

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

Victoria , B.C.
October 11th, 2017

COMMUNITY INPUT PROCEEDINGS
VICTORIA

BEFORE:

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

VOLUME 12B

INDEX

PAGE

SEPTEMBER 23rd, 2017 – Volume 1

Vancouver Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 24th, 2017 – Volume 2

Kamloops Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 25th, 2017 – Volume 3

Kelowna Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 26th, 2017 – Volume 4

Nelson Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 29th, 2017 - Volume 5A

Prince George First Nations Input Proceedings (afternoon)

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

SEPTEMBER 29th, 2017 - Volume 5B

Prince George Community Input Proceedings (evening)

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 30th, 2017 - Volume 6

Hudson's Hope Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

OCTOBER 1, 2017 - Volume 7

Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OCTOBER 2, 2017 - Volume 8

Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings

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

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

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

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

OCTOBER 5, 2017 - Volume 9

Vancouver Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

OCTOBER 6, 2017 - Volume 10

Vancouver First Nations Input Proceedings

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

OCTOBER 10, 2017 - Volume 11

Nanaimo Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

INDEX

PAGE

OCTOBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12A

Victoria First Nations Input Proceedings

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

OCTOBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12B

Victoria Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OCTOBER 13th, 2017 – Volume 13

Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings

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

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

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

OCTOBER 14th, 2017 – Volume 14

Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

VICTORIA, B.C.
October 11th, 2017

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening. Thank you for joining us for the last of our community input sessions. As you know, we've been traveling the province in the last two and a half weeks, listening to people's views on our interim report and the Site C inquiry.

My name is David Morton, and I'm the Panel Chair for the Site C inquiry. I'm also the Chair and CEO of the B.C. Utilities Commission. With me today are my fellow Site C inquiry panel members. Dennis Cote is on my left, Karen Keilty is on my right, and Richard Mason is on Ms. Keilty's right.

This community input session is part of the second important phase of the Site C inquiry. As you know, we spent the first six weeks of this inquiry collecting data and analysis from many parties interested in, and affected by, BC Hydro's Site C project. The quality of these submissions was commendable. Many people committed a great deal to producing a quality submission within the short time frame that was provided.

This affirms what we already knew: that there are experts and affected parties who can bring us insight into the many complexities of evaluating

1 the economic impact of the Site C project.

2 We now have the task of making findings in
3 this inquiry, and we recognize that our findings are
4 better with your input.

5 Before we begin, I just want to talk a
6 little bit about some of the logistics. You've met
7 Mr. Bemister. He's from Allwest Reporting. He'll
8 help us to organize speakers, and help with other
9 logistics, and his team will be recording and
10 transcribing these sessions. The live audio -- and
11 they're sitting over here, and over there.

12 The live audio can be streamed from our
13 website, SiteCInquiry.com, and following these
14 sessions, all presentations will be transcribed and
15 posted with the rest of the inquiry documents.

16 There is a list of speakers up on the
17 screens here, and when you find your name appears
18 within the next two or three speakers, if you could
19 make your way down to the front, sit in some of the
20 front rows and be ready to speak, that will help us
21 keep things moving along and give your fellow speakers
22 the opportunity to be heard also.

23 If you're not prepared at the time you're
24 called upon, we'll go ahead with the next speaker in
25 line and then we will return at the end of the list
26 and make sure that we catch anybody that wasn't able

1 to come up when their name was called.

2 Submissions made here today, as well as
3 those made in writing, that are outside of the scope
4 of our review cannot be considered further in our
5 final report to government on November 1st.

6 When you speak, we ask that you not
7 disclose any confidential or personal information,
8 other than your name.

9 We are aware of the circulation of the
10 unredacted Deloitte report that was filed in the first
11 phase of the inquiry. The information that was
12 redacted in that report was done so to ensure that
13 current and future negotiations between BC Hydro and
14 its suppliers were not compromised as a result of this
15 information being publicly available. The panel still
16 considers that information confidential, despite its
17 inappropriate disclosure in the press. Therefore, the
18 panel may redact or refuse submissions that contain
19 reference to that confidential information, both here
20 tonight as well as in written submissions.

21 Again to allow all speakers, all registered
22 speakers, at least, to have an opportunity to speak,
23 we are asking you to limit your talk to a maximum of
24 five minutes. There is a timer at the front here, and
25 when you're getting close to the end of the five-
26 minute period, I will -- if it doesn't look like

1 Association, the Peace Valley Environment Association,
2 the Site C Inquiry. Five minutes is not a long time,
3 but I do take some comfort from the fact that as an
4 intervener, one usually only gets five minutes before
5 the Supreme Court of Canada.

6 We wish to thank the Panel for its
7 extraordinary efforts to fulfil the terms of reference
8 for this inquiry. You look surprisingly well rested
9 given the punishing schedule that you've faced over
10 the last month or so.

11 The fundamental question for the Panel is
12 this. Before spending another \$7.3 billion on Site C
13 Dam construction over the next seven years, is there
14 another, less costly, viable option? If the answer to
15 that question is yes, then BC Hydro ratepayers are
16 best served by the cancellation of Site C.

17 We filed our answer to that question
18 earlier today. By terminating Site C and deploying
19 wind power on an as needed basis. We are very
20 confident the ratepayers of this province will save
21 between 2.08 billion and 4.37 billion. Now, you may
22 have one or two questions on how we arrived at that
23 number, and I'm not an energy expert, so I invite you
24 to ask all the hard questions of our energy expert,
25 Robert McCullough, when he presents this Friday. And
26 we very much do appreciate the opportunity to make

1 that presentation.

2 What I do have is personal experience with
3 courage, and that is want to share with you today.
4 For personal courage, two moments stand out for me.
5 First, sitting at Ken and Arlene Boone's kitchen table
6 looking out to the road where BC Hydro chose to
7 monitor the Boones' movements, the Boones, despite the
8 stress of this random surveillance and other BC Hydro
9 provocations, including threats of driving them from
10 their home of over 30 years well in advance of the
11 need for the land, said to me, "We will do whatever it
12 takes to speak truth to power and do what's right for
13 British Columbia."

14 Second, a different kind of personal
15 courage. It was the moment when a husband and wife,
16 who had built a beautiful home many many years ago in
17 the Site C flood zone, broke down and cried in front
18 of me because the 40-year-long controversy over the
19 construction of Site C was literally killing them. To
20 save their house they -- to save their health they
21 sold out to BC Hydro and turned their back on their
22 whole life in the Peace Valley.

23 Another moment of courage I recall took
24 place in October 1991 when then Attorney General Colin
25 Gabelmann showed great political determination when he
26 confirmed that the new NDP government would proceed

1 with freedom of information legislation. The NDP
2 government did not do this to win political points.
3 Every government, often to their chagrin, is subject
4 to the same scrutiny under the Act. FOI legislation
5 got done because it was in the best interest of
6 British Columbia, because it supports our democracy,
7 because it was a principled decision, because it was
8 the right thing to do.

9 Making your findings on whether to
10 terminate construction of the most expensive
11 undertaking ever begun by this province will also
12 require substantial courage. You will require the
13 courage to make clear, unequivocal findings based on
14 the information before you, the courage to make
15 findings that ignore the \$2.1 billion sunk costs in
16 the project, the courage to look to the future rather
17 than be a captive of past decisions, the courage to
18 make findings rather than punting the decision on Site
19 C down the road. And everything I've seen and
20 everything I've heard says that you are up to that
21 task.

22 And so November 1st is the date when you
23 deliver your report to government, and that'll be one
24 of those moments etched into your memory and etched
25 into the memory of everybody in this room. It'll be
26 where were you when you heard the decision, or -- not

1 the decision but the findings on Site C? November 1st
2 is the day we will learn whether you as the Panel,
3 charged with protecting the interests of B.C.
4 ratepayers, have the courage to make findings based on
5 the evidence presented to you, findings that are going
6 to be unpopular with some of your friends and
7 colleagues. I actually drafted B.C.'s freedom of
8 information legislation when I was a young rascal, and
9 I can tell you it was a career limiting move. I was
10 pretty unpopular with some of the people that I find
11 as close friends.

12 But the point is that this will be the most
13 significant decision that will affect the future of
14 government and the future of this province and British
15 Columbians for many many years to come. And the
16 evidence we've presented today will demonstrate that
17 it's time to terminate Site C and move on. And
18 demonstrate the courage to make this fundamental
19 finding, you'll be encouraging the government of
20 British Columbia to join the 21st century rather than
21 continuing to be mired in the big dam thinking of more
22 than a half century ago.

23 Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir, thank you.

25 **Proceeding Time 6:12 p.m. T14**

26 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COSTE (#0241):**

1 MR. COSTE: Good evening. My name is Torrance Coste, C-
2 O-S-T-E on the last name, and I work for the
3 Wilderness Committee. I want to begin by
4 acknowledging our presence on the unceded Lekwungen
5 territories of the Esquimalt and Songhees Nations and
6 express my gratitude for being on these lands this
7 evening.

8 Your initial report stated that this
9 inquiry would look into questions of cost recovery
10 under different possible scenarios: going ahead with
11 the dam, putting it on hold, terminating it. But it
12 overlooked another aspect of recovery. It didn't ask
13 about recovering the public trust that will disappear
14 if this dam is approved.

15 I feel that BC Hydro has a role to play in
16 our future, in this province's future. A public
17 utility powered by renewable sources is a huge tool
18 for the people of this province and one we'll
19 desperately need if we're to survive in a changing
20 climate. That said, BC Hydro can only function
21 properly as a public utility if it holds the respect
22 and the trust of the public. Most people don't want
23 this dam forced through. Reading through the
24 submissions to this process from the last -- from the
25 previous ten hearings, all of which is available
26 online as you mentioned, the vast majority of the

1 comments call for this dam to be cancelled. Last
2 night in Nanaimo seven people spoke in favour of the
3 dam and 25 spoke in opposition to it.

4 If BC Hydro moves ahead with Site C, if it
5 tramples the wishes of indigenous nations in the area,
6 if it destroys habitat and migration routes for
7 important species, if it floods valuable farmland, if
8 it does all this to create power that we don't need,
9 trust in our public utility will be lost. And that
10 lost trust is a cost that can never be recovered.
11 Every development BC Hydro attempts from now on will
12 be met not with interest or open-mindedness, but with
13 the fierce opposition deserved of a public agency that
14 has proven itself not to act in the public interest.

15 If this kind of recovery isn't within the
16 scope of your review, that's a grave oversight. You
17 could multiply the cost of cancelling this dam by a
18 thousand and it still wouldn't be equal to the cost of
19 that lost trust. We deserve a public utility that
20 still has the respect and trust of the public, and
21 it's not right for a current government to take that
22 away from us, take that away from the next generation
23 and the next one after that.

24 Finally, the cancellation of this dam must
25 be based in justice. That means not leaving behind
26 the workers who have moved to Fort St. John or banked

1 on income and opportunity from this project.
2 Fortunately, cancelling Site C will be a massive
3 savings for taxpayers and ratepayers alike, and some
4 of that saving should be mobilized as compensation
5 packages for the workers facing immediate term
6 disruption from the cancellation of this project. We
7 can save ourselves a lot of money while preserving
8 some of the public's sense of trust in our public
9 utility and ensuring justice for our workers. That's
10 something my generation deserves, it's something I
11 believe everyone in this province wants, and that's
12 what I hope you'll recommend to the government of B.C.
13 in your report.

14 Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

16 **Proceeding Time 6:16 p.m. T15**

17 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SIMPSON (#251):**

18 MS. SIMPSON: My name is Janet Simpson, S-I-M-P-S-O-N.

19 Hydro claims that if the dam is terminated
20 we will have spent a fortune "without anything to show
21 for it". But there would be a vital show of respect
22 and support for the ecosystem of the river and its
23 wildlife. The dam would flood 83 kilometers of the
24 Peace River, 36 kilometers of five other waterways,
25 and 5,500 hectares of land. Wolves will suffer a loss
26 of 22 percent of landscape productivity, caribou 37,

1 grizzlies 44 percent. Fishers, weasels, will suffer a
2 major loss of habitat. Bull trout and Arctic grayling
3 will also be impacted. Over 60 percent of the Peace
4 region has been disturbed by human land use. There
5 are already over 190,000 kilometers of pipelines,
6 roads, and seismic lines.

7 Site C must be considered in the context of
8 this enormous cumulative industrial footprint, which
9 is destroying wildlife habitat at a blistering rate.
10 It will add unacceptable stress to an already
11 overstressed environment. This mega-dam would drown
12 land equal to 14 Stanley Parks.

13 Hydro admits they are threatening fish, the
14 ecology, and birds. They admit local fish species,
15 Arctic grayling, migratory bull trout, and mountain
16 whitefish, could be wiped out by the dam's
17 construction. Site C will result in the loss of bird
18 habitat for warblers, rails, and owls. Ecological
19 impacts from the reservoir include the loss of mature
20 flood plain forests and rare plants.

21 Hydro expects increases in mercury levels
22 in locally caught fish because flooding land increases
23 organic levels of mercury. Try selling that to 90
24 percent of the population at Grassy Narrows First
25 Nation suffering from mercury poisoning.

26 Thirty scientists desperately catalogued

1 animal and plant life in an effort to record what's
2 there before it is lost. It was a five-day effort
3 that left much of the valley unstudied. We don't know
4 how many rare species Hydro may be about to eradicate.

5 The wildlife biologist who wrote B.C.'s
6 management plan for the area said,

7 "The Peace Valley old growth forest slated
8 to be clear-cut is just as important, if not
9 more, ecologically significant than the
10 Great Bear rain forest. It's more important
11 from a biodiversity point of view because
12 there is far less of it."

13 In fact, the boreal forest around the
14 confluence of the Peace and Moberly Rivers is so
15 ecologically important that the B.C. government gave
16 it three different protective designations. It's an
17 old growth management area with centuries-old poplars,
18 spruce, and cottonwood trees that offer prime habitat
19 for at-risk species.

20 It is official ungulate winter habitat,
21 critical and increasingly rare thermal and security
22 cover for the moose population which is in such sharp
23 decline that the government has a five-year study to
24 probe the reasons. Logging would destroy much of this
25 cover.

26 The area targeted for immediate clear-

1 cutting was also set aside in '69 to protect unique
2 wildlife values, including habitat for the at-risk
3 wolverine. The reserve contains some of the highest
4 wildlife values in the entire Peace.

5 Clear-cutting must take place before the
6 end of March, before song birds return to nest.
7 Great. Let's remove their habitat just in time for
8 their return.

9 Canada is signatory to the *Migratory Birds*
10 *Convention Act* which prevents migratory birds from
11 being killed or their nests from being destroyed, but
12 not, evidently, from their essential habitat being
13 wiped out.

14 The reserve provides important nesting
15 habitat for four at-risk songbird species, found
16 nowhere else in B.C.: the black-throated green
17 warbler, Connecticut warbler, morning warbler, and
18 Canadian warbler. The latter is one of five migratory
19 bird species whose sustainability is threatened by
20 Site C. The review panel concluded that the dam and
21 reservoir would likely cause significant adverse
22 effects to migratory birds relying on valley bottom
23 habitat, and these losses would be permanent and
24 cannot be mitigated.

25 The Peace is unusual, supporting starkly
26 different ecosystems and wildlife. It's unique, with

1 semi-desert on one side of the valley and old-growth
2 spruce on the other. Half of the world's wildlife has
3 been lost in the past 40 years. That decline could
4 reach two-thirds among vertebrates by 2020. And
5 animals living in lakes, rivers, and wetlands are
6 suffering the biggest losses. For fresh-water
7 species, the decline is 81 percent because of the way
8 fresh water is used and removed, and because of the
9 fragmentation of fresh-water systems through dam
10 building. Yet we are considering --

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ma'am, I just want to remind you, your
12 time is --

13 MS. SIMPSON: Two more sentences?

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

15 MS. SIMPSON: Thank you. Considering the damming of one
16 of the last remaining free-flowing sections of the
17 Peace in B.C., the destruction of an invaluable
18 ecosystem, the government needs to terminate this
19 project permanently.

20 Thank you.

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

22 **Proceeding Time 6:21 p.m. T16**

23 Good evening, sir.

24 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MITCHELL (#0252):**

25 MR. MITCHELL: Tom Mitchell, M-I-T-C-H-E-L-L.

26 The Site C dam should be stopped for the

1 following reasons. I believe the decision made to
2 initiate this mega-project was flawed and based on
3 political ideology, the interest of the fossil fuel
4 industry and a profound lack of concern about the
5 worsening effects of climate change and impacts of
6 this project.

