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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
the economic impact of the Site C project.

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

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

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

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

If you're not prepared at the time you're called upon, we'll go ahead with the next speaker in line and then we will return at the end of the list and make sure that we catch anybody that wasn't able
to come up when their name was called.

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

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

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

Again to allow all speakers, all registered speakers, at least, to have an opportunity to speak, we are asking you to limit your talk to a maximum of five minutes. There is a timer at the front here, and when you're getting close to the end of the five-minute period, I will -- if it doesn't look like
you're wrapping up, I will try and remind you, and ask that you get to a wrap-up so in that way people that haven't yet been heard will have an opportunity.

And I notice that we have some speakers registered that we have heard in previous community input sessions. We certainly welcome you to update the information that you've given us before, but I ask that you be mindful of the fact that there are other people that want to speak too, and that have not had an opportunity to speak before, and time is limited. So please keep that in mind.

Before you begin your presentation, all speakers, please state your first name and spell your last name, so that the people that are transcribing are able to get your name correct on the transcription record.

With that, we're ready to open this community input session in Victoria, on October the 11th.

Will our first speaker please state your first name, spell your last name, and begin your presentation. Thank you.

Proceeding Time 6:07 p.m. T13

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOTTERELL (#0001):

MR. BOTTERELL: My name is Rob Botterell, B-O-T-T-E-R-E-L-L. I represent the Peace Valley Landowner
Association, the Peace Valley Environment Association, the Site C Inquiry. Five minutes is not a long time, but I do take some comfort from the fact that as an intervener, one usually only gets five minutes before the Supreme Court of Canada.

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

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

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

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

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

Another moment of courage I recall took
place in October 1991 when then Attorney General Colin
Gabelmann showed great political determination when he
confirmed that the new NDP government would proceed
with freedom of information legislation. The NDP government did not do this to win political points. Every government, often to their chagrin, is subject to the same scrutiny under the Act. FOI legislation got done because it was in the best interest of British Columbia, because it supports our democracy, because it was a principled decision, because it was the right thing to do.

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

And so November 1st is the date when you deliver your report to government, and that'll be one of those moments etched into your memory and etched into the memory of everybody in this room. It'll be where were you when you heard the decision, or -- not
the decision but the findings on Site C? November 1st is the day we will learn whether you as the Panel, charged with protecting the interests of B.C. ratepayers, have the courage to make findings based on the evidence presented to you, findings that are going to be unpopular with some of your friends and colleagues. I actually drafted B.C.'s freedom of information legislation when I was a young rascal, and I can tell you it was a career limiting move. I was pretty unpopular with some of the people that I find as close friends.

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

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir, thank you.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COSTE (#0241):
MR. COSTE: Good evening. My name is Torrance Coste, C-O-S-T-E on the last name, and I work for the Wilderness Committee. I want to begin by acknowledging our presence on the unceded Lekwungen territories of the Esquimalt and Songhees Nations and express my gratitude for being on these lands this evening.

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

I feel that BC Hydro has a role to play in our future, in this province's future. A public utility powered by renewable sources is a huge tool for the people of this province and one we'll desperately need if we're to survive in a changing climate. That said, BC Hydro can only function properly as a public utility if it holds the respect and the trust of the public. Most people don't want this dam forced through. Reading through the submissions to this process from the last -- from the previous ten hearings, all of which is available online as you mentioned, the vast majority of the
comments call for this dam to be cancelled. Last night in Nanaimo seven people spoke in favour of the dam and 25 spoke in opposition to it.

If BC Hydro moves ahead with Site C, if it tramples the wishes of indigenous nations in the area, if it destroys habitat and migration routes for important species, if it floods valuable farmland, if it does all this to create power that we don’t need, trust in our public utility will be lost. And that lost trust is a cost that can never be recovered.

Every development BC Hydro attempts from now on will be met not with interest or open-mindedness, but with the fierce opposition deserved of a public agency that has proven itself not to act in the public interest.

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

Finally, the cancellation of this dam must be based in justice. That means not leaving behind the workers who have moved to Fort St. John or banked
on income and opportunity from this project. Fortunately, cancelling Site C will be a massive savings for taxpayers and ratepayers alike, and some of that saving should be mobilized as compensation packages for the workers facing immediate term disruption from the cancellation of this project. We can save ourselves a lot of money while preserving some of the public's sense of trust in our public utility and ensuring justice for our workers. That's something my generation deserves, it's something I believe everyone in this province wants, and that's what I hope you'll recommend to the government of B.C. in your report.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SIMPSON (#251):

MS. SIMPSON: My name is Janet Simpson, S-I-M-P-O-N. Hydro claims that if the dam is terminated we will have spent a fortune "without anything to show for it". But there would be a vital show of respect and support for the ecosystem of the river and its wildlife. The dam would flood 83 kilometers of the Peace River, 36 kilometers of five other waterways, and 5,500 hectares of land. Wolves will suffer a loss of 22 percent of landscape productivity, caribou 37,
grizzlies 44 percent. Fishers, weasels, will suffer a major loss of habitat. Bull trout and Arctic grayling will also be impacted. Over 60 percent of the Peace region has been disturbed by human land use. There are already over 190,000 kilometers of pipelines, roads, and seismic lines.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The area targeted for immediate clear-
cutting was also set aside in '69 to protect unique wildlife values, including habitat for the at-risk wolverine. The reserve contains some of the highest wildlife values in the entire Peace.

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

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

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

The Peace is unusual, supporting starkly different ecosystems and wildlife. It's unique, with
semi-desert on one side of the valley and old-growth spruce on the other. Half of the world's wildlife has been lost in the past 40 years. That decline could reach two-thirds among vertebrates by 2020. And animals living in lakes, rivers, and wetlands are suffering the biggest losses. For fresh-water species, the decline is 81 percent because of the way fresh water is used and removed, and because of the fragmentation of fresh-water systems through dam building. Yet we are considering --

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

MS. SIMPSON: Two more sentences?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

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

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.
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Good evening, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MITCHELL (#0252):

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

The Site C dam should be stopped for the
following reasons. I believe the decision made to initiate this mega-project was flawed and based on political ideology, the interest of the fossil fuel industry and a profound lack of concern about the worsening effects of climate change and impacts of this project.

