rights,  
17 ecological justice, inclusive of economics, and  
18 dignity and human rights. I thank you, BCUC panel  
19 members, for being here with us today as part of the  
20 Site C review process, and I thank many of whom is in  
21 this room today by imagining that things are made  
22 possible through imagination. And we are here in this  
23 place together.

24 Also, thank you for already taking the  
25 necessary steps for ensuring a comprehensive review by  
26 asking BC Hydro for significantly more information.



1 It is paramount that BC Hydro respectfully shares back  
2 the required information in a timely manner.

3 Thank you for listening today. I have read  
4 and understand your scope for this hearing. And in  
5 the limited scope of economics, I simply ask, why is  
6 Site C even being considered, given that the demand  
7 for electricity has been flat for the last ten years,  
8 with still questionable forecasts of demand?

9 So why push this forward? There is a high  
10 cost for not stopping the Site C dam construction,  
11 given all that we know. The fact that we no longer  
12 live in a large hydroelectric dam construction era of  
13 the 1950s and '60s. That there are alternative ways  
14 of geothermal, wind, solar, and wave, if or when there  
15 may be, even though questionable still, more demand.  
16 And we have surplus capacity already in existing  
17 infrastructures we can utilize if we need. And by  
18 taking climate change science seriously, we must act  
19 on it and change our ways for "building a sustainable  
20 economy that works for everyone", as the B.C.  
21 NDP/Green agreement had stated.

22 This includes taking conservation  
23 seriously, as this can help reduce costs in many ways,  
24 and funding ways to modernize our ways.

25 I share with you words written by the late  
26 John Dylan of KAIROS.

1 "Ecological justice includes social justice,  
2 participation in decision-making and  
3 sustainable use of natural resources, and  
4 requires putting the economy in its place as  
5 a sub-system within society, and the wider  
6 natural world."

7 Reminded by Dr. Sally McFady, a leading  
8 eco-theologian, ecology is at its simplest words about  
9 home. *Oikos*, home, and *logos*, word. With our house  
10 rule being everything is related to everything else.  
11 The relationship we have with the land, water, and air  
12 is sacred. Having traveled on the rolling justice bus  
13 organized by BC/Yukon KAIROS in 2015 and 2016, I was  
14 able to see first-hand the contrast of the before and  
15 after of the tree-cuttings along the shores of the  
16 river. I witnessed from eagles soaring above us to  
17 the loss of eagle nesting habitat, taken over by flat,  
18 grey, silty water and grey river banks. If any of you  
19 believe in our connection to the land, water, air and  
20 wildlife, you would have wept with me.

21 The dam would flood over 31,000 acres of  
22 agricultural land, including some of B.C.'s best farm  
23 land. How is this possible, when we need more locally  
24 produced food sources? This is part of the economic  
25 equation. And here we are at a time when words we  
26 hear and read about are supportive of the adoption of

1 the United Nations declarations on the rights of  
2 indigenous peoples and the Truth and Reconciliation 94  
3 calls to action. This means taking economics to  
4 another level, inclusive of social costs, by honouring  
5 the voices and rights of the indigenous peoples, first  
6 and foremost.

7 A reminder to us all, quoting John Dylan  
8 again, that two existing Hydro dams have already  
9 flooded 70 percent of the Peace River Valley. If  
10 built, the Site C dam would flood half of the  
11 remaining 30 percent of the Peace River Valley. These  
12 include lands most used by Treaty 8 First Nations for  
13 hunting and fishing, and are the location of 78  
14 indigenous heritage sites, including burial grounds.

15 I teach in schools the history that is not  
16 taught in our classroom textbooks. I cannot go  
17 forward knowing that the same atrocities that were  
18 committed back then are potentially going to be  
19 repeated. No longer can we live by the cognitive  
20 dissonance surrounding Site C and other resource-based  
21 decisions, evaluated narrowly only by economic lens.

22 When we know so much, we can think and do  
23 things in a new way, to change and adapt. The federal  
24 adaptation framework applies here as well, and B.C.  
25 can be a positive example. I see hopes in new  
26 relationships and alliances being formed around

1 indigenous land and water rights, such as we see here,  
2 and with friends in the Peace River Valley with the  
3 Land Owners' Association, Prophet River First Nations,  
4 West Moberly First Nations, and Blueberry First  
5 Nations.

6 Trusting in your ability to listen and  
7 believing in a vision greater than what often we only  
8 see in the immediate, I pray BCUC will do the right  
9 thing for our future generations. This is a big first  
10 step in right relationship with all of us, as the  
11 people of beautiful British Columbia. May it be so.

12 Thank you.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

14 **Proceeding Time 8:30 p.m. T27**

15 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRAHAM (#0196):**

16 MR. GRAHAM: Hello. My name is Scott Graham, G-R-A-H-A-  
17 M. I have a solar company, ReNew Energy. I looked at  
18 the report, focusing on utility solar, and I was a  
19 little surprised by the numbers there, so I thought  
20 I'd give you some facts.

21 There was a system put on in Cranbrook on a  
22 government building, 100 kilowatts, which is basically  
23 about 300 panels, for \$2.40 a watt in 2015. It's now  
24 two years later. We are approaching \$2 a watt on  
25 small-scale commercial-size installations. 300 panels  
26 is a commercial installation on top of a multi-unit

1 building or IKEA or something like that. A commercial  
2 installation would be 3,000 panels and would be closer  
3 to a buck fifty. Right now, Germany's at about a buck  
4 fifty a watt. Most of those costs have been on soft  
5 costs coming out of the system. The regulations, tie-  
6 in -- all those kind of things. Financing, which of  
7 course Site C is being financed. And unfortunately we  
8 do not support solar to develop. It's been developing  
9 elsewhere, but it's not been developing here.

10 On a local installation, on buildings, in  
11 the future, it will be tied in with batteries, as  
12 people have brought up. That work is going on as we  
13 speak right now, and in fact UBC will be starting a  
14 pilot project where they're going to put solar panels  
15 on top of the parkade and tie it into charging  
16 stations for electric vehicles where they will  
17 exchange energy in smart grids.