7 The previous government claimed that the
8 power generated would be used to power 450,000 homes,
9 but BC Hydro file, 8015927, belies that claim. It
10 states:

11 "The Peace River electrical load is forecast
12 to increase in the next 30 years, primarily
13 driven by unconventional gas production.
14 Gas producers have expressed an interest in
15 using electricity rather than gas for
16 upstream gas production, processing and
17 compression facilities."

18 And of course, unconventional gas is fracked LNG.

19 This dam was turned down twice before by
20 the B.C. Utilities Commission until former premier,
21 Gordon Campbell, created the *Clean Air Act* which
22 allowed the dam application to make an end run around
23 the B.C. Utilities Commission. Economically the dam
24 is fast becoming redundant due to the accelerating
25 transition to sustainable energy. In 2015 the
26 international energy agency indicated an increase in

1 renewables of 153 gigawatts, exceeded the increase in
2 coal, oil, gas and nuclear combined with China
3 installing two wind turbines per hour.

4 The agency also estimates that in three
5 decades solar TV and other clean sources will take the
6 dominant share of the world's power supply.

7 Mark Eliesen, former CEO of BC Hydro,
8 stated in a recent report that the completion of the
9 dam would inevitably impose a huge financial burden on
10 B.C. taxpayers and lead to job losses, business
11 failures and financial damage to BC Hydro and
12 government.

13 In the same report he points out the
14 falsehood of the proposed \$1 billion transmission line
15 to supply Site C power to Alberta, as that province
16 has its own existing cheaper gas plants. He also
17 points out that in the unlikely event electricity
18 demand increases in B.C. that the Burrard thermal
19 generation station could be restarted cheaply and
20 effectively with the added advantage of being close to
21 the densely populated mainland.

22 Recent studies show that demand in B.C.
23 has been steady over the last decade, with a slight
24 decrease in the last one and a half years. This in
25 spite of a population growth of 500,000 people and no
26 major efforts to introduce conservation measures. At

1 present time there is actually a surplus.

2 Jane Ineeche in the October 5th News Energy
3 Politics writes that the dam is currently 610 million
4 over budget. In 2014, Harry Swain, former chair of
5 the federal/provincial joint review commission stated
6 that the dam would have significant negative effects
7 on the lives of First Nations, flooding sacred burial
8 sites, hunting and fishing grounds. With almost 100
9 kilometres of value class 1 land flooded, the resulted
10 methane released from decaying vegetation and
11 subsequent CO₂ from the manufacture of concrete used in
12 building the dam would greatly reduce Canada's ability
13 to meet its Paris climate commitments.

14 Methane is 25 to 85 percent worse than CO₂
15 for the first decade. One ton of cement roughly
16 equals one ton of CO₂. Cement manufacture, at present,
17 makes up 7 percent of the world's greenhouse gas
18 emissions.

19 In conclusion, I believe the negative
20 impacts are many and substantial and outweigh the
21 short-term benefits of job creation. We are in a
22 planetary climate crises with CO₂ levels world-wide
23 over 400 parts per million and the grassland going
24 vertical. For the sake of present and future
25 generations, including other life forms, we must take
26 this seriously and change course away from business as

1 usual. We cannot have our cake and eat it too.

2 Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, sir.

4 **Proceeding Time 6:26 p.m. T17**

5 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRAY (#0253):**

6 MR. GRAY: Hi, my name is Steve Gray, G-R-A-Y. I live in
7 Victoria, and I'm speaking today on behalf of the
8 Rolling Justice Bus.

9 I'd like to thank you for the work that you
10 folks are doing. We're very pleased that a regulator
11 has become involved in reviewing the Site C project.

12 We were pleased with the preliminary report
13 and your questions posed to BC Hydro. Thank you for
14 today's opportunity to provide input into your
15 deliberations. Let me start with a few concerns.

16 Number one, your independent expert,
17 Deloitte, has questioned Hydro's ability, estimating
18 large contracts.

19 Two, the folks who vouched for how BC Hydro
20 built their Site C budget were caught up in the CBC
21 investigation on cost overruns of the Port Mann
22 bridge. Those overruns are now the subject of a
23 government review.

24 Three, there have been significant
25 geotechnical problems at Site C. Some of these were
26 predictable, some not.

1 A few months ago, the selected Canadian
2 civil works partner on the project went bankrupt.

3 Five, this past week we learned from BC
4 Hydro that the Site C project is now officially over
5 budget. There have been construction delays and
6 critical timelines won't be met.

7 Six, to make matters worse, and we might
8 expect it at this stage of the game, we are told that
9 BC Hydro is in dispute with its contractors over the
10 causes of the delay and who should pay for what.

11 None of this inspires confidence. It's not
12 just a question of the numbers, it's whether a project
13 of this size and complexity can be managed
14 successfully by our local talent, and it's whether the
15 location is appropriate from a geotechnical standpoint
16 and how expensive engineering solutions may drive the
17 final spend.

18 I am thinking here about what happened with
19 Muskrat Falls and the Keeyask hydroelectric projects.
20 BC Hydro and Deloitte now seem to agree that the
21 project faces important risks of future overruns. We
22 ask that you highlight these concerns and detail these
23 risks in your final report so that the full potential
24 costs of completion are on the table, rather than what
25 has clearly been overly optimistic assessments to
26 date.

1 We also would appreciate knowing how such
2 budget overruns will affect our Hydro rates.

3 By now you will know that there is a fair
4 amount of opposition to this project based on the
5 scale of the destruction caused by the flooding of the
6 land, without compelling evidence of our need for the
7 electricity to be produced from Site C. You are aware
8 of the tremendous costs borne by the indigenous people
9 and their communities who lived on the land flooded by
10 the Williston Reservoir. You are aware of BC Hydro's
11 vow to never make the same mistakes again. You are
12 aware of the treatment of indigenous women during the
13 building of the W.A.C. Bennett Dam. You are aware of
14 Treaty 8 and the United Nations Declaration on the
15 Rights of Indigenous People.

16 You are aware of the 94 calls to action
17 from the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. You are
18 aware of the inquiry into missing and murdered
19 indigenous women. You are aware of the risks to the
20 World Heritage Site downstream. You are aware of the
21 loss of good farm land. You are aware of the climate
22 change arguments against the building of hydroelectric
23 dams. These are only some of the implications of
24 completing Site C. We ask you detail these in your
25 final report.

26 Some are arguing that Site C is primarily a

1 make-work project. They want to preserve Site C
2 construction jobs at all costs. We must remember the
3 real question here is not whether the jobs are needed
4 but whether the project is needed. Unfortunately,
5 these lines are being blurred. We ask that you
6 require BC Hydro to explain their job numbers now, so
7 that you, the government, and the public are better
8 informed as decisions are made, in the event of a
9 cancellation that a proper labour adjustment strategy
10 can be developed. Ditto sunk costs. We ask that you
11 recommend against consideration of sunk costs in
12 reaching a final decision on Site C.

13 Now we want to mention, I guess, one of the
14 elephants in the room, BC Hydro's finances. Moody
15 Investors Services, the bond rating agency, have been
16 sounding the alarm bells about BC Hydro's rising debt
17 for years. They say that the BC Hydro's finances are
18 among the weakest of Canadian provincial utilities.

19 With the unusual accounting rules of BC
20 Hydro, the deferral accounts, the concerns of the
21 Auditor General, and Hydro's ever-increasing debt
22 threatening B.C.'s credit rating, it's no wonder the
23 government has ordered a financial review of BC Hydro
24 itself. We ask that you review the likely impact on
25 B.C.'s credit rating of cancellation, mothballing, or
26 continuing with the Site C project, especially in

1 consideration of any further overruns, and sort out
2 what would be required in terms of hydro rate
3 adjustments to address Moody's concerns.

4 Finally, reading through your report and
5 many of the submissions made to the panel, we wanted
6 to make the point that the alternatives to Site C,
7 from demand management, the Columbia River
8 entitlement, to distributed wind and solar, likely
9 provide the key to a most sensible and least costly
10 future electricity supply for British Columbia. As a
11 result, we ask that you devote your remaining time and
12 energy to findings on alternative portfolios.

13 Thank you again for your work. We
14 appreciate that you have very short timelines to
15 produce the information asked of you, and we also want
16 to say thanks to your staff for their hard work and
17 diligence.

18 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. Thank you.

19 **Proceeding Time 6:31 p.m. T18**

20 Good evening, ma'am.

21 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DRAPER (#0254):**

22 MS. DRAPER: Good evening. Susan Draper. D-R-A-P-E-R.
23 I'd like to begin by acknowledging that we are meeting
24 on the traditional territories of the Lekwungen
25 speaking people. For over 4,000 years Coast Salish
26 people have lived on and cared for these lands and

1 waters with the knowledge and appreciation that right
2 relationship with the earth is critical to human
3 survival. Their careful stewardship of this region
4 has allowed me as a settler to enjoy a comfortable
5 lifestyle, a lifestyle that I am now questioning as I
6 witness the devastation of so many watersheds
7 throughout B.C.

8 I am speaking tonight as a settler, but
9 also as a member of a national faith based social and
10 ecological justice organization known as KAIROS.
11 Kairos is a Greek word that means a moment in time
12 when change is possible. Because we are a network
13 that examines the critical issues of the day, that
14 looks at the big pictures and tries to connect the
15 dots, we are always seeking the kairos moment. A
16 point in time when we can say, aha, something new has
17 come out of the situation, transformation is possible
18 now. And then we work to make it so.

19 I believe, as does the KAIROS Network, that
20 this public consultation is an opportunity to have a
21 critical conversation about the Site C Dam and the
22 current path we are walking, as well as to raise
23 questions that do not often get asked enough as we
24 pursue development in B.C. Fundamentally ethical in
25 their nature, these are questions that look at the
26 relationship we have with one another, as well as

1 humanity's relationship with the earth itself.

2 After considering the ethical issues that
3 Site C Dam represents, as well as the economic issues
4 it raises, BC-Yukon KAIROS has concluded that this
5 project is not in B.C.'s long-term interest and needs
6 to be stopped as soon as possible. Even if this dam
7 could be built on time and on budget, we would still
8 be recommending that it be halted and plans for
9 remediation at the site be developed.

10 You should know that our national
11 organization produced a policy briefing paper on Site
12 C Dam in June, 2016, which faith communities across
13 B.C. and Canada have been using to inform their
14 discussion on Site C. It raises all the important
15 issues that have been eloquently and passionately
16 lifted up by many groups and individuals at these
17 public consultations. Rather than expand on each of
18 these points, I'd like to instead go back to why the
19 KAIROS Network decided that Site C Dam represents a
20 kairos moment or a watershed moment, if you will, for
21 B.C. and for Canada.

22 I'd like the panel members and everyone in
23 this room to imagine two different scenarios in their
24 mind's eyes. One, the media headlines and the
25 commentary across this country if our provincial
26 government announces in early December that it will be

1 proceeding with Site C Dam or, two, the media's
2 stories that will be told when our provincial
3 government announces it is stopping Site C and finally
4 laying to rest the idea of a third dam on the Peace
5 River.

6 I am having a hard time imagining the first
7 scenario under an NDP-Green government. Anyone else?
8 Why is that? Because something has already shifted in
9 the public's consciousness. There are too many
10 ordinary people no longer content with business as
11 usual. I believe progressive leaders and citizens in
12 our province are eager to embrace a new vision for
13 economic and social development, one that is truly
14 sustainable in the long-term.

15 50 years ago when they were building
16 Bennett Dam, human beings didn't think too much that
17 they were part of the web of life, only indigenous
18 people had that kind of message. Today most, of us
19 though, are fully aware that human beings cannot
20 continue to act as plunderers and pirates of the
21 natural world.

22 Call me naive, but I believe as do the
23 KAIROS network that I am a part of, that a majority of
24 British Columbians are ready to signal to the rest of
25 Canada that we no longer view the lands and waters of
26 our province as a commodity to be sold. We are

1 calling for the roller coaster ride that is resource
2 exploitation in B.C. to be replaced by an economic
3 development model that will see the creation of good
4 jobs in the communities where people are living,
5 meaningful work that takes care of the people and the
6 watersheds we all depend on.

7 To conclude, a quote by Aldo Leopold. A
8 hundred years ago he wrote about the land or what we
9 now call the watershed.

10 "We abuse land because we regard it as a
11 commodity belonging to us. When we see land
12 as a community to which we belong, we may
13 begin to use it with love and respect. The
14 hope of the future lies not in curbing the
15 influence of human occupancy, it's already
16 too late for that, but in creating a better
17 understanding of the extent of that
18 influence and a new ethic for its
19 governance."

20 The cancellation of Site C Dam represents
21 the start of this new ethic. When that happy day
22 finally dawns in B.C. our hearts will be filled with
23 gratitude for the Forces of KNOW, K-N-O-W, who have
24 been fighting this proposal for decades and are minds
25 open to the amazing opportunities that will surely flow
26 from this dam busting decision. #watershedsareus.

1 Thank you.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

3 **Proceeding Time 6:37 p.m. T19**

4 MS. SAYERS: Good evening.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening, ma'am.

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SAYERS (#0255):**

7 MS. SAYERS: My name is Judith Sayers, that's S-A-Y-E-R-
8 S. And I'd like to acknowledge that we are on the
9 unceded territory of the Songhees and Esquimalt
10 peoples.

11 I am here tonight on behalf of the B.C.
12 First Nations Clean Energy Working Group, of which
13 there are approximately 80 to 90 members. We're very
14 loosely configured. We come together on common issues
15 to help promote clean energy within the province. And
16 of course Site C is one of those issues.

17 The preliminary report, on page 84, talks
18 of natural capital, and this is quoting a David Suzuki
19 quote. And the impacts that Site C has on the natural
20 capital in the Peace Valley and associated ecosystem
21 services which sustains the health and well-being of
22 local communities, contributes to the culture and
23 traditional ways of First Nations, and are worth
24 hundreds of millions of dollars annually in non-market
25 values. I'd like to speak about some of that natural
26 capital, and some of the alternatives, and the

1 benefits that are being denied First Nations because
2 of Site C.

3 First Nations have been involved in
4 developing clean energy in this province since the
5 early 2000s, and very little research has been done as
6 to how much we're developed. So, the B.C. First
7 Nations Clean Energy Working Group, environmental --
8 the School of Environmental Studies at UVic, and Clean
9 Energy B.C. did a survey, and this is also quoted in
10 your report at page 100.

11 And we did a province-wide survey and we
12 got 105 responses which, out of 203 First Nations, is
13 a pretty good sample size. And so it's not a complete
14 picture, and we wish we had a complete picture because
15 I think the results would be stunning.

16 47 percent of the First Nations surveyed
17 were a part of the energy industry. And that varied
18 from being owners to getting royalties. 98 percent of
19 them were or wanted to be involved in the clean energy
20 - 98 percent. It's a very high percentage.

21 First Nations in existing projects produce
22 a total of 1,836 megawatts, or 40 percent of the
23 independent power producers' contributions to the
24 grid. 32 projects have projects in development, 15
25 are under construction. Those First Nations that were
26 interviewed said there are 249 projects they want to

1 build; 249. And those have some of them that are in
2 pre-feasibility, and some that are stalled.

3 Even with the lack of opportunity to create
4 energy to BC Hydro, First Nations are still producing
5 projects. Of course, some are diesel-dependent.
6 Others want to become grid-independent, and others
7 just want clean energy.

8 61 percent of the respondents said the
9 biggest barrier to creating clean energy is, there is
10 no opportunity to sell power to the BC Hydro grid.
11 And of course we know that this is very frustrating
12 for First Nations because they want to do that.

13 First Nations have already invested \$35.5
14 million in operating projects and there are 3.8
15 million in clean energy projects that are not --
16 cannot proceed because there is no opportunity to
17 develop. An approximate value of \$3.3 billion is not
18 being invested by First Nations into this province
19 because there is no opportunity sell power. Remember,
20 this is half of the First Nations of British Columbia.
21 So, we have a potential of 6.6 - almost the cost of
22 Site C - First Nations that would take on the debt.
23 It wouldn't be the public debt.

24 Jobs have been anywhere from 96 to 212. If
25 we were able to get those 249 projects up and
26 operating, minimum there, 300, 400 jobs.

1 I'm running out of time. So, this natural
2 capital is not being utilized that's in First Nations
3 communities. The economics of First Nations being
4 denied the ability, even though the *Clean Energy Act*
5 needs it and says it has to be done, isn't happening.
6 The world is advancing technologically in clean
7 energy. And B.C. is going to be out of that, because
8 who's going to come to B.C. if there's no opportunity?
9 We're going to be way behind the curve.

10 And we're losing out on natural capital.
11 And I hope you look seriously at the alternatives that
12 First Nations can provide to British Columbia. It's
13 significant, and it makes a huge difference in our
14 First Nations communities.

