

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

NELSON , B.C.
September 26th, 2017

COMMUNITY INPUT PROCEEDINGS
NELSON

BEFORE:

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

VOLUME 4

INDEX

PAGE

SEPTEMBER 23rd, 2017 – Volume 1

Vancouver Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 24th, 2017 – Volume 2

Kamloops Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 25th, 2017 – Volume 3

Kelowna Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 26th, 2017 – Volume 4

Nelson Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 29th, 2017 - Volume 5A

Prince George First Nations Input Proceedings (afternoon)

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

SEPTEMBER 29th, 2017 - Volume 5B

Prince George Community Input Proceedings (evening)

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

SEPTEMBER 30th, 2017 - Volume 6

Hudson's Hope Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

OCTOBER 1, 2017 - Volume 7

Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

OCTOBER 2, 2017 - Volume 8

Fort St. John Community Input Proceedings

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

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

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

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

OCTOBER 5, 2017 - Volume 9

Vancouver Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INDEX

PAGE

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

OCTOBER 6, 2017 - Volume 10

Vancouver First Nations Input Proceedings

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

OCTOBER 10, 2017 - Volume 11

Nanaimo Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY BY MS. MANLY (#0223)..... 944

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PURDEY (#0224)..... 946

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORBURN (#0225)..... 949

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LEE (#0226)..... 952

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SISSON (#0227)..... 954

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ANDERSON (#0228)..... 959

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. OAKLEY (#0229)..... 962

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CHATWIN (#0230)..... 964

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ANDERSEN (#0231)..... 968

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LIEM (#0232)..... 972

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BRICE (#0233)..... 975

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NEADS (#0234)..... 976

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NICKASON (#0235)..... 981

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WHITTAKER (#0236)..... 987

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LeBLANC (#0237)..... 990

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GRAY (#0238)..... 993

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WYTON (#0239)..... 997

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COOPER (#0240)..... 999

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. COSTE (#0241)..... 1005

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARRIS (#0242)..... 1008

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. STIFF (#0243)..... 1011

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BERRY (#0244)..... 1014

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. REINHART (#0245)..... 1018

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. SHILLITO (#0246)..... 1024

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DUMOULIN (#0247)..... 1028

INDEX

PAGE

OCTOBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12A

Victoria First Nations Input Proceedings

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

OCTOBER 11, 2017 - Volume 12B

Victoria Community Input Proceedings

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

INDEX

PAGE

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. JOHNSTONE (#0269)..... 1135
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. FIELD (#0270)..... 1138
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CAMERON (#0271)..... 1140
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAJARI (#0272)..... 1143
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ARNEY (#0273)..... 1148
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BALDINI (#0274)..... 1151
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORNBURGH (#0275)..... 1155
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GREENLEES (#0276)..... 1157
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. McGUIRE (#0277)..... 1159
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ENNS (#0278)..... 1163
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HENDERSON (#0279)..... 1167
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SPALTEHOLZ (#0280)..... 1169
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. STRANG (#0281)..... 1171
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SCOTT (#0282)..... 1173
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. TROTTER (#0283)..... 1178
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. EVANS (#0284)..... 1180
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. M. HADLAND (#0285)..... 1180
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DELA ROSA (#0286)..... 1183
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. KEEGAN-HENRY (#0287)..... 1185
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. NELSON (#0288)..... 1186
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. TUPPER (#0158)..... 1190

OCTOBER 13th, 2017 – Volume 13

Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings

SUBMISSIONS BY CLEAN ENERGY ASSOCIATION OF BC
(CEABC) (#0289)..... 1195
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. ROBERT McCULLOUGH (#0290)..... 1213
SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MARC ELIESEN (#0291)..... 1233

INDEX

PAGE

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

OCTOBER 14th, 2017 – Volume 14

Vancouver Technical Input Proceedings

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

NELSON, B.C.

September 26th, 2017

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

1
2
3
4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening. Thank you for joining
5 us as we proceed through our two and a half week
6 series of community input sessions around the
7 province. So far we've heard presentations in
8 Vancouver, Kamloops, and Kelowna. And I must say
9 we're extremely pleased, both by the level of public
10 interest and the effort that went into many of the
11 presentations we heard.

12 My name is David Morton, and I'm the Panel
13 Chair for the Site C Inquiry. I'm also the Chair of
14 the British Columbia Utilities Commission. With me
15 today are my fellow Site C Inquiry Panel members. On
16 my left is Dennis Cote; on my right is Karen Keilty.
17 And on her right is Richard Mason.

18 This community input session is part of the
19 second important phase of the Site C Inquiry. As you
20 know, we've spent the last -- sorry, the first six
21 weeks of this inquiry collecting data and analysis
22 from many parties that are interested and affected by
23 Site C's -- BC Hydro's Site C project. The quality of
24 these submissions was commendable. Many people
25 committed a great deal to producing a quality
26 submission within the short time-frame we've provided.

1 This affirms what we already know; that there are
2 experts and affected parties who can bring us insight
3 into the many complexities of evaluating the economic
4 impact of the Site C project.

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

8 The Order in Council that directed us to
9 inquire into this project specifically requires us to
10 consider the cost implications on BC Hydro ratepayers
11 of three scenarios. One is continuing the project;
12 the second is suspending the project and re-starting
13 it again in 2024; and the third is terminating the
14 project.

15 My Panel members and I recognize that there
16 are many other implications of the project beyond cost
17 implications. However, those implications are not
18 within our scope to inquire into. Considering this,
19 we ask that in the interests of all parties in the
20 room, please try to keep your submissions within the
21 scope of our inquiry into Site C, which is, as I said,
22 the cost implications for BC Hydro ratepayers. And,
23 by implication, that includes Fortis ratepayers and
24 even Nelson Hydro ratepayers, as they are all
25 ultimately customers of BC Hydro.

26 Submissions made here today, as well as

1 those made in writing, that are outside the scope of
2 the BCUC's review won't be considered in our final
3 report to government on November 1st.

4 There is copies of the executive summary of
5 our preliminary report at the entrance table, and the
6 full report is available on our website or by making a
7 request through our office if you are unable to access
8 our website.

9 I'd also like to address a number of
10 housekeeping items for today's session. I'd like to
11 introduce you to Mr. Bemister, who you've seen as
12 you've checked in, and he's given you a briefing on
13 the fire exits and washrooms and so on. Mr.
14 Bemister's going to help us to organize speakers and
15 other logistics, and his team is recording and
16 transcribing the sessions. The live audio will be
17 streamed from our website, SiteCinquiry.com, and
18 following these sessions, all the presentations will
19 be transcribed and posted, along with all of the rest
20 of the inquiry documents on our website.

21 There is some coffee and tea, as you saw,
22 just outside the entrance door. Please help yourself
23 throughout the session. As you need to, please enter
24 and exit the room quietly so as not to disrupt the
25 session. We won't be having any scheduled breaks, so
26 please feel free to go back and forth and get tea and

1 coffee as you need.

2 There is a list of speakers on the screen
3 in front of you. When you see your name appearing
4 within the next three to five speakers, please come up
5 and identify yourself, and there's three seats at the
6 side that you can sit and wait until the previous
7 speaker is finished.

8 Mr. Bemister will confirm your name on the
9 list and then he'll help you get to the podium, and
10 he'll make sure that the speaker presentations are
11 organized in that way.

12 And if you aren't in the room when your
13 name comes up, we'll get back to you at the end, and
14 add you to the end of the list of speakers.

15 When you're speaking, other than stating
16 your name, please refrain from including any personal
17 or confidential information, because it will become a
18 public record through the transcript, and so you
19 should please avoid any mention of anything other than
20 your name.

21 Please also refrain from using profane or
22 offensive language in your presentation, and any other
23 disruptive behaviour, because we may have to close the
24 session if that occurs.

25 We ask that you keep your remarks to a
26 maximum of five minutes. We have a timer for you.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, please.

2 MR. SCARLETT: Welcome to the West Kootenay region. Our
3 communities have experienced the impact of
4 hydroelectric reservoirs built hastily and with
5 insufficient attention to social, environmental, and
6 economic impacts. The Columbia River treaty dams also
7 ran over budget, to the point that other provincial
8 government obligations were cash-starved for years.
9 These are lessons that we must never forget.

10 I'm a professional engineer and electrical
11 contractor, having lived in Kaslo for 45 years. I
12 participated on the BC Hydro 1991 to '94 conservation
13 potential review collaborative committee; in 1995, BC
14 Hydro integrated electricity plan consultative
15 committee, and was an external review panellist for
16 the 2007 BC Hydro conservation potential review.

17 The overriding question before all British
18 Columbians is whether the Site C dam should be built
19 at all. The project was initiated without review by
20 the BCUC for political reasons, and billions have been
21 spent on it, largely based on assumptions about
22 markets for liquefied natural gas and pipelines that
23 have evaporated. So whether the project is on time
24 and within budget is only a measure of how efficiently
25 the money has been wasted, if Site C cannot be
26 justified under today's circumstances.

