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(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 8:28 A.M.)
THE CHAIR: Well, welcome, everyone. Good morning.

I do have -- well, a little bit of a hiccup that I'd like to chat about once I -- just let me get my screen organized here, sorry.

So we got word that we may have had a virus downloaded from our website on one of the exhibits. I have been on the phone, as Mr. Kennedy and many others, with our service provider.

Late last night, in fact, $I$ had MNP check the file
case, including our document managers who are downloading documents.

Mr. Secord, you provided, I believe, last night, an updated aid to cross and we're now getting that checked for a virus just in case because we don't -you know, if it's coming from somebody -- one of the folks -- the participants that's sending documents, we need to know that, and we don't know who it might be.

So we're checking documents. We will be trying to locate exhibits on our alternative drives that we know are clean. That might take some time and might slow our process in getting documents up this morning, so I would ask for some patience.

I think it's going to work, but it is an unexpected hiccup that we certainly didn't expect, and it's unwanted. And what a day on April 1st for something like this to happen. Hopefully, it's not some cruel joke by the virus gods.

So, with that, I'11 start with any other preliminary matters that others may have? Are there

MR. KRUHLAK:
THE CHAIR:
MR. KRUHLAK: preliminary matter, but $I$ just wanted to advise you
that we'd like to speak to a revision to an undertaking that was provided yesterday, and I think it's probably best we start that as the first item when we commence the hearing.

So if there's other more procedural or housekeeping items, perhaps we can dispense with those first.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Sure. That sounds like a good plan, Mr. Kruhlak.

Any other preliminary matters for this morning?
Hearing none, Mr. Kruhlak, proceed, please.
MR. KRUHLAK:
Yes. There was a request yesterday for an expedited response to Undertaking 31 to which we provided.

Mr. Wood would like to speak to a correction to the response to Undertaking 31, and it's also been the subject matter of an exchange of several aids to cross, which have been circulated either late last night or this morning.

So I've spoken to Mr. Secord, and I think the best approach is to simply have Mr. Wood speak to the correction, to have that on the record and clarified to the Board, and then I think if Mr. Secord would like to then address that issue with respect to any needed cross, Mr. Wood will be responding as needed.
M. WOOD
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MR. SECORD:
THE CHAIR:
Sounds good to me.
Thank you.
M. WOOD (For Alberta Transportation), previously sworn MR. KRUHLAK EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. Mr. Wood, are you prepared to speak to it at this time?
A. MR. WOOD: Yes, I am prepared.
Q. Please proceed.
A. MR. WOOD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Kruhlak.

I just appreciate the opportunity to provide a clarification and also thank you to Mr. Secord and Mr. Fennell for submitting the aid to cross.

It allowed me -- I spent quite a bit of time last night trying to figure out where this error could be and I think I've nailed it and would like to give a statement on the impacts of that data, and also request a retraction.

In Exhibit 327 of Stantec's review of Dr. Fennell's submission, which was Exhibit 261, I presented snowpack graphs with statements to the effect that the largest snowpacks do not necessarily produce the biggest floods.

While this statement maintains some validity, the snowpack data that $I$ presented was for -- incorrectly
for mid-winter snowpacks, not the annual totals.
There was some discussion about which station was being used. The station was the Little Elbow Summit station; however, as I mentioned, I was incorrectly using mid-winter snowpacks.

What Mr. Fenne11 and Mr. Secord have presented in the aid to cross appears to be annual snowpacks, and that is the data that should be looked at for such an analysis.

As noted in the aid to cross, when you consider the annual snowpack, the percentiles change and there are more years when snowpack was larger and floods occurred.

So, as a result of my error, Alberta Transportation wishes to retract portions of the rebuttal to Dr . Fenne11's intervener submission, specifically Figure 1 graph showing snow water equivalents for the five largest floods in Exhibit 327, page 48; Figure 2 graph showing floods from years when snowpack exceeded 75th percentile from that same incident; the text associated with those figures, specifically the paragraph above Figure 1 and below Figure 2 in Exhibit 327; as well as statements made by myself on March 29th, specifically page 1488 of the PDF, 1 ines 13 to 25 ; page 1489 of the PDF, 1 ines 21 to
M. WOOD
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23 , as well as the workbook, the Excel workbook that was submitted in response to Undertaking No. 31.

And if I may add, the use of this incorrect data was limited to the response to $\operatorname{Dr}$. Fennell and in the statements made, as described above. It was not used in any form during the evaluation or design of SR1.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Wood.

MR. KRUHLAK:
Mr. Secord, I'11 leave it with you if -- as Mr. Wood made reference to aids to cross of which there were a couple of versions that I haven't been able to keep track of them.

So if you wish to have any of those marked, we would have no objection.

MR. SECORD: Sure.
So, Ms. Friend, if it's agreeable, could you pul1 up the aid to cross that Mr. Wood would have reviewed yesterday evening. So that was the aid to cross that was sent to you at 7:23-- or sent out at 7:23 p.m. yesterday.

MS. FRIEND:
This is Laura speaking. I'm sorry, but we have to have that scanned before I'm allowed to put it on the screen.

THE CHAIR: Ms. Friend - Mr. Secord, did you send that to Mr. Gessner (phonetic)?

MR. SECORD: To who? I beg your pardon?
M. WOOD
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1 THE CHAIR:
That's our MNP. I'm sorry.
Ms. Friend, has that file been sent to Mr. Gessner with MNP.

MS. FRIEND:
Yes, it has, but $I$ haven't had a response yet.

MR. SECORD:
So maybe what we can do is do it this way.

If we could have the aid to cross that Mr. Wood looked at last night, which was the one sent out at 7:23 p.m., if we could have that marked as the next exhibit, then we don't have -- I don't think we need to pull it up and we can save some time.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.
MR. SECORD :
So that would be Exhibit Number?
MS. FRIEND:
That's 396.
EXHIBIT 396 - AID TO CROSS SCLG TO AT
TOPIC 5 - ADDITIONS TO ATTACHMENT TO
RESPONSE TO UNDERTAKING 31, EX 390
MR. SECORD:
And then if we could have the aid to cross that $I$ sent out this morning -- I don't know, Mr. Wood, whether you've had a chance to look at that one yet, but $I$ think it might have corrected a caption that was on Exhibit 396, and then there was some additional work that was done on that exhibit -- if we could have that one marked as the next exhibit, and
M. WOOD
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then I'm going to have a couple of questions for Mr. Wood, and then I think he can take that away and we can move on.

So could that be Exhibit 397 ?
MS. FRIEND: Yes, that's correct.
MR. SECORD: Thank you.
EXHIBIT 397 - AID TO CROSS SCLG TO AT
TOPIC 5 - JF ADDITIONS TO ATTACHMENT TO
RESPONSE TO UNDERTAKING 31, EX 390
MR. SECORD CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. So, Mr. Wood, I don't know that you need to address this now, and perhaps this has been -- you know, been solved in some degree by what you've said this morning, but I have -- perhaps three questions for you to take away. If you want to respond now, obviously that's fine.

So when we looked at Exhibit 390 , which is the response to Undertaking No. 31, what we noted was that you chose to use the SW data for the Little Elbow Summit snow station, ID 05BJ805, as opposed to the SW-SS data.

And when you take this question away, if you could confirm that the SW data and the SW-SS data provide different readings, I'd like you to confirm that the SW-SS data is actual manual snow core survey

## M. WOOD
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measurements from numerous locations, approximately 10, spaced at approximately 30 -metre intervals while the SW data is NRT, or near real time, data from a particular pillow -- a particular snow pillow location. Is that your understanding, or is that something you'd have to take away?
A. MR. WOOD: No, Mr. Chairman, I believe I can answer that now.

The description of SW and SW-SS data is correct, and Mr. Secord is correct that we used the SW data, although, I don't believe that is the error.

As correctly pointed out, $S W$ is a realtime from a sensor, and every couple of years, they would go out and do what they call snow core surveys measuring data. And the data that's available from the Alberta government includes both those data sets and they are different.

However, I don't believe that is the genesis of the error and the confusion that $I$ caused to the Board. The data that $I$ pulled, it was done as an internal exercise in 2019, and I used 2018 data. I noted that Mr. Fenne11 pointed out that it's not current.

Where my error was is that the way the data is presented, is they present historic totals for the year, and you can see every year in that report, with
M. WOOD
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the most current year being let's say 2018 in my case. What I didn't realize was that the report was from January 2018. They would have issued another one in February 2018 and March. And so the historic totals I was looking at was actually the historic totals for January, and that's why they're much smaller.

So, again, it was the exact same station. We could discuss the merits of which dataset to pick, but that was not the error. I incorrectly used the January dataset, whereas Mr. Fennell, while he pulled current data, also correctly pulled the June dataset, which would be more representative of total snowpack for the year.
Q. And so I guess the question would be why did you choose to use data from one automated location versus manual readings from numerous locations, which might be more representative of actual conditions.
A. MR. WOOD: Mr. Chair, my decision to do that was because there was more years of data. I don't know if -- while it would make sense to use measured data, it's more accurate for that measurement on that year, the dataset is less complete. But as for -- as respected -- in my retraction, we've requested that this -- all this data be removed.
Q. Okay. And then I think the second question $I$ had for
M. WOOD
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you, you've answered. How do you explain the discrepancy in the data between what you have provided in Exhibit 390 and what is shown in the yellow highlighting, which was -- which Dr. Fennell took directly from the AEP website for snowpack rankings. You've explained that; correct?
A. MR. WOOD: That is correct. That is my explanation.
Q. And then the third question was, how does this change your calculations for percentile values given the discrepancies noted, and perhaps what you could do is look at Exhibit 397 and let me know whether you agree with -- I believe Dr. Fennell did some analysis of that, but perhaps you could get back to us and let us know whether you agree that the percentage -- the percentile values would be changed in accordance with Exhibit 397. Would that be agreeable?
A. MR. WOOD: Mr. Chair, I don't believe I need to take that back.