18 So I think it's reasonable to see that  
19 people might even -- companies might even start  
20 abandoning the grid when the price comes low enough,  
21 where you can simply put a bank, an array of PV  
22 panels, say, on top of your IKEA building. Storage in  
23 the parking lot, which is coming down rapidly, and  
24 maybe a generator and some interconnectivity software.  
25 And it will be cheaper than what BC Hydro is trying to  
26 sell Site C electricity for.

1 I do -- one other element of this. I don't  
2 know if it's in your scope. But by dedicating so much  
3 money to the Site C dam, we are actually taking away  
4 from all the creative, innovative ideas that can go on  
5 throughout the province.

6 You've got a difficult job in front of you.  
7 I hope these facts will help you, because that's what  
8 you've got to go off of.

9 Thank you for your time.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank you very much, sir.

11 **Proceeding Time 8:33 p.m. T28**

12 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THOMAS (#0197):**

13 MR. THOMAS: My name is Lorne Thomas, last name is  
14 spelled T-H-O-M-A-S. Brief background -- I certainly  
15 thank you for being involved. Better late than never,  
16 for sure.

17 I've got a background in electrical  
18 engineering from Queens University and I've worked for  
19 Thunder Bay Hydro, Ontario Hydro, and indirectly for  
20 BC Hydro as well.

21 A strong sort of liking for hydro power in  
22 general, but concerned about what's been happening  
23 here for a number of reasons. The obvious assumptions  
24 of the forecast. Some of the future power  
25 requirements, if fossil fuel was regulated out. And  
26 I've heard something said that it would be six times

1 Site C being required if all cars were electric, and  
2 so on like that. That's a big concern for any  
3 forecast, if it were to come true.

4 The other thing in the forecast, of course,  
5 which has been mentioned, is the zero adjustment for  
6 the Columbia River Treaty which is a federal  
7 agreement, and I've had the pleasure of working with  
8 Dr. Vern Ruskin in preparing his and the report that's  
9 going to -- written report that's going to go into to  
10 the Commission from my talk.

11 Specifically, though, I want to bring  
12 attention to the Williston Lake reservoir. During my  
13 work indirectly for BC Hydro, I had the pleasure of  
14 visiting that site. It is enormous, and Dr. Ruskin  
15 has said that if the lake were here in the Lower  
16 Mainland it would stretch from Vancouver all the way  
17 to Seattle. And it has -- it took 20 years to fill  
18 that reservoir. It's like an incredibly huge recycled  
19 battery.

20 And I just want to bring to the attention  
21 of the panel that perhaps additional study needs to be  
22 looked at, are we maximizing the use of that,  
23 specifically when it comes to spillage. There are no  
24 spillage reports for any of the dams in B.C. to look  
25 at making that more efficient, or reusing it. We  
26 recycle aluminum and everything else, but reusing that

1 spillage may be another opportunity.

2 And when we look at, again, the Williston  
3 Reservoir, it can provide 340,000 -- 340,000 gigawatt  
4 hours. Not just somewhere around 5,000 that Site C  
5 has.

6 So, bottom line for me is to analyze that  
7 spillage, make it public, see if it can be reused in  
8 some method, to generate power without such major  
9 dams.

10 So, thank you.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

12 **Proceeding Time 8:36 p.m. T29**

13 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TSANG (#0198):**

14 MS. TSANG: Karen Tsang. I live in Vancouver. I'm a  
15 citizen of Vancouver, a citizen of B.C., a mother, and  
16 a neighbour. And I come to you as that.

17 I -- while in protocol, I will also  
18 acknowledge that I live on the lands since time  
19 immemorial of the Tsleil-waututh, the Musqueam, and  
20 the Squamish, not unceded, not traditional. Those  
21 come second to the doctrine of discovery, which is  
22 still at the cornerstone of our laws in Canada. And I  
23 want to encourage us all to consider under it as  
24 essential.

25 I also while in protocol want to notice  
26 that there is no Treaty 8 person sitting on your



1 panel. Where Treaty 8 people will be most affected  
2 because it's their lands, their burial sites, the  
3 animals they hunt and live with, the medicines they  
4 collect, there should be a Treaty 8 person who  
5 considers not just the economic dollar sign value that  
6 will be lost, but also anything that is of their  
7 values.

8 If reconciliation is to be more than a  
9 feel-good thing for the citizens of Canada, that has  
10 to look different than what we're doing right now.

11 I don't want to repeat what you have read  
12 in the Deloitte report, what you have read in the  
13 McCullough report, and heard from Mr. McCullough.  
14 What you heard from Roger Brighton, although --  
15 Bryenton, sorry. Although I do want to say that my --  
16 I have a relative that is putting in the charging  
17 stations for electric cars in B.C. It's on the second  
18 phase of the high-powered chargers. And first of all,  
19 there is enough electricity. We're in a surplus. The  
20 other people have also mentioned that we have new  
21 technologies, both to regulate the outgoing electrical  
22 charge, but also to create new charge -- new  
23 electricity. For example, from cow poo in Abbotsford.  
24 And at BCIT from photovolactic [*sic*] -- whatever  
25 that's called. Sorry, I'm a performer, not an  
26 engineer. From solar panels.

1                   So, anything that BC Hydro has put as being  
2 a direct up in need needs to be re-evaluated according  
3 to all of the information collected.

4                   I want to talk about legacy. Our legacy as  
5 people here, as European people here, our legacy is  
6 heavy. With each generation it gets heavier. We're  
7 responsible for our children and what they have to  
8 carry. Both for that reason and then for  
9 environmental purposes, those don't count in your  
10 narrow confines of economic theory. But they will  
11 count when we can't eat the dollar bills. They will  
12 count when we can't drink the water.

13                   At Muskrat Falls people are preventing that  
14 from going forward with their bodies. It will count  
15 in terms of mental health and physical health. But  
16 mostly the easiest legacy for your panel to consider  
17 is what my children will pay in their bills. We  
18 already have outrageous housing costs here. Our food  
19 prices are already skyrocketing. Everything is  
20 heavier for us than it was for you or your parents  
21 when they had children. Our children will have it  
22 even harder. We need to consider that.

