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THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening. Thank you for joining us as we proceed through our two and a half week schedule of Site C inquiry community input sessions around the province. Tonight is our second night here in Fort St. John.

We are extremely pleased by both the level of public interest and the effort that has gone into presentations that we've heard at the community input sessions so far.

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

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

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

The Order in Council that directed us to inquire into the project specifically requires us to consider the cost implications on BC Hydro ratepayers of three scenarios: continuing the project; suspending the project; or terminating the project. Suspending the project would involve suspending it by the end of the year and re-starting it in 2024.

My panel members and I recognize that there are many other implications of the project beyond cost implications. Considering this, we ask that in the interests of all parties in the room you strive to keep your submissions within the scope of our inquiry. Submissions made here today, as well as those made in writing, that are outside of the scope of our review cannot be considered in our final report to government on November 1st.

There are copies of the executive summary of our preliminary report at the entrance table, and
the full report is available on our website or by
making a request through our office.

I'd like to address a couple of other
housekeeping items. First of all, you met Mr.
Bemister just a few minutes ago. He's from Allwest
Reporting. He is here to help with organizing
speakers and other logistics, and his team will be
recording and transcribing these sessions. The live
audio can be streamed from our website at
SiteCInquiry.com and following these sessions all
presentations will be transcribed and posted along
with the rest of the inquiry documents.

There is some coffee and tea at the side of
the room; please help yourself throughout the session,
and please feel free to enter and exit the room, but
please do so quietly so as to not disrupt the
speakers.

And for those of you that are speaking, the
list of speakers appears on the TV and on the screen
up at the front here. And when your name is appearing
within the next two or three speakers, you're welcome
to come and sit at the front row until you can take
your place at one of the two podiums up here.

If you're not in the room, or not prepared
at the time you're called, we'll go ahead with the
next speaker in line. But we will return at the end
to make sure that anybody who didn't get a chance to speak will get a chance to speak at the end of the list.

Other than stating your name, and we ask that you state your name before you start speaking, or before you start with your prepared speech, and state your first name and spell your last name, please, so that the transcribers can make sure that it's recorded properly in the transcript. But other than stating your name, please refrain from including personal or confidential information in your submission, noting that it will become a matter of public record. Inclusion of confidential information may result in your presentation not being included in the session transcript, and consequently not considered any further in the inquiry.

The Panel is aware of the circulation of the unredacted Deloitte report filed in the first phase of the inquiry. The information redacted in the report was done so to ensure that current and future contract and procurement negotiations between BC Hydro and its suppliers were not compromised as a result of the information being publicly available. This information remains confidential, despite its improper disclosure in the press.

All information in the report was factored
into the Panel's findings, and the Deloitte report was factored into the panel's findings and questions in our preliminary report. The Panel may redact or refuse submissions that contain reference to that confidential information, both here tonight as well as in written submissions.

Please also refrain from using profane or offensive language in your presentations; this as well as any other disruptive behavior will result in the early close of the session.

Speakers have a maximum of five minutes and we have a clock here to let you know how you're doing as you're talking, with regard to time, at least. And I will -- as your time approaches five minutes, I'll try to give you a signal and remind you to please start to summarize your remarks.

If you've heard any sentiments from prior speakers that are consistent with yours, you may wish to just register your support of a previous presentation and that will leave you more time to present material of your own.

With that, we are ready to open this second session in Fort St. John, on October 2nd, 2017. And I ask that our first speaker please begin now. Is that Ms. Boon? Thank you.
SUBMISSIONS BY MS. BOON (#0159):

MS. BOON: Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Arlene Boon, B-O-O-N. I am a third-generation farmer, born and raised here. My family has many years of emotional history of this project, starting with my grandfather.

I would like to highlight some of the many risks I see that will be added to the budget overruns of Site C, starting with the mitigation -- the individual farm mitigation plan, condition 30. It appears this has not been budgeted for. The cost of this mitigation plan is over and above the acquisition process cost and not part of the $20 million funding for the agricultural plan as identified by the B.C. Environment Office, Assessment Office. There are 34 farm operations that will all need a plan.

Independent agrologists now have been engaged and so far not one land owner or tenure holder has a plan in place to my knowledge. Eight properties, including ours, on the Bear Flat area were expropriated for highway realignment in December, 2016. In February of 2017, the mulching and logging through these properties began. This plan was required before adverse effects occur to a specific farm. One of the agrologists commented to us, "This
evaluation is supposed to be done prior to work starting," and they had never been called into a project after destruction.

Included in condition 30 is the development of new water supplies. Historically, the farm houses were established close to good water sources. If this project proceeds, BC Hydro will have to relocate the land owners and this includes the properties that sold in the 80s and the 90s.

To date, of the three land owners that have had wells drilled, it has cost BC Hydro over 124,000 -- about $124,000. They are drilling dusters, or not finding the same quantity and quality that is being lost. How did BC Hydro budget for this, yet another unknown cost?

Of the eight expropriated lands in the Cache Creek area, all payments were based on the BC Hydro appraised values. So still outstanding is the final settlement if Site C continues.

BC Hydro has a large asset in purchased land throughout this 40-year process. The sale of these lands will help recover money spent on this project.

Most of these lands have a buy-back policy and, like many others, my husband and I will purchase our land back when this project is terminated.
I've been watching the numerous postings of BC Hydro's schedules since the consultation process. It seems that, if a project is not on schedule, it gets re-scheduled, and this puts it back on schedule. A few examples are the 271 Road improvement project and the viewpoint.

In addition to Crown lands' values not having been included in the cost of the Site C project, there is also a very large aggregate resource that should be valued if this project were to proceed.

I ask that Site C be terminated. The implementation of a land use plan and the removal of the 1957 Order in Council flood reserve. Thank you.

Proceeding Time 6:11 p.m. T03

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

Mr. Hadland.

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

MR. R. HADLAND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Randal Hadland, H-A-D-L-A-N-D. I'd like to start by acknowledging that we're on Treaty 8 territory, and supporting Ms. Tupper's comments yesterday.

Back in the late 60s, I worked in a sawmill up at Finlay Forks. And we were cutting up the logs that were being pulled off Williston Reservoir after it was filled. And I got an inkling -- I got a small bit of knowledge about the impact that our resource
development had on the Sekani and the Treaty 8 people of that -- who lived in that valley, who hunted, who recreated, who gathered their medicines and food. And so I can't claim ignorance of the impact that we caused for those people.

And ignorance isn't an excuse before the law, as I understand it. And yet when Treaty 8 Nations tried to bring this case to court, our respective provincial and federal governments chose to say that they had had a good consultation process and that they still didn't know whether or not the Treaty 8 people were being impacted. That's a contradiction that is an expression of our government's desire to be ignorant in the face of the law.

I'd like to go on, then, just for a second, with conservation that I talked about yesterday. This is part of the energy conservation potential review that the collaborative put together back in '92/'95. I don't know if you folks remember John Haig, who was secretary for the Commission. He sat in on these hearings with us, or this collaborative, and went through it all. So I'm not going to try to pawn all these books off on you, because the Commission has got to have them already.

The other comment that -- or the other report that I was asking you to refer to yesterday was
the 2007 conservation potential review that found
22,000 gigawatt hours of economic conservation
potential. That's four Site Cs at less cost per
kilowatt than Site C, that could be developed in less
time than Site C, that was squashed within two years
of its production.

    I would like to suggest that you try and
get a hold of that. I can send you the summary
report, but the other report -- or the total of the
books, is going to be another seven of these, and I'm
not going to try and download that, let alone send you
the paper. If you're interested by the summary
report, please check into that some more, because it's
very good information.

    Just one last thing that I want to take a
kick at is the notion of cost/benefit analysis. Back
in '82 at the hearings, '83, the legal counsel for the
Site C BCUC Panel got up and asked Hydro, "How do you
show a value to what Site C would be? What is the
economic benefit to the province?" And after a little
bit of wrangling, BC Hydro agreed that what you have
to do is take the productive capacity of a Site C dam
and multiply it by the net average -- by the average
cost per kilowatt. And that's your benefit.

    And BC Hydro hasn't done that. BC Hydro,
in this application, has gone through enormous amounts
of paper talking about the great benefits that would arise from Site C. Every one of those benefits would also arise from any other conservation or alternative energy project that we have, and that we could produce.

I'm almost out of time. I'd like to suggest that this Panel turn Site C down again and, as Ms. Boon said a minute ago, make it a permanent thing this time. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Proceeding Time 6:16 p.m. T04

Good evening, ma'am.

MS. GOODINGS: Good evening. Welcome to the Peace River region.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. GOODINGS (#0160):

MS. GOODINGS: My name is Karen Goodings. G-O-O-D-I-N-G-S. I have been the Area B director of the Peace River Regional District for 29 years, and much of this beautiful valley is within Area B. To be clear, I do not support the proposed Site C dam.