1 Today's circumstances are in fact changing
2 very quickly. British Columbians will want to know if
3 BC Hydro's borrowing expense forecasting is realistic
4 in light of the fact that interest rates are now
5 starting to move upward after several years of being
6 unusually low and stable. Mega-projects of Site C's
7 scale are highly vulnerable to increases in borrowing
8 costs because of their magnitude and the long
9 construction time. Technologies for electricity
10 conservation are improving faster than could have been
11 anticipated during the BC Hydro conservation potential
12 reviews. For example, LED lights are quickly
13 dominating the market, and Appendix A of your
14 preliminary report notes their potential for reducing
15 provincial electricity demand.

16 BC Hydro appears to have fallen off the
17 energy conservation wagon over the past 20 years.
18 British Columbians will benefit if the Crown
19 corporation's resources are redirected from Site C so
20 that it can reclaim the energy conservation leadership
21 role that it held in the 1990s.

22 The ratepayer cost of operating
23 environmentally destructive energy projects is
24 increasing rapidly. It is now accepted that BC Hydro
25 will pay for increasingly strict mitigation measures.
26 An example is the December, 2007 Duncan Dam project

1 water use plan mandated by the B.C. controller of
2 water rights. Requirements now include water level
3 management, erosion protection, cultural site
4 protection, boat ramp infrastructure, nutrient
5 loading, side channel fish stranding and fish
6 migration. The BC Hydro fish and wildlife
7 conservation program is another example.

8 If the *Mikisew Cree* and other First Nations
9 court cases concerning Site C operation are
10 successful, BC Hydro will incur further financial
11 obligations. These costs will only increase with time
12 and British Columbians will want to know that they are
13 fully accounted for in determining the long-term costs
14 of Site C.

15 Alternative energy sourced through
16 photovoltaic, wind, micro-hydro and possibly wave and
17 tidal sources, if scaled appropriately, will be free
18 of such mitigation costs. Moreover, distributed
19 energy generation provides a more balanced grid with
20 lower line losses than mega-projects like Site C,
21 located far from its primary loads. Net metering has
22 a great potential for facilitating this approach,
23 allowing BC Hydro to access a growing energy source
24 with negligible capital expense to the utility.

25 California offers an example of the
26 magnitude of the energy resource that can be made

1 available in this way. The California Public
2 Utilities Commission reported that in 2008 43,000
3 residential and commercial net metering customers
4 produced 570 gigawatt hours, with a negligible impact
5 on electricity rates.

6 British Columbians need to know that the
7 potential of small distributed alternative energy will
8 be taken into account in determining whether Site C
9 will ever be needed.

10 To quote the BCUC's 1983 Site C decision:

11 "An energy project certificate for Site C
12 should not be issued until an acceptable
13 forecast demonstrates that construction must
14 begin immediately in order to avoid supply
15 deficiencies, and a comparison of
16 alternative feasible system plans
17 demonstrates from a social benefit cost
18 point of view that Site C is the best
19 project to meet the anticipated supply
20 deficiency."

21 When a mistake of this magnitude is made,
22 the only appropriate energy strategy is to acknowledge
23 it and promptly cut the losses. There is abundant
24 evidence that Site C will burden BC Hydro and the
25 province with unnecessary costs far into the future.
26 Terminating the project will be the least costly

1 remedy. Should that be the B.C. government's
2 decision, BC Hydro should be held accountable to
3 Section 2(b) of the *Clean Energy Act*, that directs the
4 utility to reduce its expected increase in demand for
5 electricity by two-thirds by the year 2020, through
6 demand-side measures and energy conservation.

7 Thank you.

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

9 **Proceeding Time 6:22 p.m. T03**

10 Ms. Bramson. Please go ahead. Thank you.

11 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BRAMSON (#0082):**

12 MS. BRAMSON: Yeah, my name is Lisa Bramson, B-R-A-M-S-O-
13 N. I'm a Nelson Hydro ratepayer, and I want to thank
14 the Utility Commission for holding a public
15 consultation.

16 And the sources I am referring to are
17 mostly the Del Watt LLP review requested by the
18 Commission and also energy issue expert Robert
19 McCullough.

20 And I have a few comments about demand but
21 I'm mainly focusing on cost. But alternatives, demand
22 and costs are all inter-related. And they have
23 significantly changed since Site C was first proposed.
24 And I just think that's an important overview.

25 So about demand, over the past 20 years BC
26 Hydro's forecasts have over-estimated demand by over

1 30 percent, on average. Most of the LNG terminals
2 currently under consideration in B.C. probably won't
3 come about, and therefore BC Hydro's expected increase
4 in consumption to electrify LNG facilities will not
5 materialize.

6 Despite BC Hydro's inflated forecasts, B.C.
7 energy's demand is flat, and will remain so for some
8 time. And as Robert McCullough said, BC Hydro
9 forecasts are dangerously vintage. I like that.

10 If Site C were completed, BC Hydro will
11 lose money on exports to the U.S. Quebec and
12 Newfoundland are competing to sell energy to New
13 England at a loss. And that's something that should
14 be looked at in B.C.

15 And demand growth is effectively zero, as
16 new energy saving technology such as LED lighting
17 emerge, and also as more conservation efforts are
18 initiated.

19 Looking at costs, the effort to develop
20 Site C on the Peace River has been underway for almost
21 30 years, and interestingly, the project failed to
22 pass elementary economic tests back in the 1980s.
23 Here we are, much later.

24 Related to costs, renewables have to be
25 mentioned, primarily wind and thermal, and these have
26 declined in price dramatically. 74 percent reduction

1 for solar, 65 percent for wind, since 2010 when the
2 B.C. government announced it wished to pursue approval
3 and development of Site C.

4 Terminating Site C and building a renewable
5 portfolio of wind and geothermal would save B.C.
6 ratepayers between 0.7 to 1.6 billion dollars.

7 Another factor related to costs; Site C
8 seems to be hurtling toward significant delay and cost
9 overruns. In his report, Del Wall concluded that BC
10 Hydro is at considerable risk of failing to meet the
11 2019 deadline for diverting river water into tunnels
12 while the dam is built, due to contractor problems and
13 geotechnical issues. And in the event that the start
14 of river diversion milestone is not met in 2019, the
15 impact on the project would be approximately a year of
16 delay, and cost increases above the FID budget in the
17 range of 10 to 20 percent. And there are also cost
18 risks associated with major contracts that have not
19 been awarded yet.

20 He also noted that BC Hydro is currently
21 projecting to use 1 billion of cost contingency by the
22 end of the project, and that's a 26 percent increase
23 over the 794 million planned cost contingency, and 84
24 percent of the total available contingency of 1.195
25 billion. Del Watt understands that this increase in
26 the forecast cost contingency is explained by

1 additional indirect and management costs, higher
2 contract costs, and estimated additional unexpected
3 scope, and observes that such an increase within only
4 the second year of an eight-year contract calls into
5 question the accuracy of the project's initial
6 estimates.

7 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ma'am, I just want to remind you that
8 you're getting to the end. If you could --

9 MS. BRAMSON: Wow, okay. Well, yeah.

10 Well, I would recommend termination of the
11 project for the many cost savings to ratepayers. Much
12 less than suspension, and certainly continuing. And I
13 think it's significant that your Panel already
14 reported it's not yet in a position to determine
15 whether the project will remain on schedule for
16 completion by November of 2024. And I look forward to
17 all the information that you requested from BC Hydro,
18 and I assume that that will be in the final report?
19 Okay.

20 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. If we get it, it will be,
21 indeed. Thank you.

22 MS. BRAMSON: Very good. Thank you.

23 **Proceeding Time 6:27 p.m. T04**

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. John Alton.

25 If your name is appearing within the next
26 two or three, please come up and sit with Mr.

1 Bemister.

2 Is John Alton here? No? Okay. Please go
3 ahead.

4 MR. CARVER: Shall I start?

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, please go ahead.

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CARVER (#0083):**

7 MR. CARVER: Thank you very much for the opportunity to
8 speak with you today. My name is Martin Carver, C-A-
9 R-V-E-R. I live in Nelson, B.C.

10 I have -- I'm a hydrologist with a Ph.D.
11 from UBC, 25 years working with water resources, ten
12 years working in the Peace/Athabasca delta, looking at
13 that land form. I wear two hats as I come here and
14 speak with you today. On the one hand, I'm a subject
15 matter expert on the Peace/Athabasca delta, and on
16 environmental impact assessment processes in Canada,
17 and on the other hand I'm a ratepayer who has lived in
18 this province decades, and intends to live here for
19 decades to come.

20 My interest in speaking with you today is
21 about the downstream impacts of Site C, in particular.
22 I'm concerned about hidden downstream impacts that
23 aren't being accounted for in your costing. The
24 Peace/Athabasca delta has immense social and
25 environmental values. In 1983, it was established,
26 inscribed on the world heritage list because of its

1 outstanding universal value; that is the expression
2 that UNESCO uses.

