BRITISH COLUMBIA UTILITIES COMMISSION

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

And

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

VANCOUVER, B.C.
September 23rd, 2017

COMMUNITY INPUT PROCEEDINGS
VANCOUVER

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

VOLUME 1
## INDEX

**SEPTEMBER 23rd, 2017 — Volume 1**  
**Vancouver Community Input Proceedings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOTTERELL (#0001)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RUSKIN (#0002)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCULLOUGH (#0003)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FINN (#0004)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HUSBAND (#0005)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCARTHY (#0006)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRYENTON (#0007)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GARDNER (#0008)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HOLM (#0009)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEEVES (#0010)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRANDISON (#0011)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GIBSON (#0012)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WONG (#0013)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SPEAKMAN (#0014)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CHAPMAN (#0015)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HAMBERGER (#0016)</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. AUGUST (#0017)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. PEACOCK (#0018)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0019)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GILLING (#0020)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MILNE (#0021)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MARTZ-OBERLANDER (#0022)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SMITH (#0023)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BLACK (#0024)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. VANDYK (#0025)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. PLASHKES (#0026)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. DAVIDSON (#0027)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. HEWETT (#0028)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WADDINGTON (#0029)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. GRANT (#0030)</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. O’KEEFE (#0031)</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. ARMSTRONG (#0032)</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. ANDREWS (#0033)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. BAK (#0034)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. KULL (#0035)</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. PHILLIP (#0036)</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. PHILLIP (#0037)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. CHISSON (#0038)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. WATKINS (#0039)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. KROECHER (#0040)</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. TUFTS (#0041)</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. MICHELL (#0042)</td>
<td>143, 174, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. BELL (#0043)</td>
<td>148, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. MR. INSELBERG (#0044)</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. DODDS (#0045)</td>
<td>155, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. BLAKE (#0046)</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. BRUMELL (#0047)</td>
<td>158, 167, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. POCHAY (#0048)</td>
<td>160, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KENNEY (#0049)</td>
<td>163, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WESTIE (#0050)</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HALL (#0051)</td>
<td>171, 186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEPTEMBER 25th, 2017 — Volume 3**

**Kelowna Community Input Proceedings**

<p>| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PAYNTER (#0052) | 194     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VULCANO (#0053) | 197     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MARSHALL (#0054) | 201     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAWLEY (#0055)  | 205     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PETER KERR (#0056) | 208     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEVENSON (#0057) | 213     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MICHAEL KERR (#0058) | 215     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NEDELEC (#0059)  | 218     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LEINEMANN (#0060) | 222     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KMET (#0061)     | 223     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LEERING (#0062)  | 227     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MANNING (#0063)  | 231     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MICKALUK (#0064) | 235     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NEAVE (#0065)    | 238     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DAVENPORT (#0066) | 241     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MS. COOK (#0067)     | 242     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. OSTERMANN (#0068) | 246     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LUCAS (#0069)    | 248     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GORDON SMITH (#0070) | 251     |
| SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JOHNSTON (#0071) | 255     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. OOSTENVRINK (#0072)</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAKA (#0073)</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THIESSEN (#0074)</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JAMES (#0075)</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BUCKNA (#0076)</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STUPKA (#0077)</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KERGAN (#0078)</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SHAH (#0079)</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SHEPHARD (#0080)</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER 26th, 2017 – Volume 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Community Input Proceedings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SCARLETT (#0081)</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BRAMSON (#0082)</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CARVER (#0083)</td>
<td>296, 343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LOGTENBERG (#0084)</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CHARLESWORTH (#0085)</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WILEY (#0086)</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MacKAY (#0087)</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARTLINE (#0088)</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LAMB-YORSKI (#0089)</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MILLER (#0090)</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. OCKENDEN (#0091)</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CRAIG (#0092)</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BROUGHTON (#0093)</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DONALD (#0094)</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DeKRUIF (#0095)</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SWITZER (#0096)</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GRAOVAC (#0097)</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RICHER (#0098)</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. THOMPSON (#0099)</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER 29th, 2017 – Volume 5A</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince George First Nations Input Proceedings (afternoon)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY CHIEF WILLSON (#0100)</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY CHIEF TSAKOZA (#0101)</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GAILUS (#0102)</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY COUNCILLOR SOLANAS (#0103)</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0104)</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER 29th, 2017 – Volume 5B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince George Community Input Proceedings (evening)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DAVIS (#0105)</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NOWAK (#0106)</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GIESBRECHT (#0107)</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WAGNER (#0108)</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BACHMEIER (#0109)</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LUNDQUIST (#0110)</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS MR. WILLIAMS (#0111)</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CONNOLLY (#0112)</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. EWART (#0113)</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WERNER (#0114)</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CROWLEY (#0115)</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. EGAN (#0116)</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BAUMAN (#0117)</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR. ALLEN (#0118)</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. GREGG (#0119)</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. MUTUAL (#0120)</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. POWLOWSKA–MAINVILLE (#0121)</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. LEE (#0122)</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. HAVENS (#0123)</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. JOHANSSON (#0124)</td>
<td>523, 565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. POWER (#0125)</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. METZGER (#0126)</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. OKADA (#0127)</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. LONDON (#0128)</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. RHYMER (#0129)</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. ARMITAGE (#0130)</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. SYKES (#0131)</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. WILSON (#0132)</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. ARDILL (#0133)</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. BEAM (#0134)</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. LINDSAY (#0135)</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. SUMMER (#0136)</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. RHYMER (#0137)</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. SYKES (#0138)</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WEDER (#0139)</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. BOON (#0140)</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS. WEDER (#0141)</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KELLY (#0142) ................. 562

OCTOBER 1, 2017 - Volume 7

Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOON (#0140) ................. 575
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LITTLE (#0143) ............... 580
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. A. HADLAND (#0144) ........... 586
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. T. HADLAND (#0145) ........... 590
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NEUFELD (#0146) ............... 593
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DARNALL (#0147) ............... 597
SUBMISSIONS BY BY MR. MEIERS (#0148) ............. 602
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KOTTMANN (#0149) ............. 603
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FEDDERLY (#0150) .............. 605
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. OUELLETTE (#0151) ............. 610
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ASHDOWN (#0152) .............. 613
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FOREST (#0153) ................. 614
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ROBE (#0154) .................. 618
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. R. HADLAND (#0155) ............ 620
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. McDONALD (#0156) ............. 624
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CULLING (#0157) ............... 628
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUPPER (#0158) ................. 630

OCTOBER 2, 2017 - Volume 8

Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BOON (#0159) .................. 641
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. R. HADLAND (#0155) ............ 643
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GOODINGS (#0160) .............. 646
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MORISON (#0161) ............... 651, 713
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CULLING (#0162)</td>
<td>654,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KOECHL (#0163)</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MEIERS (#0148)</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GUNVILLE (#0164)</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PASTOOR (#0165)</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HOUGHTON (#0166)</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ACKERMAN (#0167)</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JARVIS (#0168)</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORLAKSON (#0169)</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MOTT (#0170)</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. A. HADLAND (#0144)</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAPOLEON (#0171)</td>
<td>687,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOUFFIOUX (#0172)</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SULLIVAN (#0173)</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LONDON (#0128)</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LITTLE (#0143)</td>
<td>702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BEHNAM (#0174)</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCTOBER 5, 2017 – Volume 9

Vancouver Community Input Proceedings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRYENTON (#0007)</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAVIN (#0175)</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RUSKIN (#0002)</td>
<td>726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CAMPBELL (#0176)</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HUNTLEY (#0177)</td>
<td>733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEEVES (#0010)</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WELLS (#0178)</td>
<td>740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FOY (#0179)</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. FITZPATRICK (#0180)</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0181)</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CASSELLS (#0182)</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JACKSON (#0183)</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GILDERSLEEVE (#0184)</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PEPPER-SMITH (#0185)</td>
<td>767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KEEGAN-HENRY (#0186)</td>
<td>772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHANSSON (#0124)</td>
<td>775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WILLIS (#0187)</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BASS (#0188)</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. RATCLIFFE (#0189)</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MATTICE (#0190)</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEVES (#0191)</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LAMOUREUX (#0192)</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GUNG (#0193)</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SPROULE (#0194)</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. McINTOSH (#0195)</td>
<td>803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRAHAM (#0196)</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THOMAS (#0197)</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TSANG (#0198)</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARRISON (#0199)</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WESTERMAN (#0200)</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FINN (#0004)</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MARTZ-OBERLANDER (#0201)</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BROWN (#0202)</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. J. NAPOLEON (#0203)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. KER (#0204)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. BURGEL (#0205)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MS. JONES (#0206)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. DESROCHERS (#0207)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MS. PERRIN (#0208)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MS. MASSIE (#0209)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCTOBER 6, 2017 – Volume 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver First Nations Input Proceedings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>CHIEF EDWARDS AND COUNCILLOR THEVARGE (#0210 &amp; #0211)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. CORMAN (#0212)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>CHIEF ENEVOLDSEN (#0213)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MS. McDONALD (#0156)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>894</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCTOBER 10, 2017 – Volume 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo Community Input Proceedings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. LOUHIMO (#0214)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. AIKMAN (#0215)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. STEBING (#0216)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>BY MR. HATFIELD (#0217)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MS. DESPREZ (#0218)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. PAUL MANLY (#0219)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. GARTSHORE (#0220)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. RALPHS (#0221)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS BY</th>
<th>MR. JIM MANLY (#0222)</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEX</td>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY BY MS. MANLY (#0223)</td>
<td>944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PURDEY (#0224)</td>
<td>946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORBURN (#0225)</td>
<td>949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LEE (#0226)</td>
<td>952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SISSON (#0227)</td>
<td>954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ANDERSON (#0228)</td>
<td>959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. OAKLEY (#0229)</td>
<td>962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CHATWIN (#0230)</td>
<td>964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ANDERSEN (#0231)</td>
<td>968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LIEM (#0232)</td>
<td>972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRICE (#0233)</td>
<td>975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NEADS (#0234)</td>
<td>976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NICKASON (#0235)</td>
<td>981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WHITTAKER (#0236)</td>
<td>987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LeBLANC (#0237)</td>
<td>990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GRAY (#0238)</td>
<td>993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WYTON (#0239)</td>
<td>997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COOPER (#0240)</td>
<td>999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COSTE (#0241)</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARRIS (#0242)</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STIFF (#0243)</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BERRY (#0244)</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. REINHART (#0245)</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SHILLITO (#0246)</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DUMOULIN (#0247)</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX

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

**Victoria First Nations Input Proceedings**

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

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

**Victoria Community Input Proceedings**

- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOTTERELL (#0001) .................... 1067
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COSTE (#0241) ......................... 1071
- SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SIMPSON (#0251) ...................... 1074
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MITCHELL (#0252) .................... 1078
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRAY (#0253) ......................... 1082
- SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DRAPER (#0254) ...................... 1086
- SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SAYERS (#0255) ..................... 1091
- SUBMISSIONS BY MS. RUSSOW (#0256) .................... 1094
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DREW (#0257) ...................... 1097
- SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SIMEON (#0258) .................... 1100
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VAN UYTVEN (#0259) ................ 1104
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PUTT (#0260) ....................... 1108
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MEREDITH (#0261) ................ 1111
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VAN ENTER (#0262) ................ 1114
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GORDON (#0263) ................... 1118
- SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ROY (#0264) ....................... 1123
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HOLLOWAY (#0265) ................ 1126
- SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MARTIN (#0266) ................... 1128
- SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MOSS (#0267) ..................... 1131
- SUBMISSIONS BY MS. THORBURN (#0268) ................ 1133
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHNSTONE (#0269) ............... 1135
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. FIELD (#0270) ................... 1138
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAMERON (#0271) ............... 1140
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAJARI (#0272) ................. 1143
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARNEY (#0273) ................. 1148
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BALDINI (#0274) ............... 1151
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORNBURGH (#0275) .......... 1155
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GREENLEES (#0276) ............ 1157
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McGUIRE (#0277) ............... 1159
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ENNS (#0278) .................... 1163
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HENDERSON (#0279) .......... 1167
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SPALTEHOLZ (#0280) .......... 1169
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. STRANG (#0281) ................. 1171
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SCOTT (#0282) ................. 1173
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. TROTTER (#0283) ............... 1178
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. EVANS (#0284) ................. 1180
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. M. HADLAND (#0285) .......... 1180
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DELA ROSA (#0286) .......... 1183
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KEEGAN–HENRY (#0287) ........ 1185
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NELSON (#0288) ............... 1186
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUPPER (#0158) ................. 1190

OCTOBER 13th, 2017 — Volume 13

Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY CLEAN ENERGY ASSOCIATION OF BC (CEABC) (#0289) .............................. 1195
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ROBERT McCULLOUGH (#0290) ... 1213
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MARC ELIESEN (#0291) ........ 1233
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY BC PULP AND PAPER COALITION (#0292)</td>
<td>1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY CANADIAN WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION (#0293)</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY BCOAPO (#0294)</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY ALLIED HYDRO COUNCIL OF BC (#0295)</td>
<td>1302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DAUNECEY (#0296)</td>
<td>1321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY ASSOCIATION OF MAJOR POWER CONSUMERS (AMPC) (#0297)</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY CANADIAN CUYENTRE FOR POLICY ALTERNATIVES (#0298)</td>
<td>1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY DR. DAVID SUZUKI (#0299)</td>
<td>1370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 14th, 2017 – Volume 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SWAIN (#0300)</td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HENDRIKS (#0301)</td>
<td>1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RAPHALS (#0302)</td>
<td>1439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY B.C. SUSTAINABLE ENERGY ASSOCIATION (#0303)</td>
<td>1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY CANADIAN GEOTHERMAL ENERGY ASSOCIATION (CanGEA) (#0304)</td>
<td>1483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VARDY (#0305)</td>
<td>1511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY COMMERCIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION OF B.C. (#0306)</td>
<td>1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ROBERT McCULLOUGH (Continued) (#0290)</td>
<td>1562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSIONS BY BC HYDRO (#0307)</td>
<td>1581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAARS

VANCOUVER, B.C.

September 23rd, 2017

(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 1:09 P.M.)

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon. Thank you for joining us this afternoon. This marks the first of 11 scheduled community input sessions around the province. My name is Dave Morton and I'm the Panel Chair for the Site C inquiry, and I'm also the Chair of the British Columbia Utilities Commission. With me today are my fellow Site C Inquiry Panel members; Dennis Cote on my left, Karen Keilty on my right, and Richard Mason on the far right.

We are here to start this next important phase of the Site C Inquiry. As you know, we've spent the last six weeks collecting data and analysis from many parties interested in, and affected by BC Hydro's Site C project. The quality of the submissions that we received was commendable. Many people committed a great deal to producing a quality submission within a short timeframe that we provided, and we appreciate that. This affirms what we already know; that there are experts and affected parties who can bring us insight into the many complexities of evaluating the economic impacts of the Site C project. We have the task of making findings in this inquiry, and we
recognize that our findings are better with your input.

The Order in Council that directed the BCUC to inquire into this project specifically requires us to consider the cost implications on BC Hydro ratepayers of three scenarios: continuing the project, suspending the project, and terminating the project. My Panel members and I recognize that there are many other implications of the project, beyond those cost implications. However, those implications are not within the scope of the BCUC to inquire into.

Considering this, we ask that in the interest of all parties in the room, you strive to keep your submissions within the scope of our inquiry into the Site C project.

Submissions made here today, as well as those made in writing, that are outside the scope of our review will not be considered in our final report to government on November 1st. The scope of submissions during this phase of the inquiry is to provide feedback on our preliminary report. There are copies of the executive summary at the entrance table, and the full report is available on our website or by making a request through our office if you are unable to access it online.

I'd also like to address a number of
housekeeping items for today's session. First, the room that we are in today is provided to us by Mr. Bemister of Allwest Reporting who you've probably met as you've been coming into the room. And he gave a few remarks before the Panel arrived here. Mr. Bemister will help to organize speakers, and his team is recording and transcribing these sessions over here at this table. We will be making the live audio, as well as the transcripts of the sessions, available on our website at SiteCINquiry.com.

Secondly, Allwest and BCUC staff have been assisting with your registration and signing in. The registration desk will remain open for the duration of the session. If you leave the session, you will be provided an admittance ticket that will gain you re-entrance to the room. There is light refreshments at the back of the room. Please help yourself throughout the session.

We are striving to hear all registered speakers today, so our breaks, any breaks, will be unscheduled and brief. So, as you need to, please enter and exit the room quietly so as not to disrupt the session.

As Mr. Bemister mentioned, please turn off your cell phones, and if you must make or take a call during the session, please do so in one of the
breakout rooms at the back, or outside of the building. And please note that there is no recording or flash photography permitted.

Finally for the speakers, you will now see a list of speakers appear on the screen to my left. When you find that your name appears within the next five speakers, please stand up and present yourself in a line along the wall, right there, thank you.

Mr. Bemister will confirm your name on the list, and he’ll direct you to a podium to await your turn. If you are not prepared at the time you are called upon, we’ll proceed to the next speaker in line. And I will try to ensure that those that do get out of turn or perhaps aren’t quite ready at the time, we’ll try and circle back at the end, if there is time, to make sure that everybody is heard.

**Proceeding Time 1:14 p.m. T2**

Other than stating your name, please refrain from including personal and/or confidential information in your submission. It will become a matter of public record, so we ask that you please be careful about that. And also refrain from using profane or offensive language in your presentation. This, as well as any other disruptive behaviour, will result in the early close of the session.