I was the chair of the Peace River Regional District when the Site C announcement was made and in May of 2014 the Board authorized a letter to be sent to Christy Clark, Premier. The resolution was worded as follows:
"That a letter be forwarded to the Premier of British Columbia requesting that the B.C. Utilities Commission be involved in the Site C energy project approval process, in keeping with several recommendations of the Site C clean energy project Joint Review Panel, and in the interests of open and transparent decision-making."

The letter went on to say,

"We request that our provincial government endorse the Joint Review Panel's recommendations 47, 48, and 49. We believe the public's interests will be best served if, prior to any final decision being made, the Site C project is referred to the BCUC for public hearings and the Commission's review of the project's cost and impacts on taxpayers."

The Premier did not respond to the letter. However, on her behalf, Minister Bill Bennett did. And on November the 18th, 2014, the Peace River Regional District Board again authorized a letter to be sent under my signature as Chair, in response to Minister Bennett. I am also going to read a portion of that letter into my presentation. It's stated:

"You" -- referring to Minister Bennett:
"... make a number of points which clearly show your support for the building of Site C. It is my hope that you will consider the following concerns and make a decision based on fact. The Joint Review Panel noted in its report that it did not have the information and analysis to fully, properly, and transparently assess the economic effects of Site C. And further, prior to Executive Council making a final decision on Site C, the project needs to be referred to the BCUC as per recommendations 46 to 49.

There are a number of references to a lack of cost analysis, page 280, demand forecast, page 287, and a lack of research into geothermal resources, page 299. Nor has there been a fully demonstrated need for this project on the timetable that is being proposed." That was on page 306.

That was on page 306.

"It is in the interests of taxpayers across the province that the single largest debt to be undertaken by the province, should you decide to proceed, is a decision based on proven cost analysis and proven need. There have been, and continue to be, a number of
reports and new materials that are addressing the need for further examination of potentially less costly alternatives to Site C. There is a need for further research into energy efficient geothermal, wind, et cetera."

My purpose of reading from these two letters is as evidence that the local regional government considered it very important to have an independent examination of the proposal done before the shovels hit the ground. Our concerns were relative to what you are now undertaking, one being cost and the other being need. Had this been done, we would have lived with the outcome regardless of whether it was to build or not to build.

I also want to talk briefly about some of the impacts that are not assessed to the fullest. The Peace River Valley is undervalued as to the potential of the valley to feed people. Studies that have been undertaken show that the west to east valley with a micro-climate and the superb Class 1 and 2 soils, coupled with long sunshine daylight hours has the ability to grow fruits and vegetables that are not common to this area. As our climate changes, and the days become warmer, we expect to be able to develop new markets and thereby improve the economics of a
variety of agricultural ventures.

The North Peace Economic Development Commission has undertaken a horticulture study that will be helpful in growing more foods for markets both near and far.

I'm going to run out of time.

We know that there are opportunities to provide power from many sources that have not yet been seriously considered. We know the population of the world is growing. We seem to be ignoring the fact that there is a finite amount of land with no opportunity to make more.

Let us not forget that all the fundraising done by those whose opposition to Site C has never wavered, unlike BC Hydro with their bevy of lawyers and professionals who prepared volumes and volumes of paper, all paid for through the public purse. I applaud the efforts of the many who stand up for what they believe in. May their efforts be rewarded with the permanent cancellation of any future dams on the Peace River.

In closing, there is much evidence that suggests there is no clear indication that this project can be completed on time and even less that it can be completed within budget.

Thank you for coming to our region and for...
listening. Please make sure your recommendations are fair to our residents, ratepayers, and taxpayers.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

Proceeding Time 6:22 p.m. T05

Please go ahead. Thank you.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MORISON (#0161):

MS. MORISON: Good evening. My name is Andrea Morison, M-O-R-I-S-O-N. I'm the executive director of the Peace Valley Environment Association.

When our former Premier stated that she vowed to take Site C to the point of no return, just prior to a provincial election in which she was running, it's not a stretch to conclude that even she was obviously aware that the justification for the project was questionable. I am thankful that B.C. is now undertaking this assessment. As you are aware, Site C is an extremely large project with many complex issues. I will attempt to address just a few here.

Natural capital. The Suzuki Foundation shows that there would be significant losses of natural capital in the Peace Valley if Site C were to be constructed. While their report is based on the broader Peace River watershed, it does include the land within the Peace Valley that would be destroyed if Site C is built. The report concludes that the
value for the carbon stored in the study area is 6.7 to 7.4 billion dollars per year, and the total value for other ecosystem services provided by things like forests, fields, wetlands, and waterways ranges from 8.8 million to 1.7 billion per year. These figures are huge, and I'd like to emphasize they are annual. Billions of dollars per year.

These costs were not included in BC Hydro's assessment of the project as they should be. Attributing a dollar value to ecological services and systems is nothing new. Courses in natural resource economics were mandatory in my program of study at university. That was 25 years ago, and it wasn't brand-new at that time, either. Humanity's reliance on a truly sustainably managed planet is a non-negotiable fact. When are we going to take this seriously?

Decommissioning. BC Hydro has not included plans, nor a budget, for the decommissioning of Site C, should it be built. Based on cursory research, this is a significant oversight. Several articles by credible sources state that decommissioning of dams can cost even more than the construction of them in the first place. Typically in private-sector reporting provisions are made for decommissioning costs related to production facilities, that they
would be appropriate for BC Hydro to include a reasonable estimate of such costs in their overall cost calculations.

Costs of maintaining and extending the life of W.A.C. Bennett Dam. Have these been adequately considered in the Site C business case? The continued operation of Bennett Dam is integrally linked to the operation of Site C. The life expectancy of that dam is a hundred years, and we're already at the halfway mark.

Site C has a life expectancy of 100 years as well, and if completed by 2024 Bennett Dam will be 58 years old. Standard accounting procedures require that business plans for projects that are contingent on the maintenance or life extension of another asset should include these costs.

Alternatives to Site C. I cannot accept that a project associated with this magnitude of destruction can possibly be considered progress in 2017. Especially given that, as submitted by international energy expert Robert McCullough, alternative energy options such as wind and solar are less expensive and will continue to decrease in price over time.

Having said that, I just want to emphasize, also as Mr. McCullough has submitted, the need for the
power in B.C. isn't there. If and when B.C. needs more power, it makes far more sense to consider alternatives. They can be built on an as-needed basis in geographic locations throughout the province. This will not only save all British Columbians money, but will ensure that both construction and long-term operational jobs can be sprinkled throughout the province.

In conclusion, at this time it makes far more sense for our government to use capital expenditure funds on projects that British Columbians really need, like hospitals, schools, and daycare centres. British Columbia’s leaders have the opportunity to show that they are able to recognize a huge mistake in the making, yet are progressive enough to shift gears and make a correction. I hope you are able to come to a conclusion on this project that reflects the progressive attitude that I believe most British Columbians are proud to embrace, and that you can contribute to guiding our province toward a truly sustainable future.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma’am.

Proceeding Time 6:27 p.m. T06

Please go ahead, ma’am.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CULLING (#0162):

Allwest Reporting Ltd.
MS. CULLING: My name is Diane Culling, C-U-L-L-I-N-G.

Good evening, Mr. Chairman, and Panel members.

Welcome to northeastern B.C., and thank you for making the trip so that we could have the opportunity to participate in this process.

Your panel has been tasked with helping the provincial government make what NASA a go/no-go decision, whether to stay the course or abort the mission. To explore the question of whether we are go/no-go on Site C, I’m going to frame my comments in the context of assessing the potential stock market investment. Is this company a good investment or not?

To that end, I have three questions. Does the company make good decisions? Does the company conduct its business with integrity? The third question is associated with the company's products. Is it competitively priced? Where is the sector going, and how does it compare with the competitors' products?

Question one, does the company make good decisions? In mid-December 2015, BC Hydro awarded the main civil works contract to Peace River Hydro Partner, a consortium of a Spanish corporation, a Korean corporation, and one Canadian corporation, Alberta's Petrowest.

On December 30th, 2015, a Financial Post
headline read, "Petrowest Corporation is operating on borrowed time from its lenders". Good decision? It was no secret that Petrowest was on the ropes prior to BC Hydro awarding the consortium the $1.75 billion contract. What was BC Hydro thinking?

In the past few months, Petrowest has gone into receivership and been ousted from the consortium. But BC Hydro assures us that the fact that the only Canadian partner, the one with all the heavy equipment, is no longer part of the consortium, will not affect its ability to complete the project on time and on budget.

Now, I find that a bit hard to believe. Which leads me to my second question.

Does the company act with integrity? The preliminary report suggested BCUC panel and Deloitte, as well as the media, have had at times difficulty obtaining information from BC Hydro that logically should be readily accessible. The kind of information that a publicly-traded corporation would be legally bound to provide to shareholders. All I can say is, welcome to our world.

If Site C is truly the best option for meeting future projected needs, why this culture of secrecy? This is public money, and the citizens of British Columbia should not be kept in the dark. I
see BC Hydro's lack of transparency with regards to Site C as a significant red flag.