While $I$ haven't doven into each of the calculations used, it does look generally correct. Again, my incorrect use of the base data was the genesis for the incorrect percentiles.

If Mr. Fennell is using the June snowpack and calculating percentiles accordingly, $I$ have no reason

ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION TOPIC \#5 PANEL<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Secord

to believe that it's incorrect.
Q. And then obviously this would change your comparison regarding the snowpack measurements and flood frequencies in Exhibit 327, PDF page 48, Figure 1, and PDF page 49, Figure 2. Would you be able to provide us with revised -- revised figures?
A. MR. WOOD: Mr. Chair, we've requested to retract those figures and the arguments surrounding them, as I described earlier.

MR. SECORD:
Okay. Well, I think that's good enough. Thank you, Mr. Wood.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Wood.
Mr. Kruhlak? Okay. Thank you.
Okay, Mr. Secord, I think are you ready to continue cross-examination?

MR. SECORD: I am. I'm hoping you're going to start my hundred minutes now, sir, and not -- not count the undertaking.

THE CHAIR:
That's totally fair. Thank you.
M. HEBERT, M. SVENSON, W. SPELLER, D. BRESCIA, M. WOOD,
T. NOBLE, J. HALLSON, N. DE CARLO, E. TERRY, I. WHITSON,
R. PERSON (For Alberta Transportation), previously sworn/affirmed
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Now, Mr. Secord, when was this one --
MR. KENNEDY: now.

THE CHAIR: you.

MS. FRIEND:
So can you be more specific --
MR. SECORD:
This would be --
MS. FRIEND:
-- which one?
MR. SECORD:
-- this would the Aid to Cross Number 1, the PDF document. So 396 and 397 were Exce1 spreadsheets, so this is the PDF document that I that sent out -- I sent out this morning at about 5:30 a.m.
MS. FRIEND:
Oh, right. Okay. Sorry, my head is a bit muddled, and so I just want to make sure that the document manager gets the correct one up.
THE CHAIR:
Actually, the pages -- yeah, we've been kind of all night and early in the morning trying to get all of this rectified and checked, folks, so I
really appreciate the patience.
MS. FRIEND: Okay. It's not the Water Council or weed control. I think those were Mr. Okoye's. I'm sorry. I'm just not --

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Secord, is it the spreadsheet?
MR. SECORD: No, it's the --
MS. FRIEND:
It was a document; right --
MR. KENNEDY: Yeah, 5:44 in your email, Laura.
5:44 this morning.
MS. FRIEND:
Yeah, I'm sorry. I'm not seeing it in the folder. I may have put it in the wrong --

MR. KENNEDY: I'll send it to you right now.
MS. OKOYE:
I've actually re-sent it to
Ms. Friend. It's Ifeoma Okoye. Good morning.
MS. FRIEND:
Yeah, I do have it in my email. I don't -- didn't put it in the folder for the document managers --

MS. OKOYE:
Okay.
MS. FRIEND: -- it's going to take a minute for me to get it into that folder.

MR. SECORD:
Okay. Well, while you're -- while you're doing that, I'm going to go on to Mr. Person.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, great idea. Yeah.
MR. SECORD: And, Dr. Whitson. So I'11 come back to that.
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Q. Now, I believe Dr. Whitson said yesterday around 3:50 p.m. that the thickness relevant for soil erosion due to wind is 3 centimetres, and that's why he used a 3-centimetre thickness on his maps, whereas the air quality assessment used 10 centimetres. Can you explain to me why -- why the difference?
A. MR. PERSON: Sure. Mr. Chairman, the different assessments were looking at different things. The soil assessment was looking at the erosion risk of soil in the context of the soil exclusively. So the soil assessment was not considering which potential areas do or do not have vegetation. Whereas we know from the literature and from observations that vegetation is one of the key controlling factors of which surfaces are at risk of wind erosion.

And, from this context, we used information from the vegetation assessment where they've indicated that at sediment depths greater than 10 percent -- 10 centimetres, they've conservatively assumed that all this -- all the vegetation is at risk

ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION TOPIC \#5 PANEL<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Secord

interpretation of the data.
Q. Now, Mr. Person, the AT air quality assessments only included the scenario of emissions with mitigation. And we heard Mr. Hebert say yesterday that they -- and I'm assuming this is the operator, which I understand now will be Alberta Environment. So as I understand it, AT says that the operator will apply mitigation as an adaptive measure.

Do you agree, therefore, that it is likely that non-mitigated emissions of total suspended particles, TSP, PM 10 and PM 2.5 wil1 occur or may occur before adaptive management occurs?
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Secord has not characterized the sediment management plan correctly.

The plan is to apply mitigation. Where adaptive management comes in is the approach to measuring the effectiveness and, where necessary, altering or augmenting mitigation.
Q. Okay. My understanding is there will -- we're going to go through this with Mr. Hebert, but there will be a delay -- as I understand it, it will be two weeks post-release that flood mitigation -- sorry -- I guess we better go into that in some detail -- but is there going to be a gap between the release scenario and the
mitigation?
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, yes, there is a time gap, but for the initial period of time the sediment will be very wet, and then at the point it does become dry is the time when you can get on to apply mitigation.

And I'11 ask Mr. Speller to augment that in terms of sediment management.
Q. Well, how do you know it's going to be very wet at the end --
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Speller?
Q. I'm asking you, Mr. Person.
A. MR. SPELLER: Mr. Secord, it's -- Mr. Chairman, it's Wayne Speller.

I just want to clarify the way that Mr. Hebert's opening statement was characterized.

So I've got it. It's Exhibit 380. I've got a hard copy that's got paragraphs, so it's paragraph 16, and I'11 read it. It says: (as read)
"Specifically, within two weeks of

And then that is the section where it talks about surveying the area to undertake to trafficability, surveying the areas for signs of wind erosion and
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applying mitigations; looking at alternative erosion control methods. Those are all within two weeks after a flood and --
Q. No, Mr. Speller, they are two weeks after release, those steps start. They're not during the two weeks, they're after two weeks.

Two weeks after full release, these things start; right?
A. MR. SPELLER: Mr. Chairman, it reads, "Specifically within two weeks of a post-flood release."
Q. Within two weeks. So two weeks after full release.

Why don't we ask Mr. Hebert, rather than you
interpreting it. Or did you write it?
A. MR. HEBERT: So, Mr. Chairman, I'm reading the document that I delivered yesterday, which is Exhibit 380 , and at paragraph 16 , it says, "specifically within." I don't have a dictionary in front of me, but $I$ think to benefit the Board's understanding, within two weeks would be at any point within -- within those two weeks.

And I think, as I also emphasized yesterday, these are -- these are guide posts to provide some form to a monitoring and management program and, certainly, it is not -- it's not fixed in stone. If at some point
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within two weeks there was some need to react in a particular way, AEP, as operator, and Transportation as proponent here today is saying it would make the necessary response reflecting the conditions in place at the time.
Q. Well, that's all well and good, Mr. Hebert, but we've seen no budget for this, and I guess you can pretty much say anything you want, but it's AEP who's going to operate it, and as I understand it, within two weeks of the release, the full release, AEP can decide that, gee, maybe we should get busy and do something about all the dust that's flying around. So, as I read your opening statement, it could be two weeks before AEP decides to do anything.

And so my question to Mr . Person was, the air quality assessments only included the scenario of emissions with mitigation, and I said to him: (as read)
"Therefore, it is likely that
non-mitigated emissions of TSP, PM 10,
and PM 2.5 wil1 occur before AEP gets around to mitigating or finding the money in its budget to do it."

So can you confirm, Mr. Person, that those scenarios were not provided and were not modelled?
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman --
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MR. KRUHLAK:
Mr. Secord, it's Ron Kruh1ak. I don't want to needlessly interject, but it seems you're asking a question to which the basis of Mr. Hebert has confirmed will not be the case --

MR. SECORD:
I disagree, Ron. I mean, within two weeks, so it could be two weeks before anything gets going.

MR. KRUHLAK:
He did indicate that it would be reviewed within that time frame, and if conditions warranted, steps would be taken; and throughout, we're speculating on what might occur in the future and what he's proposed is, if that situation is identified, steps would be enacted.

MR. SECORD:
I mean, if this Board issues an approval, we don't know that any of that is going to happen.

So, first of all --
MR. KRUHLAK:
We11, Mr. Secord, again, I'11 stand down here shortly, but -- but you do have commitments that have been made by Alberta Transportation on this issue. So I think the Board has some comfort as to what is going to be taking place if there is an approval granted.

MR. SECORD: We11, we'11 leave that for argument.
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Q. So assuming, Mr. Person, that AEP doesn't get around to mitigation for two weeks post release, can you confirm that those scenarios were not provided and not modelled?
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, the scenario that was modelled reflects the sediment management plan that reflects a known lag period between when you can get on the site and apply mitigation.