15 Thank you for your time.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you.

17 **Proceeding Time 6:43 p.m. T20**

18 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. RUSSOW (#0256):**

19 MS. RUSSOW: My name is Joan Russow. Russow, R-U-S-S-
20 O-W. It's 2017. It's 41 years since Habitat 1 in
21 Vancouver where Canada, under the first Trudeau,
22 agreed to the following recommendations: Reducing
23 energy consumption, becoming aware of the need to
24 cease environmentally degrading and wasteful use of
25 energy resources, identifying and developing new
26 sources of energy, developing and implementing the

1 utilization of solar and geothermal energy. Yet, in
2 2017 Site C, which is not only ecologically but also
3 economically regressive advances the tolerance for
4 externalities. Externalities are the costs that
5 affect a party who did not choose to incur the cost.

6 The first externality is the years of cost
7 caused by the irreversible resource destruction that
8 has deprived First Nations of their subsistence within
9 their territories. This destruction violates article
10 1 of the legally binding international covenant of
11 civil and political rights.

12 "In no case may a people be deprived of its
13 own means of subsistence."

14 The destruction also contravenes the
15 principle of free, prior and informed consent in the
16 UN Declaration and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
17 Canada's interpretation of free prior informed consent
18 is unfortunately out of sync with the international
19 interpretation.

20 A second externality is the loss of
21 archeological sites and of the potential damage to the
22 Wood Buffalo World Heritage site in violation of the
23 legal binding UN convention on the preservation of
24 cultural and natural heritage.

25 A third externality is a loss of food
26 security by destroying acres of rich agricultural land

1 and disregarding the warning by the inter-governmental
2 panel on climate change on loss of food security
3 caused by climate change.

4 A fourth externality is undermining the
5 potential for instituting a fair and just transition
6 for workers into a sustainable green energy: solar,
7 wind, geothermal, wave, tidal and future renewables
8 that could be provided with the subsidies that have
9 been used for years for fossil fuels.

10 Funds for Site C would displace funds for
11 the real solutions.

12 A fifth externality is the rights of the
13 future generations, a principle affirmed through
14 numerous conventions, including the legally binding
15 convention on biological diversity and the principle
16 embodied in the Bruntland Report:

17 "Sustainable development meets the needs of
18 the present without compromising the ability
19 of future generation to meet their needs."

20 Site C must be cancelled now and the sunk
21 costs absorbed. These costs were incurred from the
22 dereliction of duty on the part of the former liberal
23 governments in 2008 for allowing B.C. Hydro to defer
24 expenses for years into the future; in 2010 for
25 exempting Site C from the usual procedure of sending
26 the proposal to the B.C. Utilities Commission that

1 would have done an in-depth analysis of the exorbitant
2 externality costs; and in 2014 for ignoring the joint
3 regional panel's conclusion that the proposed Site C
4 project would likely cause a number of significant
5 adverse impacts to the rights of Treaty 8 First
6 Nations, and that some of these effects could not be
7 mitigated. At this point, the precautionary
8 principle should have been invoked, Site C cancelled,
9 not approved.

10 If Site C is not cancelled now, externality
11 costs will only be exacerbated. Thank you.

12 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

13 **Proceeding Time 6:47 p.m. T21**

14 Good evening, sir.

15 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DREW (#0257):**

16 MR. DREW: Good evening. My name is Robert Drew, and I
17 live in Victoria.

18 I respect the many opinions against this
19 project, but I would like to add a couple of insights
20 that I hope will benefit this panel. And
21 fundamentally, I urge this Commission to recommend
22 that Site C do continue. This is done on the basis
23 that BC Hydro should hire the best professional
24 experienced contract managers, supported by the best
25 contract lawyers' office -- construction lawyers'
26 office for this service. This was not done in

1 Victoria with the embarrassing Blue Bridge fiasco.

2 I'd like the Commission, or the panel, to
3 look at this in broad terms for the greatest good for
4 all British Columbians. There is one fundamental
5 point, though. British Columbians take for granted
6 that they're blessed with rivers and terrain that give
7 you the opportunity to have hydroelectric power. We
8 do not need coal-fired plants, as are necessary
9 elsewhere. I wonder if we should continue to see if
10 we can exploit and implement that advantage now.

11 The studies have been done, the groundwork
12 has been done, the land is assembled. And as I said,
13 if it's found that maybe we should hire good internal
14 management to continue for its success, if at all.
15 Why throw away \$3 billion dollars? Would it be
16 cheaper now than to wish we had done so when it's
17 revisited again in the future?

18 I have one additional new fact, I believe,
19 and that is regarding the future need for power.
20 According to Statistics Canada, there are 3 thousand
21 615,000 [*sic*] registered vehicles in British Columbia.
22 What I'm wondering if has been underestimated is --
23 has there been a review of the possible need for power
24 because of the electrification of passenger cars,
25 trucks, and public transportation? This is not just a
26 pipe dream, it's imminent. It's about to happen.

1 Almost all car manufacturers in Europe, North America,
2 and Asia have presently prototypes for fully 100
3 percent electrical cars, not just hybrid, and they're
4 ready for introduction in 2020. Besides providing the
5 outlets, 240 wiring in homes, there are already plans
6 for quick-charging infrastructure. This is done
7 already in Vancouver. In Germany, they're setting up
8 to do quick-charge stations along the freeways.

9 There's also obvious health benefits for
10 greenhouse gases.

11 The good news about taking into account the
12 source of users is that there is a source for cost
13 recovery, because you can charge them on the fuel to
14 get their quick charge, the same as you do presently
15 for gasoline.

16 We also have population growth in Canada's
17 best population of people moving here, a larger work
18 force. Climate change will also have denser housing
19 with air conditioning being needed with warmer
20 temperatures.

21 Your mandate is difficult, with having to
22 crystal-ball every conceivable exigency in a complex
23 project. But isn't it prudent to stay with proven
24 technology like a dam for a public utility? There's a
25 danger of wanting to be a faddist, to get on with
26 early adopters of as yet some slightly immature

1 alternate technology. They carry risks.

2 For example, with high-temperature
3 geothermal plants, B.C. is in a known seismically-
4 active area. The issues of deep fracking may or may
5 not affect earthquakes. Beautiful British Columbia,
6 do you want certain hills in certain areas to be
7 blighted with windmill farms, as you see north of Palm
8 Springs, or the resistance you had in Nova Scotia?

9 In addition, winds are -- some inland winds
10 are unreliable. And for solar power, this is such a
11 state of flux, they are improving year on year and
12 it's still in an adolescent industry, and B.C. has an
13 unreliable climate. So be cautious when people urge
14 alternate technology. Let's look for the long-range
15 good of most clients and look, it's never good to
16 relocate anybody for a large project like this. And
17 the best thing that can be done is to extremely
18 generously and fairly compensate for this huge
19 upheaval for these people. So as a taxpayer I support
20 the decision that with certain safeguards the plant
21 move, and that you hold your course.

22 Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

24 **Proceeding Time 6:52 p.m. T22**

25 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SIMEON (#0258):**

26 MS. SIMEON: Good evening. My name is Ana Simeon, S-I-

1 M-E-O-N. I live in Victoria. Are you hearing me
2 okay?

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: I can hear. Can everyone else hear
4 all right? Yes, apparently so.

5 MS. SIMEON: Great. I would like to acknowledge that we
6 are meeting on Lekwungen territory, and I would like
7 to thank the Commission and the B.C. government for
8 giving me this opportunity to share my concerns.

9 This is our hydro bill for a two-person
10 household consisting of my husband and myself for
11 January 2017. January and March are always the most
12 expensive months because they include our heating
13 costs, and our balance for those months, so January
14 2017, \$273.44. We live in a two-bedroom suite in a
15 well-insulated house and Victoria has a mild climate.
16 We practice stringent energy saving measures. We take
17 quick showers every second day and unless there is a
18 real freezing spell, the only portion of our home we
19 heat is our living room. My husband is retired and I
20 work full-time. And despite our efforts at saving
21 energy our hydro bill is increasingly cause for
22 concern.

23 Being renters, we are actually dependent on
24 BC Hydro. We don't have the option of sticking a
25 couple of solar panels on our roof. We may never own.

26 We find the rate increases that have

1 already been announced to be alarming, even without
2 Site C saddling us with a debt the two of us will be
3 paying off until we die.

4 One obvious source of this debt is Site C
5 cost over-runs which have been the subject of much
6 media coverage recently, and I know the panel asked us
7 not to refer to the leaked report, so I will just say
8 since the panel is aware of the numbers that are in
9 the report, that I find it quite disturbing that only
10 a month earlier BC Hydro stated in its report that the
11 dam was moving ahead on budget and on schedule.

12 And this lie – and there is no other word
13 for it – shows that B.C. Hydro has gone way beyond the
14 creative accounting that prompted the B.C. auditor
15 general to initiate an inquiry in 2016.

16 I was pleased to see that in your
17 preliminary report the Commission did not accept BC
18 Hydro's comparison of different potential sources of
19 power at face value. I believe the phrase you used
20 was "apples and oranges". I trust that the Commission
21 will not leave it like that, but will conduct its own
22 evaluation and will continue to subject any
23 information received from BC Hydro to the most
24 stringent scrutiny.

25 However costly and shocking, cost overruns
26 are merely a matter of running a project more

1 efficiently. The burning \$11 billion question is: Is
2 a major power project needed at all, and if so, is
3 Site C the best alternative?

4 BC Hydro's narrative about the need for the
5 power comes from its load forecasts, which according
6 to Deloitte's show a chronic pattern of over-
7 estimation. In the absence of domestic demand, BC
8 Hydro will have no other option but sell the power on
9 the open market at a vast loss.

10 Even assuming the need for the energy, and
11 the Joint Review Panel chastised BC Hydro back in 2014
12 about its lack of due diligence in exploring possible
13 alternatives to the project, the JRP practically
14 implored BC Hydro to look in depth at the geothermal
15 energy potential. All in vain. Nothing has been done
16 since then to remedy this omission. By 2016, wind
17 power producers were leaving the province en masse for
18 greener pastures while geothermal generation never
19 even got to the table.

20 One example will suffice to illustrate the
21 other recklessness and profligacy with which BC Hydro
22 manages the resource with which it is entrusted on
23 behalf of all of us. The Columbia River treaty power
24 is currently sold back to the U.S. at the market
25 price, around \$35 per megawatt hour, well below the
26 planned 83 per megawatt hour cost of Site C power.

1 Meanwhile BC Hydro is paying independent power
2 producers \$88 per megawatt to produce power
3 domestically.

4 Site C has been pursued blindly to the
5 point of obsession and to the exclusion of any other
6 alternative for serious consideration. I say enough
7 is enough.

8 In this presentation I have focused
9 primarily on the finances and the economics, since
10 this is the Commission's terms of reference. It is
11 not to be forgotten that Site C has tremendous social
12 and ecological impacts. I object to being made to pay
13 to subsidize the destruction of prime farmland. I
14 object to being made complicit in the dispossession
15 and displace of Dene Za, Saualteau, Dene, Métis and
16 other indigenous people yet again. It is time to
17 reject the Site C dam and I urge the Commission to do
18 so.

19 Thank you.

20 **Proceeding Time 6:58 p.m. T23**

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

22 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VAN UYTVEN (#0259):**

23 MR. VAN UYTVEN: Thank you. My name is Guy Van Uytven.
24 Last name spelled V-A-N U-Y-T-V-E-N.

25 Good afternoon and thank you for giving me
26 this opportunity to speak at this inquiry for the Site

1 C Dam.

2 I am a power systems consultant with over
3 50 years national and international experience.
4 Although I will be 80 in January, I am still active.
5 In fact, last year I was in Mozambique doing a report
6 for the African Development Bank on that country's
7 power system problems. I love my work.

8 As a power systems engineer I've been
9 closely following developments on Site C, Muskrat
10 Falls in Labrador, and Eastern Canada's growing sales
11 of hydro energy to the U.S. I want to stress in the
12 short time I have available three important technical
13 aspects for the Commission's evaluation.

14 The first is regarding alternative options
15 to Site C. When comparing options from a technical
16 and cost point of view it is usual to compare the
17 levelized cost of electricity of the various options,
18 which is the cost of energy produced in dollars per
19 megawatt hour. This cost includes capital cost, fixed
20 and variable cost, including fuel, over the economic
21 life of the asset.

22 Present day levelized cost can be found in
23 the U.S. Energy Information Administration for plants
24 entering service in 2022. The lowest cost renewable
25 options are wind and hydro. The overall lowest cost
26 option is natural gas combined cycle. An important

1 factor often neglected that which should be considered
2 is that wind or gas plants have a life of only about
3 25 years. Compare that to hydro, which has a life of
4 at least 100 years.

5 So wind or gas plants need to be replaced
6 after 25, 50, and 75 years, which increases their
7 levelized cost by about 20 percent. When comparing
8 supply options with the same time horizon hydro
9 becomes the least expensive option, even less
10 expensive than natural gas. But, of course, hydro has
11 other advantages not shown in its cost of production,
12 such as its ability to store energy and to provide
13 firm energy during peak demand. Hydro is thus the
14 lowest cost option and is the reason why provinces
15 with hydro resources have the lowest electricity rates
16 in North America.

17 The second important aspect is about the
18 oft-quoted statement, "We don't need the power." This
19 is based on the observation that the demand for
20 electrical power has been stagnant since 2009. But I
21 ask you, does this mean it will stay that way? Does
22 one steer a ship by looking at its wake? It is one
23 thing to look at the future demand within the
24 province, but when one looks at our neighbours, one
25 realizes there's a big demand for firm energy.

26 Alberta wants to eliminate 5,000 megawatts

1 of coal-fired generation. Presently, it wants to do
2 that with gas plants. But, as I noted before, Hydro
3 can compete with natural gas, especially as Alberta
4 plans to impose in 2019 a carbon tax of \$30 per tonne
5 of CO₂ emitted, which is bound to increase with the
6 years.

7 California is desperate for peaking power.
8 Their peak system demand is around eight o'clock at
9 night when the sun doesn't shine and during a wind low
10 not much renewable generation gets produced. Selling
11 our excess hydro makes good business sense and will
12 help Canada's goal for greening our electricity grids.

13 Another major impact on demand is the
14 emergence of the electric car. Volvo has already
15 announced that they will no longer manufacture non-
16 electric cars starting in 2019. China and California
17 are looking at banning non-electric cars soon. If
18 that should happen it will immediately change the
19 demand picture. That is why electrical utilities need
20 to plan for increased demand ahead of the time when
21 that demand materializes, especially where
22 construction times, as for hydro, are in the order of
23 ten years.

24 The last important aspect I want to mention
25 is about financial accountability. In addition to the
26 \$1.1 billion required to terminate contracts and

1 rehabilitate Site C, there is already an estimated \$2.1
2 billion in sunk costs. That is a total of \$3.2
3 billion wasted. What will be the effect of such a
4 huge waste of money be on the provincial debt rating?
5 Will it influence private investment in the province?
6 Important questions for the Commission to consider.

7 Thank you.

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

9 **Proceeding Time 7:03 p.m. T24**

10 Good evening, sir.

11 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PUTT (#0260):**

12 MR. PUTT: Thank you for the opportunity to participate.
13 My name is Ken Putt, P-U-T-T.

14 First let me say that my comments will be
15 qualitative, not quantitative. Just to get my biases
16 out of the way, I believe that green hydro power
17 development from the proposed Site C dam represents a
18 strategic resource for British Columbians. It's been
19 said that economists may know the cost of everything
20 but the value of nothing. That seems to be the case
21 here when it comes to Site C.

22 For example, while the costs of the
23 proposed project are reasonably well-known, and the
24 various risks have been assessed, the demand for the
25 power is still probably uncertain. Edward Chancellor,
26 in his excellent book called *Capital Returns*, has

1 noted that in all industries it's much easier to
2 predict the supply than it is the predicted demand,
3 and that's certainly the case for Site C.

4 Electric vehicle demand, for example, while
5 it's still the penetration is quite low because of
6 high costs, limited access to charging stations,
7 battery technology, and potentially lack of critical
8 materials for the batteries, let alone the low costs
9 for gasoline, but that electricity demand could
10 increase dramatically through various actions,
11 particularly of governments.

12 For example, recently in China they talked
13 about making electric vehicles mandatory to deal with
14 their air emission issues, and the greenhouse gas
15 emissions. Similarly California was contemplating
16 electric vehicle mandate, but they haven't figured out
17 how to deal with the federal jurisdiction. And in
18 Europe, Shell is already piloting quick-charging
19 stations in their gas stations for electric vehicles.

20 Yes, the climate is changing. It's warming
21 faster in the north, and south of us in California
22 they just experienced a five-year drought that almost
23 drained their largest reservoirs, and they were
24 fighting over the critical use of water, whether to
25 use it for irrigation or other critical hydroelectric
26 needs to feed their voracious hydro appetite or their

1 electric appetite.