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

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

And of course, unconventional gas is fracked LNG.

This dam was turned down twice before by the B.C. Utilities Commission until former premier, Gordon Campbell, created the Clean Air Act which allowed the dam application to make an end run around the B.C. Utilities Commission. Economically the dam is fast becoming redundant due to the accelerating transition to sustainable energy. In 2015 the international energy agency indicated an increase in
renewables of 153 gigawatts, exceeded the increase in coal, oil, gas and nuclear combined with China installing two wind turbines per hour.

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

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

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

Recent studies show that demand in B.C. has been steady over the last decade, with a slight decrease in the last one and a half years. This in spite of a population growth of 500,000 people and no major efforts to introduce conservation measures. At
present time there is actually a surplus.

Jane Ineeche in the October 5th News Energy Politics writes that the dam is currently 610 million over budget. In 2014, Harry Swain, former chair of the federal/provincial joint review commission stated that the dam would have significant negative effects on the lives of First Nations, flooding sacred burial sites, hunting and fishing grounds. With almost 100 kilometres of value class 1 land flooded, the resulted methane released from decaying vegetation and subsequent CO$_2$ from the manufacture of concrete used in building the dam would greatly reduce Canada's ability to meet its Paris climate commitments.

Methane is 25 to 85 percent worse than CO$_2$ for the first decade. One ton of cement roughly equals one ton of CO$_2$. Cement manufacture, at present, makes up 7 percent of the world's greenhouse gas emissions.

In conclusion, I believe the negative impacts are many and substantial and outweigh the short-term benefits of job creation. We are in a planetary climate crises with CO$_2$ levels world-wide over 400 parts per million and the grassland going vertical. For the sake of present and future generations, including other life forms, we must take this seriously and change course away from business as
usual. We cannot have our cake and eat it too.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRAY (#0253):

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

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

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

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

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

Three, there have been significant geotechnical problems at Site C. Some of these were predictable, some not.
A few months ago, the selected Canadian civil works partner on the project went bankrupt.

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

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

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

I am thinking here about what happened with Muskrat Falls and the Keeyask hydroelectric projects. BC Hydro and Deloitte now seem to agree that the project faces important risks of future overruns. We ask that you highlight these concerns and detail these risks in your final report so that the full potential costs of completion are on the table, rather than what has clearly been overly optimistic assessments to date.
We also would appreciate knowing how such budget overruns will affect our Hydro rates.

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

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

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

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

With the unusual accounting rules of BC Hydro, the deferral accounts, the concerns of the Auditor General, and Hydro's ever-increasing debt threatening B.C.'s credit rating, it's no wonder the government has ordered a financial review of BC Hydro itself. We ask that you review the likely impact on B.C.'s credit rating of cancellation, mothballing, or continuing with the Site C project, especially in
consideration of any further overruns, and sort out what would be required in terms of hydro rate adjustments to address Moody's concerns.

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

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

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

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DRAPER (#0254):


I'd like to begin by acknowledging that we are meeting on the traditional territories of the Lekwungen speaking people. For over 4,000 years Coast Salish people have lived on and cared for these lands and
waters with the knowledge and appreciation that right relationship with the earth is critical to human survival. Their careful stewardship of this region has allowed me as a settler to enjoy a comfortable lifestyle, a lifestyle that I am now questioning as I witness the devastation of so many watersheds throughout B.C.

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

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

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

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

I'd like the panel members and everyone in this room to imagine two different scenarios in their mind's eyes. One, the media headlines and the commentary across this country if our provincial government announces in early December that it will be
proceeding with Site C Dam or, two, the media's stories that will be told when our provincial government announces it is stopping Site C and finally laying to rest the idea of a third dam on the Peace River.

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

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

Call me naive, but I believe as do the KAIROS network that I am a part of, that a majority of British Columbians are ready to signal to the rest of Canada that we no longer view the lands and waters of our province as a commodity to be sold. We are
calling for the roller coaster ride that is resource exploitation in B.C. to be replaced by an economic development model that will see the creation of good jobs in the communities were people are living, meaningful work that takes care of the people and the watersheds we all depend on.

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

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

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.
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MS. SAYERS: Good evening.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening, ma'am.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SAYERS (#0255):

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

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

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

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

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

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

First Nations in existing projects produce a total of 1,836 megawatts, or 40 percent of the independent power producers' contributions to the grid. 32 projects have projects in development, 15 are under construction. Those First Nations that were interviewed said there are 249 projects they want to
build; 249. And those have some of them that are in pre-feasibility, and some that are stalled.

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

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

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

Jobs have been anywhere from 96 to 212. If we were able to get those 249 projects up and operating, minimum there, 300, 400 jobs.
I'm running out of time. So, this natural capital is not being utilized that's in First Nations communities. The economics of First Nations being denied the ability, even though the Clean Energy Act needs it and says it has to be done, isn't happening. The world is advancing technologically in clean energy. And B.C. is going to be out of that, because who's going to come to B.C. if there's no opportunity? We're going to be way behind the curve.

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

Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. RUSSOW (#0256):

MS. RUSSOW: My name is Joan Russow. Russow, R-U-S-S-O-W. It's 2017. It's 41 years since Habitat 1 in Vancouver where Canada, under the first Trudeau, agreed to the following recommendations: Reducing energy consumption, becoming aware of the need to cease environmentally degrading and wasteful use of energy resources, identifying and developing new sources of energy, developing and implementing the
utilization of solar and geothermal energy. Yet, in 2017 Site C, which is not only ecologically but also economically regressive advances the tolerance for externalities. Externalities are the costs that affect a party who did not choose to incur the cost.

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

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

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

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

A third externality is a loss of food security by destroying acres of rich agricultural land.
and disregarding the warning by the inter-governmental panel on climate change on loss of food security caused by climate change.

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

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

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

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

Site C must be cancelled now and the sunk costs absorbed. These costs were incurred from the dereliction of duty on the part of the former liberal governments in 2008 for allowing B.C. Hydro to defer expenses for years into the future; in 2010 for exempting Site C from the usual procedure of sending the proposal to the B.C. Utilities Commission that
would have done an in-depth analysis of the exorbitant externality costs; and in 2014 for ignoring the joint regional panel’s conclusion that the proposed Site C project would likely cause a number of significant adverse impacts to the rights of Treaty 8 First Nations, and that some of these effects could not be mitigated. At this point, the precautionary principle should have been invoked, Site C cancelled, not approved.