Question 3: the company's product. The iconic Canadian investment guide, *Start with a Thousand Dollars*, gives an example of how important it is to look where the proverbial ball is going when making investment decisions. Company X has been in business for a century. It has an excellent price/earnings ratio, stellar fundamentals, a stable and happy work force, and its product is considered best in class. Sounds like a good investment. But there are two more pieces of information that we need. The company manufactures buggy wheels and the year is 1908, and the Ford Motor Company's Model T is about to start rolling off the assembly line. 1908 was the threshold of a transportation revolution, and buggy wheels were no longer a good investment.

We are currently in the middle of an energy revolution. The ground is moving unbelievably fast. Staying light on our feet is imperative. At this time, locking ourselves into an $8.8 billion investment that has a high risk of being neither on time nor on budget is a huge red flag.

When NASA mission commanders make a go/no-go decision, astronomical funds are at stake, not unlike the situation that you find yourselves in. But
if current conditions warrant making a call of no-go, there is absolutely no other option.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to call no-go on Site C and avert a disaster. Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

Proceeding Time 6:35 p.m. T07

MR. KOECHL: Good evening.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. KOECHL (#0163):

MR. KOECHL: Thank you. My name is Rick Koechl, K-O-E-C-H-L. I'm speaking on behalf of myself and another fellow, Mike Kroesher, who was unable to attend tonight.

So, I guess just as a point of order, there were a couple of things that I was hoping to ask the Utilities Commission, you folks, but I think what I'll do is I'll simply ask these questions and hope that at some point when your final report comes through we actually get the answers.

So question 1 is, why did the BCUC not choose on this particular occasion not to have testimony under oath from its participants, including BC Hydro or other concerned citizens, myself included, for instance?

The second point that I'd like to ask as well is, when will the general public be made privy to
the redacted documents -- I guess in a more legal format, if you will, with respect to BC Hydro, which BC Hydro, I should say, submitted to you folks, or to Deloitte. Blacked out, the numbers that obviously they didn't want the rest of us to see.

And I have a third question, I'd simply be very curious to see if you can give me an answer to eventually, and that is, Judy Kirk, communication company, Kirk & Company. Is she involved?. Was she hired at any point to give submission to the BCUC as well with respect to this particular session, ongoing session?

I first of all am not an advocate at all of the dam. But I would like to point out that in lieu of not advocating for something, I'd like to be an advocate in lieu of that to another form of energy, namely natural gas. We happen to live in natural gas country here, and I think it's incumbent upon us to understand that it had potential.

And I'd like to take this back here to 2014 when Mr. Harry Swain spoke during the joint panel review, and they came out with their final report where on page 306 of that particular document he spoke, I think, with some degree of passion about natural gas. So I'd like to actually quote what he said very briefly here. Here's what he had to say.
"Burning a small fraction of that methane for power in B.C. would have several advantages. Capacity could be added relatively quickly in small increments as demand develops, near load centres, so as to minimize losses and with lower overall contributions to the global greenhouse gas burden than if LNG were exported. The LNG developers have been promised a free hand to burn their gas here for their own purposes, but BC Hydro has been denied the same privilege."

I think those are profound words coming from Mr. Swain. And the reason why I wanted to make that quote is because it was sort of hidden in the back pages of that document, because technically the JRP wasn't even allowed to really speak to alternatives such as natural gas or geothermal, solar, whatever.

So what I wanted to actually propose to the UC is maybe the solution in part to Site C is very cheap. Natural gas first of all is a commodity that's very available to us. The cost of building -- capital costs of building such a site are about one-seventh to one-eighth the cost of building Site C. And ultimately we already have a facility that's available.
to us. The Burrard Thermal, as you probably are aware, was shut down about a year and some ago. It was used for demand power. And it was used occasionally, but not necessarily very, very often. Its production, I think, was around 900 megawatts, if I'm correct.

So I just wanted to point out one other little glitch. I mean, we think about the Clean Energy Act the minute we start talking about natural gas. But under the Clean Energy Act of 2010, it allowed something like 7 percent of fossil fuels to be used in lieu of some of the greener forms.

So I just did a little searching here, and I found out that the Burrard Thermal would still qualify us to be re-opened if need be, under the -- this is what is stated under the policy. “The authority must not operate Burrard Thermal except (a) in the case of an emergency; (b) to provide transmission support services,” which apparently it does right now, voltage regulation. “Or (c), as authorized by regulation.”

So I bring up (c) especially because I think under the present circumstances it's possible for us to perhaps re-commission this facility. Because the fact of the matter is, the Clean Energy Act was also modified at some point, I think in 2011.
by then-Premier Clark, to allow for a variety of companies such as Petronas to burn their own natural gas in order to produce the energy for compression of, you know, future sources of LNG.

So, if they were able to do that under an Order in Council, which was done back then, I don't think there's any reason why we can't do the same thing at the moment. There's no reason for the regulations to once again be modified to allow for the use of either Burrard Thermal to step back into the plate, or for a new facility if need be, to be built at about 1.3 billion, if we make some comparisons with other locations where it's already been done.

So, I think -- my point that I'm trying to bring up is, I appreciate the fact that you folks are asking the question right now. There were, what, 73 questions you're asking of BC Hydro. I think question 68 is the one that deals more specifically with natural gas. And I was delighted to see it appear, because I think it's time that we get some real answers about why this choice could not be utilized once again. We'd like to see you, the BCUC, make those recommendations about potentially the use of natural gas as a clear option if need be, in lieu of Site C.

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

Proceeding Time 6:38 p.m. T08

SUBMISSIONS BY BY MR. MEIERS (#0148):

MR. MEIERS: Mark Meiers, M-E-I-E-R-S. Good afternoon, BCUC panel. Judging by the age of the panel members, you are close to some sort of retirement. If Site C were to go ahead to completion, your Hydro rates have already been forecasted to double, triple, quadruple. How will you be able to afford to pay your Hydro bill? Others on a fixed income will find it impossible. How about your children and your grandchildren?

So, I'm going to ramble on with something different here. Recently we boated 27 miles up the Halfway River. Due to extremely dry conditions two years ago, we had a massive -- we had massive forest fires. The south side of the Halfway River for many, many miles was totally scorched. There is no green plant life on those hills to stabilize the river banks. So the hills are sliding into the Halfway River on a massive scale. We were just up there -- this is fact. And we have it on film.

Mud, trees, and all the forest clutter are sliding into the Halfway River. The Halfway River is the largest river emptying into the Peace River, and it has been muddy all year due to these slides. Millions and millions of tonnes of mud, trees, and
silt going down river. This is going to carry on forever until the hills re-grow some green vegetation.

Hydro had a warning out this summer about massive log jams at the new construction bridge. They were actually fearful that those log jams would take that bridge out. The logs came from the Halfway River. This is only the beginning. The destruction up the Halfway is unbelievable. I can only guess that you could safely assume the life expectancy of Site C could be 75 percent less than predicted due to massive silt deposits. And we're not even talking about the hills that are going to cave in on the Peace River itself.

Point being, it has already been calculated that we will be paying for Site C for the next 70-plus years, after 2024, and probably well beyond that. You can expect the river valley to be well silted in by then, a huge mud flat will displace the water and there will be no water volume to create power. And the ratepayers will be paying extremely high rates for a huge white elephant.

Then Site C will have to be decommissioned and the ratepayers will have to pay for site remediation. For how many years, and how many millions after that. While still paying for the dam that does not produce any power.
The only solution is to shut down Site C immediately and remediate the destruction already done.

And on a further note, Site C is way more involved than ratepayer increases, and your panel should not be held to these conditions only. Even though the finances alone will kill this project.

And my last statement, and I am totally appalled that here we are still fighting as independent, small business, and average citizens of B.C., for a valley that we own. And you people own this valley too. This is like a third world country, fighting for something that we already own.

Thank you for your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

Proceeding Time 6:42 p.m. T09

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. GUNVILLE (#0164):

MR. GUNVILLE: Hello, my name is Peter Gunville, G-U-N-V-I-L-L-E, I am First Nations. I'd like to give thanks to the Creator for allowing us to be here together in a good way and allowing our hearts be open and our minds.

I believe myself to be an environmentally conscious individual. I have had many lessons in my life as of now. I have worked in many different industries, and in many different First Nations
community, and have seen great change in them all over the years.

I came here today to speak on behalf of the Site C clean energy project because I feel that this project is what we need for growth of a sustainable future in the north here.

As the population continues to grow, changing climate conditions, natural disasters, we're going to be in need of clean and renewable resources like the Site C project, and be able to utilize its full potential. As we have continued growth in our province, electric cars going online, cities going green, no fossil fuels, we are going to be in need of more power. Not to mention recent events, natural disasters have left millions of people without power. This project is a provincial insurance policy for natural disasters, especially in North Vancouver and the Lower Mainland.