3 Canada applied, and it's signed up -- it's
4 a Canadian request. It also has massive indigenous
5 values. Indigenous peoples live there and they rely
6 on this area that has great value to them.

7 So first of all I wanted to say something
8 about the environmental review process. It's deeply
9 flawed in Canada, as I'm sure you're aware of, and it
10 enables projects to proceed with hidden costs being
11 not recognized during the review process. That's
12 another subject, but I just want to flag that.

13 So there's two things about the environment
14 assessment of the Site C that I'd like to raise to
15 your attention. Perhaps you know about these, but I'd
16 like to bring them up. The first is the terms of
17 reference. There was no cumulative effects assessment
18 required for the Peace/Athabasca delta, which I'll
19 just say is the delta. And BC Hydro was promoting a
20 lack of this assessment, and it was supported by
21 government in the end, so we didn't get a cumulative
22 effects assessment. So that information wasn't made
23 available.

24 Second thing I'd like to talk to you about
25 is just a bit more detail about the joint review panel
26 and what happened there. I was an expert hired to

1 give technical information at the hearing, and I have
2 first-hand knowledge of what happened there. And in
3 general, the JRP did not have technical capacity to
4 really consider much of the evidence that was given.
5 That was -- it was presumably under-funded. And so
6 there is some important evidence that wasn't
7 sufficiently considered, in my opinion.

8 BC Hydro gave some late evidence concerning
9 the impacts -- the lack of impacts, in their view, of
10 the project on the delta. And there were flaws in
11 that evidence which were rebutted by myself, and I can
12 provide you that report if you haven't already come
13 across it. But there was never a response to those --
14 to the identification of those flaws. And so it's
15 still outstanding. The panel did not -- they were
16 silent on it. They simply sided with BC Hydro that --
17 of the lack of downstream impacts. No explanation, no
18 justification that I could find.

19 Now, the other thing I want to mention is
20 the World Heritage Committee had a reactive mission
21 that went to the delta in 2016, and produced a report
22 that was very critical of Canada and the management of
23 the delta. And it rebuked the JRP's finding as
24 simplistic treatment of impacts downstream.
25 Recommendation 4 was to conduct an environmental and
26 social impact assessment of Site C on the delta before

1 it would proceed. So, that's outstanding. The costs
2 of that are outstanding. The implications of the
3 costs of that are outstanding.

4 Now, that's what I'd like to turn to
5 finally in closing is the costs of all of this. These
6 are hidden costs, and there are direct hidden costs
7 and indirect hidden costs.

8 The direct hidden costs would involve
9 settlements -- court settlements and the litigation
10 costs of court settlements. Perhaps you're aware that
11 in 1998 the Indian Claims Commission agreed that the
12 ACFN, the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nation, which
13 relies on the delta, should be able to seek costs for
14 lost economic livelihood, direct damages to an Indian
15 reserve, and rights infringement. These are all costs
16 that, to my knowledge, aren't being considered by you
17 yet.

18 And then there are indirect costs of the
19 lost livelihoods, and then the inevitable government
20 support on damage reconciliation processes that would
21 ensue.

22 So I want to put my other hat on now as a
23 ratepayer. I am asked to pay for all of this, these
24 hidden costs, which are not being factored into Site
25 C. And as an expert witness and a subject-matter
26 expert with first-hand knowledge of flaws in the

1 system, and the costs not included in the standard
2 assessments, I object to that not being considered,
3 and I would ask you to really look into those costs.

4 Because in fact the escalating construction
5 costs will be mirrored by escalating costs of damages
6 and operations, certainly in the tens and hundreds of
7 millions, but I would argue potentially in the
8 billions of dollars, as the years and decades roll
9 out. And I would ask us to let's not let the project
10 become another entry in the catalogue of our dark
11 legacy of impacts to the delta and to indigenous
12 peoples. Instead, let's generate some goodwill. And
13 this might actually lessen damages from even other
14 claims associated with dams on the Peace River that
15 are in litigation now.

16 So thanks very much.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr. Carver, if -- go ahead.

18 If you do have a report that you feel would
19 be helpful to us, to assess the costs you speak of,
20 please feel free to submit it on our website. There
21 is -- if you go on our website, you'll see a button to
22 make submissions, and you can upload your report
23 there.

24 MR. CARVER: It's highly technical, so -- I don't want to
25 overwhelm you with that. But I will be happy to do
26 that.

1 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay. I'll find someone to explain it
2 to me, then. Thank you. Thank you, sir.

3 MR. CARVER: Thanks very much.

4 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

5 **Proceeding Time 6:35 p.m. T5B**

6 Mr. Elsworth? Oh, sorry.

7 MR. LOGTENBERG: I just got skipped when I went to get
8 some water.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Ah, okay.

10 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LOGTENBERG (#0084):**

11 MR. LOGTENBERG: First of all, thanks for giving us the
12 opportunity to speak here today. My name is Rik
13 Logtenberg, and it's L-O-G-T-E-N-B-E-R-G.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

15 MR. LOGTENBERG: I'm a software engineer based here in
16 Nelson and I have a particular interest as a ratepayer
17 in – and as a B.C. citizen – in seeing a thriving and
18 growing alternative energy here in B.C. And for us
19 as a country to meet our Paris Treaty obligations and
20 to do our part to reduce our development of oil and
21 gas in B.C.

22 Now, I understand that the BCUC is not
23 charged with offering political advice to the
24 Minister, but I want to express my concern that this
25 will, in large part, be a political report at least
26 insofar as the Minister may use your recommendation or

1 at least how you present it to justify a political
2 decision.

3 So I want to start by humbly asking you to
4 be careful as possible in how you present your
5 recommendations so as to resist it being misused.

6 Now, one particular example of how this
7 report can be misused is how the unit energy cost of
8 Site C is calculate versus the alternatives. And
9 this is something I think you've noted in your
10 preliminary report. Now, my concern is that the
11 public, or the political case for keeping Site C will
12 count the cost of termination twice, in the way that
13 the BC Hydro has already done in its calculations of
14 unit energy cost.

15 First, in comparing the UEC of Site C and
16 its alternatives, and then again in a separate
17 discussion of the costs of termination and
18 remediation.

19 Now, counting the cost twice, even if only
20 in separate sections of your report, I fear that will
21 greatly inflate the perceived cost of alternative
22 energy versus terminating Site C.

23 Now, as you've noted in your preliminary
24 report, the UEC comparison must not subtract the sunk
25 costs from Site C and then add the termination costs
26 onto the alternatives. Now, some costs in termination

1 costs need to be treated as completely separate
2 matters from the expected cost of the power to
3 ratepayers. Calculating the cost to ratepayers in the
4 way that BC Hydro has done will distort the public
5 perception of how much large projects like Site C
6 actually cost and will distort the public perception
7 of the cost of alternative energy in general.

8 Now, on top of that calculating UEC in the
9 way that BC Hydro has done creates the potential for a
10 moral hazard since it will reward BC Hydro for
11 obscuring the comparative cost of started or existing
12 projects for as long as possible. In other words, the
13 longer a project continues, and the higher the sunk
14 and termination costs, the more the unit energy cost
15 will favour the status quo and will punish the
16 alternatives. So in other words, the longer the
17 project is going, the more the alternatives will be
18 punished.

19 Now, this will always make the status quo
20 more appealing and BC Hydro and the alternatives will
21 always appear more expensive. As you pointed out in
22 your preliminary report, BC Hydro has set up an
23 applies to oranges comparison here, and I hope you
24 continue to aggressively push back on it in your final
25 report.

26 Now, while I have a few more moments, I

1 want to speak to one other issue, and I think some
2 other speakers tonight will talk about the future
3 demand for power, and already have.

4 Now, if my reading is correct, you've asked
5 BC Hydro to provide multiple forecasts of energy
6 demand given a strong LNG industry, and another one in
7 which the LNG industry is much smaller. Now, given
8 the world's commitment to the Paris agreement and the
9 growing enthusiasm for leaving our oil and gas assets
10 in the ground, I think it's important to include in
11 any forecast model a probability in which the industry
12 power demands are a fraction of what they are today.

13 Now, I'd like to mention something new that
14 I didn't see in the preliminary report. And that's
15 the current forecast show a 25 percent increase in
16 internal by 2036 to 74 megawatt hours. I'd like to
17 ask the Panel to consider the question of whether the
18 BC Hydro's market model considers the global trend
19 toward mobile technology and that impact on energy
20 consumption.

21 Now, 15 years the primary computing device
22 was a desktop computer, which consumed about 56
23 kilowatt hours a year. Ten years ago laptops reduced
24 that, and then today the primary computing device is a
25 mobile phone, which consumes one-fiftieth of the power
26 of a desktop computer. Now, that technology is being

1 shared across the consumer technology in general. So
2 with that consideration -- or to question BC Hydro on
3 the market model and look at how mobile technology in
4 particular, and its incentive to increase convenience
5 is driving energy consumption downward.