2 In the past, B.C. has used low-cost
3 electric power to attract heavy industry. For
4 example, the smelter in Kitimat with their low-cost
5 power from Kemano. And since Alcan had proprietary
6 electric power rights, they too actually lowered their
7 power use at the smelter in order to export it to
8 California during the critical shortages and the high
9 cost. During California's need, they import power.

10 In the future, low-cost hydroelectric power
11 will be an economic leader that British Columbia will
12 have during the long lifetime of Site C which is
13 expected to be over 100 years. We're likely to be
14 able to attract high-tech industries such as the
15 server farms from Silicon Valley, and elsewhere around
16 the world, to use low-cost power that would be
17 available in B.C.

18 And don't listen to the American false
19 prophets. They're our competitors. In fact, they'll
20 be competing to sell power to California, and to
21 attract those high-tech industries that need power
22 extensively.

23 Site C will benefit the people of British
24 Columbia for a century or more, and provide legacy
25 low-cost green power for economic development in the
26 high-tech sector, creating not only critical jobs in

1 the future but stopping Site C would waste billions of
2 dollars with no economic benefit or future legacy
3 benefits, while any increasing -- while only
4 increasing future power costs to all British
5 Columbians and lessening our competitive advantage in
6 the future.

7 Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

9 **Proceeding Time 7:08 p.m. T25**

10 Good evening, sir.

11 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MEREDITH (#0261):**

12 MR. MEREDITH: Thank you for the opportunity to speak
13 today and for the excellent work you've done on your
14 preliminary report.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

16 MR. MEREDITH: My name is Jack Meredith. I am a
17 professional engineer and Chief Executive Officer of
18 Healthy Green Buildings Professional Engineering
19 Practice here in Victoria.

20 Am I too close? I might get some feedback
21 here.

22 I've been in the energy management business
23 for the last 35 years and I've done over 200 million
24 dollars' worth of energy management projects, the
25 majority of them taking advantage of PowerSmart.

26 Today I want to speak to question 4 in your

1 terms of reference from the Order in Council 244, and
2 that's with regards to alternative energy and demand
3 side management.

4 The current focus of my practice is net
5 zero energy projects, and I want to just stop at this
6 juncture to thank the Commission and BC Hydro for
7 enabling net metering to happen within the province.
8 It's opened up a floodgate of opportunities and
9 projects and is able to take advantage of technology
10 that is very exciting. And that's what I want to
11 share with you today is my experience with regards to
12 the net zero projects.

13 At the residential level that we are
14 working, we are installing photovoltaic systems at \$80
15 per megawatt hour, and demand-side management
16 strategies for a tenth of that. And that's with no
17 rebates, that's with customers paying full fares.

18 The comparable kinds of rates to the costs
19 that you have in Table 2, the unadjusted rates in the
20 Table 2 of the Executive Summary. Site C is noted
21 there at \$83 per megawatt hour. So just putting it in
22 other terms, what we find in our projects when we do a
23 net energy -- net zero energy project, that it's the
24 less cost alternative, the least life cycle cost to
25 homeowners. So when you add in that cost of energy,
26 the retrofit measures in fact, their cost of operating

1 mortgage plus operating costs is the least cost
2 alternative. So it's an idea whose time has come.

3 So I put to you what I think is embedded in
4 your preliminary report, is that there is a decision
5 to be made in that question 4 whether to generate
6 power remotely or to generate power locally at
7 comparable costs. The choice is for BC Hydro to have
8 a megaproject or to have homeowners have a micro
9 project. Most these projects are relatively small.
10 The last one we did was \$10,000 in order to get a net
11 zero energy result. And that provides a small simple
12 local system with no moving parts versus a large
13 complicated remote system that arguably is vulnerable
14 and has many moving parts.

15 So my call to action here today is for you
16 to aggressively pursue that question 4 and the
17 alternative energy demand-side management kinds of
18 opportunities that still are there in abundance in
19 commercial, residential and industrial projects, and
20 challenge BC Hydro to look at that as a viable
21 alternative to the big mega projects.

22 So maximize PowerSmart, I guess, like it
23 was in the heydays, where we were getting equivalent
24 power avoided -- power demand avoided at a fraction of
25 the generated cost. So the traditional PowerSmart
26 initiatives of education, perhaps financing, because a

1 lot of people, as was mentioned earlier, can't come up
2 with the \$10,000 to put something on the roof, but if
3 it was financed appropriately, they get the net
4 effect.

5 On a final note, I'd just like to support
6 your challenge to BC Hydro's adjustments in that Table
7 2, particularly around the adjustments for the
8 alternative energies, particular PV, that the line
9 loss, transmission loss integration losses that they
10 claim they have to adjust for are not valid in that
11 kind of context of the PV on a roof level. Similarly
12 the adjusted pump storage adjustment is not valid for
13 PV at a roof level where it may be for wind farm.

14 Thank you.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

16 **Proceeding Time 7:13 p.m. T26**

17 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VAN ENTER (#0262):**

18 MR. VAN ENTER: Good evening, chair and committee. My
19 name is Reighardt Van Enter. Last name V-A-N, space,
20 E-N-T-E-R. I represent the Progressive Contractors'
21 Association of British Columbia.

22 I wanted to thank you for this time and for
23 the opportunity, and also wanted to acknowledge
24 everyone who's taken the time to come and talk. I do
25 respect your opinions and the statements that are
26 made, and I hope you can grant me the same privilege.

1 One of the things that we're looking at
2 here is whether to continue the project, whether to
3 stop the project, or whether to delay the project.
4 I'm an accountant in background, and I kind of like
5 the idea of having something at the end of the day.
6 We've all kind of experienced a situation where we've
7 overpaid for something, a car or a piece of equipment
8 or something in that sense, and at the end of the day
9 we kind of say, well, you know, at least I've got this
10 thing that I can still utilize. And maybe the life
11 was only five years, and if I can squeeze an extra two
12 years, there's at least the opportunity that I can get
13 the value back.

14 At this point in time, we've spent close to
15 \$2 billion on this project. There is a chance that if
16 we put things back to the way it was, it's going to
17 cost us between 1.2 and 1.4, depending on which
18 reports you read. That's \$3 billion of nothing; \$3
19 billion of future nothing. \$3 billion that schools,
20 hospitals, that could have been used somewhere else.

21 I know that this project has got off to a
22 rocky start, and we cannot compensate for past
23 problems or past issues, or mistakes that have been
24 made. I'm not here to talk about those, and I
25 certainly don't question any of them. The fact of the
26 matter is that right now we have a project that's in

1 process, that's going to cost us a bunch of money to
2 stop, and we'll have nothing to show for it at the end
3 of the day.

4 Most people in this room have experienced
5 power outages. And it's inconvenient, when there's a
6 storm or there's a power, and having come from that
7 industry, there is nothing better than to switch the
8 power back on again. But that's because the power is
9 there to be switched on. Coming from a country like
10 South Africa, where we experience rolling blackouts
11 due to lack of power, hospitals, adjustments that need
12 to be made, I don't think I can explain to people what
13 that feels like when you're sitting there and you know
14 that power's going to be turned out. And at that
15 point in time, no matter what you decide to build at
16 that point, it's going to make a difference, because
17 it's going to not be soon enough for you to get the
18 power on when you need it.

19 In British Columbia, we have a history of
20 under-building things. Several hospitals, roads,
21 bridges; by the time they're finished being built, are
22 almost under capacity at -- it doesn't account for --
23 meet the capacity needs of that situation.

24 When we built the Hart Dam, when we built
25 the Bennett Dam, at that point in time, I don't think
26 we needed all the power that was generated by it. But

1 as a British Columbian today, it affords me the
2 ability to pay some of the lowest electrical rates in
3 North America. And that's a luxury that I hope I can
4 pass on to some of my children.

5 At this point in time, the future is a
6 crystal ball. We can try and estimate demand. We can
7 try and estimate what electrical vehicles might do or
8 might not do, how different technologies might or
9 might not increase. The challenge is, if we asked in
10 the 1800s, if I asked my grandfather or great-great-
11 great-grandfather, what do you need? He would have
12 told me, a faster horse. We don't know what we don't
13 know.

14 The last ten years, if it's shown us
15 anything, has shown us how much advancement has
16 actually happened as a society. I, for one, prefer
17 clean energy versus coal-fired energy, and on this
18 project, Hydro has -- regardless of how they came to
19 the decision, we've got the ability at least to have
20 an asset at the end of the day. To have something
21 that for the next hundred years, whether prices fall
22 or climb, has the potential to provide British
23 Columbians a return; a return on their investment.
24 And as a British Columbia ratepayer, there's a chance
25 that my money is going to get paid back at some point
26 in time, on the investment.

1 opportunity to visit the Peace River Valley and
2 witness the impacts of the Site C dam on the people,
3 lands and waters on Treaty 8 Territory. I want to use
4 these five minutes to speak to everyone in this room,
5 and ask that we reflect upon what it means for the
6 Site C project being built on treaty land.

7 Especially here in B.C., where unlike the
8 rest of Canada, hardly any treaties were signed in
9 this province, and this project is being built in one
10 of the very few areas of B.C. where European and other
11 settlers presence was agreed upon.

12 To understand the impacts of the Site C
13 project, I needed to visit the two existing dams
14 already built on the Peace River, the W.A.C. Bennett
15 dam, and the Peace Canyon dam. At both sites there
16 are information signs acknowledging that these dams
17 are located in Treaty 8 territory. In their
18 description of Treaty 8, the signs state,

19 "Treaty 8 expresses the solemn promises made
20 between two peoples. It calls on us all to
21 protect First Nations traditional ways of
22 life, and to work together on land use
23 planning."

24 The history of these previous dams and the
25 experiences and stories of indigenous Treaty 8
26 members, the Dene Za, the Tske Dene, the Cree and

1 Métis, make it clear that all three of these dams
2 represent the colonial government breaking its solemn
3 promise with indigenous peoples. On a scale that is
4 hard to imagine, unless you have seen these dams and
5 reservoirs with your own eyes, the W.A.C. Bennett and
6 Peace Canyon dams flooded vast amounts of lands and
7 rivers, displacing and dislocating communities,
8 severing indigenous peoples connections to each other,
9 and destroying the plants, animals, medicines and
10 burial sites sacred to them. All of this was done
11 without any consultation, nor consent. And in the
12 case of the W.A.C. Bennett dam, barely even any
13 notification to indigenous communities of the
14 impending flood. Adding insult to injury, flooding
15 causes a buildup of methylmercury, poisoning the
16 waters, making the fish, their last traditional food
17 sources toxic to eat.

18 What happened to the solemn promises to
19 protect indigenous traditional ways of life? To work
20 together on land use planning? In interviews with the
21 Dene Za members of Treaty 8, the word "genocide" came
22 up repeatedly. Since European contact, Treaty 8
23 members have faced sustained efforts of assimilation,
24 beginning with the extermination of the Buffalo, their
25 main food source, the destruction of their ancestral
26 lands, and their ability to maintain their sacred

1 connection to it, and the poisoning of their remaining
2 ecosystems, their medicines, and their foods. And
3 this legacy of genocide is continuing with the
4 building of the Site C dam.

5 The willful destruction of the structures
6 and practices that make up a distinct group of people
7 is cultural genocide. Land seizure, forced
8 displacement, the destruction of objects of spiritual
9 value. Disruption of cultures and families to prevent
10 values and identity being transmitted from one
11 generation to the next are all acts of cultural
12 genocide. These descriptions are from the Truth and
13 Reconciliation Commission's report, which names
14 Canada's Aboriginal policy as an act of cultural
15 genocide to gain control over indigenous land and
16 their resources. The building of Site C dam is proof
17 that these practices are continuing to this day.

18 We are all treaty people. We all inherit
19 the solemn promises made between indigenous peoples
20 and the crown. It is what this country is founded
21 upon. Canada could not exist without its treaties.
22 We are one of the only countries that has aboriginal
23 and treaty rights enshrined in our constitution, but
24 this seems more and more symbolic since the government
25 can decide that infringement of aboriginal and treaty
26 rights are justified when done for the good of the

1 country.

2 Infringement of treaty rights were never
3 considered in any of the decisions regarding the
4 approval of Site C. Seemingly it has always been
5 assumed that Site C is in the best interest of B.C.
6 and Canadians. I am sure that there are plenty of
7 other speakers, and we have heard from many who will
8 speak to the loss of agricultural lands and the
9 implications for B.C.'s food security, the destruction
10 of rare and sensitive ecosystems, the climate
11 implications from reservoirs, methane emissions, the
12 negative impacts of industrial projects on local
13 communities, especially indigenous women. The
14 inaccurate power demand forecasts, the myriad of
15 options to generate renewable energy without all these
16 negative consequences. The list of reasons to stop
17 this project are numerous.

18 This project is not in the best interests
19 of B.C. and Canadians. We are all treaty people. We
20 have a responsibility to honour our treaties and renew
21 our solemn promise to indigenous peoples. At the end
22 of the day, it is impossible to put a price tag on all
23 the negative impacts of the Site C dam, and no figure
24 in Hydro's or the province's ledger can justify
25 ongoing acts of cultural genocide. Stop the
26 construction of Site C.

1 **Proceeding Time 7:24 p.m. T28**

2 MS. ROY: Good evening.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening, ma'am.

4 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ROY (#0264):**

5 MS. ROY: My name is Marcelle Roy, R-O-Y. I have come
6 here from Saltspring Island through great cost for
7 myself, as it's taken most of the day to get here, and
8 I'm also --

9 I here representing my family of five who
10 are unable to be here due to work commitments and
11 childcare. And I am voting to a complete stop of this
12 madness called Site C dam. I think a few of the
13 previous speakers have mentioned that the dam has a
14 hundred-year lifetime, but none of them have taken
15 into account the silting and the maintenance costs
16 involved with the dam as compared to the 25-year or
17 50-year or 75-year lifetime of the renewable
18 structure.

19 Anyway, so I am opposed to this dam for
20 several reasons. The first one being that it has no
21 economic basis, no business case. And I am not an
22 expert in that area, but what I've heard from some of
23 the experts is what I tend to believe as opposed to
24 what BC Hydro might have said seeing as their
25 accounting mechanism is greatly in doubt.

26 Anyhow, one of the persons that I want to

1 quote is Robert McCullough, he's an international
2 expert in energy and he said there is no need for this
3 project. Even if there was, we'd have cheaper
4 alternatives that are more agile, easier to site and
5 easier to finalize, and less expensive.

6 My second reason is that our new
7 government, the B.C. NDP and Greens have both
8 committed to upholding the rights of indigenous
9 nations. I'm not going to go into any more details on
10 that topic, as the previous speaker has done a very
11 good job of that. But just to say that Site C has no
12 place if this government is to fulfill their promise.

13 Another reason that I do not approve of
14 this project is because of global warming. Apparently
15 the GHG emissions caused by this project are
16 equivalent to one tonne of GHG for every tonne of
17 cement that's been poured into this construction, and
18 that doesn't even the high levels of methane that are
19 going to be released by the decomposing vegetation
20 matter.

21 Another reason that has not been mentioned
22 up to now is that the Site C dam is going to be
23 located in the Monterey Shale area, in proximity of
24 that, and there is extensive fracking happening right
25 now, and injection into wells of toxic wastewater
26 which have been proved to cause earthquakes. And now

1 an independent tribunal report just said that in the
2 example of the Peace Canyon dam, that it is endangered
3 by the fracking that's going on in that area, and so
4 is the Site C dam going to be endangered. So none of
5 those factors have been taken into account. There's
6 been no precautionary measures. If this dam should be
7 built, there's been no precautionary provisions built
8 in to prevent this from happening. So those risks
9 have not been properly assessed and considered when
10 the Site C dam project went ahead.

11 Also, as it's been touched on before,
12 building the Site C dam is actually destroying the
13 natural wealth of B.C. It's endangering the water
14 supply for that area because it's contaminated with
15 heavy metals and mercury and others. And this clean
16 water and fuel security that we depend on, in the face
17 of global warming and that First Nations highly depend
18 for their culture and their livelihood.

19 So in conclusion, -- oops, have I gone over
20 time?

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: You have, ma'am, but it sounds like
22 you're wrapping up.

23 MS. ROY: Anyway, in conclusions it's no. There are
24 other alternatives and wind, solar, geothermal, tides
25 and those are dispatchable, which is a new word in the
26 industry, which means that they've said, oh, well,

1 solar is not reliable because when it's dark, that's
2 when the peak demand is, and we can't access it. And
3 that is becoming a lie because now with the new
4 batteries and the innovation that's happening all the
5 time, there is way more storage possible now. And I'm
6 sure that's even going to increase in the near future.