Speakers have a maximum of five minutes.
There's a timer in the front and with 30 seconds remaining, I'll try to remind you to make a brief closing statement.

If you've heard sentiments from prior speakers that are consistent with your own, you may wish to use your speaking time to simply register your support of a presentation rather than presenting repetitive material.

And before you begin your presentation, please state your first name and spell your last name for the record so that the people over here transcribing can make sure that it's recorded correctly.

So I'm now going to ask the first five speakers on the list to present themselves, and I see that we've got that step, and I'll remind you that all speakers must be -- again speakers be mindful of the five-minute timer here in the front.

With that we're ready to open this session in Vancouver on September the 23rd, 2017. And sir, please state your name and spell your last name for the record and begin.

MR. BOTTERELL: Yes, my name is Rob Botterell, and my last name is spelled B-O-T-T-E-R-E-L-L. Am I going to get extra time?

THE CHAIRPERSON: My fancy technology doesn't seem to
work.

MR. BOTTERELL: This is good. I'll start, I might get seven minutes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: You seem to have a lot of time available now. Where should I point this? All right. Thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOTTERELL (#0001):

MR. BOTTERELL: Great. I'll be mercifully brief this afternoon in the interests of providing time for other speakers. At two o'clock in the morning on Thursday morning when my wife said, "What are you doing up?" I said, "Oh, I'm reading this great 205-page non-fiction -- this piece of non-fiction that just came out on the stands." And then she said, "Well, don't you need your sleep?" and I said, "No, I'll catch up on sleep in the great beyond."

And the point I want to make is that after that I thought, you know, everybody is working very hard, including the Utilities Commission and DeLoitte and everybody in this room, to assemble the information to make this possible to answer these questions effectively that have been raised with the Utilities Commission in the time we have. And I just want to commend the Utilities Commission and DeLoitte and everybody who's taking a lot of time 24 by 7 to make this a productive and effective inquiry,
something we've wanted to see for a long long time.

I also want to make the point that I'm thrilled that BC Hydro has agreed to answer your questions in the time frame that you've set, and to do so in a way that allows all of us to see the information as it's prepared, because it's vital for the legitimacy and public confidence in this process that we all have a chance to look at that information. And, you know, my experience, which I won't describe in detail, is that if anybody has the resources to produce the answers to your questions in the time frame you've set, it's definitely BC Hydro. So I want to say thank you to BC Hydro too.

The other point I want to make and my final point is that at its heart, this can be a very very -- evolve into a very very complicated question, but in fact, fundamentally it's quite a simple question when you boil it down. And when you boil it down, the question that we need to answer and that flows through all the questions is: Is there a less costly, reliable and environmentally friendly alternative to Site C? And I'm really confident that we're going to have the information to be able to inform that process and that yourselves as the Panel will have all of the information you need to do that in the time that we have available. And so I just once again want to
thank you for making the 24 by 7 commitment along with us to make sure we get to the bottom of this. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Botterell, appreciate it, thank you. And we apologize for keeping you awake.
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Mr. Ruskin.

MR. RUSKIN: All right.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Hello, Mr. Ruskin.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RUSKIN (#0002):

MR. RUSKIN: Hi. My name is Vern Ruskin. I represent just a few handful of ratepayers, and also I'm doing this in the memory of 45 men and women that built the Heritage System and gave you the downstream benefits. I was director of planning of that group.

The reason I'm here is you're worried about the Columbia River Treaty, whether you can count on it. I'm here to tell you why you can count on it until 2040, and I'll give you the reasons exactly.

I tried to make a presentation and it will be available but I didn't have enough time so I'll have to just do it verbally.

Anyway, number 1, Site C is about 5100 gigawatt hours and the Columbia River Treaty actually varies from year to year, but it's at least 4,000
gigawatt hours. And there is a couple of dams that are spilling water, existing dams at Keenleyside and Duncan, which Keenleyside is about 1400 gigawatt hours. Duncan is 276 gigawatt hours. The total is 5676, which is more than Site C.

Now, I'll get down and tell you about the Columbia River Treaty. I know a little bit about it because I've been working on it for eight years paid and eight years just kind of volunteer work.

The Columbia River Treaty was signed 1961. It was signed because the Columbia River overflowed and it killed fifteen American blacks in the city of Vanport. It wiped out the City of Vanport. In case you don't know what Vanport is, it's the Port of Vancouver, Washington. And at that time President Eisenhower signed the treaty with Diefenbaker, and it was not ratified until 1964 because our "Wacky" Bennett -- I'm sorry, I don't mean anything disrespectful, I think he's the most wonderful premier we ever had, but anyway, he made sure it didn't cost of anything because he said to them, "If you want flood control dams, you're going to have to pay for them one way or the other." They had a very smart idea. He presold thirty years of generation from the Columbia River dam.

Now, the idea of the downstream benefits
came from General McNaughton. General McNaughton noticed that since there was some dams that are going to be built, obviously there's going to be some more water and the Columbia River used to trickle in the wintertime and flood in the summertime. After the dams were built, it no longer trickled in the wintertime, so it was extra water, extra generation. That extra generation is called downstream benefits. General McNaughton insisted that he get fifty percent of it.

Now, the amount varies from year to year. It gets calculated five years in advance. It doesn't vary, no matter what the weather is like, because it gets calculated five years in advance, it stays the same.

Now, the 4,000 gigawatt hours is 80 percent of the Site C energy and it's about 91 percent of the Site C megawatt capacity because actually it's a thousand megawatts for sure. It varies. The actually last time I looked was in 2011 and it was 1300 megawatts, but it's 1,000 megawatts for sure. Now, that's called a downstream benefit entitlement. And it's actually generated at Grand Coulee dam in the United States.

Now, legally the treaty can be cancelled with ten-years notice, plus under the U.S. law the
president has to have a two-thirds majority in the Senate. That knocks out Obama and it knocks out Trump, so you have at least 13 years for sure that you're going to have the Columbia River Treaty no matter what.

But I'm going to tell you, that it will never be cancelled because the whole thing was generated by the U.S. Corp of Engineers and the flood control. And the U.S. Corp of Engineers attest with the flood protection of the United States. And after Vanport --

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Ruskin?

MR. RUSKIN: -- New Orleans and Houston, the Army Corp of Engineers will never cancel a treaty. They won't let the president cancel a treaty.

Now, that gets me to the next one. B.C. is entitled --

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Ruskin, I'm --

MR. RUSKIN: I'm sorry?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Do you have a lot more to go, because we need to --

MR. RUSKIN: I'm sorry, I'm hard of hearing.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Do you have a lot more to go here, because we do have to be mindful of the time.

MR. RUSKIN: Okay, fine.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
Proceeding Time 1:25 p.m. T4

MR. RUSKIN: Can I just add one thing?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, please.

MR. RUSKIN: I didn't have time to submit it, but I'll submit it to you because it's important for you to know whether you can count on the treaty or not.

THE CHAIRPERSON: We'd appreciate that, Mr. Ruskin, and you have another three weeks to submit that. Thank you.

Mr. McCullough.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCULLOUGH (#0003):

MR. McCULLOUGH: Thank you, Chairman. My name is Robert McCullough, M-C-U-L-O-G-H. I'm principal of a consulting firm in Portland, Oregon. We have clients from Quebec to California. I have to compete a little bit with Mr. Ruskin, who did a fine job. I can remember 30 years ago having BC Hydro approach us at Portland General attempting to sell part of Site C. We turned it down, it was a bit expensive then. It may be just a bit more expensive today.

Thank you very much. You've done an excellent job so far under enormous pressure. Like Mr. Botterell, I also had insomnia on Thursday night and stayed up to read your report and I was very pleased. The work of your consultants has been excellent and detailed. Your work has been excellent
and detailed. I have learned more on Site C in the last week than I had learned in 30 years.

We are going to continue to help you. So unlike many of the speakers who want tolobby the decision, I am simply going to talk to the questions you’ve raised. We have a comparative advantage on three of them because many of them deal with U.S. issues either directly or indirectly.

I’ll start with question number 22 about Mid-Columbia, that’s extensive. But I'll note an important issue. Mid-Columbia is the centre of the largest single energy hub in the world. It stretches across the Northwest and Western Canada. It has forward markets in two major international exchanges. So I can simply look up the price for FI25. I don't need to forecast it. And as of this morning it was $30 U.S. BC Hydro is significantly off and we'll have a detailed report addressing that on question 22.

Question 16. Sorry, I didn't write these down in order. LNG. This is an enormous part of the forecast. We all know that. A single LNG terminal uses as much electricity as a 500 megawatt plant. However, we're not seeing any LNG. There's a reason for this. The Shaneer Company, based in Louisiana and Texas, is developing LNG terminals from Brownfield. They already have access to the grid. They have a
superior access to natural gas and they get to use existing infrastructure in terms of equipment and skilled workers from the area. They are producing LNG terminals at $550 to $600 U.S. British Columbia has not been able to meet that competition. It isn't because British Columbians are poor or not well skilled. It's simply an enormous advantage. Those terminals are dropping off one by one. The two in Oregon are dropping off as well.

Finally, wind. One of the ironies of wind is that the premier of Quebec recently said the time for large dams is over and cited the more deployable, the less expensive options, primarily renewables. As I drove up to one of our clients in Longview, Washington, I passed by a freight train with a wind farm on the back. Car after car of blades and turbines. That was simply purchased from one of the major manufacturers and it's delivered. It's not a multi-year process, it's a one-year process. I called a number of the people trying to figure out where they were going to. It's going to the Skokoogum wind farm outside of Olympia. So we're talking about similar geography, very similar culture. Certainly very similar economics.

I checked and that is for sale, for anyone who wants to buy power from that, for $51 per megawatt
hour U.S., $61 per megawatt hour Canadian. So, when we are debating these opportunities, we have real life data. And the Commission could actually drive down to Olympia - I'm sure the governor would welcome you - and go look at that.

So to close, we will be submitting expert reports on all three of these items to help you and support you. I have an opportunity to come talk to you in a few weeks and I hope you'll have questions for me then. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. McCullough, thank you.
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Mr. Finn?

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. FINN (#0004):

MR. FINN: Chair and Commissioners, thank you for this opportunity to address you. I commend you for affording us the opportunity. I too read the 866 page treaties. Fortunately I took a speed reading course, so I know it's about Site C.

There is a few things in your investigations and the questions you posed that aren't obvious in that 866 pages. I'll briefly go over them. Power demand, as you know, in B.C. has been flat for 15 years. Why we would conclude, or BC Hydro would conclude that it is going to rise between 30 and 40 percent over the next 15 is beyond me. I saw no
convincing evidence, as you didn’t, so far anyway, that that was going to change.

Being a retired partner of KPMG I would know something about -- as a consulting partner, about balance sheets and income statements, and I looked at BC Hydro's. You are probably aware that its debt to equity ratio is an indication of its financial health, is in the order of 4.55 to 1. The normal or average for large utilities is 1.5 to 1. That's getting up there into the 20 year or so billion dollars worth of debt which has to be discharged. And bringing it back to a more normal 1.5 ratio is going to mean a pretty big hike to rates no matter much -- what time period you decide to do that over.

Accounting standards, I know a little of those. BC Hydro uses a rather peculiar one. In fact it's peculiar to itself. It claims to be consistent with IFRS, and U.S. standards, but it is not. And under that guise, it has used deferral accounts to the extent of a whopping $5.9 billion to essentially defer the costs of real, current costs of power, and to future generations, and future generations represented here might object to that.

LNG, Robert has summed it up rather nicely. It is not likely to occur. But it is slated to be 60 percent of the Site C's output. How that figure was
arrived at, you have questions.

The decommissioning costs, under IFRS, I'll quote it, the ASC, codification topic 420, all utilities are required to include the decommissioning costs of its site in their accounting. Now, most estimates of that have roughly the same magnitude as the cost of constructing it. So, if you roll that back into 2016 dollars, you are talking about adding pretty close to half a billion dollars to the true cost, as it should be represented on the books of Site C. BC Hydro has not done that.

We have, of course, access to much more power. You have heard Vern on the subject of the Columbia River Treaty, outlawed by one act, the Clean Energy Act change. We have Keenleyside, we have Duncan Dams, and we have of course the replacement of current generators in the existing dams which BC Hydro has not accounted for, which would be far more efficient given thermal power.

The exporting below cost electricity at less than it takes to produce it is not a winning business proposition, and that is exactly what is happening, as Robert has said. Selling $35 power to the U.S. that takes $85 to produce isn’t a winning business proposition either.

Demand elasticity, you have caught that
five percent demand elasticity in a province with industries like lumber, oil and gas, and mining is going to need some re-thinking, because as you have noted from the large power industry, if rates increase by any more than 2.3 percent a year, as they're perfectly bound to, they're out of here.

In summary, to fully decarbonize our economy, and to meet its legislated climate targets, BC Hydro is probably going to need more power in the future. But the twin gambles of betting $9 billion of public money on the twin gambles that will need Site C power, and that Site C is actually the best way, cheapest way, and less risky way to go about it, that is a gamble that I think we should not take.

Thank you very much.
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THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Finn. Thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HUSBAND (#0005):

MS. HUSBAND: My name is Vicky Husband, Husband like husband and wife. It's easy, H-U-S-B-A-N-D. I often have to spell it. But that's how it is.

I want to also thank you. We've been waiting a long time for the Commission to review this project, which should never have been given the go-ahead. I think we all know that it was a political decision. It certainly wasn't an economic decision.
That's becoming more clear every day. And we're aren't talking about environmental First Nations or flooding a whole valley that's very rich or any of these things today. We're just talking about the economics.

The economics are very clear. This makes no sense. We don't need this power, and if we did we can go to the Columbia River Entitlement Treaty and we can change the Clean Energy Act. And the alternatives are going down very quickly as Robert McCullough has told me a few times. Wind and solar have dropped fifty percent in the last five years. So we have options.

And I think as ratepayers, and it seems that we're divided into ratepayers and taxpayers, but often it's all of us, and speaking for us, in a sense, we already have had an 86 percent increase in power rates since 2001. People are looking at alternatives and they will more and more, and that's why demand is flat. And if goes up, it doesn't mean that the power demand is going to go up, because people can't afford it. And this is really important in making a decision about the future of Site C.

You know, this fact that we never had a review -- and I'm glad that we saw the Deloitte Report and I'm very glad that you're here now, but, you know,
I'm not sure exactly. Someone said to me last night, "This is like Enron North." Maybe not quite, but quite close in a way. This is our $9 billion that's at stake it's probably not 9 billion, it's probably 12 and some say 15. I don't know if we look at Muskrat Falls in Manitoba.

We don't know, but this is a risk to all the people who live in British Columbia, not only to those who live in the Peace River Valley, which is an extraordinary place. But we have to take everything into account, and the social cost, and the environmental costs which I know the David Suzuki Foundation put in a submission on that. So everything is on the table, I think. And this a very important decision for you to make. And please look after all of us and future and generations. We're counting on you.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms. Husband. Thank you.
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Go ahead, Mr. McCartney.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McCARTHY (#0006):

MR. McCARTNEY: Sure. So my name is Peter McCartney. The spelling of that is M- little C- big C-A-R-T-N-E-Y, and I'm the climate campaigner for the Wilderness Committee.
I'm going to leave -- or many of my colleagues are going to talk to you over the next couple of weeks about all of the different reasons and the economics and demand forecasts of why Site C isn't important, so I'm going to touch on the intersections with the climate campaigns that I work on for the Wilderness Committee.

The first being that the majority of the power for Site C was intended for an LNG industry which is never going to happen in this province. LNG producers need prices of 12 to 13 dollars per million cubic tonnes of LNG, and prices are sitting at half to a third of that right now with no expectations of going up. When Site C was going under its review process with the federal and provincial panels, there was 21 proposed LNG facilities on the coast. So far Pacific Northwest LNG has cancelled its plans. Aurora LNG has cancelled its plans. Kitimat and LNG Canada are stalled in the Douglas Channel area. And the only one that's received a final investment is Woodfibre LNG based on a political cutting of the electric rates that Woodfibre LNG would be paying to BC Hydro. So a massive subsidy of about 50 percent for an e-drive electricity rate.

So it's very clear that the case for this power is based on an industry that is not ever going
to show up in British Columbia.

The second and I think potentially more impactful is just the folly of building a massive industrial mega-dam in 2017, when we know that prices for renewables are falling across the board. Prices for solar in the last eight years have dropped by 75 percent. For wind they have dropped by 30 percent. And by 2040 prices are expected to fall another 66 percent for solar and another 47 percent for on-shore wind. And actually the biggest one and I think something that British Columbia should be pursuing is offshore wind power, which is expected to fall by 71 percent by 2040, and those numbers are from Blueberg New Energy Finance. So we're standing on this precipice of a world that is swimming in cheap, reliable, clean energy, and yet we're reaching back into the 1970s to overhaul this dam that doesn't make any sense any more. The prices for the Site C dam -- and I'm particularly glad you guys have attached in your questions to BC Hydro pursuing renewable options based on some of the more realistic price mechanisms that are out there, because BC hydro has not done that properly.

So, as we are looking forward to this power, some people are raising the question, well, okay, Site C can provide that base power that we're
talking about, that renewables are intermittent. But British Columbia has tremendous potential for geothermal power. We're currently the only country in the Pacific Rim that is not exploring this and using this for our power. And as well as pump storage hydro where you're -- I know you guys have looked at this and the report is to basically turn a lake into a battery where you pump the water into the upper reservoir when you don't need the power, and bring it back down when you do.