23                   BC Hydro's tag line is, for generations.  
24 I'm going to second the BC Hydro Conservation  
25 Authority -- now that's for generations.

26                   Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

2 **Proceeding Time 8:40 p.m. T30**

3 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARRISON (#0199):**

4 MS. HARRISON: My name is Katie Harrison, H-A-R-R-I-S-O-  
5 N. Just want to start by acknowledging that we're on  
6 the unceded territory of the Tsleil-waututh, the  
7 Squamish, and the Musqueam people.

8 I am with an organization called Force of  
9 Nature. We represent about 30,000 supporters in B.C.  
10 And our mission is to accelerate the transition to a  
11 low-carbon future in the region. So we're mainly  
12 focused on moving away from fossil fuels, as well as  
13 supporting climate solutions like solar, wind, thermal  
14 energy, biogas, sustainable land-use planning, public  
15 transportation, electric vehicle infrastructure, and  
16 zero waste strategies.

17 And so when it came to opposing Site C, you  
18 know, we had to think about how that would fit in,  
19 because usually if we're opposing something it's  
20 fossil fuel projects. But we just had incredible  
21 passion from our constituents about this issue,  
22 feeling like it was really important to put a stop to  
23 it. And this is not the kind of renewable energy  
24 project we wanted to see in the future. It really  
25 seemed to fly in the face of a lot of core values that  
26 focus on the climate, and that are very important to

1 the people in the climate movement.

2 And I think you've heard a lot about those  
3 reasons tonight in greater detail than I can sort of  
4 expand upon, but just want to reiterate. I think  
5 first the ecological destruction of the project is  
6 really a huge issue for people. The fact that it's  
7 going to compromise our food security of the province,  
8 which is another thing that I think people in the  
9 climate movement feel like is a really important  
10 cornerstone of climate solutions.

11 Also the fact that it feeds into this cycle  
12 of sort of short-term construction jobs in a boom-and-  
13 bust economy, whereas our folks really want to see us  
14 moving to an economy where we have stable family-  
15 supporting long-term jobs that are dispersed  
16 throughout the province.

17 And then as you've heard a lot about, it  
18 violates the treaty rights of the Treaty 8 First  
19 Nations. Which is something I think people have been  
20 really disheartened and heartbroken with the federal  
21 government making these big commitments to implement  
22 UNDRIP and then backtracking on them, especially when  
23 it comes to the projects already in the works.

24 And I think British Columbia is at a point  
25 where, you know, I think people are looking to our  
26 provincial government to be the heroes on this issue,

1 where our federal government has failed to stand up  
2 for us. And so they have made this commitment to  
3 implementing UNDRIP and we want to -- really want to  
4 see that happen at the federal level. It doesn't  
5 happen at the provincial level when it comes to these  
6 actual projects, that they're not standing up to that.  
7 So they have an opportunity to kind of be heroes on  
8 this issue and we really want to see that honoured in  
9 this project.

10 And yeah, I think overall, and I think it's  
11 also been said here before, that you know, we really  
12 believe in sustainable development and this project --  
13 this province can -- if we embrace climate solutions  
14 and a low carbon future, we can have unprecedented  
15 opportunities for economically and socially -- but we  
16 have to -- in order to get there and become leaders,  
17 like other places like California and Germany, we  
18 really have to get beyond this sort of old way of  
19 thinking. And I think really Site C embodies that  
20 kind of -- the megaproject mentality embodies that old  
21 way of thinking. Where, although, you know, the  
22 energy may be renewable and it's not necessarily  
23 contributing as much to the carbon emissions, I feel  
24 like there's so much devastation and destruction that  
25 can come out of it, and we really want to embrace a  
26 future that really goes after the opportunities of all

1           these other options, like renewable energy and  
2           sustainable energy planning.

3                           That's it.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON:    Thank you, ma'am.

5   **Proceeding Time 8:45 p.m. T31**

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WESTERMAN (#0200):**

7 MS. WESTERMAN:    My name is Barbara, last name is spelled  
8           W-E-S-T-E-R-M-A-N.  And first I'd like to say I  
9           acknowledge that I'm on unceded territory of First  
10          Nations, and I guess all my life in B.C., that's where  
11          I've been.

12                           And I'm very grateful for the opportunity  
13          to come and speak to you today.  And I'm very pleased  
14          and congratulate you for taking on the responsibility  
15          of this task, that's really important.

16                           So when I was a kid, I went to Victoria to  
17          look at the museum, to learn a little bit about my  
18          world.  And I saw something there that really  
19          surprised me, and it stuck with me all my life.  And  
20          it was a display about agriculture.  And it said  
21          something like, "One-quarter of one percent of the  
22          land area in British Columbia is arable."  I've  
23          probably got my numbers wrong, but it's very, very  
24          small.  And that struck me.  And we're not getting any  
25          more land, but we've got a lot more people.

26                           So I thought about the Peace area.  And I

1 thought about the soil, and the life of the soil, and  
2 how it's probably been made after hundreds and  
3 thousands of years of natural processes. And it's  
4 just there as a wonderful gift, and then I thought  
5 about this project, and I thought, "What kind of a  
6 culture would countenance such a thing, to destroy  
7 this wonderful gift and bury it under a bunch of  
8 water."

9 So, I've also heard some talk about money  
10 and there's so much money already been spent on this  
11 project, there's no turning back. Well, this is  
12 beyond money. This is in another category. This is  
13 about life and survival.

14 So obviously this is a mistake. This is a  
15 big mistake and needs to be fixed.

16 Now, earlier this week I was listening to  
17 the radio and I heard the speech of the new Governor  
18 General of Canada, and she said, "To make intelligent  
19 use of the land." And I thought, how appropriate to  
20 this situation, that this is what we ought to be  
21 doing.

22 And I think your job -- and I haven't read  
23 any of the documents, alas -- is to act in the best  
24 interests of the province of B.C. and the people of  
25 B.C. But I think beyond that your job is to act in  
26 the best interests of the land.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

2 **Proceeding Time 8:47 p.m. T32**

3 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FINN (#0004):**

4 MR. FINN: Good evening. My name is Eoin Finn, F-I-N-N.  
5 I have a Ph.D. in science, physical chemistry, an MBA  
6 in international business, and retired several years  
7 ago as a partner in KPMG. So I've seen one or two  
8 business cases, and that's what I want to talk about  
9 tonight, BC Hydro's wonderful case for Site C.