And by this I mean, we have modelled a certain percent of control or a certain percent reduction in emission rate relative to what a -- what the uncontrolled emission rate would be, and that effective rate of control reflects both an initial period when the sediment is wet, and when it dries out and active forms of mitigation are applied. So it reflects the entire time period post release of the water.
Q. So did you model no mitigation activity taking place for two weeks post-release?
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, again, our response -- or our scenario reflects what we think is a realistic case of the potential for wind erosion right from the moment when water is released up until when vegetation establishes and becomes a surface or an area that's not at material risk at wind erosion.
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Q. So the answer to my question is no, you didn't?

It's a pretty simple question, Mr. Person.
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, the question is being put forward in a way that is not consistent with the basis of our assessment.
Q. According to the Alberta Air Quality Modelling Guideline, and this is the -- I'm assuming you used the air quality model guideline, Mr. Person?
A. MR. PERSON: Yes.
Q. And did you have regard to -- what was the date of the document that you relied on?
A. MR. PERSON: The current version of air quality model guideline that has been released and that's in effect is dated 2013. There has been a 2020 version released in draft, I believe, late last year, that is out only for public comment and is not yet in effect.
Q. And could you undertake to provide us with a copy of the 2013 guideline that you relied on?
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Secord, it's online on Alberta Environment and Parks' websites -- website, and I believe the hyperlink is provided in our March 12th reply submission, Exhibit 327.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. PERSON: You just click on the link, you'11 find it.
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Q. So you weren't relying on the 2020 air quality model guideline?
A. MR. PERSON: No.
Q. And have you looked at the 2020 air quality mode1 guide1ine?
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, I have -- I have looked at it briefly in the context of providing some input to Alberta Environment and Parks in regard to certain -- certain sections of it, but $I$ have not looked at it in the context of this project.
Q. And do you think it has any applicability to this project, or is it the case that it would be the 2013 guideline that would be applicable?
A. MR. PERSON: The 2020 draft is a draft only out for public comment. It is not in effect, and it is not the guidance that applies to this project.

MR. SECORD:
So, Ms. Friend, are you able to pull up the aid to cross?

MS. FRIEND:
Yes, Mr. Secord, the document manager has it now, so she can pull it up.

MR. SECORD:
And if we could go to PDF page 1.
Q. So, Mr. Hebert, can you confirm that there is a proposed development that we talked about earlier just to the east of the PDA?

Would you agree that this gives a -- the location
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of that proposed development that we were talking about?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chair, subject to check, I believe that's correct.
Q. And are you aware -- I take it you're aware of the Kamp Kiwanis and Camp Hope locations to the south of the PDA?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I would say those are the locations, subject to check.
Q. And are you familiar with the retreat centre that appears to be just underneath or to the south of the PDA?
A. MR. HEBERT: Yes, I'm familiar with the retreat centre at that location.
Q. Are you aware that charity programs have been conducted essentially on the -- I guess it would be the northeast side of the PDA?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I'm aware there's facilities that could provide those programs in that location, yes.
Q. And then if we could go to the next PDF S1ide 3.

In relation to the schools, can you confirm that there are, in fact, a number of schools, Edge School, Elbow Valley Elementary School, Springbank Middle School, Springbank High School?
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A. MR. HEBERT :

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that to be correct.
Q. And there's also, in that rectangular area, Springbank Park for All Seasons, a football field, two baseball diamonds, a hockey arena, beach volleyball, and two indoor hockey arenas?
A. MR. HEBERT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that would appear to be correct.
Q. There's also a senior's -- Springbank -- Heritage Club Seniors Centre and Lion's Club Soccer Park in that rectangular area?
A. MR. HEBERT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that would be correct.
Q. And are you aware that there is a future private high school being planned, including playing fields, basically in the -- I guess just to the west of the PDA?
A. MR. HEBERT :

Mr. Chairman, subject to check, I don't think that to be correct (verbatim).
Q. You don't think that's correct?
A. MR. HEBERT: No, Mr. Chairman, I'm saying, subject to check, I'll take that to be correct.
Q. Okay. And then on PDF page 4, I take it you don't take any particular issue with the locations of these various schools and facilities, et cetera, on this map?
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A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I will accept those to be correct, subject to check.
Q. And the same with PDF page 5?
A. MR. HEBERT: Again, I believe they're the same depiction, so $I$ will take those to be correct.
Q. And PDF page 6?
A. MR. HEBERT: We're now working with a different map, but I -- based on locations that have been presented previously, I will take those to be correct.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Hebert.

Can we have that marked as the next exhibit?
MS. FRIEND:
That would be Exhibit Number 398.
EXHIBIT 398 - AID TO CROSS SCLG TO AT
TOPIC 5 - AIR QUALITY AND COMMUNITY
LOCATIONS
Q. MR. SECORD: Now, Mr. Person, in relation to the 2020 Air Quality Model Guidelines that are out for draft, can you confirm that the maximum release scenario must be presented in addition to typical emissions --

MR. KRUHLAK:
Mr. Secord, sorry to briefly interrupt. It's Ron Kruhlak.

You've marked this exhibit based on Mr. Hebert generally confirming locations, but I take it the depiction of the air modelling that's overlaid on these
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documents, $I$ don't know, he wasn't speaking to that at all. I just want to confirm it on the record, and I trust you'11 have somebody addressing that if they're identified as Mr. Zelt's documents?

MR. SECORD:
Well, this is a Stantec document, isn't it, that we're looking at here?

MR. KRUHLAK: You're looking at the earlier ones, I take it, were identified by Mr. Zelt that you've just marked as an exhibit?

MR. SECORD: Yeah, those were -- those were taken from Dr. Zelt's reports, but what we have up here is from a Stantec document. I think it's just showing the same location of these various schools on various different maps, that's all.

MR. KRUHLAK: All right. Thank you.
MR. SECORD:
And I mean, Dr. Zelt will be coming up to speak to his report, but $I$ think the purpose for me for putting this in was just to show, you know, where the camps were, where the schools were, where people might be out and about breathing the air.

MR. KRUHLAK:
Q. MR. SECORD: of the Air Quality Model Guideline, do you recall it stating in Section 1 that: (as read)
"This guidance provides detailed
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> guidance on suitable methods and approaches that should be used to assess air quality."

Do you recal1 reading that, Mr. Person in the -Mr. Person, in the 2020 document?
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, the 2013 version of the model guideline is what is actually in effect today and is what what was used as the basis of the air quality assessment presented on the record.
Q. Does that document also state the same concept, that the guidance for the 2013 document that provides detailed guidance on suitable methods and approaches that should be used to assess air quality? Does it basically, you know, provide the same sort of direction to people like you?
A. MR. PERSON: Yes.
Q. That was my only point, that these are documents that provide detailed guidance on suitable methods and approaches that should be used to assess air quality; correct?
A. MR. PERSON: Yes. It reflects the preferred methods or the allowable methods established by Alberta Environment and Parks. Standards are a common method which they deem to be acceptable for regulatory applications and reflecting what they feel is best
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practices.
Q. Right. Now, in relation to Exhibit 398, I don't think we need to pull it up, but the location of -- of these various baseball diamonds, camps, soccer fields, can you tell me, has Alberta -- has AT considered the significant number of cyclists who use Springbank Road, Highway 8 and Highway 22 during the summer season, and has the proponent conducted a study of these roads to determine the -- basically, have they conducted a cycling study to determine whether there's increased respiration associated with cycling and whether the TSP and PM 2.5 and PM 10 could be of particular harm to those cyclists?

I don't know if that's a question for Ms. Noble?
A. MS. NOBLE: So as part of the human health risk assessment, we evaluated the potential for human health -- the potential human health risks at the special receptor locations. Those are the locations where people were most likely to be exposed for the exposure durations under consideration in the risk assessment, the one-hour, 24 hour and annual average.
Q. So would that include cyclists using the Springbank area?
A. MS. NOBLE: From the perspective of that we also initially considered the MPOI and provided
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guidance on potential health risks associated with the MPOI. Again, I will -- and sorry to use jargon. MPOI is maximum point of impingement. And so to the extent that we've evaluated the potential health risks associated with those locations, then yes, we would have identified the potential risk.
Q. Now, there are homes in the area, including that of my client, Brian Copithorne, who will be on the doorstep of the reservoir. What is the impact of degraded air quality on Mr. Brian Copithorne who may experience prolonged exposure to the TSP and PM 2.5 particles?

MR. FITCH: Mr. Secord, it's Mr. Fitch.

I know where your client Mr. Copithorne lives, and you obviously know where he lives, but it might be useful if you pulled up a map or provided a bit of guidance to Ms. Noble so she knows where his residence is, and also Mr. Person. That would be fair.
A. MS. NOBLE: Just to confirm, I believe that's SR Number 4?
Q. MR. SECORD:

And I was thinking, you know, there's a number of -- of camps and people who are in and around the reservoir, so you don't have to restrict it just to Mr. Copithorne if you want, but I'm just wondering about whether you can speak to these people who are nearby?
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And I mean, if you do want to pull it up. It just takes up a lot of time pulling up documents, so I prefer to keep going if $I$ can. I've still got quite a few questions.
A. MS. NOBLE: No, that won't be necessary. So as part of the risk assessment, we identified potential human receptor locations that -- where people were most likely to exposed.