The final piece that you guys aren't -- that I notice that you weren't exploring in the report is the potential for electric vehicles to manage some of the grid demand that the people are looking at from renewable energy. We are not at all far away from a future, and it's coming within the next decade, where you can drive your electric car to work, it will sit there and charge during the day when the sun is shining and the wind is blowing, drive that back home and it will power your house at night when you need it there. So the ability for us to manage our grid in a smart direction completely negates the idea that BC Hydro needs to be building these massive industrial projects for reliable power. And the beauty of the renewable energy is that we can add it as it's needed, incrementally, as we can show that we need this power.
We don't have to take a $9 billion, seven year gamble on an industrial mega-project that the chances are we probably won't need the power in 2024. And by then other renewable energy technologies will be significantly more developed and significantly cheaper.

So I thank you guys for pursuing the alternatives to the Site C dam, and I really look forward to seeing the report that you come up with.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. McCartney, thank you.
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I notice there is a flash going off there. I just remind you that there is no flash photography allowed during the session. Thank you.

Please go ahead.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRYENTON (#0007):

MR. BRYENTON: Good afternoon. My name is Roger Bryenton, B-R-Y-E-N-T-O-N. I'm a director of the Pacific Electricity Ratepayers Association, but today I'm speaking on my own behalf.

Thank you, Panel. I wish to acknowledge that we are gathered here today on unceded First Nations territory.

Thank you. Good afternoon. Thank you all for giving up your weekend, and the BCUC for your diligence to product the interim report in such a
short time.

Firstly, I think we need to acknowledge that Site C is a political project, not a clean energy project. The former liberal government has manipulated regulations via the Clean Energy Act orders-in-council, exclusions and prohibitions to facilitate their agenda to build a dam with no increase in electricity use or demand over the past ten years and little indication of any increase in the near future. We do not need Site C.

I could go into detail about forecasting errors, the costs original at $1 billion in 1980, up to 9 and more today. Transmission and other upgrades. Will there be an LNG load or not? Will there be electric vehicles? And please write this down as it seems to have been overlooked so far, the trade power now traded back and forth at the border has averaged 3700 gigawatt hours per year over the last three years, 75 percent of Site C, which we can use.

Deep DSM, or DSM 5 would provide roughly double the electricity of Site C at one-third to one-quarter of the cost. Excuse me, one-third to one-half the costs.

Time-of-use metering, which according to the environmental defence fund in a study for California, showed peak savings of 13 to 15 percent,
which, if it were half that in British Columbia, it would be 7 percent, which would amount to three-quarters of Site C's peak.

The Columbia Treaty power, everybody has talked about that. Burrard Thermal and Island Power can be used for a few hours a year if and when we need that peak, and it would be a good reliable opportunity if the transmission lines and the grid suffer major damage. We also have geothermal for baseload, wind and solar if and when needed.

We are awash in electricity now and at least for twenty years and possibly more. BCUC, other people, we are asking the wrong questions. It doesn't matter if the forecasts are not precise, with incremental least cost projects we can meet demand if and when it materializes. It doesn't matter if Site C is either on time or on budget. We do not need it. There are at least ten alternatives of lower or equal cost.

What is the impact on rates? My one word "horrific". Because of the accounting slight-of-hand that Dr. Finn identified, my calculation shows we will need rates to rise at least 50 percent in the next five years. Adding Site C will add about another 7 percent. We cannot afford it.

Termination costs. If Site C were to go
ten percent over budget, that would be a billion dollars. That would be roughly the cost of termination if we can avoid it. If it goes 20 percent over budget or 2 billion, we actually end up saving something like a billion. That would be a good deal.

Do we need Site C? No. That is the only question we need to answer. The rest are irrelevant. End of discussion.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GARDNER (#0008):

MR. GARDNER: Good afternoon, Chair Morton and BCUC Commissioners. My name is Chris Gardner, G-A-R-D-N-E-R. I am the president of the Independent Contractors and Business Association of British Columbia, otherwise known as ICBA.

It is a real pleasure to be here this afternoon, we've made a submission. I want to address and clarify some of the points in that submission, and comment on some of the findings that you've published in your preliminary report.

I'd be remiss if I didn’t point out that this morning 2500 men and women in construction woke up, and went to work on this very important, and
strategic investment in our long term energy future.

The first point I'd like to say is that your findings are informative in two very important areas. First, the project is being managed on schedule, and in fact, BC Hydro is slated to complete the project a year ahead of schedule.

Second, the contingency reserve has increased. It is now well over a billion dollars. So, the BC Hydro management team is managing this project very well.

The second point, as you indicated, is that there is some confusion and lack of information over some of the costs related to suspension and termination. But I think there is one thing we do know. If the project was cancelled or suspended, the cost to the taxpayers of British Columbia would be in the billions of dollars, and probably somewhere around $4 billion, and taxpayers would have nothing to show for it.

The third point is that there is a litany of independent studies that have been done during the review, and by Hydro since then, that have confirmed the conclusion of the Joint Review Panel. Site C is the cheapest and most effective way to ensure that we can generate clean hydro power for generations to come.
And finally, as estimates provided by Hydro indicate, electricity demand is going to increase. And we know it is going to increase significantly, because we are transitioning off coal and fossil fuels, into an area where we are going to be using a lot more electricity, and we are going to have electric cars and other demands for electric power. So, this is a very important strategic investment in our long-term energy future. And there is no doubt that if you step back and take the politics out of the review process, which I think is a very important perspective that we often lose sight of in British Columbia, we cannot be a jurisdiction that reflexively says "No" to important infrastructure projects. And to cancel or suspend this project would send a highly negative signal to not only investors in British Columbia and Canada, but international investors. But the approval process in this jurisdiction means nothing. But a change in government, and on a whim, you have a project that is 20 percent complete, you have got a new government, you don’t have a project, you don’t have an investment. That would hurt our economy, and our competitiveness in the long term.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Gardner, thank you.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HOLM (#0009):

MS. HOLM: Good afternoon. My name is Wendy Holm, H-O-L-M, and like other speakers, I'd like to thank the Commission for a doing a really thorough job in your report so far. I think that it's fair to say that if this project had been referred to the BCUC before it started, we wouldn't be all here today.

I want to also a little bit about why I'm here today. I'm here as a volunteer. I am a professional agrologist, recently retired. I did the agricultural impact assessment of the Site C dam and made a representation to the Joint Review Panel. I have 40 years under my belt as an agrologist, and I have taken on – I'm also a ag journalist – a lot of important public policy issues. My area is economics in public policy.

I have the Canadian Wheat Board, the mad cow disease, defending supply management, big, big issues for somebody in agriculture and for all of us who eat for a living. I have never become so seized with the importance of defending the public interest in a project as the Site C dam, defending the public interest in why this project should not go ahead.

I'd like to speak to you a little bit today about reducing the cost of cancellation and remediation, which was, I think, your third area of
question. As you know, I made a presentation to the BCUC as well.

So from the agricultural standpoint, without recapping the figures, these lands in an east-west running valley, the sun comes up in the morning and it goes down at night, they have a class 1 climate. They have the cropping capability of the Fraser Valley with higher yields. Cropping capability of Delta, with high yields because of longer daylight. This was not looked at appropriately by the environmental impact assessment process. In fact, they never looked at the importance of microclimate on these lands.

These lands have the capacity to provide the nutritional requirements of over a million people a year. And these are from the BCUC 1982 horticulture fruit and vegetable study. That was when BCUC first looked at this. And that million people a year is only for the BC Hydro discounted 60 percent of the class 1 to 3 improved ratings soils that are being flooded. If you look at actually the high capability soils that are being flooded, that 1 million is very conservative and 2 million is more likely the figure.

When you look at the importance of food and nutrition, when you look at the importance of vegetables -- I mean you can't give kids vegetable
flavoured potato chips and think that they are getting nutrition. They need the vegetables. We import 60 percent of our vegetables in British Columbia. 60 percent of the vegetables we could grow here we import from California, from Mexico, with draught, with water-shortages, with population increases, with higher transportation costs.

We have the highest child poverty rate in Canada. We have a food -- northern nutrition policy that has an absolute failure. Site C is our plan B for food security. Site C is the commons. These lands have been here for millennia and they are meant to feed generations in the future. If I was running policy decisions, I would say the voices of people in the future should have an impact on policy tables, because we're making a decision today that is going to impact people in the future very severely if this dam goes ahead.

I would also like to say there was a discussion. The U.S. Corp of Engineers and the planning of the Columbia Treaty. I wrote the book, Water and Free Trade – coming out with another book on Site C in January – and when the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers was tasked with making sure America doesn't run over water, they flew over Canada and the north under NORAD auspices and they mapped the water
resources of the northern part of this continent and then the dams were placed on the Columbia and the dams were placed on the Peace.

Why the Peace? Because the Peace is the only east/west running valley that can bring water east of the Rockies. This dam is the last dam that connects the dots between these major watersharing projects, and it has to be taken into consideration. We’re about to make a decision here that has ramifications for so many sectors other than energy. This isn’t a smokestack issue, and I think I would appeal to the Commission. You know how wide your mandate normally is. Please, when you do the report, explain that you have had, like a horse with blinders on. There are many issues that the government has to look at to ensure the public policy interest is being taken care of.

Thank you.
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THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR. STEEVES: Hello, and good afternoon.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STEEVES (#0010):

MR. STEEVES: My name is Keith William Steeves, spelled S-T-E-V-E-S. I have submitted prior submission, which was F101-1 and 2. And I am here to represent
myself, and my company, A.P.S.E. Inc.

I want to start off and say that there is an elephant in this room that nobody is paying attention to, and I'm here to bring this to your attention. Now, under the -- let's put it this way. Because of the Clean Energy Act, subsection (2-0), or "O", they prohibit my submission from actually being incorporated into your findings. And even so, I ask your permission to go ahead and make my presentation, and I hope you will grant me my one-third Andy Warhol moment here.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Go ahead please, yes.

MR. STEEVES: All right, basically what I am proposing is that in substitution for a Site C dam, we, myself and my company, recommend that we go nuclear. A nuclear is prohibited, and I say this is not appropriate. It is an actual, suitable source for this situation. We live in the real world, and nuclear provides a means of accommodating the various interests, and issues, and having an appropriate means of satisfying, or trying to satisfy everybody in some means. And hence, for my doing this presentation, I am bringing to your attention the Site C construction schedule by BC Hydro. I've looked at this, and I've put it into a make or buy decision process.

The first three year are sunk costs,
I've taken the next five year period to make comparison against a nuclear proposal, which called the Septimas NPP, and in this I find that by making this comparison and breaking it down, et cetera, that this proposal is as good as, or better than the Site C in terms of the construction costs. Now, this is just the construction costs. You have the indirect costs, the interest charges, and a couple other categories there, but all together, our position is, that it is cheaper, and better, to go nuclear.

I'd better get on here, two minutes left.

Now, with regards to the two other alternatives, substitution and termination. In the figures that you gave, I believe, the substitution was rated as costing $1.4 billion, the termination was costed at $1.2 billion. If you were to go with a nuclear proposal, I would say that those costs for substitution and nuclear -- or substitution and termination would be 100 to 150 million dollars less. But you still have the substitution with nuclear power plant.

Now, also, there is a flip side to this. You have been wringing your hands over the cost of the suspension. Well, the flip side is, what happens if you were to reactivate the Site C dam? Well, Site C has already incurred those sunk costs, so they are not in the calculation at the future date. When you are
comparing the Site C against a possible renewable energy source, so, what happens is, and my thinking is, that the Site C dam would come in lower in the future date, than an alternative replacement energy source.

Now, I want to go back and say that with nuclear power plant, you have more options and more flexibility. If you were to take the nuclear proposal and go with that, and say it doesn’t work out, you can always go back to the Site C, if you have it suspended. We don’t like that. We prefer the situation where you go with a nuclear power plant. It works out, but then what happens if BC Hydro finds that they need even more energy? Well, then you can have Site C.

And finally, I am running out of time here, the question of fairness with the suspension, I say put this in context. Was it fair for BC Hydro to go ahead with the Site C dam in the first place? Well, apparently they think so, so they went ahead of it, and we’re here today. So, the question of fairness in regards to a substitution issue, I don’t think is appropriate, because it is not relevant.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Steeves --

MR. STEEVES: One final point if I may? Deloittes, in their submission, they make a reference to the nuclear
issue, and they say it is not dispatchable. Well, the interesting thing is, in the list of the articles that they cite, the first one, the article says on the second half, of the second paragraph, of the second page of an eight page article, they say it is dispatchable. Now, who are you going to believe? So I'll leave it at that.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, thanks, Mr. Steeves.

Proceeding Time 2:01 p.m. T12

Thank you. Please go ahead, sir.

MR. GRANDISON: Good afternoon, everyone.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GRANDISON (#0011):

MR. GRANDISON: My name is Cliff Grandison and I'm with a company, it's called Alaska Hydro Corporation. It's not an American company, in fact it's a Canadian company and listed on the Toronto Stock Exchange. And what we're trying to do is to develop a hydroelectric project on the Moore Creek in northwestern B.C.

So what I would like to do is go through the discussion that gets to the point where I think this project should be given consideration, which at this point, and you're in the Panel, it has not.

In the Executive Summary of the Panel Report it says:
"Given the energy objectives set out in the Clean Energy Act, what if any other portfolio of commercially feasible generating projects and demand-side management initiatives could provide similar benefits including firming, shaping, storage, grid reliability, and maintenance or reduction of 2016-17 greenhouse gas emission levels to ratepayers at a similar or lower unit energy cost as Site C?"

Following that, the requirement to find alternatives was of course one of the objectives that was set out in the Order in Council, and in the case of Hydro's response to that they said in the report, Appendix A, Other Hydro-Electric with Storage:

"BC Hydro states that Section 10, 11 and Schedule 2 of CAA prohibited development of the following hydroelectric projects on Murphy Creek border, Hi Site E, Low Site E, McGregor, Lower Canyon, Homathko, Liard, Iskut, Cutoff Mountain, McGregor, River Diversion, Cutoff Mountain, and Skeena River, and McGregor Creek, McGregor River Diversion are also negatively barred."

Now, and the result of all of that, looking at what the alternative sites were for storage, they
did not include, did not mention Moore Creek. That was submitted to the Panel, that last guide was submitted, a proposal to the Panel to consider it, and the Panel finds that:

"While this project may show promise, it is an early stage of pre-development. Accordingly we are reluctant to draw any conclusions from the material presented by Alaska Hydro."

Then what I would like to go on to is a report that was prepared by BC Hydro on Iskut-Stikine, and the Iskut-Stikine included the Iskut and Moore Creek. This is the report here, and this report has determined that the Moore Creek project is a viable hydro storage project and it's target -- early stage. The project has 170 megawatts of potential, according to BC Hydro, megawatt capacity, and the cost per megawatt install -- these are old data -- is $2,240,000 megawatts. When our company got the water licence application filed, we completed the feasibility study done on it and the result of that feasibility study is that we could build that for about 3 to 3 and a half million dollars per megawatt installed. It's a smaller project. We reduced it to 70 megawatts. It could be increased to 170 megawatts at a higher wattation.
With that we have completed a pre-feasibility study on it, which indicates that it's economically viable to do it and at a substantively lower cost. This project does not pre-early development. It's in advanced planning. And to that end we have completed a study with the aid of Golder & Associates. Golder & Associates looked at our site with respect to the dam. They concluded that an arch dam would be a suitable dam. That's the same dam that BC Hydro had decided, and they indicated in that report that the dam could be as much 150 metres high. Our dam is at 95 metres. So what I would like to do is for the Panel to review what was looked at with respect to the Moore Creek project and reconsider it and consider that as one of the alternative sources of energy with respect to what BC Hydro has in the way of energy being generated from Site C.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Have you already filed that material or are you proposing to file?

MR. GRANDISON: This has not been filed.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay, and that's fine, so please feel free to file it on the website and we'd be happy to take a look at it.

MR. GRANDISON: Sure. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Gibson.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GIBSON (#0012):

MS. GIBSON: My name is Elan Gibson, G-I-B-S-O-N. I'm a Burnaby resident and I speak only for myself. I am not a scientist nor an economist, nor a lawyer, not even a technologically adept person. Neither can I speak without a prepared script, so pardon me while I read what I have to say.

THE CHAIRPERSON: No problem.

MS. GIBSON: What I am is a third-generation newcomer to this land, which believes in truth, fairness, and justice. Therefore, I come here asking that the BCUC inquiry into Site C clarifies what I consider hypocrisy in terms of social and moral costs by the leaders of my nation, Canada, BC Hydro, and previous provincial governments with regards to Site C.

I was confused by the current federal government's leader's speech to the United Nations this past week apologizing for the historical wrongs perpetrated by the indigenous -- sorry. Perpetrated on the indigenous nations and promises to adhere to the UN declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. This same government made the same promises to us shortly after they were elected in October, 2015.
They also, when new elected committed, to fulfilling the 94 calls to action of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Number 43 calls upon federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal governments to fully adopt and implement the United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples as the framework for reconciliation.

It was this same government shortly thereafter that issued permits for the Department of Transportation, as well as Fisheries and Oceans, for the commencement of construction on Site C, while the West Moberly and Prophet nations were challenging the project in court. A direct contravention and violation of the fundamental rights protected by Treaty 8. Also protect by the Canadian Constitution and international human rights law.

With regard to BC Hydro, I am confused about their recognition of the wrongs they perpetrated on the -- and pardon my Anglophone touque -- on the Kwadacha Nation when building the W.A.C. Bennett Dam, and yet are continuing to violate other First Nations with the construction of Site C.