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.
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Good evening, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DREW (#0257):

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

    I respect the many opinions against this project, but I would like to add a couple of insights that I hope will benefit this panel. And fundamentally, I urge this Commission to recommend that Site C do continue. This is done on the basis that BC Hydro should hire the best professional experienced contract managers, supported by the best contract lawyers' office -- construction lawyers' office for this service. This was not done in
Victoria with the embarrassing Blue Bridge fiasco.

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

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

I have one additional new fact, I believe, and that is regarding the future need for power. According to Statistics Canada, there are 3 thousand 615,000 [sic] registered vehicles in British Columbia. What I'm wondering if has been underestimated is -- has there been a review of the possible need for power because of the electrification of passenger cars, trucks, and public transportation? This is not just a pipe dream, it's imminent. It's about to happen.
Almost all car manufacturers in Europe, North America, and Asia have presently prototypes for fully 100 percent electrical cars, not just hybrid, and they're ready for introduction in 2020. Besides providing the outlets, 240 wiring in homes, there are already plans for quick-charging infrastructure. This is done already in Vancouver. In Germany, they're setting up to do quick-charge stations along the freeways.

There's also obvious health benefits for greenhouse gases.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SIMEON (#0258):

MS. SIMEON: Good evening. My name is Ana Simeon, S-I-
M-E-O-N. I live in Victoria. Are you hearing me okay?

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

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

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

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

We find the rate increases that have
already been announced to be alarming, even without Site C saddling us with a debt the two of us will be paying off until we die.

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

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

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

However costly and shocking, cost overruns are merely a matter of running a project more
efficiently. The burning $11 billion question is: Is a major power project needed at all, and if so, is Site C the best alternative?

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

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

One example will suffice to illustrate the other recklessness and profligacy with which BC Hydro manages the resource with which it is entrusted on behalf of all of us. The Columbia River treaty power is currently sold back to the U.S. at the market price, around $35 per megawatt hour, well below the planned 83 per megawatt hour cost of Site C power.
Meanwhile BC Hydro is paying independent power producers $88 per megawatt to produce power domestically.

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

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

Thank you.

Proceeding Time 6:58 p.m. T23

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VAN UYTVEN (#0259):


Good afternoon and thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak at this inquiry for the Site
C Dam.

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

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

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

Present day levelized cost can be found in the U.S. Energy Information Administration for plants entering service in 2022. The lowest cost renewable options are wind and hydro. The overall lowest cost option is natural gas combined cycle. An important
factor often neglected that which should be considered is that wind or gas plants have a life of only about 25 years. Compare that to hydro, which has a life of at least 100 years.

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

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

Alberta wants to eliminate 5,000 megawatts
of coal-fired generation. Presently, it wants to do that with gas plants. But, as I noted before, Hydro can compete with natural gas, especially as Alberta plans to impose in 2019 a carbon tax of $30 per tonne of CO$_2$ emitted, which is bound to increase with the years.

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

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

The last important aspect I want to mention is about financial accountability. In addition to the $1.1 billion required to terminate contracts and
rehabilitate Site C, there is already an estimated $2.1 billion in sunk costs. That is a total of $3.2 billion wasted. What will be the effect of such a huge waste of money be on the provincial debt rating? Will it influence private investment in the province? Important questions for the Commission to consider.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, sir. Thank you.
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Good evening, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PUTT (#0260):

MR. PUTT: Thank you for the opportunity to participate.

My name is Ken Putt, P-U-T-T.

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

For example, while the costs of the proposed project are reasonably well-known, and the various risks have been assessed, the demand for the power is still probably uncertain. Edward Chancellor, in his excellent book called *Capital Returns*, has
noted that in all industries it's much easier to predict the supply than it is the predicted demand, and that's certainly the case for Site C.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Site C will benefit the people of British Columbia for a century or more, and provide legacy low-cost green power for economic development in the high-tech sector, creating not only critical jobs in
the future but stopping Site C would waste billions of
dollars with no economic benefit or future legacy
benefits, while any increasing -- while only
increasing future power costs to all British
Columbians and lessening our competitive advantage in
the future.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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Good evening, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MEREDITH (#0261):

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

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

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

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

Today I want to speak to question 4 in your
terms of reference from the Order in Council 244, and that's with regards to alternative energy and demand side management.

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

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

The comparable kinds of rates to the costs that you have in Table 2, the unadjusted rates in the Table 2 of the Executive Summary. Site C is noted there at $83 per megawatt hour. So just putting it in other terms, what we find in our projects when we do a net energy -- net zero energy project, that it's the less cost alternative, the least life cycle cost to homeowners. So when you add in that cost of energy, the retrofit measures in fact, their cost of operating
mortgage plus operating costs is the least cost alternative. So it's an idea whose time has come.

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

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

So maximize PowerSmart, I guess, like it was in the heydays, where we were getting equivalent power avoided -- power demand avoided at a fraction of the generated cost. So the traditional PowerSmart initiatives of education, perhaps financing, because a
lot of people, as was mentioned earlier, can't come up with the $10,000 to put something on the roof, but if it was financed appropriately, they get the net effect.

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

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Proceeding Time 7:13 p.m. T26

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VAN ENTER (#0262):


I wanted to thank you for this time and for the opportunity, and also wanted to acknowledge everyone who's taken the time to come and talk. I do respect your opinions and the statements that are made, and I hope you can grant me the same privilege.
One of the things that we're looking at here is whether to continue the project, whether to stop the project, or whether to delay the project. I'm an accountant in background, and I kind of like the idea of having something at the end of the day. We've all kind of experienced a situation where we've overpaid for something, a car or a piece of equipment or something in that sense, and at the end of the day we kind of say, well, you know, at least I've got this thing that I can still utilize. And maybe the life was only five years, and if I can squeeze an extra two years, there's at least the opportunity that I can get the value back.