6 Thank you.

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

8 **Proceeding Time 6:40 p.m. T06**

9 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CHARLESWORTH (#0085):**

10 MS. CHARLESWORTH: Hi. My name is Kim Charlesworth, C-
11 H-A-R-L-E-S-W-O-R-T-H. My remarks will be addressing
12 the cost to ratepayers of terminating the Site C
13 project in comparison to the broad package of
14 alternative energy projects that could provide some
15 more benefits.

16 There are many aspects of the Site C
17 project that will contribute to the costs to
18 ratepayers. Others here can speak far better than I
19 on the very well-researched bleak prospects that Site
20 C has of ever operating at a profit and the resulting
21 impacts to ratepayers, but the costs include more than
22 the increase in electricity rates. They include a
23 huge economic impact that will be felt through the
24 province, so I want to speak first to the impact on
25 jobs which forms the very basis of economic
26 resiliency, and thus costs to ratepayers, which is all

1 of us.

2 Reports done, the Greenjobs B.C. 2015, one
3 recently by the Pembina Institute, Clean Energy Canada
4 2015, and Clean Energy B.C. 2016 have all shown that
5 the alternative energy field is poised to deliver more
6 jobs, permanent jobs, jobs that are better paying and
7 closer to the communities workers live in than any
8 large megaproject. Site C is directly responsible for
9 several alternative energy companies and projects
10 closing down and leaving B.C. This affects both our
11 efforts to transition to green energy, and to create
12 long-term green employment that pays livable wages.

13 Stopping Site C firmly and permanently will
14 allow the green energy sector to rebound and thrive
15 throughout B.C. Of course, it is necessary to provide
16 retraining and support to displaced workers, but the
17 costs of doing that are minute, compared to the costs
18 to ratepayers, society, taxpayers, the business sector
19 and government of not transitioning.

20 To enable this shift in energy production
21 to occur in a way that benefits employers, workers and
22 ratepayers as well as satisfies the need to decrease
23 greenhouse gas emissions quickly and substantially in
24 both the short and the long term, we must permanently
25 stop the construction of Site C dam, revise the
26 mandate of BC Hydro to include research, testing and

1 developing renewable energy generation projects and
2 develop a long-term renewable energy plan that places
3 solar, wind, biomass, biofuel and geothermal at its
4 centre.

5 The other sector where the Site C project
6 is negatively effecting stable economic activity and
7 jobs is in our food system and its infrastructure.
8 Again, these costs to ratepayers will occur over and
9 above any raise in electricity rates.

10 The approximately 5500 hectares that the
11 Site C dam will flood is the largest area of prime
12 agricultural land in B.C. outside of the Lower
13 Mainland which continues to face overwhelming
14 development pressures. It has been estimated that
15 this land can effectively feed 1 million people,
16 either in B.C. or elsewhere. That means jobs. The
17 food industry employs more people than any other
18 industry in Canada according to the Canadian Agri-Food
19 Policy Institute. Food processing is one of the
20 country's largest manufacturing sectors and an
21 essential channel for Canadian agricultural products.
22 In a time when climate change, both the slow increase
23 of average temperature and the resulting severe
24 weather events is causing havoc to food producers
25 around the globe, it makes sense to pay closer
26 attention to food resiliency here at home and where

1 our food is coming from. We need to be considering
2 the costs of not protecting our farmland.

3 Currently B.C. produces approximately 55
4 percent of what it consumes according to provincial
5 health services authority. The only reason the Peace
6 is currently not a major producer is because when Site
7 C was first being considered the zoning was put in
8 place to ensure that possible future expropriation
9 would be less expensive. No new buildings of any kind
10 would be compensated for.

11 We can provide a major boost to economic
12 resiliency in the north, as well as significantly
13 improve access to fresh locally produced food
14 throughout the province by stopping the Site C dam
15 permanently and encouraging sustainable farming
16 through changes to zoning and regulation.

17 If the area is encouraged to adopt
18 sustainable farming methods, we will win on every
19 front. Increasing economic resilience and jobs,
20 increasing food system resiliency, and reducing
21 greenhouse gas emissions, all for the long term.
22 When you compare the costs of not terminating the Site
23 C project with costs of supporting the package of
24 possible alternative energy projects that could
25 replace it, it is clear that B.C. ratepayers,
26 taxpayers, business, everyone will suffer, should it

1 go ahead.

2 Thank you.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

4 **Proceeding Time 6:45 p.m. T07**

5 Please go ahead, sir.

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. WILEY (#0086):**

7 MR. WILEY: Hello. Okay. My name is Keith Wiley, W-I-L-
8 E-Y. I live here in Nelson. And thank you very much
9 for the opportunity to present today.

10 I also am very concerned about the Site C
11 dam, about its environmental impact on the fertile
12 Peace River, and far downstream on the delta and Wood
13 Buffalo National Park, as Martin Carver mentioned.

14 But what might affect me more directly, and
15 is the main topic of your inquiry, is what the cost is
16 going to do for our electricity rates. It's a huge
17 outlay, 8 billion, 10 billion, maybe more. It's going
18 to be a dramatic impact. And that might be okay if BC
19 Hydro had places to sell the electricity. But near as
20 I can tell, that market is not there. All the reports
21 suggest that it's not there.

22 So there is quite a number of difficult
23 questions facing you as the Utilities Commission.
24 There's lots of numbers to crunch before you get us a
25 good report in short time, and we really need that
26 detailed analysis to judge it.

1 For example, in 2014 the Clean Energy
2 Association of B.C. gave BC Hydro a proposal to
3 replace the Site C project with a range of renewable
4 energy systems that would come in far cheaper. Where
5 are those numbers now? Renewable costs have been
6 dropping, and I don't believe BC Hydro really looked
7 at that option. But now the Utilities Commission
8 really has to consider it. Our electricity rate of
9 use in the province has been falling, not rising, and
10 that's even after the former Liberal government
11 cancelled energy conservation programs in the
12 province.

13 What if we did have good incentives for
14 consumers to reduce electricity? What would that do
15 to the future of electricity demand in the province?

16 Saved energy is always the best deal in
17 energy. The Commission has to consider that.

18 And what about electric vehicles? Some
19 outlying experts suggest that electric vehicles will
20 completely dominate the market in just five years. We
21 could be on the cusp of, as a friend said, an iPhone
22 style revolution in vehicles.

23 What I've heard is, people can save a lot
24 of money running an electric vehicle. So what's that
25 going to mean for electricity demand as well? The
26 Commission needs to know.

1 We've already spent 2 billion and it could
2 cost another billion to shut it down and cancel, but
3 if it goes ahead, it will be many billions more.
4 Who's going to pay for the investment? I don't
5 believe the B.C. government, or BC Hydro, ever put a
6 dollar value on the loss of the agricultural
7 resources, the Peace River valley, that Kim
8 Charlesworth was just talking about. They say it
9 could feed a million people. But more than the cost
10 of the land, there's definitely a lost opportunity
11 cost of the value of future food production that Kim
12 enunciated so well.

13 So there's a lot of number crunching, and
14 it's complicated, and I don't envy you your task. And
15 we're depending on you to do it for us. But there's
16 some simple math I could do in my head. There's been
17 a lot of talk about how many jobs the Site C dam will
18 create. So, it's supposed to cost \$10 billion, and
19 suppose 5,000 people work on it for five years, 25,000
20 person-years of jobs. And if you divide that into \$10
21 billion, that's nearly half a million dollars per job
22 per year, to build a dam. Those are very expensive
23 jobs. You know.

24 So one really wonders what that money could
25 do in creating jobs all over the province in local
26 economies, by renovating buildings, installing new

1 local renewable energy systems.

2 Thanks very much.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

4 **Proceeding Time 6:50 p.m. T08**

5 Ms. MacKay. Hi.

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MacKAY (#0087):**

7 MS. MacKAY: Hi. I'm Madelyn MacKay, M-A-C, capital K-A-
8 Y. And I'm a local organizer for Kootenay Society for
9 Lifelong Learning, and an instructor with Selkirk
10 College.

11 And recently organized a three-part series
12 of forums on creating -- investing in the new energy
13 economy. And we filled the Chamber of Commerce, and
14 had a wide variety of people and other sponsors
15 looking just at all the different ways we can make
16 that kind of investment into the renewable energy
17 economy. Divesting from fossil fuels.

18 My uncle Pete gave my dad a lot of
19 financial advice. Invest in this, invest in that.
20 And my dad's advice to me was, "Never throw good money
21 after bad." I think that's quite to the point in the
22 decision that we have to make here. And from the
23 fires that we've had this summer, we realize how
24 critical timing is. We don't want to wait until it's
25 too late to make the changes into the new energy
26 economy that we need to make to prevent harm to our

1 economy, to our environment, to the indigenous people
2 and their rights, and to each others' future.