The wonderful *Our Story, Our Voice* gallery at the Bennett Dam visitor's centre graphically portrays the displacement of aboriginal communities, isolating them from each other, erased hunting and
trapline territory, disrupted migration routes, and transformed aquatic life in the valley's waters forever. The Williston Reservoir is dead water. To me this is hypocrisy. Not my idea of fairness and justice. The creation of this storied gallery is a token gesture of reconciliation while BC Hydro continues to infringe on the rights of First Nations.

The federal-provincial Joint Review Panel concluded that Site C Dam would have significant adverse effects which cannot be mitigated on traditional First Nations' fishing, hunting, and other land uses. There are 42 sites of significant cultural or spiritual values that would be flooded. How can we, a nation of newcomers, justify erasing other nations' history of time immemorial?

And like Dr. Holm, I am also concerned about food security. Climate change leading to drought and the poverty of the north that our previous provincial governments have done nothing to alleviate. As has been pointed out by experts, the Peace River Valley has highly productive agricultural qualities that would be flooded. With high prices of food in the north and elsewhere, I am confused as to why this land isn't being used for food production. We have poverty stricken families and malnourished children in this province.
Why as a humanitarian society are we not addressing these issues with what we have within our bounders, instead of building a dam on futile promises of future unproven need when we can't feed our own children who are our future.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thanks, Ms. Gibson.
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Please go head.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WONG (#0013):

MS. WONG: Thank you, Panel, for your attention. My name is Rita Wong and live here on unceded Coast Salish territory, also known as Vancouver, and I speak today as both a concerned citizen committed to reconciliation as the previous person spoke so eloquently to, to reconciliation as the necessary path for Canadians.

I also speak today as a scholar of the environmental humanities with a focus on water. And I've been working at Emily Carr University of Art and Design since 2004 as a professor which I teach an environmental ethics class, and I'm very interested in environmental economics and what we count and what we don't count.

So the public record regarding the costs of the dam is growing as we just heard, and I would like
to dedicate my remarks to the Cree Elder Jennifer Pool. Her family lost their home, which was flooded and destroyed by the W.A.C. Bennett dam in the 1960s. This is on the public record. There's a video going around on social media of her talking about the hurt that the Site C dam would cause her and her family again.

The effects of such devastation constitute a huge social as well as an economic cost that are not adequately measured, I believe, or accounted for in conventional accounting systems. These costs tend to get externalized, but I would argue that they need to be factored in for more realistic accounting of these costs.

How do you put a price on the intergenerational destruction and damage that previous dams have brought through the homelessness and the hopelessness that they've inflicted? Jennifer Poole, for example, has one daughter who has one daughter whose been murdered, her teenaged grandson is missing. The influx of temporary workers into Fort St. John has made her community feel much less safe, as she shares on that video that I mentioned.

So when I think about the cost of the electricity that we use on a daily basis, I think about her story. I think about the colonial violence
and the historical destruction of communities embedded in the flick of a light switch in the projections that we use.

I realize that I am, on a daily basis, implicated in that history. We can't change that history. What we can change is how we respond to it by not destroying more the Peace River Valley which is more precious the more intact it is. And so I would argue that, as a society, we need this area to become more ecologically resilient and not less so, in a time of increasing climate destabilization.

Many feel that Treaty 8 have been violated, as we've heard. It is being violated again when B.C. allows clear cutting and destruction of animal habitat to happen without waiting for the courts to decide on treaty rights. The cost of living with dishonor, with injustice is borne by everyone who must live with the shame, the violence and the mistrust of a government that does not honour its treaties. How is that cause factored into the B.C. Utility Commissions accounting and analysis, and does that occur through damage to reputation of the province? Does that occur through the ever-growing perception that this is a morally bankrupt system? Is that a cost that we can quantify in terms of immense economic uncertainty for future damages that will ensue?
As Arthur Manual's book on settling Canada asserts, respecting Aboriginal title and rights is necessary for a truly sustainable economy.

As a scholar I visited the Peace River Valley in the summer of 2015 in time to witness and participate in a river ceremony held by the members of Treaty 8 First Nations on the banks of the Peace River. That ceremony happened in response to BC Hydro's notification to the Treaty 8 Tribal Association that it would be targetting and cutting down trees with eagles' nests in preparation for the Site C dam.

Given that the project would take a decade to build, there was widespread shock that Hydro would cut those trees down so quickly and hastily, unnecessarily. That's not consultation and that's not, in the long run, an economic decision. This appears to be, and was experienced as violence and insult to people who value the eagle, as do many of us who are non-indigenous.

But that visit left me horrified at the past and it committed me to think again about what it means to pay back the debt that I owe, and that I would argue that we all owe for the previous destruction and devastation that has been done to the Peace River and its communities.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. Wong, we're at your last thirty seconds.

MS. WONG: Okay, thank you. And I have mentioned in my submission to you that the David Suzuki Foundation has issued a report about the natural capital. It's an attempt to outline the costs. So I would just ask that those costs be somehow factored in, into the framing of the discussion.

Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms. Wong.
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Please go ahead.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SPEAKMAN (#0014):


I would like to acknowledge that we are on the unceded and occupied territories of Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh nations. I want to thank the BCUC so much for holding this space to talk about Site C, and I also want to thank the GreenDP for sending this project to review.

I also want to throw my wholehearted support behind the comments of Rita Wong, who just spoke. This mic is still hot from Elan Gibson, Wendy Holm, Peter McCartney, Eoin Finn, and Roger Bryenton. At the same time, if you're keeping track, I disagree
with Chris Gardner, and also Keith Steeves on their comments.

I’m going to speak on three of the points the Panel is considering, according to your website. Yeah, the cost to ratepayers of suspending the project. The Deloitte report says it will cost $1.4 billion to suspend the project, which granted is far less than the budgeted 8.8 billion to build it, so that could be great. However, I am still worried about the cost of being haunted of the spectre of this dam project.

Treaty 8 Nations have incurred expensive court cost defending their rights. As well, the cost, like Rita said, to mental, spiritual, emotional, and physical wellbeing are not accounted for in western economics, and these costs to wellbeing must be considered as a matter of survival.

Settler residence in the Peace Valley have also incurred costs in their campaigns to defend their homes and livelihoods. Though, I do want to emphasize, the system and intergenerational costs that are unique to indigenous peoples facing development projects like Site C dam.

And finally, regular concerned citizens, ratepayers, taxpayers, whatever you want to call us, like myself, do not want to live in an electricity
infrastructure regime that would even consider doing
the destruction that the Site C dam would. Thank you.

Secondly, the cost to ratepayers of
terminating the project. This one to me is super
simple. The Deloitte report says it will cost $1.2
billion to cancel it, which is so much less than $9
billion. Please save us $6 billion, and cancel the
dam. That's all I want to say on that.

Finally, what portfolio of generating
projects and demand-side management initiatives could
provide similar benefits? I am going to agree with
Roger in this one. That's kind of the wrong question,
because I see no benefit from building the Site C
dam. Almost anything would be better, and many of my
peers have spoken to that, and will continue to, I'm
sure. So, what I'm going to spend the rest of my time
talking about is inviting yourselves on the Panel to
consider sort of a lens as you do consider
alternatives.

I am currently reading *Staying Alive*, by
renowned physicist, ecologist, and feminist Vandana
Shiva. Since at least 1989 when she wrote *Staying
Alive*, and everything in there is still horrifyingly
relevant, Shiva has been vocal in the global movements
for food security, environmental justice, and the
rights of rural and indigenous peoples. She argues
that development, as perceived in mainstream western culture is truly maldevelopment. Development as exemplified by the Site C dam is a reductionist view, first posited by explicitly sexist and racist white western cis-gendered men like Francis Bacon, and Renee Descartes, with a mind to subjugate, feminized nature in order to control and profit from her exploitation. Why Bacon and Descartes views still hold traction in our society, I don’t understand, but I do find it very frustrating.

Site C will not lead to progress by even their definitions, because as my peers have spoken to you, it is such a mess of a project that we do not need. Even if it wasn’t a mess of a project in those terms, I would still want no part in it. This kind of development impoverishes nature, indigenous peoples, and particularly women. We hear about the jobs that Site C can provide, and I think about what kind of work this is. Is it hard hat work, primarily proffered -- I'm running out of time, damn.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah, 30 seconds, Ms. Speakman.

MS. SPEAKMAN: Okay, the kind of work, it's no good, I think it's really important to say no to this kind of project. I want to challenge Chris Gardner on that, very important not to cause all of the damage there, and place value in the productive work that nature is
doing in the Peace Valley.

Thank you very much. Please, please
recommend to Cabinet to stop the Site C dam.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms. Speakman. Thank you.
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Please go ahead, Ms. Chapman, thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY JS. CHAPMAN (#0015):

MS. CHAPMAN: Hello, I'm Lynn Chapman and I live in Roberts Creek on the beautiful Sunshine Coast.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Welcome.

MS. CHAPMAN: Thank you. I would like to begin by reading the following statement from the Joint Review Panel Report. I find it compelling in the context of this BCUC inquiry. The quote:

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

It's an important statement. I say BC Hydro has been asked to justify Site C, and the BCUC Panel's report, even though it's preliminary, demonstrates clearly that Hydro has failed this test. The need has not been proven. The financial costs are neither clear nor attractive. The alternative has not
been properly or thoroughly explored. The substantial environmental, social and other costs are not tolerable in this circumstance, and as a consequence Site C must not be constructed.

I would like to make four observations regarding the preliminary report. First observation. The number and nature of the questions that the Panel has found necessary to ask BC Hydro is shocking. One would expect that BC Hydro's 800-odd pages of information and analysis would be fundamentally complete and accurate. After reviewing the Panel's 73 questions, I conclude that is not the case. The citizens of B.C., who will pay through rate increases, potentially downgraded credit ratings, and a massive debt burden, deserve to know whether Site C is the best deal for their money. In my view the expert opinion in the majority of submissions to BCUC demonstrates that is not the case. It's not the best deal. I fear the Panel's important questions to BC Hydro are likely -- or excuse me, are unlikely to be clearly answered inside the time frame required. Should that occur, I submit BCUC will have no choice but to find continuing with construction unsupportable.

I've got two more pages. Okay, observation 2.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MS. CHAPMAN: I note BC Hydro's failure to adequately consider both DSM and alternative proposals. It appears BC Hydro assumes the alternatives would all be private. It seems the Panel does not agree. Indeed, the question of whether to effectively privatize power supply is a matter that should be decided in open, with public consultation and the consent of the public.

With regard to DSM, the position BC Hydro takes in its submission appears to be in direct opposition to its position in its October 1st, 2012 Power Smart publication, *B.C.'s Brilliant Energy Future: A Conservation Vision*. BC Hydro's own 27 study identifies 22,000 gigawatt hours a year in energy savings by 2026. It speaks of DSM being the lowest cost and generating some 6,000 jobs over a 30-year period. It recognizes opportunities -- oh, 6,000 jobs per year over a 30-year period. It recognizes opportunities related to green expertise in BC Hydro leadership in DSM. It notes how climate changes increases the urgency around using energy as efficiently and cleanly as possible. I sincerely recommend this visionary article to the Panel. BC Hydro produced that.

Observation 3. I'm pleased to see the
Panel begin to address costs such as biodiversity or natural capital loss. The loss of unique and irreplaceable values that pertain to the Peace River Valley have not been identified as costs in any of BC Hydro's documents. That does not mean that we as ratepayers, both now and in the future, will not have to bear these costs both environmentally and economically. I ask the BCUC Panel to account for these values as real but unenumerated costs of biodiversity loss.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Down to the last 30 seconds.

MS. CHAPMAN: Okay.

THE CHAIRPERSON: You're doing well.

MS. CHAPMAN: Observation 4. In its question 31 the Panel begins to address costs and settlement, both financial and land based, with indigenous peoples the infringement of whose treaty rights have yet to be addressed, not to mention the costs that ratepayers incur when BC Hydro lawyers defend our public corporation against entirely justified First Nations claims.

VOICES: Yes. Hear, hear.

MS. CHAPMAN: I'm missing out a part. Although there have been a series of legal challenges to Site C in Canadian courts, central issues of treaty violations and infringement of the affected First Nations have
not yet been dealt with in Canadian courts. We should expect that in time, court cases will proceed. It will be ratepayers as well as taxpayers who will pay both financially and morally.

In conclusion. Can I have an in

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, you may.

MS. CHAPMAN: Thank you. In conclusion, the terms of reference ask Commissioners to understand and explain opaque rationale beside -- excuse me, behind BC Hydro's single-minded determination to proceed with the Site C dam project despite the existence of realistic and better alternative options, and in the face of all the harms that will arise. What we need as a province is the opportunity to try again to get a responsible approach to generating energy in a way that allows the Peace River Valley to continue its life-sustaining capacity into a future far beyond the lifespan of Site C Dam. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.
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Please go ahead, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HAMBERGER (#0016):

MR. HAMBERGER: Thank you. My name is Sebastian Hamberger, last name H-A-M-B-E-R-G-E-R. Good afternoon, and thank you for giving me this
opportunity to speak at this inquiry for the Site C dam.

Let me tell you a little bit about myself. I'm a father of five. I live in Delta, B.C. The kids age range in ages from 20 to 11 and two of them are special needs. The reason I'm putting all this out to you is I'm a very busy man, yet I've taken the time here to come to you and talk to you about my concerns about the Site C dam.

THE CHAIRPERSON: We appreciate that. Thank you.
MR. HAMBERGER: Yeah, you're welcome.

On the professional side, I am a design and project manager in the B.C. energy industry for over 25 years and I’m currently working for the largest refinery, oil refinery here in B.C., and I've been following developments at the Site C dam closely over the years, seeing what an important project this is for B.C. going forward.

So what brings me here? Well, my concern really is about recent discussions about possibly delaying, or worse, cancelling this project. Site C dam is needed for the current energy independence of B.C. and the energy dependence of our neighbours who don't have the opportunity to build clean, environmentally renewable energy projects of this magnitude that we have here in B.C.
Don't forget, currently there are over 2500 workers, 2500 families up in the Peace River working, relying on income from this project that was decided on long ago. As a project manager, I have been, many times, challenged, when you do a project about, well, what are you doing? Are you sure you're doing the right thing? And I really sympathize with you, as the panel. I don't think it's fair for you to be asked on such short notice, with such tight timelines, to make a recommendation on such an important, critical issue. I really sympathize with you about the amount of work that you're being asked to do. But at the same time, we need to stay focussed on this project.

Delaying this project, I understand, is going to be well over a billion dollars. At least a billion dollars in waste which is going to pale some of past fiascos we've had here in the province, a reminder of the 400 million we wasted on the fast ferries back in the '90s.

Cancellation costs. You know, if you really add it up, we're looking at five to seven billion dollars. Billion. Which, how can we possible, you know, allow that to happen without any return. Money down the drain.

For those wondering why there's a need of Site C dam -- I know we've heard a lot of people here
talk about why we don't need and they've given us
your reasons. I got two reasons. One is, build it
and they will come. And my second reason is we really
have got to think long-term not short-term.

Our neighbours, Alberta, California,
Washington, they are just as desperate for clean
energy as we are. However, they don't have the
opportunities that we have here in B.C. for clean
hydro power.

Why do we need hydro power? How many of
you have one of these? How many of you had one of
these ten years ago? Probably none. The reason is
because these phones were developed in the last ten
years. Within ten years nobody had one and then
everybody had one. There's one very important piece
in this phone and that is a battery. And when the
phones came first out, they had to develop a battery
for it and the battery of choice now is a lithium
battery, and that technology now is being expanded
into the automotive industry.

I'm in oil refining and believe me, we are
all shaking in our boots wondering where this will go.
The electric car finally has a chance because of this
battery in this phone. There is, I think, a huge
under-estimation being done in terms of what the
electric energy needs are going to be from this
province down the road if the transportation industry
moves towards electric rather than gasoline and
diesel.

THE CHAIRPERSON: We're almost at the thirty second
mark.

MR. HAMBERGER: Yeah, thank you.

One last thing. I find it kind of
embarrassing almost that countries like China are
really ahead of us in practically developing
electricity infrastructure to ensure that they get
clean reliable energy. B.C. needs to become a leader
again when it comes to developing clean renewable
energy.

In terms of think long-term, please
remember the clean renewable energy that Site C dam
will provide is going to be the greatest legacy gift
we can give to our children. We are so close. Let's
not waste this precious opportunity this province has
been working on so hard for so long – over twenty
years – and throw British Columbia back into another
two decades of darkness.

Thank you very much for your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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Please go ahead, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. AUGUST (#0017):
MR. AUGUST: My name is Gordon August, A-U-G-U-S-T. I am a hereditary chief from Sechelt. I am here as an activist. I have been fighting against Site C dam for many years. Over the past few years, I've stood up and talked to people about the dam that we don’t need. Over the years, through my children, our house was decreased our power with all the new things that were brought out to save energy in our house. And they were taught that at school, and elementary schools, and high schools. So, I raise my hands to the children.

But I'd also like to raise my hands to the people that spoke earlier. A lot of that stuff that they covered, a lot of things I would like to say but have been covered by these people. But, I am talking too about my family. Because of BC Hydro, and the raising the rates to pay for the dam we don’t need. A lot of people don’t know.

My Hydro went up, in our family we couldn't afford it. So, now we're all separated, we're not living together no more. We all live in -- we couch surf is what we call it. And many people that couldn’t afford the Hydro.