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

I know that this project has got off to a rocky start, and we cannot compensate for past problems or past issues, or mistakes that have been made. I'm not here to talk about those, and I certainly don't question any of them. The fact of the matter is that right now we have a project that's in
process, that's going to cost us a bunch of money to stop, and we'll have nothing to show for it at the end of the day.

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

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

When we built the Hart Dam, when we built the Bennett Dam, at that point in time, I don't think we needed all the power that was generated by it. But
as a British Columbian today, it affords me the ability to pay some of the lowest electrical rates in North America. And that's a luxury that I hope I can pass on to some of my children.

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

The last ten years, if it's shown us anything, has shown us how much advancement has actually happened as a society. I, for one, prefer clean energy versus coal-fired energy, and on this project, Hydro has -- regardless of how they came to the decision, we've got the ability at least to have an asset at the end of the day. To have something that for the next hundred years, whether prices fall or climb, has the potential to provide British Columbians a return; a return on their investment. And as a British Columbia ratepayer, there's a chance that my money is going to get paid back at some point in time, on the investment.
There's been numerous statements made about the fact that Hydro is terribly bad at estimating projects and managing projects, and most of their projects have gone over, cost overruns. This particular project is utilizing different methodologies of constructing things, different way of managing a work force. It's one of the first major civil projects in British Columbia to utilize an open-managed site concept.

So from a labour perspective, I find it very hard to draw on past projects that were built on different models and different principles, and say that because they are over, this project is going get over. On all indications, the original report says it is on budget, and although there is a contingency fund, that contingency fund has grown. I hope that you look at these options, and I firmly recommend, and I hope that you recommend, that Site C continue.

Thank you very much for your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Proceeding Time 7:19 p.m. T27

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GORDON (#0263):

MR. GORDON: Good evening, my name is Charlie Gordon, G-O-R-D-O-N. I'm a settler here on the lands of Lekwungen and West Saanich peoples. As a master's student at UVic, during my research, I had the
opportunity to visit the Peace River Valley and witness the impacts of the Site C dam on the people, lands and waters on Treaty 8 Territory. I want to use these five minutes to speak to everyone in this room, and ask that we reflect upon what it means for the Site C project being built on treaty land.

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

To understand the impacts of the Site C project, I needed to visit the two existing dams already built on the Peace River, the W.A.C. Bennett dam, and the Peace Canyon dam. At both sites there are information signs acknowledging that these dams are located in Treaty 8 territory. In their description of Treaty 8, the signs state, "Treaty 8 expresses the solemn promises made between two peoples. It calls on us all to protect First Nations traditional ways of life, and to work together on land use planning."

The history of these previous dams and the experiences and stories of indigenous Treaty 8 members, the Dene Za, the Tske Dene, the Cree and
Métis, make it clear that all three of these dams represent the colonial government breaking its solemn promise with indigenous peoples. On a scale that is hard to imagine, unless you have seen these dams and reservoirs with your own eyes, the W.A.C. Bennett and Peace Canyon dams flooded vast amounts of lands and rivers, displacing and dislocating communities, severing indigenous peoples connections to each other, and destroying the plants, animals, medicines and burial sites sacred to them. All of this was done without any consultation, nor consent. And in the case of the W.A.C. Bennett dam, barely even any notification to indigenous communities of the impending flood. Adding insult to injury, flooding causes a buildup of methylmercury, poisoning the waters, making the fish, their last traditional food sources toxic to eat.

What happened to the solemn promises to protect indigenous traditional ways of life? To work together on land use planning? In interviews with the Dene Za members of Treaty 8, the word "genocide" came up repeatedly. Since European contact, Treaty 8 members have faced sustained efforts of assimilation, beginning with the extermination of the Buffalo, their main food source, the destruction of their ancestral lands, and their ability to maintain their sacred
connection to it, and the poisoning of their remaining ecosystems, their medicines, and their foods. And this legacy of genocide is continuing with the building of the Site C dam.

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

We are all treaty people. We all inherit the solemn promises made between indigenous peoples and the crown. It is what this country is founded upon. Canada could not exist without its treaties. We are one of the only countries that has aboriginal and treaty rights enshrined in our constitution, but this seems more and more symbolic since the government can decide that infringement of aboriginal and treaty rights are justified when done for the good of the
Infringement of treaty rights were never considered in any of the decisions regarding the approval of Site C. Seemingly it has always been assumed that Site C is in the best interest of B.C. and Canadians. I am sure that there are plenty of other speakers, and we have heard from many who will speak to the loss of agricultural lands and the implications for B.C.'s food security, the destruction of rare and sensitive ecosystems, the climate implications from reservoirs, methane emissions, the negative impacts of industrial projects on local communities, especially indigenous women. The inaccurate power demand forecasts, the myriad of options to generate renewable energy without all these negative consequences. The list of reasons to stop this project are numerous.

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

THE CHAIRPERSON:   Good evening, ma'am.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ROY (#0264):

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

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

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

Anyhow, one of the persons that I want to
quote is Robert McCullough, he's an international expert in energy and he said there is no need for this project. Even if there was, we'd have cheaper alternatives that are more agile, easier to site and easier to finalize, and less expensive.

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

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

Another reason that has not been mentioned up to now is that the Site C dam is going to be located in the Monterey Shale area, in proximity of that, and there is extensive fracking happening right now, and injection into wells of toxic wastewater which have been proved to cause earthquakes. And now
an independent tribunal report just said that in the example of the Peace Canyon dam, that it is endangered by the fracking that's going on in that area, and so is the Site C dam going to be endangered. So none of those factors have been taken into account. There's been no precautionary measures. If this dam should be built, there's been no precautionary provisions built in to prevent this from happening. So those risks have not been properly assessed and considered when the Site C dam project went ahead.