10 As several groups have modeled, the  
11 business case, as to whether to build it or scrap it,  
12 so have I, in cooperation with some others. What we  
13 discovered was that the 2 percent annual growth demand  
14 forecast for the next 20 years is the weakest part of  
15 the Site C business case. There's really no  
16 substantiation of that that I can find, in 866 pages  
17 of rather turgid prose.

18 This is highly unlikely, everybody's  
19 pointed out, demand has flat-lined and industry tends  
20 to favour substitution and conservation. I might add  
21 that an unnoticed part of the *Clean Energy Act* is the  
22 requirement that BC Hydro generate two-thirds of all  
23 new demand, via demand-side management. It's right  
24 there in the forefront of the *Clean Energy Act*, and  
25 nobody has mentioned it so far, least of all BC Hydro.

26 LNG is a big part of BC Hydro's forecasts.



1           60 percent, roughly, of Site C's demand. And they  
2           gave credit to three different LNG proposals that are  
3           cited as the reasons to build Site C. Well, B.C.'s  
4           Greenfield LNG plants are simply not competitive in  
5           this global commodity business, major competitors can  
6           pretty well give away associated gas to sell  
7           conventionally acquired condensates. And B.C. of  
8           course has the extreme energy frack gas, and stands  
9           little chance of being a player even with massive  
10          public subsidies, including grid electricity at fire-  
11          sale prices.

12                        I have a list of 33 unredacted plants  
13          already under construction or well advanced than these  
14          three around the world in much lower-cost  
15          jurisdictions than B.C. If they come to pass, even  
16          after them, the world supply of LNG is going to double  
17          before 2025, but demand will take until at least the  
18          mid-30s to catch up. We really shouldn't be including  
19          any great fraction of LNG demand in BC Hydro's  
20          forecast.

21                        The LNG Canada is unprofitable. Woodfibre  
22          has no customer expertise or economies of scale, and  
23          Wespac Tilbury has no expertise, and its anchor  
24          customer, Hawaii, went away when Governor Ige declared  
25          that a dollar spent on LNG was a dollar wasted in  
26          Hawaii's effort to get to 100 percent renewables by

1 2045.

2 Realistic levels of DSM and electric  
3 vehicle adoption, grid power demand, will likely  
4 decrease in our model by ten percent over the next 20  
5 years. Not increase, decrease. And especially in the  
6 energy-intensive industrial sector. If so, Site C  
7 energy will of course be surplus and have to be sold  
8 south of the border at the mid-C hub for a rather  
9 whacking loss.

10 Even without Site C, regularizing deferral  
11 accounts - that's \$6 billion - and bringing Hydro's  
12 debt - over 20 billion - down to a one and a half to  
13 one debt-to-equity ratio over the next ten or twenty  
14 years, both of those is going to require a doubling of  
15 -- sorry, a rate increase of between four and five  
16 percent, and that's double the inflation rate. You  
17 add that cumulatively over the next ten to twenty  
18 years, and you have a situation which makes BC Hydro's  
19 original motive to have the cheapest electricity in  
20 North America totally redundant.

21 Site C's contingency is inadequate, and  
22 I've pointed, as BC Hydro did not do, to two recent  
23 examples of budget overruns in large dam projects.  
24 The first, of course, is the Muskrat Falls, and you're  
25 going to hear more from Mr. Vardy about that shortly.  
26 Budget overruns, 6.7 billion to 12.7. The latest

1 expected power cost is \$233 per megawatt hour, triple  
2 what BC Hydro is postulating for Site C.

3 The power bills are set to double from \$150  
4 a month to \$300 a month for its customers, and their  
5 methylmercury accumulation's happening downstream.

6 The Keyos bifold makes for interesting  
7 reading. I have in front of me the Manitoba Hydro's  
8 rate application for this and next year. It makes for  
9 a sobering read, and I would ask you to read it.  
10 Particular aspects of it are that the budget overrun  
11 on that is going to be from 6.5 billion originally to  
12 8.7, in service date two years delayed, increased debt  
13 burden. By 2020, Manitoba Hydro is going to be paying  
14 70 percent of its domestic revenues in debt service.  
15 The remaining 30 percent is going to have to be spent  
16 actually providing the power. It's a huge risk to  
17 Manitoba's credit rating, as will Site C on B.C.'s.

18 Eight percent increase per year for the  
19 next five years. And if interest rates, as they're  
20 expected to do, notches up a hundred basis points,  
21 that's going to move to 18 percent. Do not live in  
22 Manitoba if you want to have cheap hydro power.

23 In summary, there are serious risks of  
24 budget overruns. We've seen today the admission by BC  
25 Hydro, borrowing rate hikes and export prices, this  
26 makes Site C a high-risk project.



1       you, panel, for lending us your time today. Time is  
2       money and I don't plan on wasting any so let's get  
3       started.

4                It is true that if BC Hydro meets more of  
5       the province's energy needs using the wind power, it  
6       will also need to develop additional supply and  
7       resources to meet its capacity needs. Large hydro  
8       developments, like the Site C dam, contributes to  
9       meeting both energy and capacity needs. But there are  
10      other ways to meet these needs. The question is which  
11      combination of resources result in the lowest cost.

12              The problem is BC Hydro's demand. In 2007  
13      when the Site C was first reconsidered, Hydro said  
14      that the load growth would be a steady 2 percent a  
15      year. Its 2012 forecast which was the justification  
16      for the project, said the same. But B.C. was  
17      supposed to be consuming 70 terawatts of electricity a  
18      year, and we're using 60 by 2016 to '17. And today  
19      we're using 60. The fact is the demand for  
20      electricity has been flat since 2005, and as prices  
21      rise, demand will continue to be flat even with an  
22      expanding economy.