Your client's location, Brian Copithorne, is certainly one of those locations, as are most of the locations that you've identified in red on your aid to cross.

So at each of those locations, we reviewed the predicted air quality concentrations and compared those to appropriate exposure limits.

So in terms of the exposure ratios, we consider them for the four cases, assuming that you want me to speak specifically to the post-flood scenario. Is that correct?
Q. Yes.
A. MS. NOBLE: So, as part of the post-flood scenario, as noted by my colleague Mr. Person yesterday, the risk assessment considered four different cases. Case Number 1 was similar to the environmental impact assessment with the corrected
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PM 2.5 emissions.
As identified in our submission, Exhibit 237, we compared the predicted air quality concentrations associated with post-flood conditions following a 1 in 100-year and 1 in 200-year flood event. Predicted concentrations for PM 2.5 for 1 -hour and 24-hour at each of those receptor locations was less than the exposure limit and, as a result, represented no unacceptable risk.

Under the sensitivity analyses that were modelled, those would be Cases 2, 3, and 4, as discussed previously by my colleague, Mr. Person, I'11 focus on Case Number 4, which presented the highest potential concentrations identified from the air modelling.

Under those scenarios, there were maximum -- there were maximum concentrations of PM 2.5 for 1-hour exposure durations and 24-hour exposure durations. They were higher than the health-based limits that we used to complete the assessment, and as a result, we calculated exposure ratios, which are our metric for health risk, greater than 1.

To better characterize that risk, we went further, and we viewed the -- we viewed the assumptions associated with the air modelling, the predictive frequency of exceedance, and the potential for
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additional mitigation to reduce the air quality exposure limits.

Based on that analysis, we determined that, one, the predicted concentrations were under a very limited exposure scenario, so it require a low-recurrence flood event. It also was contingent on having a finer sediment deposited than was originally assumed in the environmental impact assessment. The predicted frequency of those exceedances based on assumed partial mitigation was relatively limited, less than 1 percent of the time for 1 -hour exposures and less than 4 percent of the time for 24 -hour exposures.

Further, in consultation with Mr. Person regarding the potential for additional mitigation to be applied to reduce the risk of exposure, we identified a number of additional mitigation measures that could be applied, and we covered those off in our Exhibit 327. Those included additional application tackifier, as well as additional dust suppression methods.
Q. Mr. Person, just going back to the 2013 guideline that
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, the 2020 guideline
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is just a draft for public comment. We don't know what will be in the final version; we don't know when it will be released and replace the 2013 version. The 2013 version is what was used in the assessment. It is what should be used in assessments today.
Q. Look, things keep evolving. I'm just wondering whether the 2020 guideline would be more protective for my clients, whether you've looked at that.
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, at a high leve1, they're similar. I have not done any quantitative analysis to compare which one is more or less conservative looking at -- you know, on a project like this.
Q. So assuming this guideline comes into effect during the -- and in the unfortunate event that this project is approved, would it be reasonable for the NRCB to impose a condition that the modelling be done with using the guidance provided in the 2020 air modeling guideline?
A. MR. HEBERT: One moment, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, as others on our witness pane1 have explained this morning, the 2020 draft guidelines are just that, they're draft, out for, as I understand it, consultation and review.

We -- we are more than prepared to submit to the
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guidelines that are in effect today and to respond and comply to those as required under those guidelines or other applicable policies.
Q. Now, in Topic 2, Mr. Wood stated that the project would only have been used 10 times in the last 100 years, and I'm just wondering whether the panel has considered how much sediment would be accumulated under this assumption and what would its impact on the reservoir be in terms of depths and spread for all the known floods since, I guess, 1921.

So I guess what I'd like to get, in terms of a general sense, is if the past is a predictor of the future and if we had, you know, 10 floods like we've had -- or 10 uses of the reservoir, say, had it had been there in 1921, can anybody on the pane1 -- and this is a question from my clients.

Can anyone on the panel speak to what the sediment spread would look like around the reservoir? Would it be concentrated in one area near the embankment?

So the proponent has responded that the sediment would be moved around the reservoir to ensure drainage, so I'm just wondering if somebody can, you know, give kind of a picture for my clients to understand, you know, what would -- what would this reservoir look like if the past happens in the future?

And it may be a difficult question, and if you can't answer it, that's fine, so...
A. MR. WOOD: Mr. Chairman, this is Matt Wood. While we haven't done that specific assessment, I would like to draw the Board's attention to Exhibit 173, page 28 of the PDF.

Document Manager, if you wouldn't mind bringing that up, please?

I ask because it will allow to provide some context here.

MR. SECORD:
173.
A. MR. WOOD:
Page 28.

THE CHAIR:
28. Thank you.

MS. FRIEND: Hello, this is Laura. That one isn't preloaded, so we have to go looking for it, so you'11 have to give us a minute.

MR. SECORD: Okay.
MS. FRIEND: Thank you.
Q. MR. SECORD

Okay, then I'11 come back to that, so don't -- Mr. Wood, if that's okay with you?

And if I could go to Mr. Hebert.
Mr . Hebert said that there would be surveys and geotools used two weeks post-flood. So just to
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confirm, these surveys and geotools would be used when the reservoir is fully drained; correct?
A. MR. HEBERT: Just one moment, Mr. Chair.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'd invite other colleagues in case I -- my answer doesn't get there, but $I$ think it would be important to note that the methods that were provided as an overview yesterday would contemplate that in the event of a design flood, a large event, that the operator would begin its surveying work and its monitoring work as the reservoir -- reservoir drained.

So it wouldn't necessarily require the entirety of the reservoir to drain and then the surveying to begin. So it contemplates that as the reservoir is draining, there would be surveying activities.

I don't want to speculate on every permutation, combination of event, but certainly if events were smaller than the design flood, the monitoring activities would have to respond and reflect the -- the space that would have been consumed by the deposited water.

So, you know, certainly, the sediment management approach that's being contemplated has a range of tools that are -- that would be at AEP's disposa1, but certainly the activity would begin -- by "activity"
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meaning the surveying and the monitoring -- would begin as soon as AEP is able to get on -- onto the site.
Q. Can we have that page back up, document host?

While that's happening, so if this was a design flood such as we had in 2013, so you would have the reservoir basically filled by the -- let's say the 23rd of June, you would have 39 days on it to get rid of the water in the reservoir under an early release scenario. We looked at that yesterday on Exhibit 218, PDF page 28 , the release scenarios. So we're now into August, Mr. Hebert, 39 days post, you know, a mid-June 2013 flood, design flood.

So what geotools would be used by the operator? What do these look like? What would they be?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, one moment. I'11-I'11 invite the person on the pane1 that can provide an appropriate response.
A. MR. SPELLER: Mr. Chairman, it's Wayne Speller.

Mr. Secord, just to clarify, we didn't use the term "geotool," so I just want to make sure we're responding to your question properly. Are you referring to the sentence that says: (as read) "Given the nature of the surface in a post-flood release scenario, one or more combination of tracked equipment, rig

AMICUS
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matting or geocell installation may be required to ensure access."

Is that -- when you say "geotools," did you mean that?
Q. Yes, I did. Sorry for not being clear. Thank you Mr Speller. I was just pulling up paragraph 16(i) to check my reference, so thank you. That's what we're referring to, Exhibit 380, paragraph 16(i).
A. MR. SVENSON: Mr. Chair, this is Mark Svenson speaking. So those -- those are tools to allow access over soils or material that is soft, where regular vehicles may not be able to travel. So that's what those are. That's what those are referring to.
Q. And what is a geocell installation?
A. MR. WOOD:

Mr. Chairman, I believe I can answer that. It's a soil stabilization measure that's used temporarily to provide a little bit of a firmer base. Again, it is optional if it is necessary for trafficability.
Q. Okay. And then in paragraph 17 of Exhibit 380, Mr. Hebert's opening statement, it says: (as read)
"Efforts in furtherance of Goals 3 and 4 will commence shortly thereafter and, in any event, no later than between weeks 2 and 4 post-flood release."

So as I read your paragraph 16 of 380 , within two weeks
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of a post-flood release, there will be surveys of the area, there may be one or more of a combination of equipment matting or geocell installation may be required to ensure access, and two surveys of the area will be undertaken for signs of wind erosion, and these efforts will continue with regularity at no less than two-week intervals.

And then it says here in (iii): (as read)
"Evaluation will be made of the area for soil moisture."

And (iv): (as read)
"If certain areas are identified and conditions are considered unsuitable, alternative erosion control measures -methods will be instituted."

So in paragraph 17, you said: (as read)
"Efforts in furtherances of Goals 3 and
4 will commence thereafter and, in any event, no later than between 4 -between 2 and 4 -- between weeks 2 and 4 post-flood release."

So let's say we have a reservoir full on the 23 rd of June. We have an early release. Getting the water out within 39 days. Takes us into August. It could then be -- it could be, then, early September before certain
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areas of erosion risks are identified.
Do I understand -- I'm just trying to read your opening statement, Mr. Hebert, and understand whether your use of the words "Goals 3 and 4" refer to Roman (iii) and Roman (iv) in paragraph 16. Do I have that right?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. -- sorry. I'11 let Mr. Brescia respond.
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, it's Dave Brescia here. So reiterating what was said previously, these goals are guideposts for time and aren't fixed points in time. As was just discussed, in a design flood, the intent is not to let the reservoir fully drain before initiating any efforts.