3 When I walked out the door this morning, I
4 was really surprised to see, right by my front
5 sidewalk, a dinosaur. Now, I'm a grandmother, so
6 somebody might have assumed that it was my grandson's.
7 But there it was, and right beside my sunflowers. And
8 I just thought, "Oh, my goodness, isn't that apt for
9 the decision we're making today."

10 And so I do hope that we consider who the
11 markets are for this electricity. And the markets we
12 just don't know about, but I'm suspicious that it is
13 for some of this kind of energy, the tar sands LNG
14 projects that we know have stranded assets for a lot
15 of companies, and a lot of individual investors. And
16 I think as B.C. ratepayers and taxpayers, we certainly
17 want to put good money into good projects, not throw
18 our good money into this kind of project.

19 So, and also the big question that I have
20 living here is, we have flooded the environment here.
21 We've flooded communities, we've flooded sacred First
22 Nations sites. We have flooded farmland and critical
23 assets that Keith just referred to as well. And we
24 have dams waiting to have turbines and generators.

25 There isn't a demand to use our dams here
26 for electricity yet. But if there is a demand, if

1 people submitting to you can demonstrate that there is
2 a demand, it would make sense to me that we not lose
3 the energy in transmission, because such a high
4 proportion of electricity is lost in the transmission
5 lines from some place as far away as the Peace River.
6 And get the transmission right from the Kootenays,
7 from the southern Interior instead.

8 So we've had plenty of wake-up calls
9 lately. We know that there are many, many exciting
10 possibilities just waiting for our investment, waiting
11 for us to decide that we'll lead the way in British
12 Columbia to make these transitions to the new energy
13 economy. So I thank you for communicating the
14 recommendations to terminate the Site C project, and
15 let's move on to sun power energy.

16 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, Ms. MacKay.

17 **Proceeding Time 6:53 p.m. T09**

18 Ms. Hartline.

19 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. HARTLINE (#0088):**

20 MS. HARTLINE: My name is Sandra Hartline and last name
21 is spelt H-A-R-T-L-I-N-E. I am a member of the
22 Council of Canadians, Nelson Chapter and a local
23 representative for CHAROS, which is an inter-church
24 organization that works on justice issues in Canada
25 and throughout the world.

26 First of all, I'd like to thank the B.C.

1 Utilities Commission for undertaking this review of
2 the Site C dam. My arguments are as follows: Number
3 1, we don't need the energy that the dam would
4 generate. Number 2, there's no real market for this
5 energy. And Number 3, there are viable economic
6 alternatives to Site C that would benefit the whole of
7 British Columbia.

8 My comments are based on research primarily
9 for the Dalrod LLP review of BC Hydro's plans to build
10 Site C, McCullough Research on Energy Issues, such as
11 this one, the Pacific Electricity Ratepayers
12 Association, and my own heart and mind.

13 So, first of all, we don't need the energy
14 that might be generated by the Site C dam. Over the
15 past 29 years or so, as others have pointed out, BC
16 Hydro's forecasts have over-estimated demand by about
17 30 percent, and BC Hydro continues to forecast rapid
18 growth even though demand has been flat for years.

19 Also I've noticed that the BCUC inquiry
20 itself has as many, so far, unanswered questions of BC
21 Hydro.

22 Second, there's no real market for the
23 energy that Site C dam might produce. If Site C were
24 completed, BC Hydro would lose money on exports to the
25 United States. Presently B.C. has to sell power for
26 less than it costs to produce. Cancelling, the dam

1 would cost about 1.2 billion as opposed to the at
2 least 8.8 million it would cost to build it, and it
3 would cheaper to cancel the project than to suspend
4 it. They have a cost of about 1.4 billion if we
5 waited until 2025.

6 It's also the question of the needed river
7 diversion, construction schedule and budget delay.

8 Borrowing 10 billion dollars for Site C
9 means we don't have the opportunity to borrow for the
10 projects that we really need, like affordable housing,
11 education, hospitals, daycare centres. These kinds of
12 projects would provide fair wage construction jobs
13 throughout British Columbia, thus easily replacing the
14 so-called lost jobs from Site C.

15 Thirdly, viable economic alternatives would
16 cost a whole lot less. Terminating the project and
17 building a renewable portfolio of wind and geothermal
18 would save B.C. ratepayers way over a billion dollars.
19 They are more cost-effective, more easily built and
20 more flexible resources available.

21 I quote on page 7 of your own inquiry
22 report:

23 "The present cost of a windfarm that comes
24 on line in ten years will be different from
25 the cost today of the identical resource
26 that comes on line because of the possibly

1 declining costs of the technology.”

2 I notice that the inquiry also mentions
3 solar biomass and battery storage for alternative
4 generation. B.C. is not food secure due to the
5 flooding necessitated by the dam. Over 31,000 acres
6 of farmland would be destroyed. Yet this land is
7 capable of producing a sustainable supply of fresh
8 food for over a million people.

9 It’s a footnote, if I may, knowing that
10 this is outside the parameters of what the inquiry
11 will consider, I’d like to point out that going ahead
12 with Site C contravenes the United Nations declaration
13 of the rights of indigenous peoples. First Nations
14 and the area were never asked to consent to the
15 significant deal to their territory. Those who said
16 no were essentially ignored.

17 Ron Willson, Chief of the West Moberly
18 First Nations said flood linked to Site C would affect
19 fishing, hunting, trapping and sacred sites that are
20 thousands of years old. Chief Lynette Tsakoza of the
21 Prophet River First Nation said Canada can’t continue
22 to put indigenous rights last. It’s not too late to
23 change course, Chief Tsakoza says. The damage to the
24 Peace River is not irreversible. Stopping Site C is
25 the perfect opportunity to demonstrate to all
26 Canadians that this government takes reconciliation

1 seriously.

2 Thank you for your attention to my
3 submission.

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

5 **Proceeding Time 6:58 p.m. T10**

6 Good evening.

7 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LAMB-YORSKI (#0089):**

8 MS. LAMB-YORSKI: Good evening. My name is Anna Lamb-
9 Yorski. That's spelled L-A-M-B, hyphen, capital Y-O-
10 R-S-K-I.

11 I am a resident of Nelson and a citizen of
12 British Columbia and Canada. I'm not an engineer, an
13 economist, or an energy analyst. But what I am is a
14 concerned citizen with mostly a lot of questions and
15 concerns about the decisions we collectively make, and
16 how these determine whether we will leave a legacy for
17 or a burden on the future inhabitants of this
18 province.

19 Where are our energy policies taking us -
20 into the future, or into the past? How can a project
21 that was deemed a bad idea in the 1950s, in 1982, and
22 in 1989, suddenly become a good idea? How much energy
23 do we really need? Is it better to increase supply at
24 a tremendous cost, instead of investing in tangible
25 energy saving solutions such as rapid transportation,
26 net zero infrastructure, and alternative energy

1 projects?

2 Wouldn't the economic costs be comparable
3 and free of the environmental risks and social
4 controversy that comes with the construction and
5 operation of the Site C dam? Why wouldn't we choose
6 this option? Why wouldn't we choose to be competitive
7 and train our tradesmen and women to be skilled
8 pioneers in this new industry? Isn't this in
9 everyone's best long-term economic interest?

10 How much electricity are we currently
11 wasting due to unrealistic subsidies and extremely
12 inefficient infrastructure, and why aren't homeowners
13 and businesses being offered significantly greater
14 financial incentives to make their homes and buildings
15 more energy-efficient?

16 The extraction of and reliance on fossil
17 fuels is still an integral part of this province's
18 economy. However, this doesn't mean we should be
19 supplying energy for future needs of this industry
20 when we are preparing to transition away from it, or
21 at least that's what I think we're doing.

22 Yes, hydroelectricity generation is one of
23 the cleanest forms of energy production on this
24 planet. But if you remove a significant carbon sink
25 and create a whole ton of greenhouse gases, about
26 150,000 tonnes in the process, the result should be

1 questionable. And I think that in 2024 Google Earth
2 will agree with me that green minus green does not
3 equal green.

4 What do we value? Do we value land,
5 forests, animals? What about property rights,
6 petitions, taxpayer dollars? Should our children
7 share our values? Do we really care about First
8 Nations, and their burial grounds, heritage sites and
9 treaty rights? And I could be wrong, but isn't this
10 week Reconciliation Week?

11 How does this project reflect on us and
12 what message are we sending to the rest of the world?
13 If we have \$8 billion and counting to throw around,
14 then we also have the luxury of being able to afford
15 to lead by example.

16 So finally, if Site C was your online
17 dating profile, what would it show? Would it portray
18 a fiscally-minded, socially-conscious,
19 environmentally-friendly visionary? Or a self-
20 centred, power-hungry, broke traditionalist who is
21 hated by all of his neighbours?