23              With no domestic need for the electricity  
24      from Site C, why is this still a question? Let's cut  
25      it. We'll pay less for the energy and only the energy  
26      we need. And I'm not a taxpayer yet, by the way, so.



1       you about the cost to ratepayers of suspension over  
2       termination. The first point has to do with  
3       insufficiency of information. Please allow me to  
4       summarize the panel's concerns on page 39 of the  
5       preliminary report as follows: The lack of  
6       information that BC Hydro has provided to support the  
7       additional \$1.7 billion in restart costs. BC Hydro  
8       has provided minimal explanation and no detail. The  
9       panel is unable to reconcile the cost estimates  
10      provided in the inter-office memo entitled "Site C  
11      suspend or terminate," et cetera. It does not address  
12      the matters raised in BC Hydro's submission in a  
13      substantive way, and fails to provide clear, concise  
14      information that will facilitate panel analysis and  
15      allow us to reach any definitive conclusions.

16               My comments are that I find it shocking  
17      that BC Hydro has been unable to provide clear and  
18      substantive analysis to the panel within the time  
19      frame allowed. However, it is not for me to judge  
20      whether this is reasonable under the circumstance, or  
21      whether it considers -- or constitutes incompetence,  
22      intransigence, obstruction, or withholding of  
23      pertinent information or analysis.

24               I request the panel to consider the  
25      following concerns regarding suspension. While  
26      suspending the project might seem on the surface to be

1 a reasonable middle ground, between continuing or  
2 termination, deeper consideration reveals it to be no-  
3 man's-land in no one's best interests. I submit that  
4 the apparent attractions of suspension compared with  
5 termination are unfounded in common sense and cost  
6 implications.

7 A decision to infinitely suspend but not  
8 cancel the Site C project would create a hell of  
9 uncertainty. It would, for example -- I'm going to  
10 list some consequences. One, freeze future  
11 development in the Peace Valley. In such an  
12 indecisive state, what financier, which farmer, which  
13 business, would invest in any venture in the area?

14 Two, leave Peace Valley landowners as  
15 tenants on their own land. The two-year buy-back  
16 stipulation and perhaps capacity will be jeopardized.  
17 These losses and injustices could well expose BC Hydro  
18 ratepayers to litigation and claims for damages and  
19 loss of income.

20 Three, leave First Nations treaty and  
21 cultural rights in the area unresolved. This  
22 injustice may be the cruellest cut of all, and cannot  
23 be tolerated in light of our governments' commitments  
24 to UNDRIP and reconciliation.

25 Four, lose for B.C. the opportunity to  
26 develop B.C.'s renewable power industry and forestall



1 the desperately needed transition of BC Hydro to an  
2 energy provision leader that is truly in the public  
3 interest.

4 Five, as the cost of alternatives declines,  
5 suspending the project in the short term will probably  
6 mean cancelling it at a later date with no value for  
7 ratepayers from those extra costs incurred.

8 And six, be the most complex and expensive  
9 option, as BC Hydro would face a costly and  
10 contentious decision to either remediate the site or  
11 maintain it in its current unstable state. Two  
12 examples illustrate this dilemma. The estuary of the  
13 Moberly River has been completely destroyed, which  
14 leaves in limbo the food fishery which had been so  
15 abundant, and in the absence of appropriate  
16 remediation the geological uncertainties created by  
17 the destabilization from construction will present  
18 unpredictable financial and environment costs, and  
19 potential disasters from slides and sloughing.

20 In conclusion, the cost and uncertainties  
21 that pertain to suspending will not improve over time.  
22 And that suspension will result in significant  
23 negative consequences for BC Hydro ratepayers and  
24 those directly impacted in the Peace. I submit that  
25 terminating the project and remediating the damages to  
26 the degree possible will prove to be the best and

1 least expensive option for ratepayers.

2 Thanks very much for considering my  
3 comments.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

5 **Proceeding Time 9:01 p.m. T35**

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. J. NAPOLEON (#0203):**

7 MR. NAPOLEON: Good evening. I am Julian Napoleon, last  
8 name is spelt, N-A-P-O-L-E-O-N. I understand that  
9 some of the stuff I will be discussing is outside of  
10 the terms of engagement, agreement that you have, and  
11 that's out of the scope of this hearing.

12 I also have come to the understanding that  
13 you have been conducting these hearings across the  
14 province. You were recently conducting them in the  
15 Peace?

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's correct, sir.

17 MR. NAPOLEON: My question to the panel is, did any of  
18 you take the opportunity to tour the proposed flood  
19 site of the Peace River Valley while you were in the  
20 region? If so, please raise your hand.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: We had previously toured it before.

22 MR. NAPOLEON: You previously had. And you're all  
23 apparently humans. So you all know firsthand that the  
24 existence value of that valley alone cannot be  
25 measured in dollars.

26 I'm Dane-Za and Cree from the Soto First

1 Nation. I'm a Treaty 8 Indian under the guise of the  
2 *Indian Act*. My ancestors have lived in the Peace  
3 River Valley since time immemorial.

4 Now, the four of you are left with an  
5 almost insurmountable task – cleaning up after the  
6 sloppiest, most blatantly corrupt, irresponsible  
7 undermining of democratic process I have witnessed in  
8 my lifetime. I will be praying for the four of you as  
9 you attempt to right to the wrongs that we have all  
10 experienced and witnessed.

11 The BCUC itself was undermined. The  
12 agricultural land reserve undermined. Environmental  
13 review process undermined. Treaty 8 grossly violated.  
14 All hopes of reconciliation with indigenous people are  
15 at stake if this project is to go ahead.

16 Now, you are here to look at economics this  
17 evening, so let's take a step back and look at the big  
18 economic picture of this proposed project. It's  
19 already been stated earlier this evening that the vast  
20 majority of the power is intended to go to this LNG  
21 platform that the previous government had touted so  
22 persistently. However, we are all aware of the global  
23 market for LNG, the backing out of investors  
24 continuously, the closure of plans to pursue the LNG  
25 plant that was just cancelled up around Prince Rupert.  
26 It's not happening, right? It's not going to happen.