As part of their operations and maintenance, Alberta Environment and Parks will be on site for the entire time of release. And during that time, areas of the reservoir that drain at the far reaches of the reservoir will be surveyed first and efforts will be initiated in those areas and will progress following the receding water. So it's not that there will be large gaps in time.

Also, if additional erosion control is identified during that effort, it would be applied at that time. There would be no intent to wait -- to delay specific
week mark, a two-week mark, or a four-week mark. So this is a dynamic effort and an iterative process. It's not a fixed guidepost.

I should also say that this is -- the process outlined in Mr. Hebert's opening remarks is just that, it's the initial process. The plan will be developed further as -- as the project progresses, and will need to meet other requirements that Alberta Transportation has in place in their master specifications for erosion control, and it will be adaptable to the situation on the ground.
A. MR. SPELLER: And, Mr. Chairman -- Mr. Secord, it's Wayne Speller again.

To clarify, I think, to get specifically to your question, Mr. Secord, paragraph 17 that you quoted talks about Goals 3 and 4, and then it talks about Goals 1 and 2. Those aren't the four bullets above in paragraph 16. They're actually the goals referred to in paragraph 14, which states: (as read)
"Alberta Transportation has four
specific goals in this regard:

1) safety and operations; 2) erosion
control; 3) weed control; and
2) revegetation.

I know both of them are four sets of information, but
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the goals are in paragraph 14.
Q. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speller.

So Goal Number 2 is erosion control. And so if we go to paragraph 17: (as read)
"Efforts in furtherance of Goals 3 and 4
wil1 commence shortly thereafter and, in
any event, no later than between Weeks 2
and 4 post-flood release. These
activities will be conducted at the same
time and in association with the efforts
discussed in relation to Goals 1 and 2."
And so when -- so basically erosion control would be in (ii): (as read)
"Surveys will be undertaken to assess signs for wind erosion, and survey
efforts for these items will continue with regularity at no less than two-week intervals."

So as I, then, understand it, post release every two weeks there's going to be surveys done to look at the erosion issue. Do I have that right?

It's just oddly worded and you've got things moving around. My clients are really interested in understanding the sequential process of -- given that they're going to be there potentially in harm's way,

ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION TOPIC \#5 PANEL<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Secord

they just want to get an understanding of what the operator is going to be doing and when it's going to be done.

So do I have that right, then, basically?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, it's Dave --
Q. Two weeks post-release, then, surveys every two weeks for erosion? Do I have that right?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, it's Dave Brescia.

So $I$ would agree, it is not entirely clearly as it's -- clear as it's worded, but the general premise is that Goal Number 2 is erosion control. So that's implemented immediately as post-flood, as indicated there.

Surveys for erosion control are currently estimated at two-week intervals, but the point of the survey is to identify if additional attention is required. Then with respect to erosion, we wouldn't wait for a two-week block before responding to that.

So erosion control will be dealt with in the initial post-flood event, again following the flood as
Q. So, yesterday, we were listening to -- we were on the water topic block, and my understanding was that for the benefit of the fish, they need an early release
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scenario. And then, as I understand it, today you're saying in relation to a design flood, there would not be an early release.

So what is -- sitting here today, what is the release scenario for a design flood and how long will it take for the reservoir to be completely drained?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that we can say there wouldn't be an early release. So we did indicate in the water topic that early release scenario would be more beneficial for fish, and so that was the discussion we had with respect to the guidance from Fisheries and Oceans Canada.

The early release for the design flood would take 35 approximately days to release the water. Again, I'm not certain that we said there would be no early release.
Q. I thought that $I$ heard just a few moments ago that there would not be an early release of the floodwaters as a result of a design flood.
A. MR. WOOD: Mr. Chairman, this is Matt Wood.

I believe there's a little bit of confusion. The operation rule for SR1, as indicated in the operational flowchart that I brought up, I believe on Day 1, but there's no need to bring it up now, that operational rule is to release at -- when flows in the Elbow River
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drop below 160 cubic metres per second. That is the early release scenario.

As part of the environmental impact assessment, Alberta Transportation assessed both the early and late release scenario; the late release scenario being one where, in an unplanned situation, the operator may need to hold the water longer. Again, outlined -conditions outlined in that operational flowchart.

The reason why you're hearing about it today is because a lot of the -- the modelling was done on that. Because in the later release scenario, more sediment would drop out of the water in the reservoir and be left on the bottom.

And so my colleagues here are speaking to the late release scenario because it is more conservative given the subject that we're discussing today.
Q. And, document host, can you put up Exhibit 173, PDF page 28, please so we can have Mr. Wood address that?
A. MR. WOOD: Document host, while we're doing that, $I$ hate to make you run around looking for files, but $I$ would also like to bring up Exhibit 49 , page 9 to couple with the graph that you brought up earlier for me.
Q. Thanks. So if you could pick up this thread, Mr. Wood.
A. MR. WOOD: Yes, Mr. Secord, I was just
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allowing you the opportunity to repose the question, but $I$ believe you were asking about what would it look like, given the statements about SR1 may have operated 10 times in the last, say, 100 years, 110 years, what might it look like as far as sediment extents and depths within the reservoir; is that correct?
Q. Yes.
A. MR. WOOD: Thank you. I requested this graph be brought up again. While I mentioned we had not done that specific analysis, I did want to provide some visual reference for the Board, and I requested that this graph be brought up.

What we're looking at here is a graph of instantaneous flood peaks on the Elbow River. On the far right, that tall bar, is the 2013 flood, which is the design flood.

And then of note, in this record, there are 10 events. You'11 see 160 cubic metres per second exceed a few times -- a few more times than 10 in the record, but what we evaluated is that in those scenarios, it is would have caused the operator to trigger SR1.

So, roughly, we can look at the points in there that exceed 160, and where they exceed, you'11 note that there is the 2013 flood, and there is also a major
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flood in 1932, which I believe was discussed with Mr. Klepacki at cross yesterday. There is also notable floods in the early '20s, and then some floods that may have triggered SR1 that are much, much smaller.

And in reference to the frequency, again we're talking about tying these to the modelled scenarios, of which a 10-year flood, a 100-year flood, and the design flood were modeled.

The 2013 flood is the design flood, and you can see that that only occurred once in the record.

The 1932 flood was the next largest one. And in reference to Exhibit 235, you don't need to bring that up, but that is the Golder 2020 flood frequency estimates. That 1932 flood would have been approximately a -- just under a 50-year event.

The other events that you see there, the ones around 400 would be approximately a 20-year using those same stats, and the ones below that are 10-year floods.

And now -- so if we can remember kind of what we saw here. If there's questions, we can flip back to this. I would like to draw the Board's attention to Exhibit 49 because it provides some information on the spatial distribution of what may deposit as far as sediment.

If I may, again, that was Exhibit 49, page 9 of
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the PDF.
Thank you, document manager. This is the figure I was looking for.

And I selected this specific one because it shows vegetation in the reservoir, which is the topic today.

What you're looking at is flood extents of a hundred year -- sorry, a 10-year, 100-year, and the design flood. Now, recognize --
Q. And this -- which is the design flood?
A. MR. WOOD: Yes. Yes, thank you, Mr. Secord.

The 10 -year flood is the purple line, the purple squiggles you see kind of near the dam in the southeast. The 100-year is the densely hatched blue area surrounding that. So it's a bigger flood; it fills more of the reservoir. And the horizontal hatched lines -- again, you have to remember these are overlapping. But the horizontally hatched lines, that is the design flood.

So only once in the record would the extent of the sediment and the deep deposits fill that -- that horizontally hatched area. And only once, in addition to that, would the extensive sediment fill, let's say, the densely hatched area. Again, I mentioned that 1932 flood was about a 50 -year, and so it would be kind of within that space.
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So those are the two large floods in the last 100-year record that the sediment, you know, may have filled more of the reservoir area.

The other events that you see were all in that 10- to 20-year range. So the sediment would sit down in the purple, the purple extents there.

And if I may add, I must add that it's not that the sediment deposits over this entire -- while you will see more silts in the edges, coarser stuff down towards the reservoir, it will vary in texture through there, will vary in thickness. The flood extents I'm showing here are likely a good surrogate for the spacial extent of where sediment could end up. And I attempted to try and tie it into the record, so $I$ hope that answered your question, Mr. Secord.
Q. Right. And I believe there's another depiction of this in Exhibit 218 , page 85 , but we don't need to turn that off -- up.

But let's imagine you have a design flood on June 20th; you have, what, over 2 miliion tons of
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, this is Dave Brescia.
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So there would, in a design flood, be a small area of around 5 hectares that would be over a metre in depth, but the majority of it would be less than a metre.
Q. And so after the flood event take place, there would be fish rescue teams, and their equipment would be in the area following the floodwaters, and these things would be moving from wet to dry areas disturbing the sediment; correct? Would that be happening?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, so the fish rescue teams would be in the area as we described previously. I believe they would be following the water. I don't know that they'd be going from wet to dry areas.

And there would be some disturbance of the sediment, both by -- by the foot traffic and -- and the water. But as -- as Ms. Okoye mentioned, as part of that process, there would be erosion controls in place to minimize mobilization of sediment.
Q. And will dust suppression activities occur when the biologists are performing fish rescue activities, which could run the duration of the draining, or must it wait until the reservoir has no people?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, so when the biologists are performing fish rescue activities in the location they would be in, the sediment would be wet,
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because we're hoping to rescue the fish while there is still water there, so they wouldn't be dry. And, in fact, there would still be water present.