We all hear how our oceans are being polluted, radiated, and overfished. There will be a time when we cannot eat our seafood from our oceans. Drought and natural disasters wiping out our food crops. Why are we so dependent upon all these outside resources? Fort St. John is an oil and gas industry type of city, and thinking into the future with the call for the reduction of fossil fuels, this industry
is going to slow down or balance out with no room for growth. Will there be a future for our children in these types of industries? We cannot just sit back and wait for change, we have to be the change.

Thinking of the benefits of the Site C clean energy project could do for us are countless. With the dam, we get a fresh water lake. From this new lake we could run an enhanced wild fishery that could see the return of our natural fish in an abundance. We could turn -- or we could make a commercial fishery, partnerships between regional and First Nation communities, smokehouse, canneries, exports. With a controlled and regulated fishery, this could produce year round employment, and sustainable industries that would put food back into our communities. With a new lake and enhanced fishery program, we'd be renowned for fishing. It would open up new tourism opportunities in many fields.

If we have the power, let's use it. We would be losing some agricultural land. So like said, cut a tree down, you plant another one to replace it. We could utilize our power to help feed our growing demand for fresh produce and vegetable. Like Mr. Forest stated yesterday, we could use natural gas to heat commercial greenhouses, and our new electricity to provide grow lights in our greenhouses. We could
develop a sustainable commercial greenhouse industry that could feed the north.

With a commercial fishery we could have fish fertilizer plants to feed our greenhouses. With growth and renewable sustainable industry will bring new and long term jobs, new educational opportunities into a future that will benefit our children and grandchildren. New industries and long term jobs mean growth, and with growth comes new housing, real estate development opportunities, and investment into our communities and the list goes on.

As the world changes we have to adapt to our growing needs and become more self-sufficient within our own regions, not so self-reliant upon the rest of the world for our needs. We'll need the Site C clean energy project to provide power to our province as we continue to grow, and the demand for power increases. If this project is shut down we will be at a loss and we will still need to produce more power in the future to meet our growing demand. We have most of our infrastructure in place already, power lines, et cetera. To shut this project down would hurt any potential future endeavors that could be made possible by this dam. It would also slow down economic and population growth.

It is tough for me to vision a strong
growth for the north with a decline in the demand for fossil fuels. If this dam does not go forward, we will be lucky if we just sustain what we have going right now into the future.

Thank you for listening.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Proceeding Time 6:47 p.m. T10

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. PASTOOR (#0165):

MR. PASTOOR: Good evening. My name is Josh Pastoor, P-A-S-T-O-R.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, and the honourable members of the committee, for the opportunity to speak to you today about Site C. I am the regional director of CLAC, C-L-A-C, one of the fastest-growing unions in Canada. And I live and work here in Fort St. John.

So, formed in 1952, CLAC is Canada's largest national independent multi-sector union, representing over 60,000 workers in almost every sector. Based on values of respect, dignity and fairness, CLAC is committed to building better workplaces, better communities and better lives.

I just want to start by saying that we recognize the importance of fiscal responsibility and accountability to all British Columbians, and to its own members, and therefore we do not take a position with the decision to conduct the review process.
While much information with respect to the merits of the project has already been made available to the public, we would like to impress the following four points for consideration.

One, the project has been structured around an open managed site model, where the tendering process used by BC Hydro assumes that all eligible contractors and labour models, and therefore all British Columbian workers, traditional, unions, alternative unions and non-union can bid the work. In the past, project labour agreements have been used to construct the project, and PLAs restrict the bidding to certain affiliated contractors which leads to increased costs and to projects not being built on time and on budget. We endorse the open managed site model for fair access to work for all British Columbians.

CLAC Local 68 currently has approximately 750 members working on the Site C project.

Number two, one of the main reasons for constructing Site C was to supply the nascent LNG megaprojects with a source of clean energy for the natural gas liquefaction process. Much has been said about the potential of LNG being built. To date, there are six projects at various stages of approval and development, and two to three projects that are
still moving ahead. Of these, LNG Canada and
Woodfibre are the most advanced. These projects have
continuing provincial and federal government support
and will require the electricity from Site C.

Thirdly, in the last number of years,
British Columbia has led the country in economic
growth. Many construction projects have gone ahead,
and much has been done to ensure safe, trained, and
competent construction work force. CLAC has worked
hard to train its members to be the best in the
industry: safe, competent and productive. We believe
that construction in British Columbia will be robust
for many years to come and the construction of the
Site C energy project will enhance opportunities for
B.C. construction workers to build their careers and
help build future projects.

Fourth and last, the project will take many
more years to build, and this time should be spent in
securing utilization of Site C's clean energy
generating capacity to the fullest. Opportunities
will exist for selling clean energy to other
jurisdictions and to meet demand for current and
growing electrification of transportation. While B.C.
has incentives to purchase electric vehicles, I just
want to point out other provinces such as Ontario have
far better incentives. B.C. should be a leader in
moving as much energy use to clean energy like hydroelectricity.

In conclusion, CLAC and Construction and Allied Workers' Union local 68 thank the committee for taking the time to listen and to give consideration to our arguments in favour of continuing the BC Hydro Site C clean energy project for the benefit of all British Columbians, including those living and working right here in the Peace.

Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Proceeding Time 6:22 p.m. T11

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. HOUGHTON (#0166):

MR. HOUGHTON: Hello, my name is Dan Houghton, H-O-U-G-H-T-O-N. Welcome to Fort St. John and thank you for bringing the nice weather with you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. HOUGHTON: This is going to be a little bit different, a little angle, but actually it fits in well what Josh continues to -- or it's a continuation of what Josh was saying, is the workers at Site C, we made a choice to come here.

Many uprooted their families to move here. Bought houses, placed their children in school. We just want to be a part of the community. Others are -- made the sacrifice of being in Fort St. John
without their families and commuting back on their
days off. The common thread here is every worker
there has made a choice. That choice was made in good
faith and that is to integrate ourselves within this
community and have a small part providing power for
all of British Columbia.

I'll be quick. In conclusion, when making
you final decision please don’t forget the human
element of why many have decided to come here. None
of us want to be ruined financially due to a decision
that's beyond our control. Cancelling Site C would be
detrimental to the economy and mostly likely effect
housing prices, and I personally don’t want to
continue to paying for housing prices for the rest of
my life, again, because of a decision that's out of my
control.

I think the obvious choice is to continue
with Site C and let us and let them do the job that we
came here for. Dinosaur Lake is a beautiful place,
Williston Lake is a beautiful place, and the Peace
River will also be a beautiful place in the coming
years.

Thanks.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Proceeding Time 6:52 p.m. T12

MS. ACKERMAN: Good evening.
THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening, ma'am.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. ACKERMAN (#0167):

MS. ACKERMAN: My name is Lori Ackerman, A-C-K-E-R-M-A-N.

I am the Mayor of the city of Fort St. John.

I'd like to acknowledge that we stand on the traditional territory of the Treaty 8 First Nations.

I'd also like to introduce members of Council that are with me this evening. Councillor Bolin, Christensen, Hansen, Klassen, and Stewart. And on behalf of Council, I'd like to welcome the B.C. Utilities Commission to our beautiful community.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you.

MS. ACKERMAN: Sitting before you is a wealth of information and concern for this community. This has been our number-one issue, and it's dominated our agenda for several years.

Fort St. John has risen to the challenge of becoming a community that offers a quality of life with prospects of work. Those two are not often found together. Our vision is to be a flourishing community where nature lives, businesses prosper, families are active, and diversity is celebrated. And this will be done by facilitating a community that embraces opportunity, diversity, and sustainability.

While we understand that the role of BC
Hydro is to produce low-cost power to British Columbians, we are emphatic that empowering the province should not disempower Fort St. John. With that in mind, we took every opportunity to connect with our residents and businesses, both face to face and online, to gather their thoughts, hopes, and concerns in relationship to this project. There were a gamut of positions and opinions on Site C, and we must not overlook the democratic rights and privilege that we all enjoy as Canadians.

With all of this information gathered before us, and knowing that it was outside of our decision-making authority and outside of our jurisdiction, City Council through deliberation chose a pragmatic and proactive approach to protect and promote the community.

We believe that Noah was in all likelihood not in favour of the flood. But he built an ark. He built an ark to get his precious cargo through his challenge. We approached our challenge in a sophisticated, planned, and principled manner. After these two years of consulting with our citizens, we developed a vision, principles, and positions.

So presently we have a community measures agreement with BC Hydro that we are managing. This community measures agreement is legally binding and
includes a dispute resolution clause. It is an agreement that speaks to collaboration with community, water quality and quantity, a legacy fund, funding for non-profit organizations in the region, and in-house community housing, to name a few. We'll submit this document on line.

Your preliminary report is comprehensive and creates many questions and possible scenarios. Our position is that of community, not a project. We've been here for many years and we will be here for a long time after.