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

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

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

MS. ROY: Anyway, in conclusions it's no. There are other alternatives and wind, solar, geothermal, tides and those are dispatchable, which is a new word in the industry, which means that they've said, oh, well,
solar is not reliable because when it's dark, that's when the peak demand is, and we can't access it. And that is becoming a lie because now with the new batteries and the innovation that's happening all the time, there is way more storage possible now. And I'm sure that's even going to increase in the near future.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

Proceeding Time 7:30 p.m. T29

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HOLLOWAY (#0265):

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

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

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

The second item I think I want to mention, just things that matter to me, is I look ahead to this question of the flooding of farmland and I think today we live in a world which is crazy. All over the world foodstuffs are somehow grown under some environmental and social conditions, I have no idea what those are. And they arrive on our grocery market shelves and they're so cheap. But I think that's a crazy world. I don't think that world is going to last. And there will be a time I really feel when if we have flooded B.C.'s best farmland – according to BC Hydro's own assessment of that land – for a project such as this, we can in some day in the future hardly imagine what was on our minds as we destroyed our own potential to grow vegetables.
And I think that the third and last thing that I wanted to mention is just when I sometime hear the comment that, well, but hydroelectricity is green electricity. What -- and many comments could be made, but the one that leaps to my mind is that if this particular project is built largely with the purpose of providing subsidized -- taxpayer, ratepayer subsidized electricity for fracking and LNG, well, that's -- you know, you look and the bigger picture and that's by no means a green energy component. So, again, I just want to say I think it's appropriate and I'm glad that you have this opportunity to hear these other things that really weigh upon us. And how in the world you're going to fold that into your final report? I don't know. I can't imagine sitting in your seats. But thank you for giving me this opportunity.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Proceeding Time 7:34 p.m. T30

Good evening, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MARTIN (#0266):

MR. MARTIN: Hello. My name is Tom Martin, M-A-R-T-I-N. And I want to thank the members of the Commission for this opportunity to say a few words about Site C. Have I got this at the right level?

THE CHAIRPERSON: So, are you comfortable there? Okay.
MR. MARTIN: I also want to acknowledge the land that we are standing on is unceded land of the Songhees and Esquimalt Nations. And I also want to remember the old-growth forests that used to be right here.

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

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

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

And the local Maori tribe talk about their relationship with that river in very intimate terms.
They say, "I am the river, and the river is me. I am the river, and the river is me." Those of us, like me, brought up in Western culture, I believe if we could even just begin to understand that kind of a relationship with a river, then you and I wouldn't be standing here discussing the Peace River valley tonight.

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

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

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

Then the remaining part of the budget for the project could be spent on the Taylor Bridge and on developing alternative energy when needed, geothermal, solar, wind, hydro pumps, and of course providing stability for the Peace River valley by supporting
long-term agriculture and horticulture, together with traditional indigenous lifestyles.

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

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Go ahead.

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

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank you.

Proceeding Time 7:40 p.m. T31

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MOSS (#0267):

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

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

I just wanted to say that to go up there
and to see the beauty of this wonderful valley just absolutely captivated me.

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

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

Now we have our song.

It's got no name.

It's just Site C.

It's far away where can't see.

But it will be a calamity.

Who needs that blasted Site C dam.

Fields of wheat no longer there,

Sacred lands will disappear,

Water, water, everywhere.
But Christy, they didn't give a damn.
What is all that water for?
Hydro doesn't need any more.
But fracking does, that's what it's for.
It was part of Christy's power plan.
It's not too late to save the site.
We promise we won't cease to fight.
Because we know that we are right.
We'll stop them building Site C dam.
We will!

Thank you.
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THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you ma'am. Ma'am --
MS. THORBURN: My name is Fran Thoburn and I'm supposed
to speak a lot lighter than this.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Are you part of the --
MS. THORBURN: Yes, I am.
THE CHAIRPERSON: She's part of your presentation?
MS. MOSS: Yes.
MS. THOBURN: Yes, I am.
MS. MOSS: Do you want me stand with her?
THE CHAIRPERSON: No, no, it's fine.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. THORBURN (#0268):
MS. THOBURN: They know my name. They know me.
I'm sure that I'm going to say has been
said many, many times and far better than I, but I
want you to know that I am speaking for our children, grandchildren, great grandchildren and all the babies that are barely a spark in our imaginations.

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

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

In the North indigenous peoples are greatly affected. There will be irreversible damage by flooding and their lands, wiping out their meadows and forests and wildlife, hunting, sacred lands, and graves will be under water. We Raging Grannies urge the government as well as those who may monetarily profit from the building of this dam, we vehemently urge you to reconsider and halt the building of Site C dam. The strongest threat we Raging Grannies can muster to force a halt to dam Site C is this: We
shall continue to speak our minds by singing off-key, outrageous lyrics that speak the uncomfortable truths.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Ma'am? Ma'am?

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

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

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

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

MS. JOHNSTONE: Hello.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Could you --

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

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

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

Well, someone from Saltspring can talk about agriculture because -- this is from a prologue
to a pamphlet put out by our farmers institute.
"Saltspring Island will always be remembered as
absolutely the first agricultural settlement in the
then-colony of Vancouver Island."

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

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

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

We've been responding to the important
needs of agriculture. Through our agricultural
alliance we've raised over $750,000 to have our own
abattoir. Because at one point the government thought all of the animals should be taken off-island to a big abattoir up near Nanaimo.

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

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

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

We're not going to thrive on LNG and -- you know, we need the food more. Oh, five minutes. Besides, I can look at --
'It's more important that we have food than LNG, and electricity, and electric cars. And those can all get changed too. But food, good food, is very important.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

Proceeding Time 8:02 p.m. T34

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. FIELD (#0270):

MS. FIELD: Hello, my name is Dorothy Field, F-I-E-L-D.
I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak and I'd like to acknowledge with real heart that we are unceded Lekwungen land.

I wrote all this stuff and I'm not going to read any of that because it's all been said. Farmland, First Nations, et cetera, et cetera.

Okay, but I started thinking about twenty-five years ago when I spent five years fighting the Bamberton project on the Saanich Inlet, which some of you may remember. We talked about full-cost accounting.

Full-cost accounting means that if you're going to ruin the air, it doesn't really matter what else you're going to do. And so I guess what I would like to say is I do have great hopes for this review, if it is done honestly and with the deep interests of British Columbia at its core it will determine what
we've known for a long, that we don't need Site C and that the many losses that it will incur are not warranted.

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

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

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

Big dams are fossil thinking. LNG is fossil thinking. Ignoring climate change is real problem. Continuing with fossil thinking will be phenomenally costly financially. I urge you, because I know your mandate is to think about the economics, to think in terms of full cost accounting and to think in terms of all of us as people here in British
THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAMERON (#0271):

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

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

MR. CAMERON: Sorry.