The -- in the design flood, as you can see from the figure on the screen, there is -- there is area in which sediment and erosion control could be applied distal from where the active fish rescue was going on.
Q. But I'm just saying, in relation to -- as the reservoir is being drained and, for instance, as the lands near the Copithornes are drying out, would you be potentially applying dust suppression while you still have biologists and their people in the reservoir performing fish rescue?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, I think that would certainly be a possibility. As I -- as I indicated earlier, the fish rescue would not be in the same location as the dust suppression, given that the fish rescue is occurring near the wet areas of the reservoir; and if those further areas had begun to dry out, the fish rescue would have -- had already been completed. So they would be in two separate locations and could occur simultaneously.
Q. And as the water recedes from the shallow areas on the shoreline, would you agree that any deposited finds in -- of any elevated areas would be exposed to air and
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wind long before the reservoir is empty so that airborne particulates could begin as soon as the waters began to recede?
A. MR. BRESCIA: One moment, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, it's Mr. Brescia.
As I -- as I was articulating previously, erosion control would be following the soil drying as it progresses through the reservoir. So the intent would be to apply erosion control to areas that -- that appeared to be at erosion risk.
Q. As water -- so has any weed mitigation taken place to this point during the drying process? So we're now a -- we're a month or so now post-flood.
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that that timeline correlates for me. As I said, the process is progressive, so weed mitigation would be following the erosion control aspect of it.

So, again, the process starts as the reservoir water recedes, and then -- so as we said, the fish rescue would be sort of the first part, and erosion control would follow in those areas as they started to dry out, and then weed mitigation would be following that process.

Now, I would say that, again, the process is adaptive, and if for some reason, there was an area
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that was found to have already established a problematic area of weeds, that wouldn't be ignored. That would be dealt with to remediate the situation, if it were required.
Q. So here's the timeline that I'm working on, just so the panel can be clear: Basically we have the June 2013 flood. We have the reservoir filling and completely filled by June the 20th. We have the waters receding on June 21, 22, 23. And assuming everything goes as planned, the reservoir drains over 30 to 40 days.

So that's the timeline I'm working on.
So the question then is: During this drying process, as the reservoir is receding, has any weed mitigation taken place to this point during the drying process? And we are now, say -- let's say we're a month post-flood. So we're into July.
A. MR. BRESCIA: So, Mr. Chairman, weed mitigation is definitely one of the -- one of the factors that's considered in this overall process. And, again, I'd like to reiterate that weed mitigation would occur at the areas of the reservoir that had dried earlier. And so we're not talking about a one-month time span before any action is taken again.

Like, the reservoir, as I indicated, has approximately just over a month to drain in a design
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flood, so weed mitigation would be initiated at the far ends of the reservoir where water drains first much sooner than the reservoir is completely drained.
Q. So you're going to do weed control; you're going to apply tackifiers to control erosion. You still have fish presumably entrained. Presumably there will be rain, periods of rain occurring during the drawdown.

How many types of chemicals are you going to be applying to the reservoir area, in the tackifiers, and in the weed control process?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, so there's a couple of things in here.

The process is dynamic, and the process of vegetation management and reclamation is an integrated process. It's not -- it's not discrete elements that don't work together.

I think the rain, if it were to occur, would be in itself an erosion management measure, as we know and have heard the wet sediment is less erodible, so that would be an aid in that respect.

In terms of tackifiers, tackifiers, there's a wide array of non-toxic biodegradeable tackifiers that are available and are widely used throughout the province and the country.

And with respect to weed management, we've
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indicated the preference for weed management is mechanical or cultural control. "Cultural control" being seeding to out-compete weed species with a cover crop or something. And that herbicide application may be necessary, but it's not the preferred option.

And as I outline these options for weed control, there's not a single choice that would universally be applied across the reservoir. This is -- this is a suite of options available depending on the -- what the sediment looks like and -- and can be applied adaptively as necessary to manage the conditions on the ground.
Q. So we're in midsummer, July 20, July 30; the reservoir is drained. Now, the proponent states that sediment will be moved around for drainage in preparation for the next flood. Will this work cause the sediment to become airborne?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, so I just -- one point of clarity is $I$ think the sediment may be moved around if it affects drainage. I don't think there's the intent to -- to certainly go in and move sediment around post-flood.
Q. Is there a target depth for sediment during this redistribution?
A. MR. BRESCIA: One moment, Mr. Chairman.
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MR. SECORD:
Mr. Chair, is it okay with you if we take our midmorning break? I wouldn't mind just taking a look at my notes. I know I'm approaching my end of my time, but $I$ would just like to take a few minutes and make sure that $I$ get the really important questions asked before $I$-- before the rug is pulled out from underneath me, sir, so...

THE CHAIR:
No, that makes sense, Mr. Secord.
So it's just a little bit after 10. Let's get back at 10:15 then and resume then. Thank you.

MR. SECORD: And we can pick up the --
THE CHAIR:
Yes.
MR. SECORD: -- answer at that point. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, you bet.
(ADJOURNMENT)
THE CHAIR: $\quad$ Sorry, we were ready to go. 10:15. We were just in our breakout rooms. I'm sorry, I had given no warning, but I think folks should be ready. Mr. Secord? Mr. Kruh1ak?

MR. WIEBE: Was it $10: 15$ or $10: 30$ that you called?

MR. SECORD :
Mr. Chair, how much time do I have?

THE CHAIR:
I think it was right around

ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION TOPIC \#5 PANEL<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Secord

20 minutes. 20 -- right around there, Mr. Secord, if I had it right. 20, 25 minutes.

MR. SECORD: Okay. I will endeavor to be done, sir.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. The floor is yours.
Mr. Wiebe, if we could go to a regular screen share.
MR. WIEBE:
Yes. Sorry, my apologies.
THE CHAIR:
No, no problem. Thank you. And speaker view for some of you. Okay.

MR. WIEBE:
We should be good.
THE CHAIR:
And we could have maybe Mr. Secord and then whoever else is on for speaker view.

MR. WIEBE:
Yes --
MR. SECORD:
So do -- are we good to go?
THE CHAIR: Yes. Please proceed. We're good.
Q. MR. SECORD:

So do I have an answer then?
A. MR. HEBERT:

Sorry, Mr. Chairman. We're just directing traffic inside the Transportation witness room.

Mr. Wood will be in a position to provide an answer to Mr. Secord.
A. MR. WOOD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you, Mr. Hebert. And thank you, Mr. Secord, for your question.

I believe you were asking about the -- I
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believe you -- if I can paraphrase, it was about the thickness of sediment that would -- the threshold at which we'd start to move it for positive drainage; is that correct.
Q. Yes.
A. MR. WOOD: Okay. So there's not a specific threshold or thickness of sediment as mentioned by my colleague, Mr. Brescia. Any sediment moved around would only be to achieve positive drainage.

So what this would look like is as drawdown is occurring, if there are undulations in the sediment that are trapping water, through the monitoring plan, this would be identified; and when trafficability is appropriate and at an appropriate time, a machine like an excavator or perhaps a loader may go in and almost surgically remove sediment that may be holding back that water from draining positively.

So it's not a mass earthworks exercise. It is somewhat surgical following the results of the monitoring of the drawdown.
Q. So, you know, I think we all remember the pictures from Mary Robinson's presentation and some of the exhibits that the SCLG filed in terms of the sediment that was distributed on her property.

I take it some of that was obviously, you know, a
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metre or more in thickness. So what you're saying, Mr. Wood, is that in certain areas of the reservoir, that type of thickness would only -- that sediment would only be moved around to allow the reservoir to be able to drain fully. Do $I$ understand that correctly?
A. MR. WOOD: Mr. Chairman, and perhaps I can request that the document controller bring up Exhibit 218 to help explain this a little bit.
Q. See, I'm really short of time, so if we could not do that, Mr. Wood, unless it's really necessary.
A. MR. WOOD: I believe it is necessary. The question was around the areas that are 1-metre depth or greater. And if I may request, it's page 85.

MR. SECORD:
That was very quick, document host. Thank you.
A. MR. WOOD: Yes, thank you, document host. I apologize for bringing up so many exhibits today.

But the reason why I wanted to bring up this specific exhibit is that you can see the very dark grey shade in the legend for areas of sediment that are a metre thick. Those are limited to that one very small spot. As Mr. Brescia mentioned, it's, I believe, 5 hectares, is what he said, in the middle of the reservoir.

And so, you know, as we're talking about removal
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of sediment and depths and thickness, you know, it is anticipated that following a design flood and, again, under the late release scenario, there's very little sediment that is in excess of 1 metre thick.
Q. So do you move the sediment and silt that is stuck on the bushes and the trees? I mean, do you -- or do you just leave it there?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, this is Dave Brescia.