7 Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

9 **Proceeding Time 7:30 p.m. T29**

10 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HOLLOWAY (#0265):**

11 MR. HOLLOWAY: Hi, I'm Greg Holloway, it's H-O-L-L-O-W-A-
12 Y. And like others I'm so glad to have the
13 opportunity to speak with yourselves, to imagine all
14 of the work that you've done, especially I think the
15 long and technical work, demanding work with respect
16 to the business plan that you've been evaluating.

17 What we're hearing tonight a lot and I
18 think it's appropriate and I'm grateful to have the
19 opportunity to contribute to that, is there is so much
20 more on the minds of British Columbians as well. It
21 takes nothing away from your technical and important
22 work on the business plan, but clearly we all feel and
23 think a lot of things. And I just want to mention
24 three things that I think especially press upon myself
25 and they're not new to yourselves.

26 First of all, this disregard for indigenous

1 rights and title. Well, it's starting to sound rather
2 repetitive, but that's a statement of what's really in
3 people's hearts, you know. There's not only the
4 treaty obligations, the United Nations declaration,
5 even Amnesty International recognizes the affront to
6 indigenous rights by the Site C project. And so,
7 apart from a faulty business plan we, that is the
8 government, the province of British Columbia, are in
9 the wrong and we need to be able to say something is
10 wrong, and that means it needs to be addressed. Well,
11 that's point one.

12 The second item I think I want to mention,
13 just things that matter to me, is I look ahead to this
14 question of the flooding of farmland and I think today
15 we live in a world which is crazy. All over the world
16 foodstuffs are somehow grown under some environmental
17 and social conditions, I have no idea what those are.
18 And they arrive on our grocery market shelves and
19 they're so cheap. But I think that's a crazy world.
20 I don't think that world is going to last. And there
21 will be a time I really feel when if we have flooded
22 B.C.'s best farmland – according to BC Hydro's own
23 assessment of that land – for a project such as this,
24 we can in some day in the future hardly imagine what
25 was on our minds as we destroyed our own potential to
26 grow vegetables.

1 MR. MARTIN: I also want to acknowledge the land that we
2 are standing on is unceded land of the Songhees and
3 Esquimalt Nations. And I also want to remember the
4 old-growth forests that used to be right here.

5 I recognize that the mandate of the
6 Commission is to deal primarily with the economics of
7 Site C Dam. So I want to start by quoting the
8 economist, Kate Raworth, who in a recent book has said
9 that one of the goals of economics for the 21st century
10 is to achieve prosperity for all within the means of
11 our planet. Prosperity for all within the means of
12 our planet. And I would also quote John Ruskin, the
13 art and social critic, who in 1860 wrote that there is
14 no wealth but life.

15 You can see where I'm going here. I've
16 been to the Peace River valley four times in the last
17 four years. It's a beautiful valley, and it's full of
18 life. That's where the wealth is.

19 And I want to start by talking about the
20 Peace River valley by drawing your attention to
21 another river; a river on the North Island of New
22 Zealand called the Whanganui River. And this is the
23 first river in the world, the first river in the
24 world, to be given the legal rights of a person.

25 And the local Maori tribe talk about their
26 relationship with that river in very intimate terms.

1 They say, "I am the river, and the river is me. I am
2 the river, and the river is me." Those of us, like
3 me, brought up in Western culture, I believe if we
4 could even just begin to understand that kind of a
5 relationship with a river, then you and I wouldn't be
6 standing here discussing the Peace River valley
7 tonight.

8 Mega-dams, I believe, are a thing of the
9 past. When we didn't know any better, actually. Now
10 we know much more about the adverse effects, and I'm
11 not going to list the adverse effects because lots of
12 other people have done that, and I'm sure you're well
13 aware of those.

14 My message is going to be very brief. Stop
15 Site C. And, what to do with the 2 billion? Regard
16 the 2 billion, or whatever the exact figure is, as a
17 very expensive learning process for the people of B.C.

18 However, one suggestion in passing. I
19 expect that the turbines already contracted -- is it a
20 turbine, or turbines? -- could be used on some already
21 existing dam in B.C.

22 Then the remaining part of the budget for
23 the project could be spent on the Taylor Bridge and on
24 developing alternative energy when needed, geothermal,
25 solar, wind, hydro pumps, and of course providing
26 stability for the Peace River valley by supporting

1 long-term agriculture and horticulture, together with
2 traditional indigenous lifestyles.

3 Jobs to reduce the effects of climate
4 change are urgently needed in other parts of the
5 province.

6 And I just want to finish by saying -- I'm
7 out of time, I see that.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Go ahead.

9 MR. MARTIN: I want to see jobs in Canada, but I want to
10 see non-destructive clean and healthy jobs based on
11 economics for the future. I don't want legal
12 historians in the future to be listing the Site C Dam
13 as another Canadian ecocidal project. Please don't go
14 there.

15 Thank you.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank you.

17 **Proceeding Time 7:40 p.m. T31**

18 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MOSS (#0267):**

19 MS. MOSS: I'm Patricia Moss, M-O-S-S, and I'm here with
20 the Victoria Raging Grannies.

21 UNKNOWN: Just a word or two before we entertain you
22 with our song, three of us went up to the Peace River
23 Valley with the Rolling Justice Bus in 2016. I was
24 one of them. Patty was there and there was one other,
25 and also Patty was there this year.

26 I just wanted to say that to go up there

1 and to see the beauty of this wonderful valley just
2 absolutely captivated me.

3 Now, on the Sunday we went to support the
4 weekly rally at Fort St. John a group there had every
5 Sunday, and I was surprised at the number of
6 congratulatory honks on the horns of all the people
7 that were there. I thought maybe Fort St. John would
8 be for Site C. It seems to me that a lot of them are
9 not.

10 I also talked to a young man who was
11 working in a furniture store and he was very very
12 upset by this because the furniture was going to be
13 used by BC Hydro. He said, "Why don't they build, BC
14 Hydro build wind farms up on the hill? All that wind
15 is going there for free." So that is something that
16 I want to suggest that BC Hydro does instead of Site
17 C.

18 Now we have our song.

19 *It's got no name.*

20 *It's just Site C.*

21 *It's far away where can't see.*

22 *But it will be a calamity.*

23 *Who needs that blasted Site C dam.*

24 *Fields of wheat no longer there,*

25 *Sacred lands will disappear,*

26 *Water, water, everywhere.*

1 want you to know that I am speaking for our children,
2 grandchildren, great grandchildren and all the babies
3 that are barely a spark in our imaginations.

4 What we do today has far reaching
5 implications for us and for those yet to come. Do we
6 need this dam? Experts say no. Those in favour of
7 the dam, most of them, don't seem to understand or
8 take into account this dam's social, environmental and
9 true financial costs, as well as the tragic loss of
10 huge tracts of indigenous land.

11 The United Nations has called for a halt
12 until there is a full review of how this dam would
13 affect indigenous people and their land. We've come
14 this far in the dam building because the B.C. Liberals
15 passed clean energy laws that allow projects to bypass
16 a review of the regulatory agency.

17 In the North indigenous peoples are greatly
18 affected. There will be irreversible damage by
19 flooding and their lands, wiping out their meadows and
20 forests and wildlife, hunting, sacred lands, and
21 graves will be under water. We Raging Grannies urge
22 the government as well as those who may monetarily
23 profit from the building of this dam, we vehemently
24 urge you to reconsider and halt the building of Site C
25 dam. The strongest threat we Raging Grannies can
26 muster to force a halt to dam Site C is this: We

1 shall continue to speak our minds by singing off-key,
2 outrageous lyrics that speak the uncomfortable truths.

3 Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ma'am? Ma'am?

5 **Proceeding Time 7:45 p.m. T33**

6 Ma'am, before -- sorry. Before you start,
7 we'd like to take a short break. I'm sorry. We'll
8 come back in about seven or eight minutes. Ten
9 minutes, let's say. Thanks.

10 **(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 7:45 P.M.)**

11 **(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 7:56 P.M.)**

12 MS. JOHNSTONE: Hello.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Could you --

14 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHNSTONE (#0269):**

15 MS. JOHNSTONE: My name is Myna Lee Johnstone. Wherever
16 I go, I generally acknowledge that I'm probably on
17 unceded territory belonging to First Nations.

18 I live on Saltspring Island. And I too am
19 one of the people who was flabbergasted to know that
20 the B.C. government would approve the flooding of farm
21 land. So I'm going to talk to you about Saltspring
22 Island and our agriculture, because that's my focus is
23 agriculture. And then I want you to relate it to the
24 Peace River Valley and why we need to oppose Site C.

25 Well, someone from Saltspring can talk
26 about agriculture because -- this is from a prologue

1 to a pamphlet put out by our farmers institute.
2 "Saltspring Island will always be remembered as
3 absolutely the first agricultural settlement in the
4 then-colony of Vancouver Island."

5 In the mid-1850s, the population of the new
6 colony of Vancouver Island was approximately 600
7 persons. However, by April, 1988 -- oh, excuse me.
8 1858. By April, 1858, the first wave of gold seekers
9 arrived in Victoria from San Francisco. This was the
10 first of about 20,000 who had passed through Victoria
11 on their way to new gold finds in the Fraser River.
12 But the rush did not last long. By 1859, most of
13 these miners were returning to Victoria disillusioned,
14 and many no longer had the funds to leave the colony.

15 During this time, Governor James Douglas
16 decided to start settlement of Saltspring Island as an
17 agricultural community. So, in 1859, the first 17
18 settlers arrived to begin farming on Saltspring.

19 So, I've been an organic grower for about
20 40 years. My dad was a pioneer grain grower in
21 Saskatchewan. And I've been a member of our Island
22 Natural Growers on Saltspring for about 28 years, and
23 I sit on the board of our agricultural alliance.

24 We've been responding to the important
25 needs of agriculture. Through our agricultural
26 alliance we've raised over \$750,000 to have our own

1 abattoir. Because at one point the government thought
2 all of the animals should be taken off-island to a big
3 abattoir up near Nanaimo.

4 So, this is an example of incredible
5 community project responding to the real need for
6 local agriculture and local food. Now we're moving
7 into a new food security and produce centre. We are
8 seeing such an increase in young people on Saltspring
9 Island coming and wanting to farm, and supporting
10 themselves through value-added products.

11 You want to talk about economy and you want
12 to talk about costs. You know how much it costs to
13 bring up food from other countries like California,
14 and then you go and taste a local tomato, or local
15 corn, or apples; anything that's grown where you live,
16 and you know how much more nourishing that is. You're
17 eating spirit, and your body responds.

18 So, when we think about the Peace and the
19 beautiful farm land up there, and we think about the
20 amazing projects we're doing on Saltspring in
21 agriculture, I'm really wondering how could the former
22 government of B.C. ignore the importance of food.
23 Food security and local food.

24 We're not going to thrive on LNG and -- you
25 know, we need the food more. Oh, five minutes.
26 Besides, I can look at --

1 we've known for a long, that we don't need Site C and
2 that the many losses that it will incur are not
3 warranted.

4 So speaking of full-cost accounting --
5 well, okay, here, I'll read this:

6 I beg you to think with vision, to think
7 honourably about what reconciliation really means. I
8 beg you think humanely, environmentally, and
9 ecologically to remember farmland and of course,
10 bottom line to think of what's best for the economic
11 future of B.C. in the broadest, most visionary way.

12 The loss of farmland is a financial loss.
13 The loss of a burial ground and good relationships
14 with First Nations is a financial loss. We will pay.
15 The loss of the most beautiful valley in the province
16 is a loss for tourism, but for all of us. The loss of
17 real jobs, energy efficient jobs, green jobs, is a
18 financial loss. The loss of species is a financial
19 loss.

20 Big dams are fossil thinking. LNG is
21 fossil thinking. Ignoring climate change is real
22 problem. Continuing with fossil thinking will be
23 phenomenally costly financially. I urge you, because
24 I know your mandate is to think about the economics,
25 to think in terms of full cost accounting and to think
26 in terms of all of us as people here in British

1 Columbia.

2 Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

4 **Proceeding Time 8:05 p.m. T35**

5 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAMERON (#0271):**

6 MR. CAMERON: I showed up here confident that everyone
7 has three --

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Can you say your name, please, for the
9 record, sir?

10 MR. CAMERON: Sorry.

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: It's okay. Thank you.

12 MR. CAMERON: Ted Cameron. C-A-M-E-R-O-N.

13 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

14 MR. CAMERON: Hopefully that everyone has three common
15 goals: continue generating a reliable electric power
16 system for B.C., emitting a minimum amount of
17 greenhouse gasses in doing so, and keeping the cost of
18 electricity the lowest in the world.

19 Our electric energy in B.C. is inexpensive
20 because it's almost 90 percent hydro. In Germany
21 their power is only 6 percent hydro and they pay four
22 times our rates. To eliminate burning fossil fuel we
23 must electrify everything. So over the next 50 to 100
24 years the following events will occur. Not maybe,
25 they will.

26 The population of B.C. will double. All

1 cars, trucks, buses, and trains will be electric.
2 Airplanes will be electric. I just found this out
3 today. It was in the news, Zunum Aero of Seattle
4 announced that in five years they will have an
5 electric commuter airplane. A little trivia there.

6 All homes will be heated by heat pumps with
7 geothermal assist. And natural gas and diesel
8 generating plants will be phased out sooner than
9 later.

10 Is 100 years too far ahead to plan our
11 energy strategy? You're right, it's not soon enough.
12 In 75 years when my four-year-old granddaughter is my
13 age – look at this face – all the above electricity
14 demands must be in place and the planning starts now
15 or we burden them with our debt. Our share, including
16 Site C, should be installed and paid for by us while
17 BC Hydro has triple-A borrowing rates and the interest
18 rates are low.

19 We are here to decide how we generate all
20 these power requirements. Green power, hydro, solar,
21 wind, geothermal, biomass, pump storage, run-of-river,
22 to name the most likely. Of the above, solar farms
23 and wind farms appear to be the wave of the future.
24 Over the last 25 years huge installations have been
25 installed in countries that do not have the luxury of
26 hydro power potential. So we have loads of data about

1 their intermittent nature and subsequent efficiencies.
2 From that data I found two reasons that I choose hydro
3 power.

4 The Site C Dam and an equivalent wind farm
5 will cost about the same to install. Now, granted,
6 the wind farm may not be all in one place, distributed
7 across B.C. Same with the solar farm. But the solar
8 farms, the total equivalent output of Site C will be
9 30 percent more. These quotes are from the U.S.
10 Energy Information Association. I didn't figure that
11 out.

12 Now, industry uses a term called levelized
13 cost of energy. So Site C will cost about \$8.8
14 billion to build. However, you have to add the
15 interest on the money borrowed to be realistic.
16 That's the levelized cost. I like to think in terms
17 of what we see on our Hydro bill. That's the
18 equivalent of 8.8 cents a kilowatt hour for 30 years
19 is the most educated figure that I can find to pay for
20 the dam, or the solar farm, or the wind farm.

21 So for each of the above three power
22 sources we take out a 30 year loan and at the end of
23 that time they're all paid for. But the wind farm has
24 been beaten to death by vibrations and abuse of the
25 wind over the years and it has to be replaced. The
26 propellers, which are made of layers of fiberglass

1 delaminate and pit so that they are no longer an air
2 force. The turbines and transmission wear out.

3 The solar panels have degraded in
4 efficiency over that time, 30 years, and have to be
5 replaced.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sir, can you just start to wrap up,
7 please?

8 MR. CAMERON: These are manufactures' recommendations. I
9 didn't make them up. However, the hydro power dam,
10 the plant, Site C, at that 30-year date has 70 more
11 years of life and it's free electricity, except for
12 the operating and the maintenance costs, which is one
13 or two cents per kilowatt hour.

14 And by the way, it came up a little while
15 ago, when I arrived here in 1960, 1,000 kilowatt hours
16 of power – I worked for the forest industry – it cost
17 me eight hours of labour to pay for that. Today, a
18 forest industry worker can pay for that in three and a
19 half hours. Figure that out. Check it out.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir. Thank you, sir.

21 **Proceeding Time 8:13 p.m. T36**

22 Please don't heckle the speakers, sir.

23 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAJARI (#0272):**

24 MR. NAJARI: Mehdi Najari, Mehdi with M and Najari is N-
25 A-J-A-R-I. I am just a citizen here in Victoria, a
26 ratepayer. The fundamental problem with the issue --

1 is the issue of the trust of BC Hydro. BC Hydro since
2 1980 overestimated the power needs of the province.
3 You can overestimate once or twice, but you cannot
4 consistently overestimate and not lying. Not
5 manipulating the public with misinformation. And that
6 is what BC Hydro has done.