The concern for many in our community is uncertainty. It's the reason we took the position that we should be left better off as a result of this project, not a project -- not a community that has had a price to pay with a megaproject built on its doorstep. Fort St. John is open to creating partnerships that focus on long-term commitments with our industry, that include involvement and the understanding of leaving us better off. These are integral to building and creating responsible and sustainable communities.

Whatever your decision is, this uncertainty is not healthy. People, businesses, and community cannot make plans around uncertainty, so we look forward to its end. As I travel this province, I see
my colleagues and their communities that strive to
decrease their carbon footprint. I also see sectors
that demand reliable energy; schools, hospitals, and
industries. We are B.C.'s energy capital. We know
what's behind the light switch and the thermostat. We
have B.C.'s only 100 kilowatt micro-hydro project.

As demand grows, there will be need for
reliable energy combined with these renewable
resources, or we will all be praying that our loved
ones only need surgery on sunny or slightly windy
days. There is a Greek proverb that says, "Society
grows great when men plant trees whose shade they know
they will never sit in." Good luck in your
deliberations. Good evening.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you, ma'am.
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Please go ahead, sir.

MR. JARVIS: Good evening.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. JARVIS (#0168):

MR. JARVIS: Art Jarvis, J-A-R-V-I-S. I'd like to
welcome the BC Utilities Commission to Fort St. John.
Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. JARVIS: I'm a local business owner and resident in
Fort St. John for over six decades and a voting member
of Northeast BC Resource Municipalities Coalition.

And as executive director of Energy Services BC I am very proud of the personal investment and group effort we devote to ensuring local contractors receive a fair opportunity to work on developments and projects in Northeastern B.C. I'm the northern representative for ICBA, Independent Contractors and Business Association, and as such my position here tonight is to broadcast the voice of the service sector.

Could be 2,000 workers do not have to be concerned about losing their homes or feeding their families because they have a job at Site C today. This megaproject has injected tens of millions of dollars into the municipality and Peace region at the most opportune time when the oil and gas service sector took the worst economic downturn since 1981. Thousands were left unemployed, risking the loss of homes and businesses.

This project has been an economic saviour to Fort St. John and surrounding area. The $4 billion price tag to stop this project with no chance of revenue stream to compensate does not make sense when compared to a probable 9 billion investment capable of producing revenue for a hundred-plus years. How many people in this room depend on electricity every day? Probably everyone. How many do not require their
supply from BC Hydro? Pretty convenient, isn't it?

Natural gas is a clean source of power generation, but how can natural gas be as clean and efficient as utilizing the same resource three times to generate electricity without expending that resource as we will do with the Peace River should this project come to completion.

I remember touring the W.A.C. Bennett construction site several times in the early '60s. What a massive project that was, with the majority of workers coming from elsewhere. The impact of it devastated multiples more property and salable lumber than the 87 kilometers affected by Site C. We learned to harvest the valley prior to flooding. Furthermore, the positive impact to Hudson's Hope, the region, and the province far outweighs the negative with infrastructure development to the community, outstanding recreation area, and continuous power supply from Bennett and Site 1 dams.

The continued construction of subdivisions, hotels, commercial buildings, facilities, and other power demanding projects in Canada are growing at a greater rate than the construction of power facilities, other than Site C. Last night we heard from individuals, land owners, and retired people all with grave concerns regarding the decision to continue
or not with this project. Many of these people are my friends, neighbours, old classmates, and even my former elementary school teacher.

The beautiful valley has always been a wonderful tourist attraction, but will it continue? With the largest project ever in B.C. history, absolutely it will continue. It was stated last night that this valley has the capability to grow enough vegetables to feed millions of people. Has anyone ever attempted to develop this? Not in the last hundred years.

Cancelling this project at 20 percent completion stage broadcasts a definite message to Canadian and foreign investors that B.C. and possibly Canada is untrustworthy to conduct business with. If this project is allowed to continue and does have an excess of power generation, that translates into no power out shortages for B.C. and a saleable product for the province for the next hundred-plus years.

This mega project was discussed and studied for years prior to moving the first dirt and 29 months by an independent panel. Has been upheld in 14 court decisions and is subject to more than 150 environmental and technical conditions.

We beg the BCUC, after absorbing each testimonial, to conduct a thorough, in depth, and
complete investigation in order to ensure a final true report on the viability of the project and end the confusion and indecision between friends, neighbours, and taxpayers of this province.

Thank you all for your time and careful consideration.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

Proceeding Time 7:04 p.m. T14

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. THORLAKSON (#0169):

MR. THORLAKSON: Good evening. My name is Steve Thorlakson, T-H-O-R-L-A-K-S-O-N. I’m a 38-year resident of Fort St. John, and I also, as others have mentioned, would like to acknowledge that we are on Treaty 8 traditional territory. And that six of the eight Treaty 8 bands support the Site C project.

I spent 19 years serving on city council, 15 of those years as the mayor of Fort St. John. I served on the executive of the Union of B.C. Municipalities for 9 years, and was the president of that organization in 1999/2000. I also am a former member of the Board of Governors of the University of Northern British Columbia.

BCUC mandate, as I understand it, is to examine the economics. And my understanding, my involvement in local government over many, many years, showed the value of life-cycle cost and benefit
analysis. That was the fundamental principle that
guided the city's new water supply project that
happened after a drought struck us, when they started
going to the Peace River wells for water.

Preliminary report has identified that
approximately $4 billion of costs that would have to
be borne by the ratepayers if the project was either
stopped or mothballed, for no net economic benefit.
That's going to have to be paid for by the people on
their hydro bills.

Canada's Paris Accord commitments to reduce
greenhouses gases can best be accommodated by clean,
green hydro not only in support of British Columbia's
own commitment but also to support our neighbours in
Alberta who have committed to transition off of coal-
fired power and have an interim proposal for cleaner-
burning natural gas in the interim.

I don't think we're going to see any
nuclear for the foreseeable -- certainly not in my
lifetime.

Hydro bought more power last year than it
sold. But it generated a net profit of $125 million,
and that's money that's to the benefit of the
ratepayers. I'm just going to restate that. They
bought more power, imported more power, than they
exported, but still made a net profit. And that's
because of the beauty of hydro power, being able to buy somebody else's fixed overnight power such as Alberta's coal-fired power, has to run 24/7, at night when they don't have a market for it, Hydro buys it cheaply, supplies to meet their peak load requirements during the day, when the ratepayers in British Columbia can benefit from that.

In summary, I encourage you to stay within the Order in Council economic mandate that gives -- and please give duly weighted consideration to the 100-plus year life cycle costs and benefits of this project.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. MOTT (#0170):

MR. MOTT: Good evening to you, my name is Oliver Mott, M-O-T-T, and I represent myself. And I'm afraid I don't really have the academic background or technical background, but I would like to express my outrage at this project and the way it has been handled by the obfuscation and delays that have been held, like we've got to prevent these hearings until the point of no return. So there has been an unseemly haste to get along with it.

The rights of the First Nations people have
been consistently rebuffed and ignored. Their access to information has not been easy or open, and I would like to say that we live in a fragile world, where the only value we have seems to be that of the almighty dollar.

And I'm afraid that proceeding with the Site C is going to cause immense damage in the long run, and cost to all, and I think that is all I have to say at the moment. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. A. HADLAND (#0144):

MR. A. HADLAND: Chairman Morton, fellow members of the Commission. Thanks again for taking time to listen to all of us.

I'm just going to iterate just a little bit of what I covered off yesterday, and I'll start off with in secret lies a conspiracy, and that was in the 1700s. We have a public utility that operates on secrets. It's basically a business model that is becoming bankrupt, and it's got an exploding taxpayer debt obligation. Under the NDP it was 30 billion, which I thought was terrible. What I know right now, the debt obligation under the past Liberal government is 76 billion.

I would ask the Commissioners to take a
look at the independent power producers model which, as I noted earlier, is a vehicle for transferring wealth from the taxpayer to private interests. And we don’t know a single thing about those private interests. All of that power, however much it is, has been developed and paid for in secrecy.

Other thing with geophysical, shale is not bedrock. It is rather old mud. It's about 70 million year old mud. And there was talk about the two cracks. Well, there was no talk about a slide that actually happened, of the shale, right over the adit about -- I think it was around 2011. I have a photograph of that. Through that shale there are lenses of gravel and clays. I don't know how they're going to grout that and stop. It's outside my technical expertise. But I do know it's a problem and it sort of parallels the issue that happened with the Teton Dam in 1976, that was constructed in a sedimentary basin. Once it was filled, immediately the water came bubbling out and the whole thing collapsed.

Another interesting fact, in 2006 there was a LIDAR survey. That means Light Imaging Detection something-or-other system. And there was identified 410 slides within the valley, within the proposed reservoir.
Another thing that happened is, I really do not believe as a citizen of this community for many years, that we have seen the social license developed by BC Hydro. There is no costing of the lost opportunities that we've had in the valley, and these opportunities might not be in the forefront today. They might be in a hundred years. But if we destroy the valley, they won't be there.