In February, Hydro made a statement that, oh, we’ll give you six months to pay off the winter hydro rates that were raised up twice. A lot of
people didn’t know about it. So, as an activist, I've been out there talking to people on the streets, talking to people at seminars and workshops. What a lot of people don’t know, the devastation of the land, the mother earth, the laws of the land. If you look at all the trees that were cut down, trees create clean air. So you're looking at all that. Climate change is going to be affected up there. By the flooding, and all the cutting down of all the trees, and the plants that grow, that people use. Not just First Nation people, but many people use the plants that are growing out of the ground. Animals, insects, there are species, 86 species are going to become extinct. 16 are nearly extinct now. So, are they taking this all into consideration? Do they talk about that? No.

Today, I see power housing through and not communicating with the people like they say they do. They always just do it. You know, like what they've been doing for years. You look at years ago, the powerlines that they put through B.C. For instance, in our village, was permission granted? No, they just did it.

Over the years, there was a story that I'll share with you that a sacred area in our area, that BC Hydro was told not to go through, that it was very
sacred. Well, three people that were working for BC Hydro were affected by it. And a lot of things that people don’t understand is the power of the land. We got no control over it. We don’t own the land, the land owns us, and provides for us. And you look at all the different things that are happening right now, like the crack, the 400 metre crack. What is the land telling you, what is mother earth telling you? Do they take people in consideration? It's all about money, it's all about power. They don’t take all of us here, they don’t listen to our voice. They step up, and they don’t communicate with people. They say they communicated with us? They haven’t. They haven’t.

And as an activist, I stand up for the people, I stand up for everybody, because we're all affected by it in B.C., with the Hydro rates going up, and it was estimated that it would take 70 years to pay off that 8 billion, so projected. But, calculating things that maybe anywhere from 13 to 17 billion dollars. So, why are the people of B.C. paying for it, when we're not getting nothing back from it? When 50 percent is going elsewhere, 50 percent was projected for LNG, now all that is dying down.

So, we weren’t getting no money back, so
what's the use of building a dam? I'd rather take that $1.2 billion loss, and then put the rest of the money into poverty, into homes, affordable housing, and bring things back to the people. Work with the people of B.C., not for the big corporations, like LNG and BC Hydro, they don’t care. I raise my hands to everybody here today. I'd like to thank you for doing what you're doing. I'd like to thank the provincial government for bringing it forward and pushing it forward to you, and I alliterate what other people have said, that you guys have got a lot of work on your hands, and I raise my hands to you. Osseum [sic].

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Chief.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. PEACOCK (#0018):

MS. PEACOCK: My name is Adrienne Peacock, P-E-A-C-O-C-K.

First of all, Commissioners, let me thank you. Your work to date explains why so many of us worked so hard to get the Site C project examined by the BCUC. And I should tell you that while I live in Belcarra now, I lived and worked in Fort St. John during the first Site C hearing and I attended every day of those hearings as a consultant to one of the major interveners. And prior to arriving in the north I had never visited the Peace River Valley. I had seen
pictures of it and understood it was a beautiful place, but I was swept away when I saw it. It is a magnificent valley.

The BCUC hearings were rigorous and I became convinced that it was essential to have an independent agency that should examine expensive energy projects. And I know you have some very difficult decisions to make, but I would remind you that in May 1983 the Commission said:

"The Commission therefore concludes that an energy project certificate for Site C should not be issued until (1) an acceptable forecast demonstrates that construction must begin immediately in order to avoid supply deficiencies; and (2) a comparison of alternative feasible system plans demonstrates from a social benefit cost point of view that Site C is the best project to meet the anticipated supply deficiency."

I suggest to you that neither of these conditions have been met. I thought this project would never be built until these conditions were met, and I'm very disappointed that you weren't invited in before they started construction. As far as I can see from all the evidence, we will not have supply...
deficiencies in the forecastable future, and Site C is
not the best project to meet the future. What we need
are flexible low-cost alternatives, and they abound.
Site C didn't make any economic sense then and I don't
think it makes any more now.

And I might also point out that back in
1983, BC Hydro was on track to spend almost 27
million, and that was when Site C cost 3 billion,
considering how to put dams on the Stikine River, and
almost 18 million on how to put dams on the Liard
River. Aren't we glad that the BCUC stepped in and
brought some sense to this, if it slows down that
picture? Now we actually celebrate Rivers Day
tomorrow in fact I think it is. But given that Site C
project is already begin and you have the difficult
decision whether or not it should continue, and I
would suggest to you it's time to cut and run.

And I found, I read your report with
respect to Muskrat Falls and the Manitoba dams, but it
did strike me that Muskrat Falls has many parallels to
what we've seen here. It was not reviewed by an
independent regulator. It was a political decision.
It was promoted as a job creator and it was promoted
as necessary for clean green energy. It has been none
of those. It has been a boondoggle according to the
head of Nelcor.
And I would suggest to you that we don't even know when we talk about jobs at Site C, we don't even know how many full-time equivalent jobs there are, and that's actually rather important when you start talking about it to the public, because they believe that 2600 and yet it might actually, if we looked at full-time equivalent jobs, who knows? 20 maybe. I don't know. Because BC Hydro isn't telling us. And so I would respectfully ask you to compel BC Hydro to justify their numbers.

I would also suggest that we look seriously at Muskrat Falls, because generations of Newfoundlanders and Labradoreans are -- we're told that they would benefit from this clean green low-cost hydro power, and that's not at all what they got. They got almost a doubling in their power rate from 15.3 to 23.3 cents a kilowatt hour. Is that what we're going to get? I really hope you will find that out. And I hope you will listen to Mr. Vardy, who has very good experience in Newfoundland who said, "B.C. has the luxury of being able to stop this now without going further." And he also said that in terms of takeaway from Muskrat Falls, it's not too late to stop it.

And I just want to very quickly -- I realize I'm running out of time -- to point out that
in addition to all the other sources of people have said Burrard Thermal is something worth giving a second look because it was, as Mark Ellison said, a person who should know because he was in fact President and CEO of BC Hydro at one point, there has never been any economic, social or environmental reason as to why Burrard Station was shut down. It was perfectly dispatchable. It was only operated about 10 to 12 days a year and yet it was the perfect backup system. And it's right in the Lower Mainland. Environmental activists were happy with it. And I suggest it wouldn't be that hard to reactivate it.

In conclusion, I would like to thank you. I'm grateful for the way in which you have been going about the examination of this project, and I thank you for submitting the DeLoitte report so that we could all read it and for your diligence in pursuing the many questions in your September 20th report. Many many of us are counting on you. Thank you.
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THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JONES (#0019):

MR. JONES: My name is David Jones. I am a metallurgist who just retired and I worked in the mining industry, but I have an abiding interest in the environment and that's mainly what I want to speak about. I echo the
previous speaker's sentiments. She said so adequately, I don't need to repeat them.

First of all, the power from Site C is not needed. It's not needed now, it's not needed ten years from now, it won't be needed 20 years from now. Many speakers have spoken to this and the reason is clear, the consumption of power in B.C. is not going up any more. It stopped rising about 12 years ago, and if anything, it is slightly going down. And the reason for this is the main consumers of power, the industrial users, can't afford it anymore. It has nearly doubled in price in the last ten years, and it is probably going to double again. It is already uneconomic. I know this from the mining industry, the large mining industries can't afford to pay the present rate, let alone double it.

When the CEO of BC Hydro gave a speech to a mining conference that I attended about five years ago, about the time the project was sanctioned, I was sitting next to a CEO of a mining company that wanted to put in a new project. And I remember the BC Hydro lady said the cost was going to be about 8 or 9 cents a kilowatt hour. And I turned to him and said, "What cost are you putting into your feasibility study?" He said "4 cents." "What will the result be if it is 8 cents?" He said "It's a no go. It kills the
project." And I've done a lot of those project finances myself, I already knew the answer, I worked many years for Teck.

This project, this Site C should never have even been looked at, which is probably why it was in abeyance for so many years. It was on again, off again. And in fact, we probably should never have built all the dams we did. I'm old enough to remember when "Wacky" Bennett took over the B.C. Electric, and then he instituted this two rivers policy. What a disaster. There is nothing worse than a hydroelectric project for the environment. It kills the environment. As the previous speaker said, it's dead water behind the dams.

I lived up north in Northern B.C. for several years, where the results of the Kemano project were evident everywhere. Those huge dead lakes that nothing lives in. And now -- and the Peace River, the dams that existing on it, there is nothing behind them either. And the Columbia River Valley, I worked at Trail for many years, the dams behind Castlegar. It's killed everything. We should never have built all those dams.

And this Green Energy Act -- *Clean Energy Act*, it's called Green energy? It should be called the "Dirty Energy Act" in terms of the environment.
It is killing the environment.

Anyway, we know power consumption isn’t going up anymore, you’ve heard that several times. The LNG expectation is dead in the water. Even if they did build the LNG plants, they produced the energy onsite from the LNG gas itself. All the gas companies do that. There was never going to be an electric power consumption by LNG, but thank God there is not going to happen anyway.

So now we have huge debts looming over BC Hydro. You probably know that province of B.C., largely due to BC Hydro is by far the most indebted province in Canada. In fact, the debt is now approaching that of the Federal Government itself. On a per capita basis we are several times that of any other province, and it’s getting worse. And we’ve actually spiraling down now, because as the rates have to go up, the consumption is going down. What does this tell us? It’s the spectre of bankruptcy. BC Hydro is going to go bankrupt. Guarantee it. I’ve had a bit of experience with this. This is the early stages of bankruptcy for BC Hydro. They can’t pay these debts. It is something like 100 billion dollars including the contingent liabilities which will never be paid back. And we can’t get out of it, because we can’t raise the rates because that depresses
consumption. And B.C. isn’t big enough to pay off the debts without it.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Jones, just wanted to let you know your time is --

MR. JONES: You’re absolutely right, and I didn’t get half as far -- I want to see the thing terminated, and the termination costs can be paid by increasing the agricultural land, and growing. Which is what I mainly wanted to speak about, I got carried away, I'm sorry. But Wendy Holms said it much better than me, and we calculated it could be far more benefit from the new act -- from the increased production from those lands than we'll ever get, ever cost us in termination. The termination will cost no money at all, it will actually benefit the province. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Jones.
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Mr. Gilling.

MR. GILLING: Good afternoon.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GILLING (#0020):

MR. GILLING: My name is Joseph Gilling, I'm a resident of Vancouver and I speak on my own behalf.

I've made my career on engineering economics, primarily in the electric power sector. As
a senior energy economist with the World Bank, I assessed many hydro power projects with regard to economic costs and benefits and with particular attention to demand forecasts and whether or not the proposed projects with the least-cost solution for meeting incremental demand.

I led a team to assess the environmental impacts on the costs of long-term generation options for the Philippines power sector, using planning models analogous to those used by BC Hydro and Deloitte in evaluating generation supply options.

Now, as a taxpayer and a customer of BC Hydro, I am relieved that the BC Utilities Commission was finally requested to review the Site C project. I am impressed with the depth of analysis and the scope of inquiry being carried out. This work is proving to be far superior than that of the National Energy Board and the subsequent public consultations on the Kinder Morgan Pipeline.

The preliminary report of the Commission has identified many uncertainties and especially the need for further information. On the evidence to date, however, it is clear that the Site C project is marginal at best. The decision to go ahead with construction without a review by the Utilities Commission is, in itself, evidence that the decision-
makers recognized that the project would likely not stand up to detailed scrutiny.

The preliminary report of the Panel has reviewed in detail the aspects of the Site C as a marginal project. I'll not go into detail, but simply highlight the key areas of concern. Number one, the demand forecast is over-estimated. This has been spoken to by several previous speakers. The cost estimate of $8.3 billion as a base case, includes contingencies of 14 percent only. By comparison, the World Bank at final investment decision stage would typically include a 20 percent contingency, and a review of completed projects in Canada and elsewhere suggests that much higher contingencies in the range of 30 to 50 percent are warranted, and for Site C, this would be especially true in the event of a delay in river diversion, with the result that the cost could rise to the level of in the order of $12 billion.

There has been an incomplete evaluation of alternatives. This too has been spoken to.

The Panel has quite rightly asked for further information, especially in light of declining cost for new technologies, wind and solar, biomass, whatever, and the options relating to the Canadian entitlement under the Columbia River Treaty.
Now, the biggest issue also mentioned previously, but I would like to reinforce it, demand-side management and energy efficiency. Demand-side management and energy efficiency offer the cheapest alternatives with a relatively short payback time to provide energy services of light, heat and mode power rather than simply building more facilities to add to the supply. This option is the least explained by BC Hydro and was subsumed in the demand forecast rather than being treated as an explicitly supply option.

BC Hydro's smart meter program has made available a wealth of information, not as yet mined, it would seem, that can be used to identify areas for reducing energy consumption and for the shaping of load demand.

I submit finally that the exclusion from the analysis of the opportunity cost of flooding the river valley, thereby precluding agriculture production possibly forever, is an omission from the analysis and should be included in the cost of completing the Site C project.

The major lesson I've learned through my experience in the evaluating hydro power projects, that marginal projects seldom improve. Project preparation times get dragged out, more costs are sunk in studies and/or construction, leading to further
delays in the development of alternatives.

Thank you for the opportunity for this presentation.
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THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Gilling, thank you.

Please go ahead.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MILNE (#0021):

MS. MILNE: Good afternoon. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to present my comments today. I have shown up --

THE CHAIRPERSON: I'm sorry to interrupt. Could you please state your name, so that the trans- -- yeah.

MS. MILNE: Oh. My name is Onni Milne, O-N-N-I, last name Milne, M-I-L-N-E.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Please go ahead.

MS. MILNE: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to present my comments today. I have shown up now. I'm speaking out today to defend my home, this native land. I'm disappointed that First Nations issues are not going to be considered as part of this process because I think they belong as part of this process. I'm disappointed that as the speaker before me talked about agricultural land, I'm disappointed that isn't going to be included as well, because that is also part of the economic consideration.
I look forward to seeing that this process is more than the usual public relations spin that we are offered as a consultation. I look forward to seeing that you are not only listening but you are hearing what we are saying to you.

On September the 13th I attended the Peace Valley Landowners' Association press conference where Robert McCullough talked about the DeLoitte report that had just been released. He thrashed the figures that BC Hydro had offered, their inflated, misleading, fairy tale figures of jobs and revenue. Harry Swayne was also at the press conference, the chair of the former Joint Review Panel that said no to Site C Dam. He supported Robert McCullough's statements.

I thank you for giving me the opportunity to be here. As a citizen, as a taxpayer, as a ratepayer, I say no to this project and I'm asking you to say no to this project.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, thank you very much.
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Please go ahead.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MARTZ-OBERLANDER (#0022):


First I would like to say that it's an
honour to be here on unceded ancestral homelands. That means a lot to me as a grandchild of refugees. My grandparents found safety here and so I honour the legacy of strength and resilience continued by the people of this land. I don't have an ancestral homeland, and so I will fight for the right of Treaty 8 people to live where they have belonged since time out of mind.

I don't think that most people in this room can understand what it means to belong deeply to a place. There is value in that, and that is much greater than any number or sum, and it will be valuable long after economics, as we know it, cease to exist.

As the youngest person, so far, to address the panel today, and as a woman, and as a survivor of sexual violence, I'm going to keep speaking against a system that does not prioritize consent, that does not take no for an answer, and that does not value the autonomy of marginalized people. Treaty 8 people have not given consent for this dam, and that is a piece of the puzzle that is far more important than any argument for jobs or possible future energy demands.

We exist in a system that says that some bodies are more important than others, some colours, some lands and some resources are more important than
others. Across this country women in communities based around extractive resources with large numbers of transient workers experience higher rates of abusive violence. This is a world that says that those with money, those who talk a certain way, those who present as a certain gender can take what they want, when they want, in the bedroom, in the streets, in the fields and from the rivers.

This dam is part of a long history of colonial violence and extraction and it would not be proposed in southern or more predominantly white parts of this province.

This is a human rights issue. It's a huge human rights issue. It takes migrant workers away from their homes and families and forces them into dangerous and short-term jobs instead of giving them opportunities to work building infrastructure projects in their own communities, and that's a problem.

I am going to keep screaming "No means no" to the process which insists that no actually means maybe, that if we have more process, more consultations, more stalling, that the no will turn into a maybe.

But I invite us to celebrate our no. This dam is not part of the world I want to see built in my lifetime. It is not part of the world I want to leave.
for my children. It is not something I want to be paying for until I'm 90 years old.

Until we lose our voices and have to scream with our feet and hands and bodies, no still means no. Thank you.
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THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

Please go ahead, sir.

**SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SMITH (#0023):**

MR. SMITH: Hello. My name is George Smith. I live in Gibsons. I too want to recognize that I'm on Coast Salish territory today.

I work for the Office of Energy Conservation in Ottawa, for the Native Citizens' Group in the Secretary of State Department; and from Gibsons as the National Conservation Director of the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society. I have spent significant professional time in the Peace River Valley since 1992. So my interest in the Site C issue is enlivened by my experience with First Nations, energy conservation, and environmental sustainability.

I'm concerned about the cost to ratepayers of continuing this project or choosing a more rational, sustainable economic path for British Columbia. BC Hydro has yet to substantiate energy demand for the $8.8 billion debt they say Site C will
cost. The 70 year payback period will have a serious effect on opportunity cost implications for B.C., limiting capital availability to support a more sustainable economy for needed infrastructure projects, more cost-effective alternate energy projects, as well we more traditional commercial and industrial businesses.

Today I wish to draw your attention specifically to one part of the troubled economics of Site C and that is jobs. Apparently a mere 28 full-time jobs will be in place to maintain operations following construction. Yet BC Hydro and the former BC government claimed that many thousands of jobs will be created during construction. They still assert that 2200 to 2600 jobs are currently on site and in danger of disappearing should the project be cancelled. However, Peace River -- Peace Valley residents report a significantly smaller workforce and challenge the veracity of on-site job numbers touted by Hydro. I respectfully suggest that the BCUC Commissioners would be well served to require Hydro to publish specific employment figures to verify the current jobs reality.