22 Thank you.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.

24 **Proceeding Time 7:02 p.m. T11**

25 Garth Georgetti. Garth, are you here?
26 Mark Miller? Are you Garth or Mark?

1 MR. MILLER: Mark.

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

4 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MILLER (#0090):**

5 MR. MILLER: Evening. My name is Mark Miller, last name
6 spelt M-I-L-L-E-R. I'm the business agent for
7 Construction and Maintenance and Allied Workers Local
8 2300, the Kootenays Carpentry and Construction Union.

9 CMAW is a member of the Allied Hydro
10 Council, a group of unions specializing in
11 hydroelectric construction and representing the best
12 dam builders in Western Canada.

13 I'm going to speak to you in favour of Site
14 C tonight, not only as a representative of the workers
15 that are likely to build the dam, but as an
16 environmentalist, a ratepayer and a pragmatist that
17 sees the current need for a switch to carbon-free
18 sources of power. I'm also a democratic socialist
19 that sees value in retaining public ownership of our
20 resources.

21 Currently my understanding is 94 percent of
22 B.C.'s electricity comes from renewable resources.
23 That's a very nice statistic. The problem is, only 16
24 percent of B.C.'s energy currently comes from
25 electricity and only 17 percent of that energy comes
26 from renewables. Therefore, 83 percent of B.C.'s

1 current energy supply is carbon based. Clearly, if we
2 are going to fix this problem and meet our carbon
3 rejection targets, we are going to need to find
4 massive sources of carbon neutral energy quickly.

5 Some say we can fix this problem by
6 supplying the grid with power from wind turbines,
7 solar and geothermal production. I do not disagree
8 with this assertion. However, I am not convinced that
9 those alone will be enough or that their combined
10 social, environmental or financial impact will
11 ultimately be lesser than that of hydroelectric power.

12 There are many statistics circulating about
13 the room tonight and I will leave it to the experts to
14 confirm or deny their integrity. However, one
15 statistic that has hit home for me is that the act of
16 converting all of B.C.'s vehicles to electricity would
17 require a power supply equivalent to the capacity of
18 15 Site C projects. To convert all of our homes,
19 buildings and industry to electricity would require
20 the further capacity of another 15 Site C projects.

21 If you consider that it would take
22 approximately 600 wind turbines, or 5500 hundred acres
23 of solar panels to provide the equivalent power
24 production of one Site C, you can see very quickly how
25 we need to pursue all alternative sources of
26 electricity with as much vigour as we can.

1 To bring it all into perspective and to
2 give this some local relevance, Nelson's new solar
3 garden produces approximately 60 kilowatts of
4 electricity. In order to equal the power output of
5 Site C, we would need approximately 18,333 of these
6 projects.

7 With regards to the cost issue. There are
8 a couple of factors I would like the panel to
9 consider.

10 Number 1, we hear a lot about cost
11 overruns. No options for new electricity production
12 are cheap and none are immune to cost overruns.
13 While many large construction projects do go over
14 budget, there are no statistics to support the
15 assertion that hydro projects are any more or less
16 likely to go over budget than geothermal, solar, or
17 wind projects.

18 In fact, many recent hydroelectric
19 projects, including our own Arrow Lakes generating
20 station and Waneta expansion projects, have come in
21 ahead of schedule and under budget.

22 Number two, the lifespan for hydroelectric
23 generators is between 50 and 75 years. The lifespan
24 for a photovoltaic panel and a wind generator – sorry,
25 the lifespan for photovoltaic panels, wind generators
26 and geothermal heat pumps is 20 to 25 years, therefore

1 when considering costs per megawatt for alternatives,
2 you need to budget double or triple the cost of
3 initial installation in order to replace them as they
4 wear out. You are not replacing Site C with 600 wind
5 turbines, but actually 1800.

6 Finally, I would like to speak to the fact
7 that BC Hydro is a publically-owned utility. There
8 have been no reassurances that in the absence of Site
9 C the replacement electrical generation will be owned
10 by the public. This is a great concern to me as I
11 believe we have already given enough of our streams,
12 creeks and rivers away to private interests for run-
13 of-river projects.

14 So, in conclusion Site C is not a perfect
15 project, however none are. And this is a publicly-
16 owned, carbon-free way to produce a massive amount of
17 electricity quickly. If we are going to meet any of
18 our stated climate change targets, we are going to
19 need each and every imperfect project that comes our
20 way, and the sooner the better.

21 Thank you very much for the opportunity to
22 speak on this very important subject.

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

24 **Proceeding Time 7:07 p.m. T12**

25 Is Roland Hilger here, please? Roland
26 Hilger? Gary Ockenden?

1 MR. OCKENDEN: Very good.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

3 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. OCKENDEN (#0091):**

4 MR. OCKENDEN: Thank you for coming to Nelson. I'm Gary
5 Ockenden, that's O-C-K-E-N-D-E-N.

6 I live in Nelson and I'm making my points
7 as a citizen and also as the vice-president of the
8 board of Amnesty International in Canada. My
9 statement may seem beyond your scope initially, but
10 bear with me and you'll see the connection.

11 So the Site C dam has been condemned as a
12 violation of the rights of indigenous peoples by the
13 Assembly of First Nations, Amnesty International
14 worldwide, and the United Nations committee on the
15 elimination of racial discrimination. Concerns over
16 the violation of indigenous rights are relevant to the
17 BCUC, because when the federal and provincial
18 governments designed a process to review the
19 environmental impacts of Site C, they purposefully
20 excluded any consideration of whether or not the
21 project would violate Canada's legal obligations under
22 Treaty 8. Both BC Hydro and the federal government
23 have openly stated in court that no treaty
24 infringement test was ever done.

25 In all the court cases that have gone
26 forward, BC Hydro and the federal government have

1 successfully resisted efforts by First Nations to
2 resolve this issue through the expedient legal means
3 available, the judicial review. This doesn't rule out
4 the possibility of a future legal action.

5 As a result, a significant potential
6 liability hangs over this project that is not
7 acknowledged in the BCUC's preliminary report. At any
8 time, First Nations could launch a credible legal case
9 for compensation for violation of their treaty rights,
10 leading to significant legal expense for the province,
11 and with a very high chance of being awarded
12 significant compensation. This is a financial
13 liability that can be avoided by cancelling this
14 project.

15 As someone concerned about justice and
16 reconciliation with First Nations, I strongly believe
17 that potential harm to the rights of First Nations
18 must be addressed before a project is approved and
19 construction begins. Once the damage is done, it's
20 already too late for true justice.

21 There is also a financial case for
22 respecting indigenous rights. International financial
23 institutions like the International Monetary Fund and
24 a growing number of the world's largest corporations
25 have adopted free, prior, and informed consent
26 policies because it's financially more prudent to

1 MR. CRAIG: Last summer I had the opportunity to go and
2 paddle on the Peace in my canoe and it was very
3 beautiful country. I had the opportunity to meet many
4 people up there and some of the stories I've heard and
5 some of the people I met, I'll relay those. It has
6 economic input.

7 One was an equipment operator. He worked
8 up there for 25, 30 years, lived there. He was making
9 \$10 an hour less now than he did ten years ago because
10 of the influx of more workers up there and cheaper
11 rates.

12 Another was, while I was paddling down the
13 river I met up with a grandfather and his two
14 grandsons. There were of indigenous -- anyway they
15 were native to the area, partially native. He was a
16 farmer, a fisherman and a hunter. He had lived there
17 all his life, was born there, and he wanted to protect
18 the Peace to help his grandchildren out.

19 Another couple I met were ranchers on one
20 of the other Bennett reservoirs further up the Peace
21 and they had been ranchers there before the reservoir
22 and were still ranching there, and their concern was
23 that they couldn't -- the land wasn't the same after
24 the reservoir came in. They couldn't fish anymore and
25 the wildlife wasn't the same around the river.

26 And then this summer I had the opportunity

1 to travel across Canada and two places that are
2 relevant are Ontario and Newfoundland. And
3 Newfoundland, they've just built one of this big
4 boondoggle dams, and the people are facing double the
5 rates in the next five years. Whether that will
6 actually materialize --

7 So people are looking at having to move
8 away from their homes because they can't afford their
9 hydro rates any more. There was lots of good jobs
10 there and there was lots of boys with lots of toys and
11 big houses and bigger mortgages. And you know, once
12 the jobs are gone, they are probably just going to be
13 all bankrupt. So that's what's happening in
14 Newfoundland and it could happen here in B.C.

15 Another place is Ontario and they've had a
16 run amok with their hydro company as well, and they're
17 planning on mortgaging their future generations to
18 help pay for the mistakes they've made. There's a lot
19 of very upset ratepayers in Ontario.

20 A little closer to home, another story of
21 another family is a friend of mine used to work for BC
22 Hydro. He was an engineer in their renewable energy
23 section and they gave him a pink slip. They fired
24 him. And now he's moved to the Northwest Territories
25 to work. We've lost a good-paying job out of this
26 community and a family that brought lots of money

1 here.