1           The economics are not there.

2                       So this project has been intended for the  
3 vast majority of power to -- and you know, they  
4 already built three power lines from the proposed dam  
5 site to LNG processing facilities, although you might  
6 not be aware of all of them because two of them were  
7 also exempted from the BC Utilities Commission Review  
8 process. Although the one that wasn't did require  
9 three million dollars of public money for a power line  
10 to go to a foreignly owned LNG processing facility in  
11 my territory. This is poor economics. Poor, poor  
12 economics.

13                      So I have a minute and 43. Let's talk  
14 about farming. The Peace River Valley has been under  
15 the flood reserve for a long time now, meaning that  
16 any development that landowners undertake, they will  
17 not be able to recoup any of their investment. Now,  
18 I'm a farmer, as well as a fisherperson and hunter for  
19 my community, but I can tell you that the agricultural  
20 potential of the Peace River Valley is incomparable.  
21 It is by far the best farmland that we have.

22                      Now, I do a lot of talks around the country  
23 around food security, and I can tell you after being  
24 at the Food Secure Canada Conference in Toronto, that  
25 people in the Arctic are facing a severe food crisis.  
26 The Peace River Valley is the northern-most prime

1 agricultural area in the country. It's an anomaly.  
2 You can grow crops there that you don't see heading  
3 south from there until you get to the Okanagan.

4 The agricultural value is again  
5 unmeasureable as we move forward, especially  
6 considering the implications of climate change and  
7 drought in the next best farm area that we have in the  
8 Fraser Valley.

9 Now, in closing, I would like to state that  
10 my ancestors have participated in an indigenous  
11 economy that has existed since time immemorial, and I  
12 understand that those factors can't be taken into  
13 consideration, but I ask you in your hearts and minds  
14 to consider that we have non-monetary currencies that  
15 have supported the existence of our people, and this  
16 project will destroy our economy and destroy us as a  
17 distinct race on the face of this planet.

18 Thank you.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

20 **Proceeding Time 9:06 p.m. T36**

21 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KER (#0204):**

22 MR. KER: Good evening members of the panel, my name is  
23 Russell Ker, K-E-R. I am here to speak to you  
24 tonight, and first off on the order that you are  
25 empowered to deal with. And one is to check out the  
26 assessment of the costs to complete, the cost to

1 suspend, and the cost to terminate. But there is an  
2 additional one which I think has been missed on some  
3 of the opening addresses that I've read in the  
4 submissions, and that is to investigate alternatives.  
5 And what -- to investigate what if any other portfolio  
6 of commercially feasible generating projects and  
7 demand-side management initiatives could provide  
8 similar benefits.

9 On September 13<sup>th</sup>, your consultants  
10 delivered you a report on the alternatives. They  
11 identified 15, including run-of-the-river, including  
12 solar, including wind. And 12 others. But one was  
13 missing. The one that was missing is stored hydro,  
14 which currently is generating over 95 percent of the  
15 power in this province. And I wondered why that is.  
16 Why would it be that your consultants would not look  
17 at other potential dam sites on rivers and creeks in  
18 this province that are commercially feasible? And I  
19 went to look a little further, and I saw that one was  
20 submitted to you, the Moore Creek project of Alaska  
21 Hydro. A fellow by the name of Groundesson has issued  
22 a submission, and several submissions, including one  
23 just a few days ago. This is a project that will  
24 generate approximately 100 megawatts. It dams the  
25 Moore Creek in northwest B.C. and I went to look at it  
26 a little bit further. It turns out that -- well

1           actually I should go back a bit.

2                         That your consultants also -- actually I  
3           think the panel on September 20<sup>th</sup> said they looked at  
4           Moore Creek but they thought it was too early a stage  
5           of development. Well, I found the Moore Creek project  
6           is actually one year into both the federal and the  
7           provincial environmental review process. This is a  
8           process that would normally take between three and  
9           four years. It's one-third of the way through. I  
10          don't think that the federal government and the  
11          provincial government would have accepted it this far  
12          if they didn't think it had merit. And I ask your  
13          consultants to look at it to see if it does have  
14          merit.

15                        The problem that I have, though, is that  
16          this project is within 10 kilometers of an existing  
17          transmission line that the province built to look  
18          after the three run-of-the-river plants up in  
19          northwest B.C. owned by AltaGas. They were  
20          independent power producing projects. So, this  
21          project is ongoing, but as far as you're concerned,  
22          it's in the pre-feasibility stage. Now, perhaps that  
23          is information that was given to you by your  
24          consultants. And if that's the case, then perhaps you  
25          could ask them to do a little bit more work.

26                        The situation though with the consultants,

1 and that's the one and final reason I am here. You've  
2 engaged consultants, Deloittes, as have the BC Hydro.  
3 But they've engaged the same consultants. When you  
4 have consultants advising you, as the independent  
5 review panel, and consultants advising your primary  
6 supplier of power in this province, would it not be  
7 advisable for you to consider asking other consultants  
8 what they think? And perhaps looking at more at the  
9 alternatives, whether they be solar, or that they be  
10 wind, more run-of-the-river, or more stored hydro  
11 projects that might exist. There are protected rivers  
12 in the province, they are well spelled out in the  
13 Water Sustainability Act. The schedule to it tells  
14 which rivers there are. You may decide that there are  
15 few rivers in this province that still are available  
16 that don't have extensive arable lands, and their best  
17 use is to produce hydro power, just as we have done  
18 for over 100 years in this province.

19 So, I ask you to please consider additional  
20 consultants. And you might decide that you need more  
21 time. You may decide that the time you've been given  
22 to come up with a decision is far too short. That by  
23 only engaging one set of consultants to advise you and  
24 BC Hydro, may have caused problems, and it's time to  
25 maybe look and recognize that engaging others to do  
26 more work, especially engaging alternatives is the



1 best solution.

2 Thank you very much.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

4 **Proceeding Time 9:11 p.m. T37**

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is there a Mr. Kent? Mr. Mather? Mr.  
6 Burgel? There we go. Take your pick. That looks  
7 good, yeah.