Apparently BC Hydro simply asked contractors to provide their job numbers. How convenient. Does a one hour a week subsidiary job
qualify? How about somebody who works but one day last summer? To discover the current employment truth, one needs to see specific information which provides specific details such as full versus part-time workers, ongoing versus terminated workers, seasonal, out-of-province, Hydro headquarters staff, temporary or former workers and so on. To truly understand the current employment picture, the key is to require Hydro to provide you with full-time equivalent numbers, FTEs as they say, as is standard in major project analyses. This would provide valuable information to the public and political decision makers who will have final say in this issue. So let's look beyond temporary construction jobs to see some of the longer-term implications to the B.C. economy and hydro rates.

By example, the submission of the Association of Major Power Customers of B.C. expressed concern that hydro annual rate increases stable 02.6 percent. To quote:

"Doing so will help keep B.C. electricity rates competitive relative to other jurisdictions for both existing businesses and new industrial investment. In contrast, if electricity rates increase by more than 2.6 percent, that heightens the risk of
destroying demand, i.e. existing industrial consumers, customers will scale down or shut down operations or even transfer production to other jurisdictions. In turn, these consequences would negative affect jobs in B.C. as well as all BC Hydro ratepayers who would then have to bear a greater proportion of BC Hydro costs."

Given the current $22 billion debt load of BC Hydro, billion dollar commitments to independent power projects, and the probable $10 billion plus cost of Site C, I wonder how Hydro is going to keep its annual rate hikes below the industry's level of concern. Are individual homeowners or small business operators supposed to suck it up and pay increased rates to keep our economy afloat? I submit the example of our already stressed thermal mechanical pulp mills. Energy costs for these mills are approximately one-third of their overall production costs. If U.S. competitors can buy BC Hydro energy at spot market price of 25 to 35 dollars, while our own B.C. mills have to pay far higher rates, how can they compete and survive?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Smith, I just want to warn you about the time, please.

MR. SMITH: Got it.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you. If four of these mills go down, with about 500 employees each, that eliminates 2,000 jobs due in part to Site C. By contrast, if Site C is not allowed to diminish the borrowing power of the B.C. government for other capital investment projects, consider the long-term benefits for our society.

A couple minutes?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Sure.

MR. SMITH: Or a couple sec. B.C. needs improvements to our schools, hospitals, highways and bridges. Current Site C employees could be put to work on the long-term -- excuse me, on the long-needed reconstruction of the Taylor Bridge just down river. Other longer-term project benefits from stopping Site C would include a robust home energy retrofit program and solar installation subsidies, whereby B.C. could provide sustainable long-term employment for many workers close to their homes.

I thank you very much for the extra times.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir, thank you.
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Mr. Black, my apologies. The Panel is just going to take a short break, so if you could just stand down for probably five minutes, that would be appreciated. Thank you.
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 3:06 P.M.)

(PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 3:15 P.M.)

THE CHAIRPERSON: All right, thank you.

Please go ahead, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BLACK (#0024):

MR. BLACK: Hi, my name is David Black, and I'm president of MoveUP, the Movement of United Professionals.

I'd like to too acknowledge that we are on the unceded territory of the Tsleil-Waututh, the Squamish and the Musqueam First Nations. And I'd also like to acknowledge the Commission.

Sorry, not close enough?

I'd like to acknowledge the Commission for holding, not only this hearing, but hearings in the Treaty 8 First Nation Territory who are, of course, most directly affected by this.

Our union represents about 12,000 members across B.C. and about 56 of our members, right now, are working directly on that project. So I'm here partially to talk about the human cost of cancelling Site C, which in many cases seems to get lost amidst the controversy and multi-billion dollar estimates.

Our members in Fort St. John are very worried about what the future looks like for them. Many have moved their entire lives and their families
to the area based on promises by the previous
government. One of the members I was speaking to
recently talked about how tough it had been for his
family to make the decision to move to Fort St. John
to take the job. They were settled in their
community, the kids had friends, they went to schools,
but they had the promise of a better life. So he was
told that they were going to have an LNG industry and
that Site C would bring prosperity to the Peace area,
and that they'd be building a future asset for British
Columbians.

So they invested in Fort St. John. They
helped to build the community. They bought a house
there when real estate prices were high, given all the
optimism around Site C and LNG. And again, because of
the promises of the previous government.

And now the kids are settled in that
community, they've got new friends, they play on
sports teams there. Now, he's scared. LNG does not
appear to be materializing, and now the project he's
working on, Site C, is up in the air as well. He's
afraid that real estate prices are going to plunge.
He'll have to sell the house that he purchased at a
premium in a rising marking, into a falling market,
into a depressed area.

BC Hydro has promised him other work if
Site C is cancelled, but it most certainly won't be in the Peace. Through no fault of his own, this family faces an uncertain future now.

The preliminary report on Site C that the Commission released this week is now adding to that anxiety for our workers and their families in Fort St. John. Will they have to leave? Will they lose their investments in their houses and where will they go? They will be forced to start all over again in another community.

I would, however, be remiss not to mention a few other points regarding your assessment of Site C, and I think it's a good report given the short timeframe, and the questions are not entirely surprising, that there's more questions than answers at this point.

With billions of dollars at stake either way, it is ultimately B.C. ratepayers who will pay the price, whatever the decision is on Site C. We know that whether you go ahead with it, you recommend going ahead with it, or recommend cancelling it, our rates are all going to go up either way. And this situation is the result of a complete lack of fiscal responsibility by the previous government.

At the outset of this session we were told to refrain from using profanity, but when I think of
the mess that we're in now, the mess that has been handed to you in a short time period, I have a hard time describing that to people without using profanity. How did this project get this this far without proper oversight? How could this have happened to British Columbians? How could this have happened to our members who in good faith took those jobs and thought they were doing the right thing for this province?

MoveUP has always maintained that this review should have been done before any work began on Site C. Unfortunately, as you know, that's a moot point. We're over $2 billion into and two years down the road. However, I'm very appreciative of one point that you made in your interim report about mitigating costs going forward. As you rightly noted in your preliminary report, private power operators have been overpaid by the government in the past, leading to the enormous debt that BC Hydro is on, and must be reined in. We appreciate the suggestion to BC Hydro that when alternative power sources are looked at, they are looked at being built publically rather than simply privately, because public power is always much cheaper.

We ask the Commission to confirm in its final report that any alternatives to Site C, if that
is your recommendation, should be built publically at a reduced cost to ratepayers.

Thank you very much for time and good luck with your mission.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. VANDYK (#0025):

MR. VANDYK: Good afternoon everybody and good afternoon, Commission.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good afternoon.

MR. VANDYK: My name is John Vandyk, V-A-N-D-Y-K. Been living in Langley for 30 years, and a BC Hydro user, and a taxpayer.

If BCU is considering either A) continuing or B) suspending restarting the dam, the reasons why BCU [sic] immediate needs to get Site C Dam reviewed by top engineers and geologists outside of B.C. to ensure first the safety of people living downstream of the dam and, second, the best value for tax ratepayers' money.

I believe Keith Kid, an ex-Ontario Hydro, originally designed a standard, slightly curved Site C Dam 1. BC Hydro tabled that standard Site C Dam 1 with BCUC in 1982 and therefore must have checked that it complied with our earthquake regulations. BCUC turned Site C down at that time for lack of sufficient
load to justify its construction.

Under Premier Gordon Campbell, BC Hydro re-purposed that standard Site C Dam Number 1. Vancouver Sun reported it cost about 3.3 billion in 2005. Under Premier Christy Clark, in 2011, BC Hydro consulting engineers changed Site C Dam to an upgraded right-angle design, Dam Number 2, which raised the cost to 7.9 billion.

The upgrade resulted in a 4.6 billion surge in contractor cost, about 200 million more for the engineer's supervision of that construction. The cheaper alternative to the upgraded Site C Dam Number 2 was the original Site C Dam Number 1 at much lower cost, 4.6 billion.

I believe BC Hydro managers knew it but were afraid to admit they had spent a lot of time and money on Dam Number 2, so they tried to hide their error using media release, then claiming doubtful advantages for their upgraded dam design. Unfortunately they misled the government, MLAs, and many B.C. citizens and wasted billions of dollars in direct and differed charges of obligations now clearly stated by Dalalight.

Eventually the truth will out, the so-called upgrade Dam 2 is at best a serious error or worse a boondoggle benefiting contractors and not
ratepayers. The truth that it cost taxed B.C. ratepayers an unnecessary extra 4 billion plus, it may comprise safety of people downstream of the Dam Number 2.

Nobody can say BC Electric's plans sites like Dam C, Dam Number 1, were not well investigated, drilled, checked out, and signed off by B.C.'s most famous Geologist, Dr. Vic Dolmage, who blew up the famous navigation hazard, namely Ripple Rock and Seymour Narrows just north of Campbell River, B.C. It was the biggest ever controlled non-nuclear explosion on earth. All site geological maps, including Site C, were given to Dr. Dolmage for check out.

I believe Peace River Dam's A, B, C and D, E and which A, B were built, and 12 Columbia River dams, of which four were built, also built four smaller dams. All together the ten dams we designed have all all stood a 50-year test of time and every day produce most of BC Hydro's electricity at around $7 per megawatt hour.

IPP's produced electricity at around 86 per megawatt hour and the current Site C was estimated to produce electricity at around $132 per megawatt hour. They have completed included interest during construction and all deferred charges, which are applied when it goes in service. Experience with the
ten dams is that cost mainly depends on the quantity of material moved from source location to the dam's site. If Site C Dam 2 clearly physically requires a lot more material than the original Site Dam 1, which I believe contributes to the much higher cost.

My earlier concerns increase -- sorry. Plus, I believe the upgraded Site C Dam Number 2 is geo-technically weaker than B.C.'s electric Dam 1 design because it's not tied into the midstream island. I believe that the so-called upgrade change in 2011 in Site C Dam Number 2 design is costing B.C. ratepayers 4.4 billion. Vancouver Sun reported in 2005 that Site C cost had increased from 3.3 billion when BC Hydro had earlier tabled BC Electric's standard design of Site C with the BC Utilities Commission.

In July 2016, rains caused slides and slopes (inaudible). And that you can see in picture X-3 on F26-4.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Vandyk, we're out of time, but would you like to provide a summary, please? I'm sorry.

MR. VANDYK: No, that's it. Thank you for having this opportunity.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. PLASHKES (#0026):

MS. PLASHKES: Good afternoon, my name is Tova Plashkes, P-L-A-S-H-K-E-S. First, I'd like to thank you all for your time, and for the quite wonderful work that you put forward, and also to the other speakers today who really put together some quite important points.

I wanted to express my displeasure that your mandate that you were given did not allow you to consider First Nations rights, which considering the Walk for Reconciliation is here tomorrow in Vancouver, it seems a bit sad.

We also can't discuss the rights of farmers, nor the environmental issues with the dam, which are many. Thankfully this is a situation in which the economics and all of those issues agree, the Site C dam should not be built.

I'm here today to represent people like me all over British Columbia. I work in the public service here in Vancouver, I pay my taxes, and my rates. As the cost of living continues to rise obscenely in this province, it is your job as a committee to make sure that the utilities are not part of the problem. This will allow middle class, ratepaying, taxpaying citizens to consider staying in
B.C. when they could go elsewhere for a lower cost of living, and/or to get paid more.

The way you do that is by not throwing good money after bad. Three billion dollars to cancel the dam is a lot of money, but 9 to 12 billion for a dam we don’t need, is much, much worse.

There are many things about the economics of this dam that you spoke about in your preliminary report that are a problem. Here is the most important one; we don’t need the power. We are basing this on BC Hydro’s load forecasting. In 2008 they made a prediction that we are going to be using nearly 70,000 GWh of power in 2017. The reality is 15 to 20 percent lower. Now they’ve made another estimation in 2016 and once again, it’s a line that grows rapidly over time. Reality and these forecasts are not related. So, in order to make this dam worth it, you need to believe two things that BC Hydro is telling you. That their estimation of power needed is correct, which is proven to be untrue, and then you need to believe that the estimation for how long the dam is going to take, and how much it is going to cost is correct.

As your own preliminary report says, if it’s delayed at all, these costs could balloon. The other projects, such as Newfoundland’s Muskrat Falls has shown us, this is not just a possibility, it could
be a likelihood.

Another factor to consider is BC Hydro's continued failure to aggressively use demand-side management as you stated. This can't -- they can, and should do more. Why not take those jobs that are concentrated around the dam, and spread them into communities all over B.C. to save power?

I urge you to consider these problems when making your recommendation. I don’t want my public utilities saddled with huge debts for a dam we don’t need. Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.
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THE CHAIRPERSON: Can we reset the clock, please?

Please, go ahead.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DAVIDSON (#0027):

MS. DAVIDSON: Hello, my name is Gail Davidson, D-A-V-I-D-S-O-N. I'm here to make some comments about the Commission's mandate and also to ask this Commission to advise the provincial government that construction of the Site C Dam must be terminated because the project is not necessary for the public convenience and does not properly conserve the public interest.

By order of the Lieutenant Governor in council the Commission has been directed to conduct an inquiry and advise the province about the implications
of completing, suspending or terminating construction of Site C. B.C.'s Clean Energy Act stripped the Commission of its power to issue or refuse a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity specifically for Site C. Although the August terms of reference and directive seeks to impose restrictions, having been ordered to conduct an inquiry, the Commission remains bound by the Utilities Commission Act to answer the questions posed by the province within the context of the statutory requirements for all projects seeking approval under the Act, namely, is the project Site C necessary for the public convenience, and secondly, does Site C properly conserve the public interest?

Overwhelming evidence publicly available in reports from the Joint Review Panel and a plethora of scientists and other experts informs us that the answer to each of these questions is indisputably no. There is no need for Site C electricity that could possibly justify the unavoidable and terrible legacy of Site C, the permanent and irremediable environmental, social, economic and cultural damage and violation of the internationally and domestically supposedly projected rights of Treaty 8 members.

A yes answer, advice to complete Site C now or in 2024, could only be obtained if the Commission
ignores that evidence and the Act does not allow the Commission to do so. The Commission must base its advice on a necessity and public interest analysis of all Site C costs, not just those related to questions specifically posed by the terms of reference.

For example, the David Suzuki Foundation report before the Commission calculates the cost to the public of Site C related environmental destruction alone at billions per year. Costs not considered also are those raised by my colleagues Rita Wong, Chloe Speakman, Lynn Chapman and others.

The Commission is an important statutory body created to be the watchdog of the public interest in relation to BC Hydro and other public utilities. The August directive does not and cannot operate to convert the Commission from a watchdog of BC Hydro to its lap dog. Approval of Site C without a full review of necessity, environmental impacts, First Nations rights, and the public interest was made possible by the undemocratic enactment of the Clean Energy Act in 2010 and amendments to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act in 2012. Proper review is further prevented by restrictions on the scope of the Joint Review Panel. Objections to Site C approval in the absence of responsible environmental assessment, the consent of Treaty 8 members and affected First
Nations, and a proper determination of necessity and public interest continues to spark alarm and concern from provincial, Canadian and international sectors. Hundreds of scientists cautioned against the projects stating "the number and scope of significant adverse environmental effects arising from the Site C project are greater than for any other project ever assessed."

In September 2006 the Union of B.C. Municipalities passed a resolution calling for the immediate suspension of all work pending a full review. This month, September 13th, the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination recommended that to comply with its international obligations, Canada must, number one, immediately suspend all permits and approval for Site C construction; two, conduct a review in consultation with indigenous people of treaty and consultation rights; and three, identify alternatives to the irreversible destruction of indigenous lands and subsistence that will be caused by Site C.

I'm here to urge --

THE CHAIRPERSON: Ms. --

MS. DAVIDSON: -- the members of this Commission to use the limited time allotted to carry out your public duties to advise termination of Site C. Enough resources have been spent on reviews looking through
limited lenses and invariably concluding, well yes, we did see a wall of white, and while you said it was an elephant we don't have proof and we're not mandated to look beyond our lens. This Commission is required by statute to consider necessity, conservation of the public interest and First Nations rights by looking at the whole elephant. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
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Please, go ahead. Please go ahead, thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HEWETT (#0028):

MS. HEWETT: Okay, thank you. My name is Kari Hewett, H-E-W-E-T-T. Thank you, B.C. Utilities Commission and everybody in this room for being here and for bearing witness in this very important discussion. It is important to have open, respectful, informed and meaningful discussions about issues in a democratic society.

I also acknowledge that we are on unceded traditional territory of the Musqueam, Tsleil-Waututh, and Squamish First Coast -- sorry, Coast Salish peoples.

I was born on raised on Coast Salish land, and I heard somebody mention earlier about the international reputation of B.C. and Canada should a
dam not go ahead. I would like to offer as consideration the international reputation and obligations that Canada has to meet with reference to the inherent rights of the indigenous peoples of both B.C. and right across Canada. This will be a big black mark on our collective reputation if we do not complete the respectful meaningful discussions and get the consent of these First Nations Peoples.

I'm a teacher. I'm very fortunate to be working with young people who are our future here in Vancouver. Our students are now learning more about indigenous peoples and projects like Site C as part of their Social Studies learning about B.C. and resources. You may note the curriculum is changing, but these are still important discussions that we have with them.

One very important and central part of their learning is critical thinking, where we explore with them multiple perspectives, we evaluate evidence for a number of different backgrounds and people, and we come to ethical conclusions, and these are all central to their balanced learning. It's very similar to what we are all engaging in right now.