The community of Hudson's Hope, for example, has withered on the vine. And this will continue to be an escalating demise of that community if this project continues.

The next one was Peace River Basin Trust. We don't have one of those. There is a cost that would go with that. That was ignored. I think that should be included in your deliberations. There is one that exists for the Columbia River. They should apply to the Peace River Canyon Dam and the W.A.C. Bennett Dam that destroyed a lot of valley and a lot of families' lives.

In summary, I just wish to iterate the ruining of a productive river valley is neither clean nor green, and in this instance it is not economic.

Thank you to the panel.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAPOLEON (#0171):

MR. NAPOLEON: My name is Bud Napoleon. I am former Chief of the East Moberly Reserve place and the first Tribal Chief of Treaty 8 Tribal Association.

As an elder -- my last name is Napoleon, N-A-P-O-L-E-O-N. As an elder, a hunter, a trapper, a former big game guide, a user of the land and a steward of Treaty 8, and all that -- I feel that I am capable of making a presentation to stand before you to represent many elders and children who cannot speak on their behalf. I also speak on behalf of the moose, the rabbit. All creatures, big and small.

With that being said, I am here to welcome you on Treaty 8 territory. You, the B.C. Utilities Commission. Welcome.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.

MR. NAPOLEON: I hope to highlight the foundational rights of the Cree and Dene Zha, and all the aboriginal peoples on the Site C debate, as what's going to take place in Canada and internationally towards the recognition of rights and status of the indigenous people, which includes the treaty.

Prior to the arrival of the Europeans on our land of Turtle Island, we lived in our own laws, as given us by the Creator. We're still trying to live those laws under our -- we have the very mature
and sophisticated method of government based on our four laws. Share, respect, honour, and love. I know for a fact that the government cannot say that they have honoured the treaty obligations. Instead they have infringed our treaty rights. We, the First Nations, have honoured treaty -- have more than once protected this treaty. However, on our Site C issue, we have no recourse but to say -- to come up and say, and be heard, and hopefully that the part of the process to stop this dam once and for all.

When my ancestors entered into a treaty, they did not give up our laws. We still haven't. To this day, I do not find anywhere where we gave up our water rights. In fact we still have our riparian water rights, which includes the Peace River, the river that BC Hydro is trying to build a dam on.

We have always lived in harmony with our physical environment, and that includes living in harmony with the flora and the fauna, and all that it has to offer.

As a primary colonizer, Great Britain assumed obligations to the First Nations which became known as the sacred trust of civilization. This trust is presently incorporated under the Section 9124 of the British North America Act, that's the Indian Affairs. The obligation of the colonizer to protect
the property and status of Indians was once recognized by Britain. It was expressed in a Royal proclamation of 1763, which is a fundamental principle of consent. In that document, it is clearly spelled that the lands belonging to our First Nations remains reserved to them until through a process of formal surrender they yield to the Crown.

The Royal proclamation is the oldest law directed by Britain which applies to Canada. Its force is found in Sections 25 and 35 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which was expressly conferred by Lord Denning in his decision in 1982 in the British Court of Appeal, and that case, the Royal proclamation of 1763 continues to bind the governments of Canada, as long as the sun shines and the rivers flow.

In keeping with the principle of consent spelled out in the Royal proclamation, treaties were concluded between the Crown and the First Nations. The obligations were assumed by the imperial Crown, which were -- which passed to Canada upon Canada achieving the independence in the latest of 1930, with the passage of the Statute of Westminster.

The general and -- fiduciary obligations give rise to obligations according to a high standard, when the government has the jurisdiction to act on
behalf of the Indians and the Indian lands.

In such transactions, the federal government may be held accountable for court for any wrongdoing. And on the Site C, the government weren't there. Where was our fiduciary to be standing beside us to help us fight? They weren't there. We had to do it alone. Like some of the people said, we raised money. We didn't have money to fight.

My elders did not sign the treaty with Canada. We never signed a treaty with the provinces as well. How can any of these governments have anything to do with our treaty?

Around 1982 or so, the patriation of the Canadian Constitution by Trudeau, who tried to diminish our treaty rights, brought all First Nations from all across Canada to fight the federal government. As a result, Sections 24, 25, and 35 were added into the Charter of Rights and all our treaties were protected under these sections. Since then, both the governments have taken the responsibility as applied fiduciary on behalf of the First Nations involved. The sad part is here, that the non-native governments have traditionally taken the most narrow, legalistic interpretation of the text of the historical treaties.

The treaty First Nations have demanded
their treaties to be interpreted according to their
original spirit and intent, which keep their -- keep
all our rights. When it comes to dams and waters, and
the treaties, the territorial integrity of Canada and
integrity of aboriginal territories is of little
consequence.

Further, despite legal opinion to the
contrary, various court cases, the government
continues to claim that treaties have no power to what
they mean and what they call progress. But just what
is progress? And at whose expense? The farmers? The
ranchers? The land owners? They have all been
overlooked because of the corporation structure of who
the province is following.

I know I ran out of time and I got a lot
more to read, but -- with that, I'll just let that go.
But I would like to say, on the first dam that came
out, the Wacky Bennett Dam, we didn't have any
recourse to put a fight. There was no chance for us
to even have a say. They flooded those lands. We
lost all the hunting areas. A lot of fishing areas.
A lot of berry-picking areas. A lot of herbal
medicine areas that we used is gone.

The caribou and the sheep that used to
migrate across our lands can no longer migrate there
because of the flood. I talked to the Ingenika
people, I worked with them. They said that waters came right up to their houses and kept on going. They were not given any chance to -- they just ran away, left everything, their houses, their trap lines. I seen the tears in their eyes when I talk to them. We stand by the river, sometimes we see the floating -- a box floating, coming up, as I believe one of our relations. We see trees floating by with bears hanging on for life on those trees. We walk and we see moose, we see elk. All drowned.

All of that was never ever published by the province of B.C., nor by BC Hydro. It was all kept under cover.

What is going to happen when -- once this lake comes up? How are the moose going to -- a lot of those areas are steep, and after swimming a long ways, they ain't going to have no power to get up and go on the other side. There's going to be another victim.

I asked BC Hydro what they're going to do with the moose, and they said, "Oh, we'll round them up just like cattle." No, it cannot be done. Are they going to put a fence on each side of the lake for mitigation purposes, to keep the animals out? If they are, maybe they'll need to take a course from Trump with his fence.

Because when I listen to BC Hydro and all
these hearings, I hear diarrhea of words and constipation of ideas. I am totally against this project. It's too bad I ran out of time too. But I thank you for allowing me to be able to make my statement.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir. We appreciate you making it.
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Yes, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BOUFFIOUX (#0172):

MR. BOUFFIOUX: My name is Bill Bouffioux, B-O-U-F-F-I-O-U-X. Mr. Chairman, panel members, good evening and welcome to the North Peace.

We have a fourth-generation bison ranch with three and a half miles of frontage on the Peace River about four miles below Site C. The ranch operates on a very tight budget and decisions are based on economics, not emotions. Williston Lake reservoir has 92 zillion or whatever comes after trillion litres of free renewable environmentally clean stored energy. Why shouldn't we take advantage of that?

From BC Hydro's budget you can calculate the percentage of the total cost of Site C that is returned directly to the B.C. economy, somewhere between 60 and 70 percent in wages; materials;
supplies; contracts; taxes, both provincial and personal income tax. With the billions already spent on or committed to the project, without completion and electrical generation how do we propose to pay back those funds?

Here's some basic calculations. Site C has the potential to provide electricity to 450,000 homes. At an average cost per house of $100 per month for 12 months, that equates to $540 million a year. So a payback in 18 to 20 years is a pretty fair investment. And over the next 80 years has the potential to return an additional $40 billion to provincial revenues.

According to Google, it would take 750 windmills working at peak capacity to provide the same amount of electricity at a cost of $3 billion for every 20 years, or $15 billion for the same hundred-year time frame. That's at peak capacity, and often they only operate as low as 30 percent capacity. Counting maintenance, this is double the cost of Site C.

If B.C.'s population increases by 1.4 million in the next 20 years as forecast, Site C will barely produce enough power to supply this increase in population, let alone any new industry. Ms. McDonald, who spoke last night, stated we must accept change and move forward to teach our kids to give to the
community to survive. Very wise words.

If BC Hydro has one fault, it is not providing the public with information or countering false information. Reams and reams of information are readily available on their website right down to the number of squirrels affected, but obviously many people don’t take the time to search for it. In the immortal words of John F. Kennedy, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

Thank you.

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

THE CHAIRPERSON: Good evening, sir.

SUBMISSIONS BY MR. SULLIVAN (#0173):

MR. SULLIVAN: My name is Ryan Sullivan, S-U-L-L-I-V-A-N. I was registered to speak yesterday, but I was sick and wasn’t able to make it, I apologize.

I had my son earlier here with me tonight, I was going to bring him as a prop, but he was acting up, so I had to bring him home. But I speak on his behalf more than anything.