The intent is to move the sediment that is factoring into positive drainage of the reservoir.
Q. Yeah, I guess what I'm wondering about is when you have bushes and trees that get covered with sediment and then the flood recedes, you would have this fine material on the bushes and the trees. Does that get dealt with at all or is it just left to dry and blow in the wind?
A. MR. BRESCIA: One moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this is Dave Brescia. So the intent is not to remove sediment from specific trees and vegetation. I don't believe there would be substantive quantities of sediment attached to the vegetation that would be erodible.
Q. How is the tackifier being applied? Is it, you know, by hand, by air?
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A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, so the specific application method hasn't been determined. As I indicated, there are options available depending on the situation. Commonly, it's applied from trucks with tanks, but it can be applied in other manners via -- via hand or aerially.
Q. And in relation to a design flood like we see here on Exhibit 218 at PDF page 85, what is the budget for tackifier to do erosion control so that my clients aren't exposed to excess air pollution?
A. MR. BRESCIA: One moment, please.
A. MR. HEBERT

So, Mr. Chairman, as addressed previously, this would be an operational cost that would be incurred at the time of the operation of the event subject to the size and the extent of the event.

I would add, Mr. Chairman, and this is not unusual in the scope of emergency response when these types of events occur, budgets are not typically set, bearing in mind that it's not possible to predict the scope, the nature, the extent of the response.

But certainly if a response occurred in relation to the need for tackifier for sediment management, certainly the government of Alberta would appropriate the funds required to undertake that work. That would be without any doubt.
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Q. Now, is water being used at any point for the reseeding operations, growing vegetation, and where is the water coming -- if so, where is the water coming from and what is the budget for this?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I'll invite the appropriate person in a moment to respond to the sourcing question.

But in terms of the budget for a response operation, the answer $I$ just provided in relation to the budgeting related to tackifiers applies in this case also.

And in terms of sourcing, my -- Mr. Brescia seems to be ready to respond.
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, it's Dave Brescia. So the exact source hasn't been determined. We do appreciate that some may be required. One of the options is a temporary diversion licence from the Elbow River.
Q. Now, in relation to this map, Exhibit 218, PDF page 85, you'11 notice depths of sediment in the 10 to 100-centimetre area basically moving up the diversion channe1. There are entities like Kamp Kiwanis and other camps in that area.

Can you tell me, would these camps be exposed to dust and sediment being blown from these large sediment
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depositions that we see?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, if I could just clarify something. I think that grey shading that's in the diversion channel is actually the -- unfortunately, the same colour as the sediment depth. I believe it's intended to indicate the diversion channel itself.
A. MR. WOOD: And, Mr. Chair, if I may. Any materials deposited at the diversion structure are likely to be of a very coarse nature. We saw this in the 2013 flood all along the Elbow. A good analogy of what that area may look like is the braided extensive channe1 that are there right now.

So it is anticipated that the situation relative to the Kiwanis and folks around the Elbow River wouldn't be much different than the current conditions.

Perhaps my colleagues could comment further.
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, all that $I$ would add there -- it's Dave Brescia -- is that should that coarser sediment need to be managed, it would be managed as appropriate.
Q. Now, in Exhibit 159, page 231, Table 49, you don't need to pull it up, but you have annual operating costs of \$300,000.

However, the project appears to have no full-time staff; no cost for fire suppression operations; no
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costs for testing and reporting requirements for water or air; no costs for wildlife surveys and reporting; no costs for security or emergency planning preparedness, including staff training, community liaison and administration of First Nations land use committee.

Do I have that right?
A. MR. SPELLER: Mr. Chairman, it's Wayne Speller.

So the engineering cost opinions do not include all of that information, and some of those costs aren't included, but $I$ want to draw attention to the benefit costs analysis that was done. You don't have to pull this up, I'11 just read it, but it's Exhibit 100, and I'm on PDF page 7 of 14 . And I'11 just read the second bullet from the bottom of that page and it says: (as read)
"Operating and maintenance costs have been refined. The estimated annual operating costs for SR1 is $\$ 975,000$ with
a $\$ 12$ miliion capital cost every ten years."

So those are additional costs to what you would see in a cost opinion that were included in the benefit cost analysis.
Q. All right. I'm going to use up my last 13 minutes with a series of conditions proposed by my clients. And,
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Mr. Hebert, I think I'11 give them over to you and then perhaps have you deal with them or take them away as you so choose.

Condition Number 1, the proponent shall commit to mitigate airborne dust within 24 hours of the issue or a complaint arising. Best practices for dust suppression should be applied, and the methods and effectiveness should be evaluated over time, dust suppression required at all times when dust could be expected to become airborne for the life of the project with the focuses on natural solutions, including reseeding and watering.
A. MR. HEBERT: Just one moment, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the panel that Alberta Transportation is committed to managing the sediment and the impacts of those potential risks, but I think it would benefit Mr. Secord and his clients to receive a written response and Alberta Transportation will take it as an undertaking.

UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT WILL
COMMIT TO MITIGATE AIRBORNE DUST WITHIN
24 HOURS OF THE ISSUE OR A COMPLAINT
ARISING (SEE TRANSCRIPT FOR FURTHER DESCRIPTION)
Q. MR. SECORD:

And just going back to Mr. Speller
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and your reference to the cost benefit analysis. Can you tell me how those costs in the benefit cost relate to Exhibit 159, Table 49, page 231? Is this not the same cost, just on an annualized basis?
A. MR. SPELLER: Could you provide the PDF page number again?
Q. Sure. That's PDF page 231.

So the costs that you were talking about, are those not the same costs?

Maybe while you're thinking about that, I'11 go
A. MR. SPELLER: Yes.
Q. The next condition is, we request that a condition on insects be applied to the post-flood operations. We request a baseline monitoring to measure increases in insect activity. And we also request that the regulators direct the proponent to develop mitigation plans for increased insect activity.

I'm thinking, particularly, mosquitos, potential for West Nile virus, and that sort of thing?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be appropriate to add that to the undertaking.

UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT WILL
COMMIT TO BASELINE MONITORING TO
MEASURE INCREASES IN INSECT ACTIVITY
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## AND DEVELOP A MITIGATION PLAN FOR SAME

Q. MR. SECORD: The next condition is the project operator or proposed independent authority shall work with local residents in Rocky View County to monitor air quality with live readings at locations identified by the Springbank community, including but not limited to, Range Road 33 near Springbank High School and Soccer Park; Elbow Valley Elementary School, and Highway 8 areas.

Earlier, Mr. Hebert, you stated there would be monitoring to the east. My clients do not find that to be acceptable. They would like to see air quality around the project monitored for as far as the dust can travel, and the wind, of course, can change direction at any time.

Any air quality monitoring program would be at the proponent's expense and will include an allowance for handheld monitors supplied to residents who require them.

Any monitoring that identifies an issue with air
of the cases I've been involved in, in some areas there are stations where you can actually go onto a website and see what the air quality is like, you know, in real time.

So that would be the -- I know that's quite a bit of a -- it's a fairly lengthy condition.
A. MR. HEBERT: Thank you, Mr. Secord.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Pane1, you know, as I said in my remarks yesterday, Alberta Transportation is very sensitive to the concerns of the community relating to the potential impacts of dust due to sediment deposition in the project area.

My statement yesterday included a commitment relative to air monitoring post-flood. We certainly hear the concerns and expectations of the community relative to the appropriate level of monitoring.

While I'm not prepared in this exact moment to confirm, you know, the volume or the extent to what Transportation is prepared to consider, I can advise the Board that Alberta Transportation is open to additional monitoring stations as reflecting any sort of appropriate scientific advice, and, believe, through my statement yesterday, made certain commitments relative to sediment management, both monitoring, surveying and response.
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While it does not constitute in its entirety a sediment management plan, Alberta Transportation is prepared to consider making an appropriate plan under the -- any sort of regulatory guidance, but I believe, in this case, it would be appropriate if Alberta Transportation confirm and conclude this in a written response as part of an undertaking.

UNDERTAKING - TO CONFIRM THAT THE
PROJECT OPERATOR OR PROPOSED
INDEPENDENT AUTHORITY WILL WORK WITH
LOCAL RESIDENTS IN ROCKY VIEW COUNTY TO
MONITOR AIR QUALITY WITH LIVE READINGS
AT LOCATIONS IDENTIFIED BY THE
SPRINGBANK COMMUNITY, INCLUDING BUT NOT
LIMITED TO, RANGE ROAD 33 NEAR
SPRINGBANK HIGH SCHOOL AND SOCCER PARK;
ELBOW VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, AND
HIGHWAY 8 AREAS (SEE TRANSCRIPT FOR
FURTHER DESCRIPTION)
Q. MR. SECORD: The next condition would be the of reservoir operations that impact Springbank Road and air quality warnings. Cyclists access Springbank Road and Highway 22 through a variety of paths. So there should be some thought given to how cyclists might be
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warned about adverse air quality.
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be appropriate to add that response to the undertaking.

UNDERTAKING - FOR THE PROPONENT TO
ADVISE IF IT WILL CREATE A MECHANISM TO
NOTIFY CYCLISTS OF RESERVOIR OPERATIONS
THAT IMPACT SPRINGBANK ROAD AND AIR
QUALITY WARNINGS (SEE TRANSCRIPT FOR
FURTHER DESCRIPTION)
Q. MR. SECORD: And in the event of dust storms -- sorry, let me start that over again.

I think I've covered that.
Okay. And I think there were a few conditions yesterday that Ms. Ifeoma Okoye did not get to so I would like to put those to you, Mr. Hebert, as well.

The proponent shall include as a condition of approval an elk monitoring and management plan that engages local landowners.
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Secord said "elk"?
Q. "Elk," yes.
A. MR. HEBERT: Elk. Sorry, my -- I think it's just a consequence of nine days in very dry rooms.