Of their own accord over the past few years, and almost to a person, and I'm talking about high school students, they are very confused and
concerned about this project. I do not speak for them. However, I believe their voices do need to be heard. They have a few main questions: How can a government ignore the treaty rights of the indigenous peoples of the Peace Valley and surrounding areas? They don't understand this. They truly do not understand this.

They are concerned about up to 70 years of debt and that they have a say in this, and they want alternatives that don't tax their future, because that's the way they see this. Are their voices important to us, and how can we include them?

My brother is a certified welder and heavy-duty mechanic. He does not have a job at Site C. However, he has trained over almost 20 years to be part of projects and infrastructure building such as this. As he is not able to be here today, I must ask on his behalf how many long-term sustainable jobs is Site C providing and who is getting these jobs? They can be distributed throughout the province.

There are many unanswered questions and there is a lot at stake. I ask that considering the $9 billion or more debt that is possible for our province, that we cannot afford for generations, when our public schools continue to struggle even for basic funding for food programs, sufficient support for
students with disabilities, indigenous students, and seismic upgrading. What concrete evidence-based, ethical and public interest economics demonstrably support continuing with Site C?

What are our priorities? When we have earthquake drills in this city, the students laugh. We are in building that will crumble. We will be squashed. And they know it. And that is something that's not being paid for.

So, how could $6 billion of our money be spent developing more economical, sustainable, ethical energy alternatives? All of us and future generations will certainly hold all decision makers accountable.

Please stop this dam. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
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Mr. Waddington?

MR. WADDINGTON: Hi, thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: You're welcome. Please go ahead, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WADDINGTON (#0029):

MR. WADDINGTON: Thank you to the members of the Commissioners, the members of the public Utilities Commission for this opportunity to speak concerning recommendations to be given to the government of British Columbia regarding the future of Site C dam. So, I'd like to thank Richard Mason, and Karen Keilty,
and David Morton who is the chairperson I believe, is that correct?

THE CHAIRPERSON: That's correct sir, yes.

MR. WADDINGTON: And Dennis Cote. Did I pronounce your last name properly?

COMMISSIONER COTE: Correct.

MR. WADDINGTON: Well, I'd like to thank the Commissioners very much for this opportunity, because as a resident of British Columbia, and my name is Marcus Waddington, M-A-R-C-U-S, W-A-D-D-I-N-G-T-O-N. I feel privileged to be able to speak before you today. It is a wonderful opportunity for me, and I think that you as commissioners have a phenomenal responsibility for this very, very important decision that you have to take regarding the possible cancellation, mothballing I guess, or continuation of this project. So, I'm going to leave out the other aspects, a lot of people have spoken about them that are germane to this project. Such as the agricultural farmland that has been destroyed, that will be destroyed. The environmental destruction that is already taken place, but will continue to take place, and I especially acknowledge the voices of the First Nations who have not really been fully heard here today, but I expect they've been heard in Northern British Columbia where you undoubtedly have had
hearings.

So, I will restrict myself to simple economic considerations from a layperson's point of view. I am not an economist. First, the price tag for this project is very, very high. It is mind-bogglingly high. 8,000 million dollars, or eight billion dollars and counting? That is such a high number, it is unimaginable for me as a layperson to imagine how much money this actually represents. But it is very, very high. And it is so high, that it may jeopardize not only the solvency of British Columbia Hydro, but also the province itself.

Now, I'm just going to have to put my glasses on, which I just got, to read this. That is a matter of great concern to ratepayers, taxpayers and all residents of British Columbia. Even if you don't pay taxes, it's of concern, because it involves the continuation of what is now a very important body, the public Utilities Commission, and its powers, in a sense, BC Hydro itself, and also our government. All this democratic process is at stake to a certain extent.

One very important question then is, do we need the power now? Well we might need it 100 years from now, or maybe 200 years from now, that is very true. We might even need it 40 years from now. But a
lot is happening in this timeframe.

The Deloitte report says we do not need this power now. So, building for the future possible demand invites incalculable variables, and incurs high risk for very little tangible benefit. But, and this is question that hasn’t been asked very much today -- I know I am over time. Who benefits the most? Another important question. It appears that more and more likely that it is big oil and gas interests who stand to benefit the most from this project.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Waddington --

MR. WADDINGTON: "Electrification" via this project of their energy needs for oil and gas development would soon be seen to mitigate and offset their production of greenhouse gasses, and at the same time subsidize their costs.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Waddington, we're running out of time.

MR. WADDINGTON: So indeed the secret meetings between Calgary -- in Calgary rather, in 2016 between government and big oil, seemed pretty well to have accomplished that, in this respect. Site C is simply a part of a big oil play in Northern British Columbia that has been on their drawing board for years.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Waddington, I'm afraid we've run out of time.
MR. WADDINGTON: So, can I sum up?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, please do, thank you.

MR. WADDINGTON: So, that's how in simple terms the government can end up subsidizing one of the most powerful and richest industries in the world. Big oil and gas at ratepayers' expense, at taxpayers' expense. And the final horrific scenario, which I'm not going in to, because I don’t have time, is the privatization of BC Hydro, which has taken place in Ontario, and which has taken place in Nova Scotia, with the result you have huge rates, very high rates for taxpayers, ratepayers, and deplorable services.

So, that is the real danger, is the solvency and the possible privatization of this wonderful public asset.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
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MR. WADDINGTON: Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Mr. Waddington, appreciate it. Thank you.

Yes, ma'am.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GRANT (#0030):

MS. GRANT: My name is Ann Grant, G-R-A-N-T, the last name. I would like to thank you for having us here and for letting me speak.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
MS. GRANT: And I would like to say that I think you get the feeling of the majority of the people in the room, and you know, I'm very impressed with all the sincerity and the research that people have gone into, and I think you've heard a great number of the ideas and concerns, so I won't repeat them.

I feel the same way, that Site C should be stopped and as far as, you know, the question of the agricultural land and First Nations concerns there and the people who live there and so on, I certainly support everything that's been said. And I would use the term -- I don't know, I don't quite understand I guess -- "cost" can be interpreted in many ways and "ratepayer" in many different ways. And I'm sure you've heard the economic term of "externalities", and I think that, you know, one can sweep a lot of things under the rug with that term, and I hope that you don't. But, as I said, I'm not going to repeat everybody else's speech.

And thank you for the opportunity and for this great demonstration of what democracy really looks like when people really get the chance to speak their minds. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you for coming. Thank you.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. O'KEEFE (#0031):
MS. O'KEEFE: My name is Jennifer O'Keeffe. I stand before you here today to ask you to take into consideration the human cost of Site C. Site C is a proposed 60 metre high, 1050 metre length dam on the Peace River on Treaty 8 territory in northeastern British Columbia. If built, the project would create an 83 kilometre reservoir, submerging 78 First Nations heritage sites, burial grounds, places of spiritual and cultural significance. The province's approval of the project is in flagrant violation of the Constitution Act. The province is only able to remove land from the ALR if deemed in provincial interest. Site C is clearly not in the public or the province's best interest. Site C violates international and federal law by breaking treaty rights. Site C and all construction therefore are in direct contravention of Section 35 of the Constitution Act. Section 35 falls outside the Charter of Rights and Freedoms beginning in Part 2 of the Constitution. This means that Section 35 is exempt from the notwithstanding clause that applies to the Charter. Essentially under the Canadian Constitution, the provincial and federal governments cannot make decisions that override indigenous rights. It is therefore evidence that the provincial government is acting in extreme negligence of duty, as they are actively violating federal law by
voting approval for a project which so clearly contravenes constitutional law.

Under Section 16 of the Agricultural Land Commission Act it is stated that land included in an agricultural land reserve remains agricultural land in the agricultural land reserve unless excluded under this Act. Since the province is only able to remove land from the ALR if it is deemed in provincial interest, and as it is obviously not in the provincial interest to violate the federal Constitution Act, I ask that the B.C. Utilities Commission take immediate steps to intervene with regard to this project.

Site C infringes on the U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People. The former provincial government has allowed BC Hydro to bypass regulatory reviews on Site C Dam without a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the BCUC. The government has bypassed all due process and public examination of Site C, which would flood an 83 kilometre stretch of the Peace River from Fort St. John to upstream of Hudsons and Hope, submerging 78 First Nations heritage sites, burial grounds, places of cultural spiritual significance, and destroying British Columbia's food security through flooding 5,550 hectares of ALR land that have the capacity to feed over one million people, flooding vital habitat
for 63 endangered at risk species that live in the valley.

I ask that you consider the human costs for the people whose livelihoods and their entire history and existence live in the valley. I ask that you consider the human cost of medical health expenses that will be suffered if the water is contaminated by methyl mercury in the area. I ask you to consider the costs of the loss to the environment and to the habitat in that area. I ask you to consider the costs of losing the existence of the animals that are currently at risk in the area. And I ask you to consider the cost on future generations.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.
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Please go ahead, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARMSTRONG (#0032):

MR. ARMSTRONG: Thanks.

Hi, my name is Galen Armstrong, I'm the Peace Valley campaigner with Sierra Club B.C. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

Mr. Morton, I heard you on the radio earlier this week. I think it was the Early Edition, is that right?

THE CHAIRPERSON: Right, yeah.
MR. ARMSTRONG: And the question brought by Rick, Rick Cleff, was, "Well, so if we stop this dam, if we cancel the project, then we won't get anything out of the money that we've spent. It will cost another billion dollars." And your response to that was in the affirmative.

And so I think what we've heard today from so many people who spoke about the things that we will lose by building this dam, it's like we need to flip the question. What can get for $1.1 billion, the cost that it will cost to cancel it. And there's so much we can get.

If somebody told you for $1.1 billion you could get enough prime agricultural land to feed more than a million people. You could also get prime hunting and fishing -- hunting land and fishing waters used by First Nations for time immemorial, sacred sites. Also for no additional charge you can have prime wildlife habitat, and we'll throw in the lack of debt for future generations, for young people like me.

That's all just for $1.1 billion, and we'll add on for free the downstream benefits. We're going to protect the world heritage site, and the Peace Athabasca delta. There's so much that we get for this incredibly low price.

I hope that these hearings -- the hearing
today has been helpful to you. It was rather an open-ended ask for the public to come and respond to the report, and so I hope this has been helpful and I would love some feedback, because there's eight more hearings that the public will be speaking about, and it needs to be as helpful and useful as possible.

I want to speak to, a little bit to the agriculture. I spent time with Arlene Boone, one of the farmers up in the Peace. She said something that really stuck with me, which is that if this was good for B.C. she would be willing to move out of her farm house that's been in her family for three generations. She'd be more than willing. But it's not. It's not good for B.C.

I want to speak to some of what reporter Sara Cox has written about agriculture. The agricultural land BC Hydro counts as permanently lost to Site C, another 5900 hectares of farmland falls within what BC Hydro calls a stability impact zone and it's at risk of destruction. BC Hydro insists a further 1125 hectares of farmland, an area about the size of four Stanley Parks, will be lost only on a temporary basis during the last ten years, but farmers and a soil scientist question whether topsoil on the land can ever be replaced.

The list of agricultural land lost
temporarily to Site C includes 203 hectares of agricultural land in a flood impact zone that may experience "crop losses when flooding occurs," according to BC Hydro. Collapsing Peace River banks will create a landslide generated wave -- and we know there have been many landslides there just during the last two years. A landslide generated wave that will sweep over an additional 174 hectares of prime farmland. Since water will not remain on the fields forever, BC Hydro does not include these areas in its tally of permanently lost farmland. That's a big omission. Even though flooding in waves can cause soil erosion and leave behind debris. It's a huge impact to the area.

With 1:20 left I want to also bring up, as a couple of people have, the David Suzuki Foundation report on natural capital. It just seems like something that needs to be repeated again. I'm looking at the numbers here.

The study that they did found that ecological services provided by farmland and nature in the Peace River watershed are conservatively worth an estimated 7.9 billion to 8.6 billion dollars a year. A year.

So this is, in addition to what I was saying at the beginning, for $1.1 billion the cost of
cancelling the dam, we get all those wonderful benefits, plus we get up to $8.6 billion in ecological services back per year. It just seems too good to be true.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Armstrong, just want to point out the clock. If we could -- I'd like to get your conclusion, thank you.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Absolutely. Okay. Yeah, I'll conclude. The total annual value for carbon stored in the forests, wetlands, grasslands – this is from David Suzuki – of the Peace River watershed was estimated at 6.7 to 7.4 billion per year, and the total value of other ecosystem services was estimated at 1.2 billion per year in economic benefits. $1.2 billion per year. Just to point out, that .1 billion more than it will cost to cancel. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Armstrong.
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Mr. Bemister, are we at the end of the list we have, right?

THE HEARING OFFICER: Yes, the last speaker is here.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Is there anyone else in the audience that is signed up to speak and not had an opportunity for whatever reason? Okay, please go ahead.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ANDREWS (#0033):

MR. ANDREWS: My name is Bill Andrews, A-N-D-R-E-W-S. I
represent the B.C. Sustainable Energy Association. The BCSEA takes a sustainable energy approach to Site C. That is, its goal is to ensure that cost-effective, clean renewable electricity is available to displace fossil fuels in British Columbia, referred to usually as low carbon electrification. Meeting B.C.'s share of Canada's Paris Climate Action commitments will require not only aggressive demand-side management, but also substantial amounts of new clean electricity. This new clean electricity will have to be low in cost, at least as low in cost as possible, in order to compete effectively with fossil fuels.

Before the Site C projects was approved in December 2014, BCSEA said it should not be approved without being sent to the Commission for a full review of the costs and alternatives. But that's history and Site C is now under construction.

The basic question the Inquiry Panel must answer is whether it would be financially cheaper to BC Hydro customers to meet B.C.'s future electricity needs by completing, terminating, or suspending construction of Site C. It is the responsibility of the B.C. government to make the decision on the future of Site C after it receives the Commission's report on the financial consequences of these options.

BCSEA says that when the government makes
that decision it should take into account not only the financial consequences of the options, but also the other important factors that are beyond the scope of this inquiry. That would include the environmental implications and the First Nations rights and title issues.

Meanwhile BCSEA is participating actively in this inquiry because they genuinely want to know what really is the most cost-effective way forward. They don't see themselves as having a thumb on either end of the scale. They want to help the Commission produce an answer that is accurate. Accurate in the sense of getting the right answer to which option would cost BC Hydro customers more or less than the other options.

This is a matter of cost comparison between options and not a precise cost estimation of each option. The most accurate way to compare the cost of different options in this realm is a portfolio analysis. BCSEA encourages the Panel to rely primarily on a portfolio analysis, and then to use the unit energy cost method as a way to communicate the results of a portfolio analysis.

The preliminary report correctly notes that there are important limitations to the unit energy cost analysis. However, BCSEA submits that the
solution is to rely first on a portfolio analysis and
not to try to redefine the unit energy cost analysis
in order to achieve a purpose that the UEC analysis is
not designed for.

The actual cost, as the Commission knows,
the way of the portfolio -- of a portfolio analysis is
a single dollar figure and the value is to be able to
compare with the cost in a single dollar term of the
other options. However, the most important part of
the portfolio analysis is the ability to change the
input assumptions to determine the sensitivity of the
outcome to changes in the input assumptions, the
sensitivities. And so for load forecast, for example,
BCSEA suggests that the Commission should not try to
reforecast or do a new forecast. It should, as it
has, require Hydro to provide sensitivity on a high
load forecast and a low load forecast.

Specifically in terms of the cost of
supply-side energy resources, we suggest that the $68
per megawatt hour for onshore wind that was estimated
by power advisors at the point of interconnection is a
useful low end for sensitivity purposes.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Andrews, I'm sorry, but --
Mr. ANDREWS: I see ten seconds. For supply-side
capacity resources the biggest challenge the
Commission has is the pump storage versus commercially
feasible battery storage. And those are my submissions. We do intend to make a written submission. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Thank you very much, sir. Proceeding Time 4:03 p.m. T35

Yes, go ahead.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BAK (#0034):

MR. BAK: My name is Jason Bak, the surname is B-A-K. I'm the chairman and CEO of Solar Alliance Energy, a B.C. company formally named Finavera Renewables, or Finavera Wind Energy. We've developed over 300 megawatts of wind projects now operational or in construction, equivalent to about a billion dollars of capital cost, including the Meikle project in the Peace region which we subsequently sold to Pattern Energy.

We took our capital, following our exit from wind in British Columbia and start investing it, with the change of our name and our focus, in solar energy primarily in America. Exclusively in America. Primarily in southern California, Tennessee and Illinois and the states surrounding Tennessee.

We've developed a number of residential and commercial solar systems. In total we've developed renewable energy projects that power over 150,000 homes, with over 10,000 of those being residential
solar systems. We've installed solar in North Vancouver. The system cost was $23,000 for a 7 kilowatt system that has a fifteen year payback. Payback is what people should focus on, not the fact that it's too rainy for solar power in Vancouver or British Columbia. The payback is what matters.

In California that payback period is five or six years for solar plus storage. The homeowner designed an energy efficient, 5,000 square foot home in North Vancouver that, with solar, and utilizing BC Hydro's net metering program, is net zero energy uses from the grid. Over a year.

The capital of the homeowner was used to build this, not the province, not the ratepayer, not the taxpayer.

We've sold and are in the process of installing a number of home battery systems in Los Angeles. We're based here in Vancouver, we work in L.A. and in California. So we have direct experience in working in the California market and installing new technologies like the Tesla Powerwall, the LG battery and hopefully soon the Mercedes battery which looks like an amazing piece of technology. We've done that under California's self-generation incentive program which provides the grid with stability, load shifting and back-up power. This is happening today. Last
week we were down there installing. So we're literally doing this today in California and have that direct experience of how solar can be utilized to provide power.