I’ve been a resident here, permanently for 13 years. I’ve been coming up to work for 17 years. There is no denying anywhere that the climate is
changing across the world, and specifically affecting us. It's changing. You only have to go as far as the point that overlooks the Peace River on the end of the 100th there, and you can see in the last few years alone it has just slid, the point is disappearing. We're going to have to do something to shore it up, or it is going to disappear.

That is directly because of the warming planet. You can deny it, you can believe that it doesn’t matter, it’s happening, and the effects are going to be as predicted, as we've seen them come true. Instability, extreme weather conditions, and those are not words that you want with a dam structure built on shale. Instability is not the way to build a dam. It makes me wonder about the future of the river system itself if all the water is going to be coming from precipitation instead of melting glaciers and runoff, that is a big chance for failure in the future.

There are -- obviously dams are clean energy, they are a very efficient way of making electricity, but as I understand they only make up about 18% of the province's electricity. So, with the cost of this dam, and with the rates increases because of this project, it makes me wonder how well this money is being spent on this project, and what we are
actually paying for. If the BC Hydro is that far in debt, as we've heard, and I believe, then I think we're in trouble no matter what happens, our rates are going to go up. And if the $4 billion is forecast for not completing this dam, the rates going up are going to be tremendous no matter which way, because $76 billion is a lot more than $4 billion.

ICBC [sic] -- might just be personal opinion, but it is defunct, it's bankrupt, it's way in the hole. These two things have been pulled from the coffers to balance budgets and the gamble was the golden goose of B.C. was going to be LNG, and the Site C was touted for LNG from the start of the campaign in 2013, and that did not come to fruition as they had hoped. Mostly because the market was saturated and we were late to the table. There is still a possibility for that, you know, coming to British Columbia, and it would be a good benefit to us, it would use our resources that are not getting to market.

With the energy production in Alberta, I believe that we have that same potential for -- Site C is nine times the cost of these natural gas production facilities for the same amount of electricity. I think that would be a much better investment.

I know that there is the Climate Act and all that to work around, but my personal belief is it
doesn’t matter for our future because no matter what
is causing it, it’s changing anyways, and I think that
the way the province is sitting, the way the citizens
of the province are sitting, we are very close to a
bankrupt line. Housing markets are inflated like
crazy. I know that there is a lot of economic gain in
this city here specifically for having the dam for the
housing markets. Personally, I can’t afford to buy a
house here, because it’s too much. A lot of single
people living here can't afford to buy a house. So,
that is a positive as far as keeping people in their
homes.

Emplo[ying people is very important, but I
would say that employing people has always been very
important, and that without the dam, people were
working. And they will not starve because the dam
will be shut down. There will be energy needs in the
future. Personally, I think that energy storage is
going to be our next big investment opportunity
because that seems to be a very strong emerging thing,
and that there are very, very many alternatives that
could produce power for much less than this dam would.

Anyways, I'm out of time. Thank you very
much for listening.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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Is there a Petra Fischel? No. Is that the end of the list? So, we've reached the end of the list. Is there anyone else that would like an opportunity to say something?

Please come ahead, ma'am.

SUBMISSIONS BY MS. LONDON (#0128):

MS. LONDON: Hi, I'm Clara London, L-O-N-D-O-N. Public speaking is not my thing, but I do have to come up here and state this. I think I have about three things.

Site C will always be at risk regarding hydraulic fracking. Right now, 19 kilometres northwest of the well site, it is two properties over from my house. I received the material. There is a gas well has been drilled. It will be fracking soon. Last night when I went home, there was a truck going in there that I think is the water truck. They get enough water trucks on site, and I have the paperwork here, and it's stated that part of the process of this well is hydraulic fracking. If it causes an earthquake, it will reach the dam site. It is only 19 kilometres northwest, and there was a fracking rig up the highway that caused an earthquake. It was either a 4.1 or a 4.3. The shaking reached Charter Lake, 100 kilometres away.

The Oil and Gas Commission -- I asked for
this fracking well not to happen there. It is too close to houses. And the oil and gas companies are allowed to do what they want to do. Therefore, Site C will always be at risk because they are in -- it is in unstable ground. If you get any kind of shaking that dam is at risk. And as everybody has stated here, you are in oil and gas country. The Oil and Gas Commission does not regulate things. They allow mistakes to happen and then afterwards say, "Oh, that shouldn't happen.".

And I would like to address two other things. I live on the land. I know the animals. I know agriculture. And the people here that stated today that we didn't read the material, and that we didn't look for all the animals and everything, we did. For ten years my family has been going to open houses and reading this material. And -- excuse me.

What BC Hydro has printed, the studies were done by very good companies. They had the material there. BC Hydro was allowed to pick out what they printed. BC Hydro's printed material is not accurate. I can't speak to anything except the land and the animals, because that is what I know. I've been 50 years on that land. I know the animals. I know agriculture. And BC Hydro did not properly represent the landowners or the animals, even right down to the
squirrels. They refused to study the black bear. I presented to the assessment people the fact that BC Hydro should not be able to leave out the black bear, because they were flooding Bear Flats. It's called Bear Flats because that's where the bears are. They were there this fall because the berries grow in the valley much better than they do up above.

My husband has been going out and he has been seeing seven and eight bear every evening, because they're there for the berries. And BC Hydro refused to study the black bear. So what BC Hydro did to myself, my family, and the land is not fair. We deserve a proper oversight and these people that's saying it's for the jobs -- there are jobs out there. My son started -- he has a job. He has worked all his life. He's 25. During the downturn, he was out of work two weeks. That was it. He started the other day to look for jobs because he thought he might want a change. Within a week he had two companies phoning him and saying, "Please come to work, don't even give your work two weeks' notice, we want you now." And so he decided to stay where he is at. But there are jobs out there, and I'm sorry, but BC Hydro has not been fair to us.

I am a landowner. I love the land and I want my land back. And my family has been destroyed
because of this process. (inaudible) ten years of their life fighting this, and I'm sorry, but we deserve what is right, and that's what we've always stood for. We are right, and the land owners are right. We know the land. We love the land. We protect the land. And we want it back, and we want to do agriculture.

Thank you for your time. Thank you for doing this.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am. Thank you.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. LITTLE (#0143):

MR. LITTLE: I appreciate I spoke last night. My name's James Little, L-I-T-T-L-E. And I'm going to be short. I just want to add to the -- I mentioned alternate energies, but there's some points in there I feel that I should bring up because I wasn't able to put it on the oral record. I did pass the total document to your recorder yesterday, but I'll just read this quickly. I appreciate your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you sir. Yeah.

MR. LITTLE: Geothermal energy. In the report BC Hydro has requested for further information on this potential source of energy. The report suggests that only the ring of fire area in B.C. are areas of potential for geothermal energy. Saskatchewan,
Alberta, and North Dakota are all using or planning to use abandoned oil and gas wells to supply either electrical energy or heat source.

In the Peace there are a significant number of suitable wells that could be used for the production of either electricity or for a heat source. A recent example is Hinton, Alberta. There are plans to reopen an abandoned gas well near the community to use as a heat source for municipal buildings. Further documents on this potential source of energy from these examples can be provided. I could provide you a whole list of stuff if you want that.

Solar. BC Hydro discounts the value or potential of this resource. In fact, Hudson's Hope has just completed a project for most of their municipal buildings which will save the municipally some $71,000 annually at current rates, and obviously more going forward. The U.S. has dramatically increased the construction of solar power units, especially in California. That's the one Hydro touts they're going to sell our extra energy to.

Yeah, okay, has got -- and the cost of construction has gone down significantly and continues to just decrease. Even in Fernie, B.C. a new solar farm has just opened. A new company in the Okanagan has just opened up and is hiring staff for significant
solar installations in that area. I personally was asked for some references for some people that are going to work in that industry starting very shortly.

They discuss in this report shows a requirement for electricity -- for electric vehicles. On the way to town tonight -- that electric vehicle thing, keeps talking about it big time. They announced that GM is getting into that big time. And that was on the radio, CBC, tonight. They said they don’t except it for 30 years to go to any kind of a max where it's going to affect the electrical market, and that's GM quoting that tonight on the CBC.

Wind energy. There are a number of wind energy projects on the books, development in the Peace. One source tells that Tumbler Ridge, and I believe that's Thunder Mountain, has a similar potential to Site C. There are currently -- are applications for wind energy along all the high points all the way to the Yukon border, along the Alaska Highway all along the highway points. There's -- if you go to the government -- which I used to work for B.C. Lands. If you go to their system there's applications from here all the way to the border. There's not a spot you could put an application on.

Buyer energy. This consists of a variety of mediums from wood waste to methane produced in
waste products. This has become a significant source of energy for the forest industry. They're using black liquor from the pulp process and other wood wastes from milling. It is noted that First Nations at Fort Ware are building wood waste plant to supply electric energy at this time because they aren't on the grid.