7 It's not mistake, it's political game they
8 are playing. And we have to ask ourselves why.
9 Withholding information from the public. BC Hydro
10 providing misinformation to the public. Why? They
11 were saying that we are on time and on budget, just
12 few months ago. Meanwhile, they had the information
13 in their hand, not releasing it to the public, that
14 they were not on time, they are not going to be on
15 budget, because of the tension cracks that is going to
16 delay for one year, with the cost of \$600 million for
17 cost of borrowing. But they don't tell us what's the
18 cost of mitigating for tension cracks.

19 How much increase is going to be? We look
20 -- the accountant came out in September, said that
21 they think it's going to increase -- the cost of the
22 Site C dam is going to increase by 40 percent, to 12.5
23 billion. So why are they still talking about 8.7
24 billion?

25 And then what is the cost of borrowing
26 money for the whole project? Why don't you put the

1 real number in front of us? We are the ones that are
2 paying for it. Why are we being lied to? You know
3 why? Let me read you executive profile, role profile,
4 for B.C. Public Service. This is what they want, B.C.
5 government want in executive.

6 Under characteristic and behaviour, this is
7 what I read. "Executive anticipate and are prepared
8 to institute changes quickly. At times, to capitalize
9 on the best opportunity, executive create a crisis to
10 force change." This is the public service now? This
11 crooked corrupt province that we have? And we were
12 lied to by the last government every step of the way.

13 And you want -- and who -- and it took you
14 out of the equation. It said you cannot make any
15 decision on that. We are not going to allow you to
16 consider this project. Why? Why did they take you,
17 BCUC, out of looking at the transmission to northwest?
18 \$700 million of our money, for who? For a mining
19 company, Imperial Mine? The friends of Liberals? Who
20 is paying for it? We, the people. Who is going to
21 protect our children with the -- all those deferral
22 accounts.

23 The BC Hydro debt, \$18 billion. How much
24 is it really? Let the owners know. Give us the right
25 number. Who is going to pay for it? Deferring it to
26 the future? Your children and my children and our

1 children? Are you kidding?

2 Are we decent people if we allow that to
3 happen, to put our children, saddle them with the huge
4 debt so in future we are not going to have money for
5 the social expenditures, because we have to feed the
6 banker? Is that what we want?

7 This is the BC Hydro that tell us it's
8 going to cost 8.7 billion. Then there is a study in
9 Oxford, 2014, it said the big hydro project in average
10 are 90 percent cost overruns. So here in La-La Land,
11 in Lotus land, suddenly we are clean and we are going
12 to be right on money, 8.7? In the province that is
13 one of the most -- in the jurisdiction is one of the
14 most corrupt in North America?

15 Muskrat Dam, 6.54 billion. Now it's come
16 to 12.7 billion. And it's increasing. So BC Hydro
17 said, "No, no, no, no, no, no. We are just going to
18 be 8.7 billion." And we should trust it?

19 This is a project -- the way I see it, is a
20 project we should call it a project to bankrupt BC
21 Hydro. If you remember BC Rail three years before,
22 three years before, BC Rail was given away to CN. BC
23 Rail was considering to buy CN. Their situation,
24 their financial situation, was that good.

25 Gordon Campbell come to power, change the
26 leadership of BC Rail, in three years put them in

1 debt. And gave it away. And that is going to happen.
2 They did it to Greece, they did it to Spain. They are
3 going to do it to BC Hydro, put a huge debt on BC
4 Hydro and then sell it in a fire sale.

5 I was, I was -- I bought my place in 2000,
6 the year 2000. The last owner gave me the account of
7 the heating costs, it's his electric furnace. It was
8 \$1480 a year, in the year 2000. I went and changed
9 the windows, put more insulation, put the baseboard
10 heating, area heating, and state of the whole house
11 heating, and still I pay. You know how much I paid
12 last year? 1780. You know why 1780? 400 of it, more
13 than 400 of it, because I refused to accept a
14 SmartMeter. That means in 17 years I was paying less.
15 I was -- I am paying less. With 35 percent increase
16 in Hydro rate, I still paid -- was paying less.

17 Before the 400 for the -- not accepting the
18 B.C. -- the Smart Meter.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Sir, can you please --

20 MR. NAJARI: I am asking you --

21 THE CHAIRPERSON: Can you start to wrap up, please, sir?

22 MR. NAJARI: Yes, I have 42 minutes there. You never
23 told anybody else -- 42 seconds.

24 I am -- this is -- this is really amazing.
25 Are you going to stop this corruption, sir? Are you
26 going to uphold the public right to know what is the

1 cost or increased rate in Hydro that we have to pay if
2 this boondoggle continues? You don't know. How can
3 it be? You guys go and support this project, without
4 the owner. Without the taxpayers. To know what are
5 they going to increase rate is going to pay?

6 Thank you.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

8 **Proceeding Time 8:21 p.m. T37**

9 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARNEY (#0273):**

10 MR. ARNEY: Good evening. My name is Jeremy Arney, A-R-
11 N-E-Y, and I'm going to be awfully boring after that.

12 Thank you for the opportunity to present to
13 you, and welcome back into the Site C fray. You've
14 been there before, you're here again. I wish also to
15 acknowledge, like other people have, that we are on
16 the Songhees territory.

17 In view of the financials for B.C., they've
18 been talked about tonight, and I think you heard about
19 them yesterday in Nanaimo from my friend Eric Andersen
20 who has kept me up-to-date with what's been going on,
21 and he's been talking to me about the accounting
22 system which we've also heard about tonight, and the
23 struggles of that accounting system, even corrupt as
24 it is, has managed to keep the 80/20 relationship
25 between assets and liabilities so that we can get a
26 dividend paid into the British Columbia government.

1 BC Hydro is really suffering for it.

2 But the question we're talking about
3 tonight is Site C dam. Do we need it? And if so,
4 why? In my view we do not. Over the last few years
5 the demand for hydro has been stagnant, as we've heard
6 tonight several times. In spite of BC Hydro's
7 predictions that it will go up, it hasn't.

8 The dams that already have been built in
9 conjunction with the Columbia River water control
10 agreement have served us very well since they were
11 built fifty-sixty years ago, and we can put extra
12 turbines into those dams without contravening anything
13 in that agreement. So why shouldn't we do it? If we
14 need that extra hydro, easy.

15 We also have the environmentally disastrous
16 and seasonal-only operations called the run-of-the-
17 river projects, which BC Hydro is obliged to buy hydro
18 from at a rate which they cannot even contemplate
19 selling for, either to Alberta or to California, our
20 major exporter. And on that particular note, let me
21 say that the State of California has designated our
22 run-of-the-river projects as ungreen,
23 unenvironmentally sound. This was done on January
24 15th, 2014. The California Energy Commission found
25 that our run-of-the-river projects did not conform to
26 the California *Renewable Energy Resources Act*,

1 therefore they will not buy any hydro that comes from
2 our run-of-the-river projects.

3 Then there was another aspect to this whole
4 thing too. Originally it was called Free Trade
5 Agreement and then it was called NAFTA. In Article 65
6 of the NAFTA, it states that we, Canada, can increase
7 our percentage of energy exported to the United
8 States, but we cannot reduce it. That is a percentage
9 of what we produce. We can export, but we cannot
10 reduce the percentage of what we produce.

11 And nor can we change the price unless
12 there is consensus between the Prime Minister and the
13 President, and we all know that's going to happen.

14 This means that the promotional price set
15 by W.A.C. Bennett for a twenty-year period to
16 encourage the western states of the U.S. not to get
17 involved in building their own hydro projects, fell --
18 the twenty-year period fell after the free trade
19 agreement. So in essence, we are selling our hydro
20 now to California at a deal that was set, a price that
21 was set 1960, 1966 something like that. And they
22 still think it's too much.

23 One of the reasons that the power from Site
24 C dam was spoken about was because of Petronas, and
25 because of the mines. Well, Petronas have pulled out,
26 so they don't need it. The Imperial Metals at Mt.

1 Polley Mine are still being used, and the Red Chris
2 dam is still using hydro, so what do we need extra
3 for? We don't. We can get that extra.

4 Another question that has almost been
5 touched on tonight but not quite, what about the banks
6 along where the lake is supposed to go, behind the
7 Site C dam? I've seen videos of where it's collapsing
8 and they haven't even started filling it with water
9 yet. So when the water gets in there and those banks
10 eventually start to collapse, where is the water going
11 to go? It's going to go downstream and downstream
12 there are two other dams. If those dams can't take
13 that volume of water, they will go, and by the time
14 you hit the third dam, that water won't stop until
15 somewhere in Saskatchewan, and that doesn't seem to be
16 talked about very much.

17 I urge you, because it's cheaper to stop
18 this project than to continue it, to do just that.

19 Thank you.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

21 **Proceeding Time 8:25 p.m. T38**

22 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BALDINI (#0274):**

23 MR. BALDINI: Good evening, panel. Thank you for holding
24 his hearing. My name is Maurizio Baldini, B-A-L-D-I-
25 N-I. I lived in B.C. for the last 60 years, beautiful
26 British Columbia, like to see it remain beautiful and

1 green.

2 I think we can take some hints from a dam
3 being built right now in Labrador, the Muskrat Falls
4 dam, should serve as a warning for B.C. Site C. Says
5 a former head of Newfoundland and Labrador's public
6 utilities regulator, David Vardy. He's a former
7 economics professor, and a retired civil servant in
8 that province. Their Muskrat Falls project has now
9 more than doubled in cost. It's not yet finished, it
10 is over \$11 billion already for a small province like
11 Newfoundland and Labrador. He says also that the rate
12 of technological advances will make the project
13 obsolete before long.

14 Now, BC Hydro is not predicting that we'll
15 need this electricity until 2036, although the dam is
16 predicted to come on stream at 2024. So that is two
17 decades for technology to advance. There is already
18 cheaper, cleaner, energy alternatives. There is
19 devices to store electricity at off times so it can be
20 used at peak times. Takes the grid offline a bit,
21 less power off the grid and peak periods.

22 The Telus company, showing a show home in
23 British Columbia now that uses a lot less electricity.
24 The Tesla Corporation that makes electric cars and
25 solar panels has just announced a new shingle for
26 roofs, solar shingles. These can replace asphalt

1 shingles when the asphalt shingles have to be replaced
2 every 15 years or so. These are more efficient,
3 slimmer in design than the old solar panels.
4 Eventually these can be replaced on homes.

5 A lot of my -- the rest of my presentation
6 is taken from an excellent article from the *Tyee News*
7 by Zoe Duckman from May 3rd of this year. And talks
8 about Harry Swain who chaired the only independent
9 review of Site C, criticizing the growth of efficiency
10 is now outpacing the growth of population. A new
11 technology is -- of course we've heard this, reduces
12 power use, and as electricity rates will go up, there
13 will be less use, there will be less consumers wanting
14 to use it at a higher price. And as reported in the
15 *Globe and Mail*, former energy Minister Bill Bennett
16 acknowledged the lack of firm demand for Site C's
17 electricity at an energy conference last November when
18 he was quoted as saying, "Our opportunity is to drive
19 demand, it's to get people to use more electricity."
20 There is really not a lot of demand. There won't be
21 any demand -- it won't even be necessary until 2036.

22 BC Hydro is predicting to take 70 years to
23 finance this project and pay it off. It's going to be
24 our grandchildren and great grandchildren indebted
25 with all this debt. It is now pegged at 8.8 billion,
26 it is already 610 billion overrun. Muskrat Falls is

1 11.4 billion, double predicted cost. Another dam
2 being built in Manitoba now the Keeyask dam, 34
3 percent over budget. It's not finished. The reason
4 both of those are over cost -- one of the reasons is
5 the ground problem, building on soft ground. That has
6 been identified in Site C as being a real problem, as
7 some of the other speakers have noted. So, we can
8 expect to see similar, if not worse overruns in Site
9 C.

10 Also, BC Hydro's former CEO Mark Eliesen,
11 has a similar morning. An Ernst and Young audit of
12 the project identified the same risk for construction
13 about the ground problems, developing the dam on soft
14 ground on the edges of the river. We've heard about
15 the lost farmland, the lost parkland, damage to the
16 environment, species, First Nations people losing
17 their territories. The debt. People have talked
18 about it, 18 billion and up, going upwards of BC Hydro
19 and that is according to their accounting records.
20 Other people have reviewed their accounting systems
21 and believe it's actually much higher.

22 Now, this debt is going to be guaranteed by
23 the province, and of course the taxpayers will foot
24 the bill for that. Do we really need a 60 year old
25 design in technology when all of these other new
26 technologies are coming on stream? I don't think so.

1 It is kind of like the Egyptians, building pyramids
2 today.

3 Thank you.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

5 **Proceeding Time 8:31 p.m. T39**

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORNBURGH (#0275):**

7 MR. THORNBURGH: I'm Jack Thornburgh, T-H-O-R-N-B-U-R-
8 G-H. I'm a member of Peninsula Ecovision and the
9 Rolling Justice Bus. I've been to the Peace River
10 Valley for the last three summers, talked with
11 countless regular citizens, First Nations, the mayor
12 of Fort St. John and others so I feel very fortunate
13 to have had that experience, to know some of this
14 firsthand.

15 Thank you, panel members, for your
16 commitment, and I must say, your stamina in staying
17 with all this. I would like to say a couple of things
18 about First Nations issues in the Peace River region,
19 namely Treaty 8 First Nations. I don't envy the panel
20 in their work. Many of the tangible and intangible
21 values that the speakers and the written responders
22 bring up are crucial issues, but to assign a cost or
23 price on them will be well nigh impossible.

24 Just a word or two about the United Nations
25 declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. I
26 take an excerpt from Article 10 and Article 8.

1 Article 10:

2 "Indigenous peoples shall not be forcibly
3 removed from their lands or territories. No
4 relocation shall take place without the
5 free, prior and informed consent of the
6 indigenous peoples concerned, and after
7 agreement on just and fair compensation."

8 And from Article 8:

9 "States shall provide effective mechanisms
10 for the prevention of and redress for any
11 action which has the aim or effect of
12 dispossessing First Peoples of their lands,
13 territories, or resources."

14 Unquestionably, the completion of Site C
15 with its inundation of so many square kilometres of
16 traditional territories for fishing, hunting, native
17 foods harvesting and cultural practices will be a
18 gigantic cost to Treat 8 First Peoples and how is that
19 assigned, how is that assessed? How can you cost it
20 out?

21 If Site C is completed, we'll need to
22 factor in the costs of the loss of trust in our public
23 corporations and just as important, the cost to our
24 public decision-making processes. This is a huge
25 cost, but how do you put a monetary value on it.

26 If completed, we'll need to factor in the

1 cost of the huge injuries to the truth and
2 reconciliation process. The cost of the trust loss by
3 indigenous peoples not only in the Peace and Treaty 8
4 territories, but elsewhere in Canada who see this as a
5 precedent.

6 We need to factor in as well the cost of
7 habitat loss for the creatures of the Peace River
8 Valley. How can you price this? How can you cost
9 this?

10 Researcher Ben Parfitt says it very
11 eloquently in his statement that:

12 "The rights and wellbeing of Treaty 8
13 peoples depend on the streams, rivers and
14 lakes that sustain their very web of life on
15 which their communities have relied for
16 thousands of years."

17 As I said at the outset, I don't envy the
18 panel their attempts to quantify the unquantifiable,
19 but I wish you all, in your deliberations, the wisdom
20 of Solomon, or the modern equivalent thereof.

21 Thank you.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

23 **Proceeding Time 8:36 p.m. T40**

24 Thank you, ma'am.

25 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GREENLEES (#0276):**

26 MS. GREENLEES: Hello. My name is Cory Greenlees, G-R-E-

1 E-N-L-E-E-S. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.
2 I am speaking for my family and as a community member.

3 For many reasons, I am opposed to the 20th
4 century thinking that the Site C project represents.
5 I am convinced the dam is not in B.C.'s best economic
6 or environmental interests. I am concerned what Site
7 C will cost my family. As we learned from the federal
8 provincial review, Site C is projected to cost \$9
9 billion. The project will create a massive debt to
10 taxpayers and ratepayers. BC Hydro is already
11 planning to raise rates 28 percent over the next five
12 years. Site C costs will be added to that once the
13 dam is operational. Can our families afford that?

14 Is the energy needed? There is no current
15 demand for the electricity that would be generated by
16 the Site C mega-dam. BC Hydro's own data doesn't
17 project any demand for at least ten years into the
18 dam's operating life, and BC Hydro has a long history
19 of over-estimating future demand, as indicated in
20 UBC's 2017 study program on water governance.
21 Additionally, by eating up any possible future demand,
22 Site C has driven away investments and jobs in solar,
23 wind, and geothermal sectors.