THE CHAIRPERSON: It's okay. Thank you.

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

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

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

The population of B.C. will double. All
cars, trucks, buses, and trains will be electric. Airplanes will be electric. I just found this out today. It was in the news, Zunum Aero of Seattle announced that in five years they will have an electric commuter airplane. A little trivia there.

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

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

We are here to decide how we generate all these power requirements. Green power, hydro, solar, wind, geothermal, biomass, pump storage, run-of-river, to name the most likely. Of the above, solar farms and wind farms appear to be the wave of the future. Over the last 25 years huge installations have been installed in countries that do not have the luxury of hydro power potential. So we have loads of data about
their intermittent nature and subsequent efficiencies. From that data I found two reasons that I choose hydro power.

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

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

So for each of the above three power sources we take out a 30 year loan and at the end of that time they're all paid for. But the wind farm has been beaten to death by vibrations and abuse of the wind over the years and it has to be replaced. The propellers, which are made of layers of fiberglass
The turbines and transmission wear out. The solar panels have degraded in efficiency over that time, 30 years, and have to be replaced.

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

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

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir. Thank you, sir.
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Please don't heckle the speakers, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAJARI (#0272):

MR. NAJARI: Mehdi Najari, Mehdi with M and Najari is N–A–J–A–R–I. I am just a citizen here in Victoria, a ratepayer. The fundamental problem with the issue --
is the issue of the trust of BC Hydro. BC Hydro since 1980 overestimated the power needs of the province. You can overestimate once or twice, but you cannot consistently overestimate and not lying. Not manipulating the public with misinformation. And that is what BC Hydro has done.

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

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

And then what is the cost of borrowing money for the whole project? Why don't you put the
real number in front of us? We are the ones that are paying for it. Why are we being lied to? You know why? Let me read you executive profile, role profile, for B.C. Public Service. This is what they want, B.C. government want in executive.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Gordon Campbell come to power, change the leadership of BC Rail, in three years put them in
debt. And gave it away. And that is going to happen. They did it to Greece, they did it to Spain. They are going to do it to BC Hydro, put a huge debt on BC Hydro and then sell it in a fire sale.

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

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Sir, can you please --

MR. NAJARI: I am asking you --

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

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

I am -- this is -- this is really amazing. Are you going to stop this corruption, sir? Are you going to uphold the public right to know what is the
cost or increased rate in Hydro that we have to pay if this boondoggle continues? You don't know. How can it be? You guys go and support this project, without the owner. Without the taxpayers. To know what are they going to increase rate is going to pay?

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARNEY (#0273):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

One of the reasons that the power from Site C dam was spoken about was because of Petronas, and because of the mines. Well, Petronas have pulled out, so they don't need it. The Imperial Metals at Mt.
Polley Mine are still being used, and the Red Chris dam is still using hydro, so what do we need extra for? We don't. We can get that extra.

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

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

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BALDINI (#0274):

MR. BALDINI: Good evening, panel. Thank you for holding his hearing. My name is Maurizio Baldini, B-A-L-D-I-N-I. I lived in B.C. for the last 60 years, beautiful British Columbia, like to see it remain beautiful and
I think we can take some hints from a dam being built right now in Labrador, the Muskrat Falls dam, should serve as a warning for B.C. Site C. Says a former head of Newfoundland and Labrador's public utilities regulator, David Vardy. He's a former economics professor, and a retired civil servant in that province. Their Muskrat Falls project has now more than doubled in cost. It's not yet finished, it is over $11 billion already for a small province like Newfoundland and Labrador. He says also that the rate of technological advances will make the project obsolete before long.

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

The Telus company, showing a show home in British Columbia now that uses a lot less electricity. The Tesla Corporation that makes electric cars and solar panels has just announced a new shingle for roofs, solar shingles. These can replace asphalt
shingles when the asphalt shingles have to be replaced every 15 years or so. These are more efficient, slimmer in design than the old solar panels. Eventually these can be replaced on homes.

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

BC Hydro is predicting to take 70 years to finance this project and pay it off. It's going to be our grandchildren and great grandchildren indebted with all this debt. It is now pegged at 8.8 billion, it is already 610 billion overrun. Muskrat Falls is
11.4 billion, double predicted cost. Another dam being built in Manitoba now the Keeyask dam, 34 percent over budget. It's not finished. The reason both of those are over cost -- one of the reasons is the ground problem, building on soft ground. That has been identified in Site C as being a real problem, as some of the other speakers have noted. So, we can expect to see similar, if not worse overruns in Site C.

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

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

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORNBURGH (#0275):

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

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

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

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

And from Article 8:

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

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

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

If completed, we'll need to factor in the
cost of the huge injuries to the truth and reconciliation process. The cost of the trust loss by indigenous peoples not only in the Peace and Treaty 8 territories, but elsewhere in Canada who see this as a precedent.

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

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

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GREENLEES (#0276):

MS. GREENLEES: Hello. My name is Cory Greenlees, G-R-E-
E-N-L-E-E-S. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am speaking for my family and as a community member.

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

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

The Site C dam was first proposed in the 1950s. Projects like it are based on outdated ideas about energy development. Newer technologies like
wind and solar are becoming cheaper and more effective every year. These alternatives also create jobs, can be built as needed, and have a lower overall environmental impact.

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

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

MR. McGUIRE: Hello.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Hello, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McGUIRE (#0277):

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

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

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

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

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

Recent figures show that at 99 cents per watt, these turbines currently supply the lowest cost
per kilowatt of electric power with expected further reductions in costs. In fact, last month, in
Scotland, which has a slightly larger population than B.C., produced -- well, 1108 gigawatts from wind
turbines alone which, when annualized, amounts to over 13,300 gigawatt hours, more than BC Hydro's projected
5100 gigawatt hours from Site C.

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

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

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

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

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

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

   Also the ten kilowatt solar panel array
Allwest Reporting Ltd.

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

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

Thank you very much.