2 So I think it's only pertinent that you
3 cancel this project and perhaps we could put a
4 monument to the liberal government there or something
5 instead. Thank you.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

7 **Proceeding Time 7:15 p.m. T14**

8 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BROUGHTON (#0093):**

9 MR. BROUGHTON: Hi, I'm Don Broughton, B-R-O-U-G-H-T-O-
10 N. Unfortunately I've never spoke at one of these
11 things, so if I'm a big off base here, please forgive
12 me. But I want to tell you, like fifty, sixty,
13 seventy years ago, when the rivers of BC heard of
14 Hydro's future plans, they said, "We'll be dammed, and
15 dammed and dammed."

16 And I've worked on a couple of these.
17 That's why I wanted to speak. When I was on the 7-
18 Mile dam, anybody who was familiar with the Pend
19 d'Oreille River, there was beautiful rock formations
20 and stuff up there behind the dam. It was a wonderful
21 place to drive through or go look around. I can't
22 take any of my grandkids, I couldn't - well, one of my
23 kids saw it, but she was only a year and a half old.
24 I can't show any of my other kids or grandkids any of
25 that.

26 I looked at that one, and I thought, okay,

1 well, we probably need the power so, you know, trade-
2 off, it's a shame to lose the beauty.

3 When I worked on the Revelstoke dam, which
4 was the third one I worked on, I stood on top of that
5 dam looking back as they filled up that lake and I
6 witnessed two great big slides. Well, the first one I
7 thought was big until I saw the second one in just a
8 little farther up the river, and realized how much of
9 those mountains are falling apart when we build
10 something as big as the Revelstoke dam, as high. I
11 know every dam is different. The Peace we're not
12 going to be so high but we're going to wipe out a lot
13 more fertile land.

14 That's when I realized that we really blew
15 it. When you look at these dams -- I've never heard
16 through all the climate change and worry about all
17 that, I've never heard any of these scientists stand
18 up and say, hey, all over the world we have stopped
19 rivers from flowing. Cold water doesn't evaporate a
20 lot. Put that in a pond and see how much more
21 evaporation. I'm not a scientist at all. I remember
22 a couple of things from school, but I didn't graduate.
23 But this is one thing that just makes sense. So, when
24 you've got that much evaporation, the climate is going
25 to change.

26 That's not quite as scary as my biggest

1 point. I believe it's a square foot of water weighs
2 ten pounds. How many billions of square feet of water
3 are we going to back up if we build Site C? How many
4 millions, billions, whatever, cubic feet of water have
5 we got here in the Kootenays. Think of all that
6 weight. I'd like for you folks at one of your
7 meetings to take one of those big old globes that
8 stood on a stand and you could sit there and spin it
9 around and around. It goes so nice and smooth. While
10 you're having your meeting, have somebody stand there
11 with wads of gum slapping them on just whenever. That
12 things going to start to wobble a bit. After a while
13 you're all going to jump from your seats when all that
14 goes crashing to the ground because it can't take all
15 this stupidity going on all over the world.

16 I really think we need to take the
17 leadership role and say, hey, look, we've got to do
18 something way different.

19 And I don't really like wind power. I've
20 heard of a lot of bird dying and stuff. There's
21 problems with everything.

22 I think the biggest solution is, we need
23 most of this -- or people that say we need the power,
24 most of it is to fuel the technology that we seem to
25 so badly crave. You know what? We don't need that
26 technology. In a dictionary when they say

1 "modernization" the definition should be "whole bunch
2 of guys not coming to work Monday morning". Because
3 computers have taken over your job.

4 These people that think, hey, I'm really
5 smart, I'm going to go and build computers. Guess
6 what? You'll build the computer that puts you out of
7 a job because it's going to build the next ones.
8 Instead of looking to where can we sell all this extra
9 energy we want to build, let's figure out how we
10 cannot use it.

11 I spent a whole summer sitting out under my
12 chestnut tree instead of watching the TV. Saved a
13 whole bunch of energy, enjoyed the view. If you saw
14 my view in Silverton, you'd really understand. But
15 why do you need five or six or ten technical devices?

16 We get all this, "Oh, yeah, well, we need
17 to be able to tweet everybody right now. Everybody
18 needs to know what I'm doing right this second."
19 Well, only you folks know what I'm doing right this
20 second. I don't have a computer, I don't have a cell
21 phone. I am fine with that. Whenever somebody offers
22 me one, I say, "Are you going to pay the cell bill?"
23 "Well, no." "Well, then I don't want it." Because
24 for what little I'd use it -- I actually had a guy say
25 to me, "Well, how do you find out things?" Hey, I
26 watch the news. I can read a newspaper, and if I

1 really need and it's only on the computer, I'll call
2 my kids or my grandkids because they'll find it so
3 damn fast that why would I pay for -- to be educated
4 on all this?

5 I see I'm going overtime so here I'm just
6 going to -- very last thing. Well, I pretty much said
7 it. We only want the technology -- or we don't need
8 the more power. We only want it to run the technology
9 that is killing our jobs and our lifestyle.

10 Now, when we finally build one dam too many
11 and -- and I'm not a doomsday kind of person, but when
12 the world quits spinning and we're all flying off, I
13 want you listen carefully. Because I'm going to be
14 screaming, "I told you so."

15 Thank you very much for your time and I
16 appreciate all of it.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

18 **Proceeding Time 7:21 p.m. T15**

19 There's a couple of people that didn't --
20 weren't here when called. I just want to make sure
21 that they're not here. John Alton? Garth Georgetti?
22 And Roland Hiller? Okay. They are not here, no.

23 So I'd like to thank everyone for coming
24 and I'd especially like to thank the speakers for
25 their thoughtful and sometimes humourous submissions
26 and comments. It's been a very informative evening

1 for all of us up here.

2 Yes?

3 MR. DE KRUIF: Excuse me. On the website it said that
4 if you ran out of speakers then you'd open the floor
5 for other people to speak.

6 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Is there anyone else? Is there
7 anyone who would --

8 MS. DONALD: I would like to.

9 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

10 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. DONALD (#0094):**

11 MS. DONALD: Hi. My name is Mary Donald and I live on
12 the east shore of Kootenay Lake, which is across an
13 hour and a half or so from Nelson across the Lake, but
14 this is my business centre.

15 THE CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

16 MS. DONALD: So there's just a few things that came up
17 for me listening. Oh, D-O-N-A-L-D. Donald, Mary
18 Donald.

19 So one of the things that really strikes me
20 is in considering whether we terminate Site C or not,
21 is what kind of jobs would be available to people to
22 dismantle the Site C dam. I mean, that could be huge
23 tradesmen's work, I would think. I don't know enough
24 about it, but I would like that to be seriously
25 considered.

26 I'm leaning towards cancelling it for all

1 the reasons that have been said tonight, and in
2 response as well to -- I forget who it was that spoke,
3 the man that spoke about working on the dams, I'd
4 really like to see the facts that compare the cost of
5 green tech versus -- the cost of green jobs compared
6 to the cost of working with the trades jobs.

7 Like you suggested that if we don't use the
8 tradesmen -- I've got to get this straight here.
9 Yeah. To compare. Could we still -- no, I'd like to
10 know what is the higher electric output. Could they
11 compare wind, geothermal, solar. Like we need facts
12 to see really that they can support, those alternative
13 energy sources could support electricity need. We
14 need to have that in view, I think.

15 And the other thing is, as well, if we
16 cancel the Site C dam and open it up to the
17 agricultural world where Ken Charlesworth mentioned
18 the agricultural sector is the highest number of jobs
19 in Canada, those are ongoing jobs, whereas the Site C
20 dam building of it is a one-time event. Maybe five
21 years, but it's a one-time event and then it's done.
22 There will be a few ongoing jobs running it. But the
23 agricultural sector would be longer long-term jobs and
24 as well would not infringe on indigenous rights as
25 well.

26 And with the drought in California, who

1 provides a lot of food for North America, we could
2 certainly benefit from growing food in B.C. It could
3 be a huge income boost for our province so.

4 Thank you very much.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.

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

7 Thank you.

8 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. DeKRUIF (#0095):**

9 MR. DeKRUIF: You're going to have fun with my name.
10 it's Theo, T-H-E-O; De Kruif, D-e-K-R-U-I-F.

11 Incidentally I'm with the IBEW, the International
12 Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. I need to change
13 my glasses.

14 So, it seems that the best option for Site
15 C would be cancelation, considering the lack of demand
16 for new power which could result in electricity rates
17 doubling or more for all future ratepayers in B.C.
18 However, if Site C is cancelled, workers in the
19 construction trades desperately need the provincial
20 government to rapidly mobilize, create public works
21 and infrastructure projects to compensate for the loss
22 of jobs this decision would cause. It would be best
23 if such projects were equitably divided around our
24 province and could be such things as retrofitting
25 public buildings for energy efficiency, adding
26 generating capacity to existing hydroelectric

1 installations, which is very green, by the way.
2 Developing green power technologies and creating value
3 added industry, especially wood products which could
4 dramatically reduce the number of raw logs B.C.
5 exports.