24 The Site C dam was first proposed in the
25 1950s. Projects like it are based on outdated ideas
26 about energy development. Newer technologies like

1 wind and solar are becoming cheaper and more effective
2 every year. These alternatives also create jobs, can
3 be built as needed, and have a lower overall
4 environmental impact.

5 If completed, Site C would destroy critical
6 farm land, displace families, and remove irreplaceable
7 wildlife habitat. The project has been condemned
8 internationally by the United Nations Committee on the
9 Elimination of Racial Discrimination for causing
10 irreversible damage to First Nations cultural sites
11 and failing to get free, prior and informed consent of
12 indigenous people. Wouldn't our tax dollars be better
13 spent on health care, education, and creating real
14 green energy solutions?

15 Evidence confirms Site C is not past the
16 point of no return. Stopping now will save billions
17 of dollars. I urge the Commission to recommend
18 termination of the Site C project.

19 **Proceeding Time 8:38 p.m. T41**

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

21 MR. McGUIRE: Hello.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Hello, sir.

23 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McGUIRE (#0277):**

24 MR. McGUIRE: My name is Mike McGuire, M-c-G-U-I-R-E.
25 In my opinion and in the opinion of many people that I
26 know, the Site C dam project needs to be shut down

1 immediately and the site remediated.

2 Why? Well, a wise man once said, "When you
3 find yourself in the hole, it's time to stop digging."

4 Advance technology can now meet our future
5 needs at a fraction of the cost of Site C. There's an
6 opportunity to create far more than the 2500 temporary
7 jobs presently at stake at Site C. These would be
8 full-time jobs in renewable power, spread around the
9 province providing ongoing well-paid, secure
10 employment.

11 To date, unsubsidized renewable
12 alternatives have proven to provide more than twice
13 the high-paying jobs that combined oil, coal and gas
14 and fossil fuel alternatives. Assuming a gradual
15 increase in demand for electricity, newly available
16 offshore wind turbines, each capable of producing ten
17 megawatts and soon to be fifteen megawatts, can be
18 purchased and financed incrementally as needed, which
19 means lower interest charges on any monies borrowed
20 for the project.

21 Situated off shore where the wind
22 invariably flows, these high output turbines should
23 not offend First Nation treaty rights, nor would
24 precious farmland be encroached upon.

25 Recent figures show that at 99 cents per
26 watt, these turbines currently supply the lowest cost

1 per kilowatt of electric power with expected further
2 reductions in costs. In fact, last month, in
3 Scotland, which has a slightly larger population than
4 B.C., produced -- well, 1108 gigawatts from wind
5 turbines alone which, when annualized, amounts to over
6 13,300 gigawatt hours, more than BC Hydro's projected
7 5100 gigawatt hours from Site C.

8 On-site solar power, which should be
9 mandated in all new commercial and residential
10 buildings, can be installed without the need of
11 transmission lines. Solar panels, both PV and
12 evacuated tube solo hot water systems, can offset
13 consumption of hydro-powered electric water and
14 baseboard heaters. This would free up considerable
15 amounts of power for the growing adoption of electric
16 vehicles.

17 Fluctuations in power generation caused by
18 normal weather conditions, like a wind, or sunshine,
19 have been largely overcome with the use of large scale
20 battery storage. Using vehicle to grid to systems
21 batteries in electric vehicles charged in off-peak
22 times are now successfully being used in Europe for
23 load balancing. Studies have shown most families use
24 their cars only 9 percent of the time. A small
25 percentage of thousands of charge batteries in parked
26 electric vehicles can easily be fed back into the grid

1 in times of peak demand, minimally affecting the
2 electric vehicle's range, by the way.

3 The perceived need for Site C's 11
4 gigawatts of power sits at a cost now exceeding \$9
5 billion, with a likelihood of future increases. Over
6 the years, projected power consumption figures by BC
7 Hydro have consistently been exaggerated. The record
8 shows that power consumption in recent years has
9 remained level or has actually declined due to
10 technological advances.

11 Wind, solar, geothermal, pumped hydro,
12 tidal and wave generation need to be developed. I
13 understand that BC Hydro has, in the past, been
14 directed by our previous government to disregard
15 alternative renewable sources of cheaper, cleaner
16 energy in favour of Site C.

17 While we're trying to build a dam, our
18 neighbours to the south, in Washington, Oregon and
19 Northern California, are, at great expense,
20 decommissioning dams.

21 A letter in the *Times Colonist* of September
22 22nd stated BC Hydro is paying \$55 million a year to a
23 defunct pulp mill in Campbell River to not produce
24 power. Is this true? If this is true, then why do
25 we need Site C?

26 Also the ten kilowatt solar panel array

1 recently installed locally in North Saanich at the
2 municipal hall, I'm told is for emergency use only.
3 Why is this system not tied to the grid to reduce
4 expensive hydro consumption?

5 BC Hydro is currently paying independent
6 run-of-the-river producers not to produce power. Why?
7 Very clear. We obviously do not need Site C.

8 Thank you very much.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

10 **Proceeding Time 8:44 p.m. T42**

11 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is there a Ms. Moon, Anne Moon here,
12 please? And Jacob Enns? Go ahead, sir.

13 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE VOICE: Anne Moon was one of the
14 (inaudible).

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Oh, okay. Very well, thank you.

16 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ENNS (#0278):**

17 MR. ENNS: Hello. I'm Jacob Enns, E-N-N-S. I live here
18 in Victoria.

19 There's been a lot of eloquent speakers
20 tonight, acknowledging that we are standing on the
21 land of the Songhees and Esquimalt Nations. We talked
22 to -- we've heard someone say we're all treaty people.
23 I wanted to say, thank you for that, to that person.

24 This is an issue that is really important
25 to me. I'm here to speak for my son. He's seven
26 years old. Well, he will be at the end of the month.

1 I'm not going to go over all the things that have been
2 said before, but I want to leave you some images. The
3 rear-view mirror of my son, when I first started
4 driving an electric car. That was a moment of
5 integrity that I appreciated and will keep. I drive
6 an electric car, and an electric motorcycle. They're
7 fun. One of the things we know about electric
8 vehicles is that they actually have low centres of
9 gravity, and a lot of torque. The windy roads are
10 fun. The most important thing to me is that I am now
11 working toward my son's future.

12 I don't want my son to have a big debt from
13 a big mega-project. Not when we can use renewable
14 energy to put solar panels on the roof of houses, and
15 on public buildings. What about building domes? In
16 parks, and other places. Where we could have solar
17 panels and wind. And a distributed electrical system
18 can have the effect of building community, because
19 there's a structure where people can meet under, no
20 matter what the weather. But the lights are always
21 going to be on in an emergency. They can be situated
22 so that they can be there for times of crisis. They
23 can be easily erected quickly. This is something --
24 the technology that we have today, we don't need Site
25 C, given the current nature of technology, and that's
26 just going to get better.

1 The financing of this big project, I don't
2 want that to be on my son. And who knows what the
3 rates are going to be when it gets refinanced in 30,
4 40 years? It's not viable. Not when we can have a
5 system that grows and is infinitely scalable to the
6 demand -- the real demand, in the moment. Because we
7 can build lots of solar panels on roofs, the solar
8 shingles, wind turbines that don't make that same
9 noise, don't have the same vibrational problems. All
10 that technology is coming, and it actually is here.

11 Another image I want to leave with you. If
12 these domes, these beautiful architectural structures,
13 are there when there's an earthquake; centres where
14 people come to when their own home is not functioning
15 because of an earthquake, or a flood, or a fire, and
16 we're seeing a lot more of those things.

17 So let's build a future for my son. And
18 for all children, that's free of the burdensome debt,
19 that's free of the burden on the conscience of, what
20 are we doing to the land? What are we doing to the
21 First Nations? What are we doing with that treaty?

22 This is important for my son to have a
23 future that is free from those things, and is -- I
24 drive an EV, I want lots more people doing it. I have
25 a friend who drives all around for free, because he
26 sells a lot of excess power to BC Hydro already, just

1 from his roof. And he drives around in his EV. I
2 would do that myself, but right now I'm renting. But
3 as soon as I'm not, I'm putting up solar panels.
4 Because the cost in the long run is already as good as
5 what I can get from BC Hydro.

6 So this is the future. And so let's just
7 say no to Site C, and let's build lots of beautiful
8 things in parks, and on buildings. Let's have a
9 renewable energy system that's distributed, that's not
10 vulnerable to the emergencies and disasters that seem
11 to be happening more and more. Let's have a future
12 that doesn't have Site C.

13 Thank you.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

15 **Proceeding Time 8:49 p.m. T43**

16 We are just going to take a few minutes
17 break here, we'll be back. Thank you.

18 **(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 8:49 P.M.)**

19 **(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 8:55 P.M.)**

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: All right. The following six speakers
21 were people who had registered to speak, but had not
22 arrived by 20 minutes before the session. So, since
23 we have time at the end, we are happy to hear these
24 six people speak.

25 And is Mr. Warren here? Mr. Warren? Okay.
26 Mr. Henderson?

1 MR. HENDERSON: Hi there, thanks for accommodating me, I
2 didn't realize about the 20 minute cut off.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: It's okay, sir.

4 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HENDERSON (#0279):**

5 MR. HENDERSON: So, off we roll. So, good evening,
6 commissioners, fellow citizens, my name is Irwin
7 Henderson, H-E-N-D-E-R-S-O-N and I'm a resident of
8 Victoria.

9 To members of the panel, thank you, it has
10 been a long time since members of the public were
11 permitted or invited to give their thoughts on the
12 future of our electricity supply and service. We
13 should be grateful to you and your staff.

14 I am part of a group who submitted
15 technical information to you in August, and I was
16 pleased to see that some of it was referenced in your
17 interim report. And historically I was part of the
18 government team involved in the first Site C review in
19 the 1980s. I was present when the government of the
20 day had the courage to accept the advice of the
21 permanent commissioners' minority report, and turned
22 down Hydro's application. As I look back, there are
23 three similarities and lessons that stand out for
24 today.

25 The first is, and I'm sure you know it all,
26 Hydro will submit hundreds and hundreds of pages of

1 material. Hydro will overestimate demand and will
2 underestimate the role of conservation and demand
3 management.

4 The third lesson from the earlier process
5 for today, is that the public wants to be assured that
6 every ounce of conservation and efficiency has been
7 wrung out of the system before accepting the
8 environmental and economic cost of major new
9 generation projects.

10 To pursue this, I'd like to focus towards
11 the future on the matters within section 3(b)(4) of
12 your terms of reference, which is what portfolio of
13 commercially feasible generation projects and demand-
14 side management initiatives could provide similar
15 benefits to ratepayers or at similar or lower unit
16 energy costs? I believe that when you review all the
17 evidence, you will be able to firmly recommend such a
18 portfolio made up of four elements. First, an updated
19 and fully resourced PowerSmart program for consumers
20 adapted to the digital age.

21 Second, a smart grid transmission system,
22 again using digital technology as is already in place
23 in the EU, the U.S. and China, and which will reduce
24 transmission losses, take advantage of First Nations
25 and distributed renewable projects, and serve electric
26 vehicles.

1 doing things like walking around with portable two-
2 stroke engines our back just to blow from leaves from
3 area to another area.

4 So we may not need the power because so far
5 we haven't cared very much about heating the planet,
6 but there's no shortage of demand for energy to run
7 our economy and our society.

8 So under the Paris agreement our target is
9 30 percent emissions production by 2030, and I
10 guarantee you, without transitioning our homes and
11 vehicles to clean energy, we don't stand a chance at
12 meeting that. Planting a few trees and calling it a
13 day is not going to cut it. So in 2030 we're going to
14 look back and say, "Ah, it's another Kyoto. We didn't
15 even get close."

16 So Bloomberg predicts that by 2025 electric
17 vehicles will be cheaper than gas vehicles. At that
18 point there will be mass switchover regardless of
19 subsidies or government policy. Having clean
20 renewable energy allows us to aggressively push
21 towards electrification. Without it, we are forced to
22 drag our feet and conserve at every opportunity.

23 Even if we are incredibly unimaginative and
24 slow moving, and we can't figure out how to electrify
25 our economy in our homes, Alberta uses coal to
26 generate 40 percent of their electricity right now,

1 and they are desperate to get rid of that, and Canada
2 as a whole is phasing out coal power. So worst case,
3 we can sell to them.

4 There are no borders to global warming, and
5 thus we shouldn't be too focused on whether we can
6 scrape by without Site C. There's no such thing as a
7 power project with no environmental impact, but this,
8 I believe, is our best bet.

9 It is perverse to argue against one form of
10 clean renewable energy as it somehow precludes other
11 forms of energy. If we want to mitigate climate
12 change, we need more hydro, more solar, more wind.

13 So I just want to say that, you know, hydro
14 right now has the lowest, you know, greenhouse gas
15 emissions per unit energy, lower even than solar. So
16 just if -- I don't necessarily say that Site C is the
17 only solution. If other renewables can meet the needs
18 for a massive transition to renewable energy, that's
19 great, but I think it has to be part of the solution.

20 Thank you, that's all I have.

21 **Proceeding Time 8:59 p.m. T45**

22 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. STRANG (#0281):**

23 MS. STRANG: I am grateful to speak in Songhees' and
24 Esquimalt's territory and with the understanding that
25 cost is more than just a financial accounting. I'm
26 Hilary Strang, S-T-R-A-N-G. I'm from the Saanich

1 Inlet Network, a community-based organization tasked
2 with protecting the Saanich Inlet from
3 industrialization, specifically from the LNG industry.

4 The inlet is at the extreme end of the
5 province from Treaty 8 territory, yet is
6 environmentally connected. For example, both are what
7 Naomi Klein refers to as "sacrificial zones."
8 Gluttonous capitals of global markets throw these
9 comments on the table, then gobble them up and claim
10 the narrative "This is for the common good."

11 As many people have argued, Site C dam
12 promises to destroy habitat, trample over indigenous
13 rights, and flood farmland. Just like in fracking and
14 liquefying natural gas, it will leak the excellent
15 climate change accelerator, methane. Furthermore, the
16 likely signaler purpose of the dam is to service an
17 increase in water hungry resource projects, such as
18 the un-regulated and dangerous extraction of shale
19 gas. This once again connects LNG and the Saanich
20 Inlet with the Site C Dam.

21 As even the Minister of Natural Resources,
22 Jim Carr, agreed today, let's transition. Let's build
23 no more projects that tie us to old, earth sacrificing
24 ways. And clearly, Site C dam has no real sustainable
25 or common good.

26 Thank you.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

2 **Proceeding Time 9:05 p.m. T46**

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Is there an Anne Hansen here, please?
4 A Donald Scott?

5 MR. SCOTT: Is this mike --

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: I think so. I think it's a little more
7 stable, or sturdy.

8 MR. SCOTT: Okay, great. Thank you very much, folks.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

10 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SCOTT (#0282):**

11 MR. SCOTT: Don Scott's my name, S-C-O-T-T. I think it's
12 perhaps a bit fitting that I'm the last person
13 apparently to speak, because I'm going to try and
14 address some of the issues that have been raised
15 earlier.

16 I'm not sure if you're familiar with the
17 paper that I submitted to you back in August or not.
18 It used my -- what I've done in my home as a basis to
19 extrapolate for the rest of B.C. in converting -- in
20 particular, looking at what we can save in electricity
21 in B.C. by changing some of the technology that we use
22 in our homes and businesses today.

23 That essentially is, by reducing demand
24 permanently, by replacing old technology with newer,
25 more efficient technology, you create supply. It's
26 the equivalent of adding new supply when you

1 permanently eliminate inefficient demand. And the
2 example I'm using for this is baseboard heaters.
3 About 44 percent of B.C. homes, single-family homes in
4 B.C., use baseboard heaters. And if we replace those
5 baseboard heaters with a high-efficiency heat pump
6 like I've installed in our home, and my home study is
7 included as Chapter 8 in my submission that I
8 submitted to you earlier, we would save more
9 electricity than Site C will generate.

10 The savings per unit of household, like
11 this -- there was a lady who spoke earlier, she's
12 paying \$279 a month for a two-bedroom apartment. I'm
13 heating a 2500 square foot house, my hot water
14 included, my lights included, my fridge and everything
15 else included, for \$900 a year. My monthly bill is
16 \$700 [*sic*].

17 Six years ago, it was \$2400 that I was
18 paying for my total energy bill. I'm down to \$900
19 now.

20 The Site C is going to generate a proposed
21 5100 gigawatt hours electricity a year. By converting
22 those homes that use baseboard heaters and electric
23 furnaces to high-efficiency heat pumps, and not a
24 standard pump, a high-efficiency heat pump, you would
25 save 35 -- or 5500 gigawatt hours a year in B.C., and
26 that's just single family homes and duplexes. Add

1 apartments, condos, townhouses, you could take that
2 probably up to 7,000 gigawatt hours or more.