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

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

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

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ENNS (#0278):


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

This is an issue that is really important to me. I'm here to speak for my son. He's seven years old. Well, he will be at the end of the month.
I'm not going to go over all the things that have been said before, but I want to leave you some images. The rear-view mirror of my son, when I first started driving an electric car. That was a moment of integrity that I appreciated and will keep. I drive an electric car, and an electric motorcycle. They're fun. One of the things we know about electric vehicles is that they actually have low centres of gravity, and a lot of torque. The windy roads are fun. The most important thing to me is that I am now working toward my son's future.

I don't want my son to have a big debt from a big mega-project. Not when we can use renewable energy to put solar panels on the roof of houses, and on public buildings. What about building domes? In parks, and other places. Where we could have solar panels and wind. And a distributed electrical system can have the effect of building community, because there's a structure where people can meet under, no matter what the weather. But the lights are always going to be on in an emergency. They can be situated so that they can be there for times of crisis. They can be easily erected quickly. This is something -- the technology that we have today, we don't need Site C, given the current nature of technology, and that's just going to get better.
The financing of this big project, I don't want that to be on my son. And who knows what the rates are going to be when it gets refinanced in 30, 40 years? It's not viable. Not when we can have a system that grows and is infinitely scalable to the demand -- the real demand, in the moment. Because we can build lots of solar panels on roofs, the solar shingles, wind turbines that don't make that same noise, don't have the same vibrational problems. All that technology is coming, and it actually is here.

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

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

This is important for my son to have a future that is free from those things, and is -- I drive an EV, I want lots more people doing it. I have a friend who drives all around for free, because he sells a lot of excess power to BC Hydro already, just
from his roof. And he drives around in his EV. I would do that myself, but right now I'm renting. But as soon as I'm not, I'm putting up solar panels. Because the cost in the long run is already as good as what I can get from BC Hydro.

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

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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We are just going to take a few minutes break here, we'll be back. Thank you.

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

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

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

And is Mr. Warren here? Mr. Warren? Okay. Mr. Henderson?
MR. HENDERSON: Hi there, thanks for accommodating me, I
didn’t realize about the 20 minute cut off.

THE CHAIRPERSON: It's okay, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HENDERSON (#0279):

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

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

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

The first is, and I'm sure you know it all, Hydro will submit hundreds and hundreds of pages of
material. Hydro will overestimate demand and will underestimate the role of conservation and demand management.

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

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

Second, a smart grid transmission system, again using digital technology as is already in place in the EU, the U.S. and China, and which will reduce transmission losses, take advantage of First Nations and distributed renewable projects, and serve electric vehicles.
Third, a policy of direct price signals to influence consumer behavior, which Hydro successfully researched and piloted over 10 years ago on Vancouver Island.

And finally, success in the future won't come from a monolithic, unsupervised, hermetically sealed and politically directed monopoly system. Therefore, I urge you to recommend that the province adopt an electricity supply system which is open to new ideas from many sources, supervised by an expert and independent utilities commission, and which can be nimble and motivated to achieve the province's economic social and environmental objectives.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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Good evening, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SPALTEHOLZ (#0280):

MR. SPALTEHOLZ: Hi, my name is Leo Spalteholz, S-P-A-L-T-E-H-O-L-Z.

I want to address the recurring theme that we don't need the power. We may not need the power right now, but that's because we're doing incredibly short-sited things, like running our vehicles using gas and diesel. It's because we're heating our homes with oil and natural gas. And it's because we are
doing things like walking around with portable two-stroke engines our back just to blow from leaves from area to another area.

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

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

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

Even if we are incredibly unimaginative and slow moving, and we can't figure out how to electrify our economy in our homes, Alberta uses coal to generate 40 percent of their electricity right now,
and they are desperate to get rid of that, and Canada as a whole is phasing out coal power. So worst case, we can sell to them.

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

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

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

Thank you, that's all I have.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. STRANG (#0281):

MS. STRANG: I am grateful to speak in Songhees' and Esquimalt's territory and with the understanding that cost is more than just a financial accounting. I'm Hilary Strang, S-T-R-A-N-G. I'm from the Saanich
Inlet Network, a community-based organization tasked with protecting the Saanich Inlet from industrialization, specifically from the LNG industry.

The inlet is at the extreme end of the province from Treaty 8 territory, yet is environmentally connected. For example, both are what Naomi Klein refers to as "sacrificial zones."

Gluttonous capitals of global markets throw these comments on the table, then gobble them up and claim the narrative "This is for the common good."

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

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

Thank you.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.
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THE CHAIRPERSON: Is there an Anne Hansen here, please? A Donald Scott?

MR. SCOTT: Is this mike --

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

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SCOTT (#0282):

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

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

That essentially is, by reducing demand permanently, by replacing old technology with newer, more efficient technology, you create supply. It's the equivalent of adding new supply when you
permanently eliminate inefficient demand. And the example I'm using for this is baseboard heaters. About 44 percent of B.C. homes, single-family homes in B.C., use baseboard heaters. And if we replace those baseboard heaters with a high-efficiency heat pump like I've installed in our home, and my home study is included as Chapter 8 in my submission that I submitted to you earlier, we would save more electricity than Site C will generate.

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

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

The Site C is going to generate a proposed 5100 gigawatt hours electricity a year. By converting those homes that use baseboard heaters and electric furnaces to high-efficiency heat pumps, and not a standard pump, a high-efficiency heat pump, you would save 35 -- or 5500 gigawatt hours a year in B.C., and that's just single family homes and duplexes. Add
apartments, condos, townhouses, you could take that probably up to 7,000 gigawatt hours or more.

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

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

If you take the advantage for the CO₂ emissions, our home, we were previously heated with oil. We have reduced our carbon emissions in our home by 90 percent. This isn't rocket science, folks, it's
quite easy to do. And we just have to have the


courage and the foresight to be able to push it and do it and create new supply by creating smart use of electricity.

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

And California has now adopted -- I just got back this afternoon, it's one of the reasons I didn't get my name in earlier, because I just got back from the U.S. this afternoon -- is that they have now mandated new homes are to be net zero homes. There is no reason whatsoever that we in B.C. can't be doing that. There are several net zero homes here in Victoria. My home is a 1967 home. It's only got 2 by 4 walls in it, it's not terribly efficiently constructed. But what we've done in it, in that home, has been able to reduce our energy consumption dramatically, and our carbon emissions phenomenally.
And if more people did the same thing, we would kill many birds with one stone.