So, anyway, thank for allowing me to explain this further. Appreciate your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. CULLING (Continued) (#0162):

MS. CULLINGS: I'd like to address an earlier comment about confusion. The comments that they were --

THE CHAIRPERSON: Please --

MS. CULLINGS: -- no market gardens in the valley for the past 100 years. And just to clarify that there is no confusion. The Peace Valley had a long history of market gardens. It's documented, well documented. The early and mid-decades of the 20th century, there's an anthology called The Peace River Chronicles.

But one example, Larry and Linda Peterson immigrated from Idaho to grow potatoes in the Peace River Valley in the early 70s. And they had a highly successful commercial horticultural operation, and prior to the announcement of Site C, initial
announcement, they were shipping potatoes from the Peace Valley to Prince George, as far south as Prince George.

Now, Larry and Linda went to the mattresses fighting Site C for four decades, until their spirits were finally broken in the last few years and they elected to move out of British Columbia.

But one last point. It is not relevant when someone says they drove through the valley and they dismissed the agricultural potential because it's only growing hay. The Canada land inventory doesn't concern itself with what the land is currently used for. It ranks our land capability -- the land, according to the ultimate capability. And the alluvial soil in the Peace River Valley, coupled with a unique microclimate, literally -- and I say this as a Manitoba farm girl who's lived in northeastern B.C. for 30 years -- this valley literally has some of the highest capability land in the entire country of Canada. So please, let's clear that confusion up, that's good ag land there.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. NAPOLEON (Continued) (#0171):

MR. NAPOLEON: Bud Napoleon again. If you can bear with me for a few moments.
Because of the -- when I was talking about the loss of sheep and caribou, because of the lost sheep and caribou, the West Moberly First Nations and my reserve have taken the initiative to save our small herd that we have. I believe we started with seven, and now I think we're up to about 30, 32 or so.

And we look after them in the mountains over there, and both reserves take turns looking after them. And we make sure that -- we're trying to replenish, make them grow again like they were at one time. And as a result, both of our membership on both reserves do not even bother hunting them.

The main transmission that runs through our territories went through the reserve, and we never did get any compensation or mitigation. They were not even mentioned. At our Site C hearing, at the reserve, one person spoke -- not one person spoke in favour of it. One elder even asked, how do you justify the $7 billion bill on this dam? BC Hydro could not even answer that question.

In the past, our Hydro bills used to come to the reserve by mail. And they even charged us tax, all these years since the 60s. And by rights, under the treaties, we are not even supposed to pay tax. Yet all these years we pay tax on hydro. And they got away with it, and nobody gave them a slap on the hand.
Three years ago, I moved back from Edmonton, after living in Edmonton and Cold Lake for 18 years. I missed the Peace River. I moved back because I missed the hills. I missed the mountains, I missed the animals, I missed the horses. The first thing I did was when I went to Moberly, I unpacked all my stuff. I drove from Moberly to Fort St. John. I just love that drive. I've always loved that drive, because there is so much beauty, so much beauty a lot of people take for granted.

I felt the peace within my heart when I was driving. I even stopped one place, I sat on the side of the road, just looking at the waters, looking at the hills.

I had that monetary value within me. It's something that money cannot buy. And I came to Fort St. John, I picked up a Tim Hortons coffee and I drove back to Moberly. Only to find myself three hours later to drive back again. Because that's how much I missed this land when I was gone.

But now it hurts me when I drive from Moberly to Fort St. John to see the destruction that's already there. And just to think that what might happen if this Site C is built, and okayed. Because that's something that a lot of us have within our hearts that nobody really explained. Hurricanes,
monsoon winds, floods, are all acts of God. We have no control over them, but we must deal with them later. But with dams like Site C, we have the control, even before that happens, and that's the purpose of why we're here.

Now is the time to make it happen. No -- we'll say no to the dam on behalf of my people. There is too much uncertainties on this project. Some of them have been mentioned already with the slough of the sliding hills, wildlife being drowned. What about the mercury pollution that's going to happen in the fish, like it happened in the other lake?

Why don't they take this money that they have, and upgrade the Bennett Dam? Because I think it's getting old. Because if it ever floods, breaks down, nothing's going to stop it.

I'm glad that lady talked about fracking, because I had that in my notes here. It seems like fracking was one of the causes of earthquakes. So the thing is, what happens -- what's going to happen if we ever have a major earthquake with the Wacky Bennett Dam? Is it stable enough to even withhold all that pressure? I doubt it. That's why all that money right now should be spent in fixing it up, and never mind this dam.

And there's another thing that's not even
mentioned yet is, there is some seepages on the side of the hills over there and I think it's some kind of green slime. I don't know what kind of chemicals they may have, but if it -- if the dam is built and the water does come up, are those chemicals going to be going into the water? And what safety is there?

I guess in closing when I think about Site C what does that letter C stand for? It must stand for Christy Clark, because she's the one who okayed it. Thank you.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MR. BEHNAM (#0174):

MR. BEHNAM: Hello, my name is Sean Behnam, B-E-H-N-A-M. I'm not Canadian, so I would like to apologize if I can't speak like you, but I will try to do my best.

Anyway, there are a couple questions about Site C, like is it economical or not, do we really need that much electricity in the future or not? Is there any other option in compared to Site C?

I'm a mining engineer, I have a Ph.D., and I know that it is not about my personal opinion. I might believe in constructing Site C or not, but it's about expert people, we need expert people to make that decision. It's not about personal decision.

I know if government is going to stop Site
C, I will lose my job, but I prefer to see a decision which is according to expert opinions. So, I prefer to see that kind of report. And I believe that preparing this kind of report will need at least one year investigation, it’s going to happen within one month or two months. It’s not reasonable to see this kind of report just issued within one month or two month. It needs more investigation, I believe in that.

So, what I expect to see, I expect to see a comprehensive report, investigation, and study in this regard, with considering all kind aspects, economical, technical and social issues. So, I believe it is not reasonable to see this kind of report within just one month, or two months. It will take time, it will take at least one year, according to my experience. Because I did feasibility study, and I know what that is. It is really complicated.

Second thing, unfortunately we have to sacrifice something to earn something. I just moved to Canada like a year ago, I am so far from my family. But why I did it, because I was hoping to have a better future. So sometimes you have to spend something to earn something else. It is about -- we cannot satisfy everyone, it’s impossible. But we have to make the best decision to satisfy important things
like economical, or technical, or whatever. And when I'm talking about having other alternatives, am I really an expert about that? Am I really expert about geothermal or all kinds of options? No, I'm not. I can tell you my personal opinion, but it doesn't mean that my personal opinion is correct. So, just think about, okay, when we are going to have other options like, I don't know, using wind or geothermal, it still needs material like metal, and metal needs to be extracted from mines, and mines will have some environmental issues. So, as I said, it's really complicated.

Last thing, I heard that this project is not on schedule, or on budget. I worked 12 years for civil construction or infrastructure projects, and to be honest, I've never seen a project finished on budget or on schedule. Why? It's so simple, because it's about prediction. But you can't predict 100 percent everything. Just imagine you want to buy a house, you will say, okay I'm going to save that much money every month, and then after for example, I don't know, 10 months I can buy that house, but next month something bad happens for your family, and you have to spend money from your savings. It doesn't mean that you made a bad plan or you didn't do your best. It is what it is. Something like this happened for,
especially for this kind of mega project.

So, we have to be reasonable, we have to consider all aspects. Even if I am going to lose my job, I prefer to see a realistic report, which considers all aspects. Then I can say, "Okay, the people who made that decision really did their best." It doesn’t matter I will lose my job or not, there should be benefits for B.C. and consequently Canada.

Thank you so much for your time.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, sir.
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SUBMISSIONS BY MS. MORISON (Continued) (#0161):

MS. MORISON: Hi, I just wanted to add something quickly, but it’s very important and I’m not sure that it’s been brought to your awareness.

Just in speaking in terms of the W.A.C. Bennett Dam, and the reliance Site C would have on that dam and that reservoir, I would encourage you to look at the story called "The 60-storey crisis". And what that talks about is, in the 1990s a tourist discovered a hole in the W.A.C. Bennett Dam. And it expanded very quickly. The engineers were called in to rectify the situation. And they discovered that there was rebar in that dam, and it had corroded, and it caused the gravel fill to implode.

A couple of months later there was another
hole, and it was determined that there was no way of actually knowing how much rebar was left in that dam, and how that dam would be affected. And the engineer who was involved with that said that he would never really have any confidence in the W.A.C. Bennett Dam. He is very concerned about that, and how well it would stand up in years to come.

So it's called "The 60-storey Crisis," explains the whole thing there. Thanks.

THE CHAIRPERSON: Thank you, ma'am.

Well, I'd like to thank everyone who came out tonight very much, and I'd especially like to thank those who made a presentation. It's very helpful to us, and very interested in everything you had to say.

So I hope you all have a really wonderful evening, and thanks again, and good night.

(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 8:00 P.M.)
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