8 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BURGEL (#0205):**

9 MR. BURGEL: [non-English phrase] Hello, my name is Bob  
10 Burgel, B-U-R-G-E-L. On my grandmother's side, she is  
11 *Muskegawak-Uinawak*. People of the muskeg. Northern  
12 Manitoba. And as you probably know, the indigenous  
13 people of northern Manitoba have suffered grievously  
14 due to hydroelectric projects. But perhaps that's  
15 another issue.

16 My father -- sorry, my grandfather, he's  
17 Saulteaux, from the St. Peter's Band. And if you know  
18 Canadian history, in 1907, the St. Peter's Band was  
19 stolen from him.

20 I want to connect Treaty 8, TRC, and UNDR, and  
21 see how it might relate to Site C. If you read the  
22 René Fumoleau book, *As Long As This Land Shall Last*,  
23 he explicitly says the only reason the indigenous  
24 people in northern British Columbia and Alberta and  
25 Saskatchewan signed Treaty 8, the Crees, the  
26 Saulteaux, Dene, was the treaty commissioners

1 explicitly promised that their fishing, hunting,  
2 trapping, and gathering rights were guaranteed, and  
3 that's the word they used, "guaranteed".

4 Look at the TRC, they talk about treaties  
5 and I'll just read my notes here. Treaties are sacred  
6 obligations that commit both parties to maintain  
7 respectful relationships and share the land and  
8 resources equitably. TRC also goes on to say, and  
9 I'll read from my notes again, when I can find it,  
10 reconciliation will never occur unless we are  
11 reconciled with the earth. And that was from  
12 indigenous people all across this land. That is a  
13 common theme they brought up again and again.  
14 Reconciled with the earth, with the land.

15 UNDR -- Article 29. Indigenous people  
16 have the right to conservation and protection of the  
17 environment, and the productive capacity of their  
18 lands and territories and resources. Now, I'm not  
19 going to go through UNDR because you're probably  
20 well-versed in this document, which the federal  
21 government says that they will put in place, that they  
22 will follow, that they will honour. Well, as you  
23 know, some -- not all Treaty 8 have gone on record,  
24 but some have said we're opposed to Site C dam, it  
25 will flood 5,000 hectares of farm land. It will swamp  
26 indigenous archaeological sites, permanently destroy

1 land First Nations use for hunting, trapping, fishing  
2 and gathering. For example, plants for medicine.

3 So. I know it's quite late, and it's hard  
4 to hear all this information. But again, Treaty 8.  
5 Indigenous people regard treaties as something sacred.  
6 It is a covenant with the creator. It is a growing --  
7 it's a dynamic organism. It's there for everyone.  
8 Everyone prospers under the treaties. That's the  
9 vision that my ancestors had.

10 Personally, I am Treaty 5. I'm a citizen  
11 of the Fisher River Cree Nation. That's in Manitoba.  
12 That's on the western shore of the Winnipeg Lake. My  
13 ancestors, who -- my grandfather, who signed Treaty 1.  
14 My grandmother signed Treaty 5. They had this vision,  
15 we're all going to prosper under the treaties. We're  
16 all going to have -- like Arcat (?) says, we're going  
17 have respect. We're going to have responsibility.  
18 We're going to have recognition. We're going to have  
19 sharing. Everybody.

20 Now, I don't know if there's other  
21 indigenous people, or there's actually a person from  
22 Treaty 8, but I'm not really here to speak on their  
23 behalf. I can only tell you what I feel. And Site C  
24 -- this is not reconciliation. This is something  
25 else.

26 Is it following UNDR? It doesn't look



1 instance there was a woman by the name of Nichole  
2 Dusyk and I just will repeat some of her insights.  
3 She says:

4 "In contemplating the building of Site C we  
5 have a choice to follow and to build  
6 momentum along a particular trajectory.  
7 Would this help us build the kind of energy  
8 system that we want in British Columbia and  
9 the kind of sustainability that we as a  
10 people wish to promote? Do we need to  
11 reorient the momentum of our energy system?"

12 So really, I think it's really a question  
13 of what do we prefer to do? This is the moment in  
14 time where we can move with the rest of the planet in  
15 an intelligent way forward and really take into  
16 consideration all the heartfelt submissions that have  
17 been put forward today, and for the last couple of  
18 weeks, and for the last -- I think since 1983.  
19 There's been a lot of support for the land to be left.

20 And I also think we have a reason for  
21 celebration. These are questions that are being put  
22 forward seriously and collectively, passionately,  
23 requiring honest reply that answers to the profound  
24 and sacred source of life itself, which is the river  
25 and all that it supports. And not until the last  
26 person feels that the river itself has been fully

1           respected and understood for what it provides will  
2           this process be over.

3                           Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON:     Thank you, ma'am.

5   **Proceeding Time 9:20 p.m. T39**

6 MR. DESROCHERS:     May I sneak in there.   Sorry, thanks.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON:     Certainly.

8 MR. DESROCHERS:     Thank you.   I'll just be a minute.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON:     Please state your name first?

10 MR. DESROCHERS:     Oh, sorry.   Russell Desrochers.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON:     And spell your last name.

12 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DESROCHERS (#0207):**

13 MR. DESROCHERS:     Desrochers is D-E-S-R-O-C-H-E-R-S.

14           Yeah, thank you for letting me speak here.

15                           So I guess I just wanted to come as a  
16           concerned citizen because I feel like we haven't been  
17           told the whole deal.   I feel like we're sold the wrong  
18           deal.   The Site C project has been sold to most  
19           British Columbians as a natural renewable energy type  
20           project that is cost feasible, and I think that's just  
21           wrong.   You know, at first it sounded great to me.  
22           Hydro, you know, it's been there for thousands of  
23           years, very renewable.   It sounds great.   But when you  
24           look into it, you realize what these people are saying  
25           is true.   You look at it, there's been no demand, we  
26           don't need it, so why spend all this money, and I

1           guess what we do also realize is that it's because of  
2           this natural gas and fracking industry that's been  
3           booming and we know there's money in that and stuff in  
4           the past, but if you just look at the, you know, the  
5           popularity of Tesla these days and the way the world's  
6           going, I think we can see that that's pretty backwards  
7           in terms of technology and backwards in terms of  
8           thinking of the way we should direct our country and  
9           which way to go forward.