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

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

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Sir, would you like to make a presentation.

MR. TROTTER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: You're welcome.

MR. TROTTER: I appreciate that.

THE CHAIRPERSON: No problem.
MR. TROTTER: I sat through the whole night.

THE CHAIRPERSON: I appreciate it.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. TROTTER (#0283):

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

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

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

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

I'm concerned about the flooding of rich farmland. Look at how much farmland has been lost in the last 20 years to real estate development and industrial use. Look at the Lower Mainland. I mean, it's hell leaving the ferry and getting on that
highway and heading into Vancouver nowadays. It is just hell, when you remember what the farmland was like before. And this is land that could be flooded by climate change.

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

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

Thanks.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

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

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. EVANS (#0284):


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

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, ma'am.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. M. HADLAND (#0285):

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

I was born and raised in the Peace River valley, and Site C has been a dark cloud that has hung over the valley before I was even born. When I
started becoming aware of what was going on in the world, I remember watching TV reports of wars in the Middle East, and my family reassured me that we were safe, that we lived in a very safe place. But, at the same time, we were under warning that the first dam could possibly break with the sinkholes that had happened, and I just could not justify or understand how this could be happening. My friends lived in the Taylor Flats, and they were under -- there was a warning that at any moment that they had to be evacuated up to my school. It was an unstable climate to grow up in.

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

And so this project is projected to be put in place when a dam that is supposed to be 100 years, is already past its 50 year mark, so what is -- I guess I am proposing or asking what is going to be the length of this 9 plus billion dollar dam, and how can we put a price on the valley, is another question that has been brought about. But thinking long term, I feel like this dam -- back when the first dam was put
in, 100 years seemed like a lot. I have relatives that are 99 and 97. I think we need to think longer term. The potential of the valley that has been untapped because of the reservoir, how much financial could that bring about?

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

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DELA ROSA (#0286):

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

And I feel like it's very important for us as humans, as stewards of the earth, as creatures aiming to become masters of our resources and our environment, that it's important that we take into mind the death, decay and decomposition when we are creating new projects so that we don't end up with issues like Fukushima, where lack of foresight and just taking into account the inevitable decay of things into the long-term future, that these are the kinds of things that we need to start thinking about when we're planning. It's not just about obsessing on the creation of this new project and what it might spurn economically, but long-term consequences for future generations.
But both socially as well, as we are in this time with reconciliation with First Nations people, and that we are being -- that the world is watching, and that with social media now, that this is a global conversation and that any foul made against First Nations people will be noted and we will be accountable to the global public for that. And I feel like the rest of British Columbia citizens, it's very important that we behave respectfully and humanely and with accountability and respect.

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

And that's all. Thank you.

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


THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

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

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

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

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

I just wanted to say, as a cautionary tale, that BC Hydro has not always been honest with us. My father was sulfurous that night at dinner about the evidence he'd received.
So I know that you people are considering a whole lot of very broad issues. I wish you great luck in what is a very complicated decision process, but I just wanted to add that little bit in.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NELSON (#0288):

MS. NELSON: Thank you. I hadn't come here planning on talking, but I just wanted to say a couple of things.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Could you state your name?

MS. NELSON: Oh, sorry. It's Monica Nelson, N-E-L-S-O-N.

I grew up in the North Peace area. I've lived in Victoria for 25 years plus, and when I go home I hear both sides. I hear that people say "We need the dam. Shut up, you don't know what you're talking about" down here, and then I also hear the other side.

Something that I don't think has been brought up and I might've missed it before I came in, is that I'm aware that the original dam, the W.A.C. Bennett Dam needs repairs. It is -- and it has needed it for some time. And things have been put on hold because the big push, the political push has been for Site C.

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

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

And you would have people who are just in it for the money and they don't give a fig because they don’t want to be up there and they don’t like the north, but they make the money and they leave. But you also hear about people -- in terms of businessmen that I sat beside who told me about a worker who came to him who left the dam because he didn’t like what he
was seeing being done. And so he was coming to this company, which is not connected to the dam, but in the same trade. And as a tradesman he had been told that if he wanted to work there -- now this is a smaller trade, but if he wanted to work there he had to have a Fort St. John address before they would hire him. So he had to get a Fort St. John address. He did, he was hired, and he worked there for a while.

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

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

When that bridge was built nobody listened to the local people and they said, "Oh, no," you know, "this is a great engineering feat." All the
international papers had this beautiful looking bridge. Well, the bridge -- I can't remember how long it lasted, six months or something. No one was killed, but it caved in on one side because of the same type of soil conditions that are there where they want to put Site C. Not where the other two dams are, but where the Site C Dam area is.

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

Looking up tufa seeps. T-U-F-A; seeps, S-E-E-P-E-S. It's a very unusual and rare thing and it's something that will be destroyed with what's going to happen here. And I can tell you about Williston Lake, which was supposed to be -- which was from the previous, the first dam, which was supposed to be this great thing for tourism and fishing. Well, guess what? They cut down the trees but they didn't pull up the stumps. They were not allowed to fish on there because it was not safe to go out on a boat because periodically over the years the water pressure and everything, up comes the stump. It's dangerous, they couldn't use it.
And you can go on about mercury, you can go on about, you know, all the rest of it, right? You already heard it, you know it. But from someone who has grown up there and lived there, I know both sides of the story, that the bottom line is this is a really disgusting, stupid, strictly political thing that's been put forward.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUPPER (#0158):

MS. TUPPER: Yvonne Tupper, T-U-P-P-E-R. Treaty 8 member, and this is my third time speaking to the B.C. Commission panel within the last few weeks, and thank you again for doing this. When we were at the Rocky Mountain Fort, that was the one thing that we asked and demanded, that this project would go through this process. So, we're really grateful, and hands up.

I'd like to say, and I'll keep it short, that I am in support of everyone that spoke up opposing this dam across this beautiful province of British Columbia, who took the time and came to you with courage and words and evidence -- orally, writtenly [sic] -- and video and dance that I just saw tonight. But that means a lot, and I really hope that you take all of these kind people's words into
consideration, that we wouldn't be here if this project made sense. Right at the beginning, we would not be opposed to this project. It doesn't make sense.

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

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

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

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

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