3 Another number. Several people have talked
4 about electrification of cars. Well, I've done some
5 calculations on that. And the -- to electrify 70
6 percent of vehicles in British Columbia today, with
7 using the average demand for an electric car is 19
8 kilowatt hours per 100 kilometers. British Columbians
9 -- or Canadians, I should say, drive about 15,300
10 kilometers a year. B.C., I don't think, drives as
11 much.

12 If you convert that 15,300 kilometers a
13 year, it turns out to 2,900 kilowatt hours a year of
14 demand for the year. The number of cars and light
15 trucks in B.C. are 2.9 million. 70 percent of those -
16 - or 66 percent of that, is 1.9 million. To generate
17 -- to take 1.9 million cars 15,000 kilometers a year
18 takes 5500 gigawatt hours. Basically, the same amount
19 of electricity you would save in B.C. if we got rid
20 of, or encouraged people to get rid of, their
21 baseboard heaters and electric furnaces and convert it
22 to high-efficiency heat pumps.

23 If you take the advantage for the CO₂
24 emissions, our home, we were previously heated with
25 oil. We have reduced our carbon emissions in our home
26 by 90 percent. This isn't rocket science, folks, it's

1 quite easy to do. And we just have to have the
2 courage and the foresight to be able to push it and do
3 it and create new supply by creating smart use of
4 electricity.

5 People talked about export markets. Our
6 primary export markets are south of us. And that --
7 Washington exports power. Oregon exports power.
8 California has led the nation in the United States
9 dramatically. They've had no increase in consumption.
10 None of these states have had an increase in
11 consumption, just like B.C. And U.S. why, does not
12 have any increase in consumption after about eight
13 years of electrical consumption. And in energy
14 consumption overall, it's down as well.

15 And California has now adopted -- I just
16 got back this afternoon, it's one of the reasons I
17 didn't get my name in earlier, because I just got back
18 from the U.S. this afternoon -- is that they have now
19 mandated new homes are to be net zero homes. There is
20 no reason whatsoever that we in B.C. can't be doing
21 that. There are several net zero homes here in
22 Victoria. My home is a 1967 home. It's only got 2 by
23 4 walls in it, it's not terribly efficiently
24 constructed. But what we've done in it, in that home,
25 has been able to reduce our energy consumption
26 dramatically, and our carbon emissions phenomenally.

1 And if more people did the same thing, we would kill
2 many birds with one stone.

3 I think -- I'm sorry for running over, but
4 Site C, I think go ahead will be a millstone for
5 British Columbians and BC Hydro in particular. And I
6 think the \$2 billion or \$1 billion, whatever it is,
7 that's going to have to be written off -- I would like
8 to see an inquiry into how we got into that situation
9 in the first place.

10 Somebody -- somebody should be held
11 accountable for that. And unfortunately for us
12 British Columbians, it's just another cost of what
13 B.C. has suffered for in the last 20 years, or 18
14 years, with the B.C. Liberal government. And perhaps
15 it's just a cost of having an electric dam, and maybe
16 we as citizens will smarten up and pay attention more
17 to the type of people who we elect as representatives
18 in our government.

19 Thank you very much.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

21 **Proceeding Time 9:11 p.m. T47**

22 Sir, would you like to make a presentation.

23 MR. TROTTER: Thank you.

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: You're welcome.

25 MR. TROTTER: I appreciate that.

26 THE CHAIRPERSON: No problem.

1 MR. TROTTER: I sat through the whole night.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: I appreciate it.

3 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. TROTTER (#0283):**

4 MR. TROTTER: And I learned a lot, as you probably have
5 too, although maybe you've heard it in other
6 submissions. I'm going to try to tighten up what I
7 had to say.

8 If it's all about costs, and a lot of --
9 oh, sorry. My name is Tristan Trotter, T-R-O-T-T-E-R.
10 That's right. Tristan, first name.

11 I'll try to tighten up what I had written
12 out, and that was I think you're still faced with the
13 political decision, and a lot of what you've heard
14 tonight is political. But one thing that got me was
15 my fellow citizen who described it as putting money
16 into buying a car, and you want to get something out
17 of it.

18 Okay, so my concerns are the impact in a
19 period of reconciliation on Native people and our
20 relationship with Native people as white colonist
21 stock. So we are all treaty people, as somebody said.

22 I'm concerned about the flooding of rich
23 farmland. Look at how much farmland has been lost in
24 the last 20 years to real estate development and
25 industrial use. Look at the Lower Mainland. I mean,
26 it's hell leaving the ferry and getting on that

1 highway and heading into Vancouver nowadays. It is
2 just hell, when you remember what the farmland was
3 like before. And this is land that could be flooded
4 by climate change.

5 Economically, we're going to end up
6 subsidizing water for the United States, power for the
7 United States, power for industry, but what we're
8 giving up is priceless. So, I'm looking at what we
9 have to pay for it in terms of relations with the
10 native community, the farmland that's disappearing and
11 how much we may have to rely on that in the future.
12 You know, the land that we are flooding is priceless.
13 Once it's flooded, it's gone forever, and it may be
14 difficult for you to evaluate that financially, but
15 the political decision you have to make is that when
16 -- leadership is being able to tell people we've gone
17 up the wrong road. We're going to have to make
18 sacrifices, it's time to make a sacrifice. We've
19 tried to get away cheaply for more than 100 years in
20 this province. I mean, all of the settler stock.
21 It's been the wild west. It's been the wild west
22 politically, certainly.

23 You've got a really heavy responsibility to
24 look into the future and attach a monetary value to
25 things that are priceless. Keep that in mind.

26 Thanks.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

2 Is there anyone else that would like an
3 opportunity to speak? Ma'am?

4 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. EVANS (#0284):**

5 MS. EVANS: Yes, please. My name is Glynne Evans.
6 Glynne is spelt G-L-Y-N-N-E, Evans, E-V-A-N-S.

7 One small point and that is that I don't
8 believe that there was any real emphasis tonight on
9 the safety and security aspects of a distributed
10 production of power. It doesn't matter whether we're
11 talking about some natural disaster or, heaven help
12 us, some form of terrorism or war, to have all your
13 eggs in one basket, whether it's Site C or some other
14 huge facility that produces power. It's perhaps a
15 little dangerous.

16 That's all I have to say, thank you.

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

18 **Proceeding Time 9:16 p.m. T48**

19 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. M. HADLAND (#0285):**

20 MS. HADLAND: Marina Hadland, H-A-D-L-A-N-D. I'd like to
21 acknowledge that we're on unceded territory of the
22 Gawlkins, and that the Treaty 8 territory is where
23 Site C is proposed.

24 I was born and raised in the Peace River
25 valley, and Site C has been a dark cloud that has hung
26 over the valley before I was even born. When I

1 started becoming aware of what was going on in the
2 world, I remember watching TV reports of wars in the
3 Middle East, and my family reassured me that we were
4 safe, that we lived in a very safe place. But, at the
5 same time, we were under warning that the first dam
6 could possibly break with the sinkholes that had
7 happened, and I just could not justify or understand
8 how this could be happening. My friends lived in the
9 Taylor Flats, and they were under -- there was a
10 warning that at any moment that they had to be
11 evacuated up to my school. It was an unstable climate
12 to grow up in.

13 And there is health aspects to that. I
14 don't know how you put prices on that, but listening
15 to family members, community members, how they could
16 talk about Site C might be proposed again, I could not
17 understand that, when they were not sure of how long
18 these two existing dams could possibly hold up.

19 And so this project is projected to be put
20 in place when a dam that is supposed to be 100 years,
21 is already past its 50 year mark, so what is -- I
22 guess I am proposing or asking what is going to be the
23 length of this 9 plus billion dollar dam, and how can
24 we put a price on the valley, is another question that
25 has been brought about. But thinking long term, I
26 feel like this dam -- back when the first dam was put

1 in, 100 years seemed like a lot. I have relatives
2 that are 99 and 97. I think we need to think longer
3 term. The potential of the valley that has been
4 untapped because of the reservoir, how much financial
5 could that bring about?

6 So, I guess I can't pretend to have
7 expertise, I support and thankful to everyone who said
8 something in favour of the dam not being put through.
9 I guess -- I just want to know what is the price that
10 we can put on the future for seven generations?
11 Because in Igonquin -- Iroquois traditions, there is a
12 philosophy of decisions made today need to be made for
13 seven generations in advance. I think that is where
14 we need to look at finances. I know it's a lot being
15 asked of you guys, and thank you so much for coming
16 around the province and listening to the communities,
17 because not having a voice has been really hard on the
18 community, and has divided it. And the Site C project
19 that has been going on for 40 plus years has left us
20 in limbo, without the possibility of the potential and
21 ambitions of people who want to develop more.

22 So, please cancel the Site C dam so people
23 can start living to their fullest potential in the
24 valley.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

26 **Proceeding Time 9:20 p.m. T49**

1 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DELA ROSA (#0286):**

2 MS. DELA ROSA: Hi, thank you. My name is Rama Dela
3 Rosa, and I am from Saltspring Island. I just wanted
4 to tie in a bit of the global perspective as we're
5 dealing with a lot of food and security globally, as
6 well in the United States, and much of this is caused
7 by climate change and that we can foresee climate
8 change continuing to be a growing issue with food
9 production, and that for long term sustainability that
10 it's very important that we don't sacrifice our food
11 growing lands in a time when things are quite
12 unstable. We haven't caught up to what's going on.

13 And I feel like it's very important for us
14 as humans, as stewards of the earth, as creatures
15 aiming to become masters of our resources and our
16 environment, that it's important that we take into
17 mind the death, decay and decomposition when we are
18 creating new projects so that we don't end up with
19 issues like Fukushima, where lack of foresight and
20 just taking into account the inevitable decay of
21 things into the long-term future, that these are the
22 kinds of things that we need to start thinking about
23 when we're planning. It's not just about obsessing on
24 the creation of this new project and what it might
25 spurn economically, but long-term consequences for
26 future generations.

1 But both socially as well, as we are in
2 this time with reconciliation with First Nations
3 people, and that we are being -- that the world is
4 watching, and that with social media now, that this is
5 a global conversation and that any foul made against
6 First Nations people will be noted and we will be
7 accountable to the global public for that. And I feel
8 like the rest of British Columbia citizens, it's very
9 important that we behave respectfully and humanely and
10 with accountability and respect.

11 And so I feel like to honour future
12 generations, to honour the value of the land as an
13 agricultural place of great bounty and realizing that,
14 you know, I came from -- I grew up in -- I'm born in
15 Port Alberni but I grew up in Florida where I
16 witnessed a lot of environmental destruction, and they
17 are in a never-ending race there now trying to save
18 the Everglades, where it would have been so much
19 better if they just hadn't ruined them. There are
20 things that once they are done, can't be undone, and
21 things have long-term consequences that we must, as we
22 aim for mastery, start to take into account these
23 long-term effects.

24 And that's all. Thank you.

25 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ma'am, did you -- ma'am? Did you
26 state your name at the beginning? I'm sorry, I missed

1 it.

2 MS. DELA ROSA: Rama Dela Rosa, R-A-M-A D-E-L-A Capital
3 R-O-S-A.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

5 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KEEGAN-HENRY (#0287):**

6 MS. KEEGAN-HENRY: My name is Jean Keegan-Henry and I'll
7 try to be short.

8 I was present at the Site C hearings in
9 1982, in the winter of 1982. I was there as the guest
10 of my father, Keith Henry, who chaired that
11 commission, which is the first BCUC Commission ever
12 made.

13 I listened for about four or five hours to
14 witnesses from BC Hydro trying to explain why in one
15 year their predictions had jumped by the entire Site C
16 output year over year. The year before they had had a
17 prediction and then they increased it by the entire
18 output of the Site C dam. They had done that in a
19 one-line item labelled "Miscellaneous", which I
20 listened to these two guys from BC Hydro describe at
21 length for several hours as just part of the way they
22 did the system and so on.

23 I just wanted to say, as a cautionary tale,
24 that BC Hydro has not always been honest with us. My
25 father was sulfurous that night at dinner about the
26 evidence he'd received.

1 every time a government is having a problem they do a
2 mega-project and they do it up home, and then they
3 say, "Jobs, jobs jobs." And, of course, there hasn't
4 been as much -- there has been here, but certainly it
5 hasn't been in the papers talking about how many jobs
6 would be created by the environmental aspect, by using
7 the environmental things that people have discussed
8 today. But I did want to bring up about the W.A.C.
9 Dam needing work done on it and it's kind of sitting
10 because there's piles of money going into this
11 unfortunate Site C Dam, which I'm against.

12 Because I have family up there I've been on
13 the plane a lot with my mom, because I helping to take
14 care of her, flying back and forth. And, of course,
15 the plane was often loaded with workers who were on
16 different shifts, and so you'd hear a lot of stuff.
17 You'd be sitting beside them on the plane and you
18 would -- I wouldn't voice my view initially, I would
19 want to hear what they'd have to say.

20 And you would have people who are just in
21 it for the money and they don't give a fig because
22 they don't want to be up there and they don't like the
23 north, but they make the money and they leave. But
24 you also hear about people -- in terms of businessmen
25 that I sat beside who told me about a worker who came
26 to him who left the dam because he didn't like what he

1 was seeing being done. And so he was coming to this
2 company, which is not connected to the dam, but in the
3 same trade. And as a tradesman he had been told that
4 if he wanted to work there -- now this is a smaller
5 trade, but if he wanted to work there he had to have a
6 Fort St. John address before they would hire him. So
7 he had to get a Fort St. John address. He did, he was
8 hired, and he worked there for a while.

9 You hear about, you know, the safety
10 aspects and how good it is and blah, blah, blah.
11 Well, I could tell you for a fact there have been some
12 deaths up there. I can tell you that there is a drug
13 issue happening with the camps up there. And I can
14 tell you that there's been, like, equipment knocked
15 over and everything.

16 I want to remind people that during the war
17 years the American engineers came up and a made huge
18 big fuss in the international papers when they built a
19 bridge, the bridge in the Taylor area. The same type
20 of soil conditions where the dam is going to be, which
21 has already proven that the engineers didn't quite get
22 it right when they've had, you know, slides and things
23 happening, right?

24 When that bridge was built nobody listened
25 to the local people and they said, "Oh, no," you know,
26 "this is a great engineering feat." All the

1 international papers had this beautiful looking
2 bridge. Well, the bridge -- I can't remember how long
3 it lasted, six months or something. No one was
4 killed, but it caved in on one side because of the
5 same type of soil conditions that are there where they
6 want to put Site C. Not where the other two dams are,
7 but where the Site C Dam area is.

8 When I was in high school, because of that
9 type of soil condition there was a slide that was so
10 bad that it completely moved over where the river
11 runs. So it's not like a small potatoes thing. That
12 is a serious thing for people to be considering when
13 you're building a hydroelectric dam of that size.

14 Looking up tufa seeps. T-U-F-A; seeps, S-
15 E-E-P-E-S. It's a very unusual and rare thing and
16 it's something that will be destroyed with what's
17 going to happen here. And I can tell you about
18 Williston Lake, which was supposed to be -- which was
19 from the previous, the first dam, which was supposed
20 to be this great thing for tourism and fishing. Well,
21 guess what? They cut down the trees but they didn't
22 pull up the stumps. They were not allowed to fish on
23 there because it was not safe to go out on a boat
24 because periodically over the years the water pressure
25 and everything, up comes the stump. It's dangerous,
26 they couldn't use it.

1 consideration, that we wouldn't be here if this
2 project made sense. Right at the beginning, we would
3 not be opposed to this project. It doesn't make
4 sense.

5 We're intelligent people. We look at the
6 numbers, we look at the economical facts, the
7 environmental facts, everything. If it made sense for
8 me being a Treaty 8 nation person, I would be saying
9 yes to this. But it doesn't make sense. I work in
10 industry, and in industry we have buyers for a
11 product. This Hydro dam does not have energy buyers
12 for it. And that really concerns me. This is a bad
13 business plan. It's really going to affect our micro-
14 climate, forests, our valley that served my people for
15 time immemorial, as well as the other people here in
16 this room with their ancestors. And I would ask, and
17 I plead, please cancel Site C.

18 Thank you.

19 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

20 I'd like to thank everyone who's come out
21 tonight, and especially those who have given a
22 presentation to us. It's been very helpful and very
23 informative, and all of your views will be taken into
24 account when we write our final report.

25 So I'd like to thank you all again, and
26 say, have a good what remains of your evening. Thank

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

you.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 9:33 P.M.)

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



A.B. Lanigan, Court Reporter

October 12th, 2017