As I mentioned, it's a five to six year payback for solar plus storage in California right now. This is today, and this solar plus storage solves the diurnal nature of solar power and provides that firm baseload that people want.

Our proposal that should be assessed in light of the other alternatives to Site C is this: Moving dirt and the innovation around moving dirt is non-existent. There is nothing there. We believe than an incentive of $5,000 per residential system reduces that British Columbia payback into an economic zone that consumers then pay attention to and say, "Wow, this is exciting." And it makes it attractive.

Consumers are powerful. We dealt with BC Hydro for a long time developing the Meikle project. I love dealing with consumers because you can motivate them, you can engage them, you can get them to do things that utility companies can't. And consumers are powerful. When they want something, they get. When they want red shoes, they get red shoes. When they want iPhones, they get iPhones. So it's a powerful force if you can tack directly into the
consumer and the capital of the consumer.

Solar is visceral. People, when they have solar on the rooftop – we experience this every day – they tell their neighbours about, they tell people about it, they post about it, they engage other people and it changes consumer behaviour. It changes the ratepayer’s behaviour. It changes people’s interest in where their energy comes from.

The amount of people that you can talk to on the street that aren't aware of the project that we developed in north British Columbia is amazing. Nobody cares in the Lower Mainland because it's such cheap power. But when you have solar on the roof, when you are invested in an economic payback period, you then care and that changes behaviour.

People with solar will become aware of their energy usage. Because of the huge amount of capital in people's homes in the Lower Mainland, it's very easy to tap into that with an economic payback period, and motivate people to have a granite countertop plus solar, and that's what happened in North Vancouver.

Solar technology is bankable and proven. We found that by commuting between Vancouver and Southern California, that people are willing to install their own dollars to install solar systems.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Mr. Bak, I just want to keep your eye on the time.

MR. BAK: Absolutely. And leverage the proposed incentive that we're talking about as an alternative to Site C. Simple math shows that a billion dollars of incentives at $5,000 per residential system would result in 200,000 homes being incentivized and at 5 kilowatt per home, that's a thousand megawatts of solar for a billion dollars. Primarily most of that cash comes from the individual home owner. That's the beautiful opportunity.

Time is short. I think the province has an opportunity to lead. We have an opportunity to do something different, and we have an opportunity to bring manufacturing to the province. A Canadian solar panel manufacturer is locating a large manufacturing plant here. On Friday the U.S. Trade Commission ruled against foreign panels coming into America. Canada was exempted from that. There's a huge opportunity to build manufacturing in British Columbia, to use panels domestically but also to export to America. And this incentive could help achieve that.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much, sir. Thank you.
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Please go ahead, sir.
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KULL (#0035):

MR. KULL: Hi, my name is Bob Kull, K-U-L-L. I am not on your list.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MR. KULL: I didn’t come with prepared remarks, and I’m glad, because I’m blown away by the quality of the comments. Just incredible information and sophistication of analysis. So, I don’t need to add to that. I am glad I am not sitting in your seats, because the amount of information coming at you must be daunting.

One of the things that has struck me as I have sat and listened -- and I wasn’t here for the first hour, so I missed a couple. But what really interests me is perspective. I’ve heard only two people strongly in support of the Site C dam. And they were in support of it for very narrow and short-term reasons, of a few workers. I get that, and you know, it tugs our heart strings. But any time we move forward with innovation, new technologies, changes in our culture, changes in the economy, there are always winners and losers.

What I’ve heard over and over from those that are arguing against the Site C dam is a very long range, and broad perspective, what’s good for B.C. in the long haul. Not simply what's good for a very few
workers in the short haul. And I think that is a difference of perspective, and an important one.

I understand that your mandate is limited, that you can't consider everything you might wish to consider, but what I do encourage you to do within your mandate, as you consider all the arguments, is to take a deep breath and consider as broad and long term a view as you possibly can. It's so easy to get caught up in short term solutions, political and economic solutions. And when we do that, over and over, we get bit in the butt. So, I think it is really incumbent, if you can, to the degree you can, to try to take the longest possible view you can.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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Please go ahead, thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. PHILLIP (#0036):

MS. PHILLIP: Amstien. My English name is Joan Phillip, P-H-I-L-L-I-P, J-O-A-N. I'm just here, I've been listening to numerous presentations about the uneconomical project that Site C is. Together my husband and I have six children and 15 grandchildren, and I don't want our children and grandchildren to assume the debt that this project, that is not wanted, that is not required, that's uneconomical,
particularly for those people, indigenous peoples and farmers living in North East British Columbia like --

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PHILLIP (#0037):

MR. PHILLIP: [SPEAKS FOREIGN LANGUAGE] That's simply, "Good day my dear friends and relatives."

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Good day to you, sir.

MR. PHILLIP: My traditional name is Asiut. Joan and I are grandparents, as you've heard. We have 15 of the most beautiful grandchildren in the world and they're the centre of our universe. And we have spent considerable time in Treaty 8 territory. Probably over the last 30 years we've been supporting the Treaty 8 people in their ongoing struggle against fracking and more recently with the ongoing struggle against the Site C Dam.

Just for all of the reasons that we've heard this afternoon that were presented in an incredibly eloquent fashion, we stand in solidarity with all of those good people throughout the province of British Columbia that have opposed this project for decades. It's not a new idea. It's been rejected before by the BCUC for good reason. And we all know in this room that this was an incredibly political manipulation, that in the dismal failure of the LNG pipe dream that began to collapse around the ears of
the previous B.C. Liberal government, they reached out and dusted off the Site C Dam proposal.

And I recall the grandiose UN style press conference that they made the announcement with all of the flags in the background and indicated that this was a panacea, this was the salvation of the economy of British Columbia and so on and so forth. And we heard over the space of time many, many different markets. We heard it was going to be for tens of thousands of residences, then we heard it was going to be for -- to power the LNG industry. Then we heard it was going to -- the market was going to be Alberta. None of those were borne out.

We know that this is an absolute disaster, a white elephant. And we're somewhat disappointed that the treaty rights of indigenous peoples, the human rights and everything that that represents have been pushed off to the side. Treaty 8 territory has been absolutely devastated and fractured by oil and gas development, and every type of development you can imagine, and now they're facing the Site C Dam.

So for all of the reasons we heard throughout the day, as grandparents, as parents, as indigenous leaders we absolutely vehemently oppose this. In today's world of catastrophic climate events, wildfires, flooding events and everything
we're witnessing, we believe it's time for bold leadership. It's time to make decisions that are in the long-term and in the best interests of all of the people that we represent.

And we believe it's incumbent upon the Commission to know and understand the gravity of this decision and step outside of the safety and the security of the status quo notions that we've heard about all afternoon, and make the right and proper decision and reject, stop this incredibly stupid idea known as the Site C Dam proposal once and for all.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Excuse me, sir? Sir? Excuse me. Thank you. I'm just wonder if you would mind spelling your name for the -- thank you. If you could spell your name for the transcript? Thanks.

MR. PHILLIP: I am Grand Chief Stewart Phillip.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MR. PHILLIP: S-T-E-W-A-R-T P-H-I-L-L-I-P. I'm president of the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, a position I've held for the last 19 years. I'm chair of the Okanagan Nation Tribal Council, probably about 13, 14 years. I was chief of our community for 14 years. Ten years before that I was a member of the Band Council. I've been in the field and in the trenches, both of us, for the last four decades.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CHISSON (#0038):

MR. CHISSON: Hi there, my name is Grant Chisson, last name C-H-I-S-S-O-N.

I think we should reflect on the history of dams of this magnitude. Specifically, the W.C. Bennett dam. I grew up in Northern B.C., in the late 60s, early 70s, when the W.C. Bennett dam was being built. We used to go down the river, with my dad in the river boat, catching Artic Grayling, and Dolly Varden, down the Pac where it meets the Parsnip River and the Findlay River. I would go down there almost every week, and I would play on the sawdust piles that the portable saw mills created when they milled up a small percentage of the lumber at that proposed reservoir.

Then one week I went down there, and the entire place was flooded out. It sort of resonates in my memory quite strong. There was six inches of sawdust as far as the eye can see. Log jams, you couldn’t navigate down the river. There were carcasses, floating animal carcasses lodged in between the log dams.

So, this is what’s going to happen with Site C again. I did a presentation for Hydro a few
years back, for a run of the river. And I told him
the story I've told you now. And he happened to be a
project manager at the time, and he told me that he
was responsible for taking down the portable saw mill.
Well, the water came in so fast, that they had to
leave all the heavy duty equipment underneath that
area, so there are skidders, CATs, all sorts of heavy
equipment leaching chemicals.

Right now, I want to take my sons up the
Parsnip and fish, but it's on the red list right now,
and most of that river -- well, a third of that river
is underwater from the reservoir, and they're
wondering why. It's called the Williston Compensation
program, not conservation program.

So all these things will probably happen
with Site C, so I really can't see how you can put a
price on risking the environment. And there is a
memoir written called Under These Waters and it was a
forestry supervisor at the time, and it supports
everything that I experienced down there, and everyone
should really read that.

What else do I have to say? That's really
it. I just think you should consider that. Thank
you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Proceeding Time 4:20 p.m. T39
MS. WATKINS: Hi.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Hi. Please go ahead.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. WATKINS (#0039):

MS. WATKINS: Basically one of the things that I've heard is that --

THE CHAIRPERSON: Could you please state your name?

MS. WATKINS: Oh, sorry.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.


THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MS. WATKINS: I think the message that I would like to suggest that you send to not just the international community but to all the investors of both at home and abroad is, if it breaks treaty rights and it is against human rights, we don't want it. We don't want to support it. We will not allow you to invest in it. We won't take it. I think it's a great message to be sending out. I don't think we should be afraid to send that message out. And I would appeal to you as very pivotal decision makers that the decision that you make will send not just a message now but for the next perhaps rest of our lives.

And the other part that I would like to say is that in many discussions that I had with our governmental representatives, my own and several others, many of them said that they themselves
personally did not want Site C but they were being forced to vote for it under their own party. And several of them, one in particular said that they wished that the United Nations would stop Site C because for whatever reason, our provincial government wouldn't stop it.

Provincial government is no longer in power. I think we need to send a message and I would really really encourage you to have what I think is going to take a lot of courage, to send that message so that when people invest, when I turn on my light I do care where the electricity comes from. I also care how much I'm paying for it. Economically I want to know that it's fair trade, it didn't break any treaty rights, and that it is actually going to not just personally help me and my family but that the money that I'm paying for it is going to support other families, other people.

And I believe that economically we need to send an economic message. It's an economic necessity that we send a message to all people who are going to invest in this community and in this country, that if it breaks treaty rights and if it's against human rights, we aren't -- it's not investment then. What it is is probably -- I can't even think of the word, but it is not an investment in our country, our
community, or it is not an individual investment. And thanks for your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, thank you very much.

Proceeding Time 4:23 p.m. T40

Sir, it looks like you have the last word, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KROECHER (#0040):

MR. KROECHER: Yes, thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak. I would like to speak about --

THE CHAIRPERSON: Excuse me, what's your name, please?

MR. KROECHER: My name.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Yeah.

MR. KROECHER: My last name is Kroecher, K-R-O-E-C-H-E-R.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. KROECHER: I would like to talk about interest rates. While Site C is being built, let's assume it costs about 10 billion, BC Hydro will have to borrow one billion dollars each year. If BC Hydro pays 2 percent interest on the bonds, that -- just during the building process, the debt accumulates to more than one billion dollars.

The claim has been made by those supporting Site C that this is reliable power at a given price. No price fluctuations. The price of the power of Site C will depend totally on the interest rate that BC Hydro has to pay on the debt. If BC Hydro can borrow
money at 2 percent and the interest rate changes to 3
percent, the cost per electricity essentially goes up
by 50 percent. If it can buy -- sell bonds at 2
percent and the interest rate goes up to 4 percent,
the cost of electricity doubles. There is no
reliability. Interest rates are completely beyond the
reach of BC Hydro. They're determined outside. So
that is a great myth.

The second myth is that this project has a
life span of about 75 years or maybe 100 years. No
plans for amortization have been made by BC Hydro.
The myth continues by saying the debt will have to be
-- we will repay the debt. That debt will never be
repaid, in the same way the government debt is never
repaid. When the bonds mature, when the 5 or 10 year
bonds mature, BC Hydro will sell new bonds to pay off
the old bonds. So that debt of 10 billion,
optimistically speaking, more likely 13-14 billion or
more, will be on the books and will continue to be on
the books forever, in the same way that our public
debt by government is on the books, never decreases.
The best that ever happens is it increases slowly.

So there's the myth there that somehow this
will be repaid and there's the myth that the prices
are given or are known, but that's not true. So we're
stuck with a debt indefinitely. It will affect us.
It will affect future generations.

There is no demand for the power. At 2 percent interest I computed that BC Hydro by the end when it's built will have to pay about $200 million for interest. And this goes on and on and on indefinitely, 200 million. The cost of that electricity, the Site C electricity will be almost exclusively determined by interest rates.

You mentioned 30 jobs by 70 -- you know, long-time jobs, by $70,000 a year, gives us about 2.1 million. But there's an expense of $200 million of interest. So it goes up and down. If we had a one percent interest rate or zero percent interest rate, this would be an attractive project from an economic point of view. If it's 2 percent it's no go already. BC Hydro will end up with $200 million in interest payment and no market. And guess where the 200 million will come from? Out of my pocket, out of your pockets, out of the ratepayer pockets of B.C.

Thank you very much.

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

Proceeding Time 4:27 p.m. T41

THE CHAIRPERSON: One more last word.

MS. TUFTS: Well, I'll see if I can make it a good last word then.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUFTS (#0041):
MS. TUFTS: My name is Heather Tufts, and I'm over here from Victoria for this, visiting, and have decided to speak today, in reflection of some of the many fantastic words that have been expressed today. And I want to go on the public record to say right up front, that I'm really against this Site C project. And that we need to stop it.

Some of the things that have been mentioned I think are especially important, and listening to Grand Chief Stuart Phillip and Joan, just now, speak about the devastation in the north, I think is really significant. Even though it's not within the mandate I know of this Commission, I still think it is really a baseline for looking at the economics of this project. How can we determine economics if we are not honouring the treaty rights of our First Nations? And I also want to reiterate what was said about the United Nations committee that has been visiting on the elimination of racial discrimination, also reinforcing the fact that without the First Nations' consent, we should not be continuing with the Site C project in any case.

That being said, there is a couple of words that I haven’t heard mentioned this afternoon at all, that I would like to put on the record, and that's climate change. I don’t think it has been spoken of,
but if we are going to look at economics, then surely we need to look at transitioning our economy into a sustainable one. There have been eloquent presentations this afternoon about alternative energies, solar, and so on, because the cost is declining and that those are now readily available. If we're going to look at economics within the frame of climate change, which I believe we always should from now on, I think it's of great urgency. Then we have to really consider whether Site C is contributing or harming our efforts to pay attention to climate change.

Now, obviously, and part of this consideration for me is going to be the loss of the agricultural land. We can't afford to lose any more agricultural land, because we're already looking at importing so much food from places that are devastated by floods, and so on, because of climate change, that we are impacting our capacity to have our own food security in British Columbia, I think.

Also, it has really been said that there is a relationship to Site C originally when it was first planned, many years ago, decades ago, for the oil and gas industry. And I think this is an important point as well, that Site C was originally intended to supply what we now know fortunately is a dying LNG industry.
And I say fortunately, because I think that is another aspect that did not consider First Nations' rights and title, and did not consider the urgency that we face around climate change.

So, given those factors, I think we can sneak those in to the economic considerations quite honestly, because I think that we cannot progress with any industrial, or projected projects in our province without looking at First Nations' rights and climate change. I think those two things are really important.

But what about the cost to consumers that was mentioned this afternoon by a number of people as well? And I really have to think about a lot of businesses that would be impacted. Somebody mentioned the extractive industry. Well, that is not my biggest concern here, but I am concerned about the level of poverty that we're looking at, people that are struggling. Where I live, there are four First Nations reserves on the Saanich peninsula. And for them to have any cost increases at all in BC Hydro would be absolutely devastating.

So, given those points that have been made so eloquently by people here this afternoon, I conclude that we know that this power is not needed. We know that we were left in a political mess.
Somebody else made reference to that. We have been left with a project that we now have to say "Yes" or "no" to after it has gone so far. But surely we can't afford to continue. We can stop it, and I think that I don't envy the task that you have. I think you've been brought in really, really late, and we are appreciative of the fact that you've been brought in now. It is late in the game, however I think you've heard a lot of voices here today that I would concur with, and I think have been amazing, that we feel we cannot afford to continue with Site C dam. Thank you.

Proceeding Time 4:31 p.m. T42

Oh, I've been asked to spell my last name.

T-U-F-T-S, Tufts.

THE CHAIRPERSON:   Thank you very much.

I'd like to thank everyone. On behalf of the Panel I'd like to thank everyone who attended today, and in particular, like to thank those who spoke. We really appreciate the depth of thought that you put into your presentations. The question was posed earlier, by, I think Mr. Armstrong, whether it's been of use to the Panel, and I would like to assure you all it has been of use.

And we also -- we really appreciate you keeping your comments to five minutes. I know that that's not easy, but as you can see, there is a lot of
people that had a lot to say, and we appreciate your thoughtfulness in doing that.

So on that note, I'd like to wish you all a good evening, and once again, thanks for coming.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 4:32 P.M.)
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