10                        So I think we've been sold it as a natural  
11           renewable resource type project, but if it supports  
12           these fossil fuel -- you know, we all know the  
13           problems of fracking, we all know that it can destroy  
14           water sources, it can destroy land. It's banned in  
15           multiple countries throughout Europe, and if it  
16           supports all this, and all of the extra costs in it,  
17           we're already so debt burdened, you know, that just  
18           the average quality of living has been going down for  
19           years and years.

20                        And you know, anyways, I'm quite concerned  
21           and I just wanted to say that you know, it's not cost  
22           feasible. You can see our oils are -- our Athabaskan  
23           oil sands have been selling for foreign owned  
24           companies for pennies on the dollar because of all  
25           these other competitive type renewable resources or  
26           companies, I mean.





1 THE CHAIRPERSON: That's quite a ways.

2 MS. PERRIN: First of all, I want to acknowledge that we  
3 are on the unceded Coast Salish territory. In 2007 I  
4 did a public policy research project at Simon Fraser  
5 University and I did a survey and what it found was  
6 that B.C. residents are willing to pay a premium for  
7 electricity generation that does not harm the  
8 environment.

9 At that time I also attended a lecture by,  
10 I believe it was Mark Jaccard, that said industrial  
11 users were getting a discount and that the discount  
12 discouraged conservation. And today, industrial users  
13 are still getting a discount, such as Kinder Morgan.

14 My master's thesis was rooted in the facts  
15 that local food production and consumption reduces the  
16 1500 mile average of food transport, therefore local  
17 production and consumption of food reduces climate  
18 change as well as increasing food security.

19 In 2011 -- I want to talk a bit about  
20 conservation. In 2011 in Abbotsford our city decided  
21 they wanted to embark on a \$300 million P3 water  
22 project which was going to use water from the BC Hydro  
23 Stave Lake dam. And while they said, they said, they  
24 projected that by 2016 we would need extra hundred  
25 million megalitres a day, but they asked BC Hydro for  
26 400 million megalitres from the dam. The referendum

1 was defeated, soundly defeated, and since then there's  
2 been a lot of information provided to the consumers  
3 with regard to conservation, and the population has  
4 increased significantly since then, yet, the residents  
5 are using 25 percent less water than they were in  
6 2011.

7 And what I found is that people are really  
8 eager to do the right thing. They really care. You  
9 know. They really and truly care. They want to  
10 conserve. They just have to be informed on how to do  
11 that. And I think we're up for it. I think the  
12 province is up for it, the people who live here, and  
13 also the government and perhaps the B.C. Utilities  
14 Commission. I think we're really up for getting  
15 serious about conservation.

16 And so in that I say that we really -- Site  
17 C is really unnecessary. It really and truly is.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

19 **Proceeding Time 9:23 p.m. T41**

20 Okay. Well, with that, I'd like to thank  
21 everyone from -- oh, sorry.

22 MS. MASSIE: There's one more.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sorry, I thought you were just --

24 MS. MASSIE: No, no. Hi, sorry. I didn't prepare  
25 remarks or know that I was going to speak, although  
26 I'm happy --

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Could you tell me your name?

2 MS. MASSIE: -- to speak to you. My name is Pia, P-I-A,  
3 Massie, M-A-S-S-I-E.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

5 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MASSIE (#0209):**

6 MS. MASSIE: And I'm incredibly grateful to be able to  
7 live here in this -- one of the most spectacularly  
8 beautiful places on earth, and I, like many other  
9 people behind me, have been up to the Peace River  
10 Valley, and I've met the people who live there, and  
11 it's just unimaginable to me that anyone would think  
12 of destroying this incredibly beautiful place where,  
13 you know, since time immemorial, moose have come, swum  
14 to those little islands so they could birth their  
15 calves, to have the safety of having them in a place  
16 where they could raise them.

17 The eagle -- the eagles nest in the trees.  
18 All those trees were summarily cut down so that eagles  
19 that have come there for generations could not come  
20 back and nest there. I work -- my work is, I am the  
21 artist-in-residence at Emily Carr, in the Faculty of  
22 Culture and Community. Last week as part of the class  
23 that I teach, which is called "The ethics of  
24 representation", all my relations, I showed the film  
25 *Fractured Land*. I hope you have a chance to see this  
26 film, which is about a person who comes from the Peace

1 River Valley and his family, and the great tragedy  
2 that splits his family apart from having a mother  
3 who's involved in oil and gas and a father who lives  
4 out in the bush.

5 This province, this country, has been built  
6 on the cultural genocide of the people who have lived  
7 here and taken care of it since the very, very  
8 beginning of time. We have destroyed the cod fishery.  
9 We are about to destroy the salmon fishery. We have  
10 cut down all the trees. Our last precious resource is  
11 water. We are the only country in the world that has  
12 this much clean water. Why would we be giving it  
13 away? Why would we be poisoning the ground water?  
14 Why would we be using it to try and wash sludgy  
15 peanut-butter goop that nobody even wants to buy any  
16 more?

17 It doesn't make any sense economically. I  
18 know we're only supposed to talk about economics, that  
19 tomorrow the First Nations people will be allowed to  
20 present, I heard, from 10 to 12. So then you'll hear  
21 more than just economic arguments. But there is no,  
22 no moral or ethical argument for continuing with Site  
23 C dam. It must stop. There is no question in  
24 anyone's mind who lives here. And no question in  
25 anyone's mind around the world.

26 I'm sorry that this is your responsibility

1           that you have to go forward and enact this, but you  
2           know what the right thing to do is. So please make  
3           sure that the Site C dam is stopped.

4                           Thank you.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON:    Thank you, ma'am.

6   **Proceeding Time 9:31 p.m. T42**

7                           All right. I would like to thank everyone  
8           who came out tonight, and especially those who got up  
9           and spoke. Your interest is very much appreciated and  
10          your comments will be carefully considered by all of  
11          the panel.

12                           Have a great evening, thank you.

13                           **(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 9:31 P.M.)**

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

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

21

22

23

24



A.B. Lanigan, Court Reporter

25

October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017

26