6 This could also be an opportunity to
7 reverse the centralization of services by reinvesting
8 in local hospitals so people wouldn't have to travel
9 great distances for treatments and tests as they are
10 being forced to now. It would be great to see this
11 government reopening schools that have been sacrificed
12 in the name of fiscal efficiency. When schools are
13 closed and services are reduced in local hospitals,
14 communities are essentially gutted.

15 Let's take the billions of dollars about to
16 be spent on a questionable megaproject and revitalize
17 all areas of British Columbia instead. This all needs
18 to happen quickly though, people in the building
19 trades are already hurting and the last thing they
20 need is a net loss of work.

21 Thank you.

22 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

23 **Proceeding Time 7:25 p.m. T17**

24 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SWITZER (#0096):**

25 MR. SWITZER: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the
26 opportunity to speak. I wasn't registered but the

1 opportunity is here.

2 THE CHAIRPERSON: Yes, that's fine. Please spell your
3 name.

4 MR. SWITZER: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm Richard John Switzer,
5 S-W-I-T-Z-E-R. I'm from Castlegar, and I'm retired.
6 My first comment is BC Hydro has an atrocious history
7 on dealing with land claims for everybody, not just
8 tribal Indians. But if they look at their own record
9 on the Upper and Lower Arrow Lakes, especially the
10 Lower Arrow Lakes starting from Nakusp on down towards
11 Castlegar, the way they treated the people in Nakusp,
12 Needles, Arrow Park, Renata, Deer Park, Syringa Park,
13 they were forced off their lands by expropriation
14 brought on, partly by the Americans, and by BC Hydro
15 and the federal government of that day. I forget who
16 it was. I think it was Conservative. People were
17 given ten cents on the dollar or maybe twenty cents on
18 the dollar for the value of their lands that were
19 expropriate to make way for the flooding of their
20 orchards and their town sites.

21 And my in-laws were one of them. There is
22 a lot of bitter hatred in this area for BC Hydro for
23 the way they mistreated these people who were forced
24 off their lands. These lands were there long before
25 Hydro came along. These lands were not Indian tribe
26 lands, they were white man lands because they bought

1 them with their own hard work and sweat and labour.

2 And the other one is, on Lake Wilson behind
3 the W.A.C. Bennett dam up north, past Chetwyn there,
4 there is a mercury poisoning going on in the lake. BC
5 Hydro and the Ministry of Health have advised the
6 people, Indians and everybody else, not to eat more
7 than one fish per month because of mercury loading in
8 the fish. They've advised the parents not to let
9 their children eat fish at all that is caught in those
10 waters because of mercury poisoning.

11 And the other one is, in California they
12 are moving more towards more deserts coming. It's
13 moving northwards from Mexico. And so now, the
14 growing season is growing longer in the north because
15 of the climate change. So the growing season is
16 moving more from California into Oregon and Washington
17 and British Columbia.

18 Well, the Peace River Valley has a
19 beautiful climate right now for growing and the good
20 soil. Why put that under water and flood it? We need
21 that food more than we need the power. And if
22 California can't produce more food because they going
23 more towards deserts and a lack of water, those people
24 are going to move their farms northward.

25 And right now, it's the historical fact,
26 the wineries in California are moving to Oregon and

1 Washington because they can't grow grapes to make wine
2 because there is no water. So we need that food.

3 And as for more electricity, we could do
4 more with less. And we've had many people here speak
5 of doing more with what we have, instead of producing
6 more of what we don't need.

7 So that's all I can. Anyways, thank you
8 very much for this opportunity to speak. And have a
9 good night.

10 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

11 **Proceeding Time 7:30 p.m. T18**

12 Thank you.

13 MS. GRAOVAC: Good evening.

14 THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening.

15 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GRAOVAC (#0097):**

16 MS. GRAOVAC: Thank you very much for hosting this public
17 inquiry. My name is Gwen, G-W-E-N; Graovac, G-R-A-O-
18 V-A-C. And I want to thank all the speakers who have
19 voiced their concerns tonight and I echo all of them
20 in cancellation towards the Site C dam.

21 I was born in 1986 and if this project has
22 a 50-year lifespan, I will see the end result of what
23 happens when a dam has lived its life span. And I
24 don't -- I cannot conceive that the power usage and
25 needs -- which have been voiced as unnecessary tonight,
26 which I agree with -- could possibly be better than the

1 agricultural usage and the native land that this dam
2 would flood.

3 So I just want my name to be on the record
4 that I am absolutely for cancelling this project so
5 the future generations can reap the benefit of the
6 sustenance that this wild land can provide.

7 Thank you.

8 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.

9 Gentleman at the back? Or, sorry, lady?

10 Gentleman at the back, yes?

11 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. RICHER (#0098):**

12 MR. RICHER: Hi, thanks for letting me speak. My name is
13 Fred Richer, that's R-I-C-H-E-R. And I live here in
14 Nelson And I didn't really prepare anything to say,
15 I didn't think I would get a chance to speak, but I am
16 in favour of stopping Site C dam for all the various
17 excellent reasons why we should do that, economical,
18 agricultural, native rights, et cetera, et cetera, it
19 goes on forever why not to do it.

20 But really what clinches it for me is that
21 the former executives at BC Hydro who are truly
22 experts in their field -- now I'm thinking Mr.
23 Eliesen, is that the correct pronunciation?

24 THE CHAIRPERSON: Correct. Yeah, yeah.

25 MR. RICHER: And the other fella, I'm sorry, I forgot his
26 name, who's also an executive in BC Hydro. Now, they

1 say for economic reasons that we should scrap the
2 plan. Well, for me that just clinches the whole thing
3 right there. So that's really all I have to say, so
4 thank you very much.

5 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

6 **SUBMISSIONS BY MR. CARVER (#0083) (Continued):**

7 MR. CARVER: Thank you. It's Martin Carver, C-A-R-V-E-R,
8 again, with a supplemental comment about downstream
9 impacts and in particular the hidden ones. There is a
10 complication around putting a major dam like Site C in
11 there when presumably it's just a matter of time
12 before BC Hydro is asked to mitigate for its effects
13 on lost recharge in the Peace/Athabasca Delta, and
14 that will mean it will have to change its operations
15 of its existing dams, which is a complex thing to do
16 and it costs millions of dollars per effort. And if
17 there's another dam in the sequence it will make that
18 effort much more complicated and more costly every
19 time it has to be done. So there's another escalating
20 hidden cost associated with mitigations of impacts to
21 the Delta that I did mention before.

22 Thank you very much.

23 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir. Thank you. There's
24 another?

25 **Proceeding Time 7:34 p.m. T19**

26 **SUBMISSIONS BY MS. THOMPSON (#0099):**

1 MS. THOMPSON: Thank you for coming to Nelson this
2 evening.

3 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

4 MS. THOMPSON: My name is Erin Thompson, T-H-O-M-P-S-O-
5 N. I would like to acknowledge that we are standing
6 here on unceded indigenous territory and to note that
7 the Site C is actually not on unceded territory. It
8 is part of Treaty 8.

9 I would like for these Commission, as well
10 as this government, to consider that if we want
11 reconciliation and decolonization to be more than just
12 buzz words in our community, then we need to consider
13 that we, as a settler society, need to abide by the
14 laws that we have created. This land is not our land
15 to take and to use and to expropriate from these
16 peoples. We have already done a great injustice to
17 the indigenous peoples that live on this land. Do we
18 wish to carry on in this fashion? Do we wish, as a
19 society, to have the continued legacy of pushing these
20 peoples further and further and further away every
21 time we want to use that land for something else,
22 every time we find value in something that we have
23 given them, because we thought we gave them the worst
24 parts. We thought we pushed them further and further
25 away and now we've decided that there's something
26 that's valuable there.

1 We have already done this in the north. As
2 a northern resident I have seen over and over again as
3 our communities of settlers disrespect their laws and
4 their right to have the right to say no. They have
5 said no to this project.

6 Now, I believe in public consultation and
7 democracy, but I also believe in nation-to-nation
8 relationships and government-to-government
9 relationships. And at this point, I think it's
10 necessary to say that this is enough. We have heard
11 enough. If they say no to this project, if we see
12 that it will continue to negatively impact their
13 population and continue to reproduce the
14 intergeneration trauma that we have already impacted,
15 then we should say no to this project and cancel it
16 immediately.

17 THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much.

18 Okay, anyone else? Well, again I'd like
19 to thank everyone for coming and especially thank the
20 speakers for their thoughtful comments. And as I said
21 at the outset, we find all of your comments very
22 helpful to us as we continue our report writing and
23 again, we thank you very much for that. I hope you
24 all have a great evening. Thanks.

25 **(PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED AT 7:37 P.M.)**

26

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

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



A.B. Lanigan, Court Reporter

September 27th, 2017