Mr. Chairman, I believe any concerns related to elk would be captured within the wildife mitigation
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and monitoring plan that's been proposed by Alberta Transportation. I don't have it in front of me.

I'm almost certain it would include elk, and I'm next to certain that it includes commitments relative to engagement with local stakeholders.

So I -- while I would not accept the undertaking, I'm next to positive that elk is considered within that mitigation plan.

UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT WILL AS A
CONDITION OF APPROVAL INCLUDE AN ELK MONITORING AND MANAGEMENT PLAN THAT

ENGAGES LOCAL LANDOWNER - REFUSED
Q. MR. SECORD:

Condition 2 is the proponent shal1
perform baseline quantitative biodiversity surveys, inventories, and analysis of the SR1 lands on wildiffe, birds, plants, waterbodies, springs, wetlands, and soil.

Where appropriate, this information shall be collected for a full-year cycle. The proponent shall report annual changes from the baseline in its annual reporting for SR1.
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, members of my pane1 are signaliing my attention. Just one moment. I now understand why my pane1 members were grabbing my attention. I'm advised this was presented as an

AMICUS

ALBERTA TRANSPORTATION TOPIC \#5 PANEL<br>Cross-examined by Mr. Secord

undertaking yesterday and that we provided --
Q. Okay.
A. MR. HERBERT: -- certain conditions relative to it.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And the proponent shall retain an expert on toxicology to determine the impacts of the post-flood sediment and water quality -- and floodwater quality considering the mortality of wildiffe and plants within the reservoir.
A. MR. HEBERT: Just one moment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SECORD:
Mr. Chair, I just have three left just to give you a heads up where I am. So we're almost there.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Secord.
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, Transportation has made commitments relative to the sampling of water within the reservoir, we've made commitments relative to soil sampling.

Just drawing a blank at the moment on the reporting of results, so I would undertake to provide a written response relative to the sharing of those results.

UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT WILL
RETAIN AN EXPERT ON TOXICOLOGY TO
DETERMINE THE IMPACTS OF THE POST-FLOOD
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SEDIMENT AND FLOODWATER QUALITY
CONSIDERING THE MORTALITY OF WILDLIFE
AND PLANTS WITHIN THE RESERVOIR AND/OR
PROVIDE A WRITTEN RESPONSE RELATIVE TO
the sharing of those results
(SEE TRANSCRIPT)
Q. MR. SECORD: And then on wildife rescue, would AT accept a condition that in a flood year, there shall be a complete report on the success of wildife rescue operations from the project area: fish, bird, and amphibians; reporting on the mortality during rescue and transport; and then details of the rescue effort: man hours, working conditions, resources, timelines required, cost, success?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, the items raised would be addressed within the wildlife monitoring plan. It appears as though a number of the items raised by counsel would be captured as part of reporting under the federal approval, but certainly having heard the feedback, we'll ensure that it's considered within the final wildife mitigation and monitoring plan.
Q. And then penultimate condition: The proponent shall include representatives of the west Rocky View communities when preparing a construction traffic plan. The community requests the construction vehicles not
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use local roads, especially considering the significant summer traffic to Bragg Creek, cyclists, and the use of local roads by school buses.
A. MR. HEBERT: So, Mr. Chairman, as we've previously committed, Alberta Transportation would be working with the local authority, in this case, Rocky View County, relative to the traffic management plan for the project.

Certainly, if there's feedback from locally impacted residents, Transportation would be open to that feedback.

But I just would like to assure the Pane1, Alberta Transportation, as part of its core business, is involved in multiple road, bridge construction activities, has the appropriate plans in place to manage the impacts relative to traffic.

But, certainly, as part of the efforts in finalizing the plan with the local authority and certainly our commitment to engage local residents, we would not be opposed to receiving views on any
Q. MR. SECORD: Thank you, Mr. Hebert.

And then to wrap up, Mr. Speller, over to you.
I had asked you about how those costs and the
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benefit costs related to Exhibit 159, Table 49, PDF page 231. Is this not the same cost, just on an annualized basis?
A. MR. SPELLER: Mr. Chairman, I was just -- I was looking at those as we were going through those conditions, and I don't believe they are, but I'm mindful of the time, so --

THE CHAIR:
Are you prepared to respond now, or did that need to be an undertaking?
A. MR. SPELLER: I would -- if it's okay, I would do it as an undertaking to respond, just to keep things moving along.
A. MR. HEBERT: We will take it as an undertaking,

Mr. Secord and Mr. Chairman.
UNDERTAKING - TO PROVIDE AN ANSWER TO
THE QUESTION: "HOW THOSE COSTS AND THE
BENEFIT COSTS RELATED TO EXHIBIT 159,
TABLE 49, PDF PAGE 231. IS THIS NOT
THE SAME COST, JUST ON AN ANNUALIZED BASIS"

MR. SECORD:
And thank you, pane1, for your responses to me today and, Mr. Chair, for giving me a few extra minutes. I really appreciate it. My clients really appreciate it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
You're welcome, Mr. Secord.

AMICUS
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Okay, thank you, Mr. Secord, and SCLG.
Mr. Williams, are you online, and do you have any questions for the panel, witness panel?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I do. Al1 right. Can you hear me?

THE CHAIR:
Yeah, a little soft, but yes. And you're on screen, so please proceed.

MR. WILLIAMS:
Is that better?
THE CHAIR:
Still a little soft. You were a bit louder yesterday, but if you would just raise your voice a bit, please.

MR. WILLIAMS:
Okay, yeah, can you hear me now?
THE CHAIR: It's a bit better when you're a little closer. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, okay.
MR. WILLIAMS CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Okay. So thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Chairman, and to the Board for asking these questions or cross questions.

Please hear I'm not an expert in this area, so please bear with me on some of the technical information that has been brought forward.

My first question is, and I'11 just -- for AT, I'm not sure who would respond to this, but yesterday there was several different measurements given as a -- as a
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standard.
I'm asking the question, what's the minimum standard for health for humans, livestock, and other animals when it comes to air quality? For safety health. What's the -- is it .705 mass ratio of a micron, or what is that benchmark standard for minimum safety for health?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, I'd invite the appropriate member of the pane 1 to provide that response, which is Tania Noble.
A. MS. NOBLE: So, first of all, the standard that we're using is the Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM 2.5 for 24 hours of 27 micrograms per cubic metre.
Q. Excellent. Okay, thank you.
A. MS. NOBLE: Okay.
Q. And is that the same when we use the term "fugitive dust"?
A. MS. NOBLE: Yes. So fugitive dust refers to the full range of particulate matter, and so the terms you would have heard us using are "total suspended particulate," "TSP," and particulate matter 2.5, which is the smaller range of particulate matter.

That is -- the smaller range, the PM 2.5, is the one that we look at for health effects.
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Q. Okay. And is that the same for ambient air?
A. MS. NOBLE: Yes, it is. So when we say "PM 2.5," what we're referring to is the concentration of particulate matter in ambient air. Simply the air outside that you would be breathing.
Q. And is there a distance that ambient air or fugitive dust travels and then it dissipates? Is there any distances that once it travels, let's say, 1 kilometre, it dissipates to zero or back to the safe standard?
A. MS. NOBLE: So, first of all, there was a presentation yesterday that Peter Reid (verbatim) gave, and he provided images that illustrated the extent of particulate matter, and I can refer you to him. He can show you those ranges.

At a high leve1, yes. As we move away from the source of the fugitive dust, as characterized by the concentration of particulate matter, the concentrations decrease. And perhaps I'11--
Q. Is there, like, a -- because we don't need to go in, for sake of time, through those schedules, but is it
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the "source." And then we -- we predict transport and dispersion and removal of particulate matter from the air.

And so the particulate matter consists of large particles and small particles, and the larger particles tend to deposit fairly quickly due to gravitational settling. And the smaller particles have a much higher potential to stay airborne.

As the -- so there's two factors that go on here. One is the transport and dispersion, which allows -- or which concentrations decrease with mixing and distance. And secondly, is the removal processes as vegetation due to deposition on the ground as well as some of the removal processes affected by things like vegetation and trees. And so those factors all together are reflected in our model predictions.

And so at -- you know, as you get severa1 kilometres away from the source, the concentrations typically will be right back down to near background 1eve1s.

THE CHAIR:
there, please.
A. MR. PERSON:

THE CHAIR:
Q. MR. WILLIAMS:

And, excuse me, who is speaking

Sorry, this is Mr. Person.
Thank you.
Okay. So that -- yeah, I
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understand that. So if for whatever reason it didn't meet the minimum standard for health for humans, what would the project do? What would be the immediate action by the project to get it back into a, say, standard -- obviously, it would be mitigating actions, but what -- would pausing the construction of the project be one of those actions?

So if you had air quality...
THE CHAIR: Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Yeah, I'm waiting. They're breaking. They're caucusing right now.

THE CHAIR: Oh, I'm sorry.
A. MR. SVENSON: So, Mr. Chair, this is

Mark Svenson. So I'11 start out to answer your question, Mr. Williams. I'm not sure I caught the last bit as we were conferring.

So, yes, there are -- during construction, there are things that can be done to limit that -- the generation of dust, and one that you mentioned is the suspension of any activities, so -- or those activities that could generate dust. So the excavation, that sort of thing.

So what we have committed to do during construction and dry operations, we have committed to monitoring, so monitoring stations. There's three that
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we've identified that would look at the total suspended particulates, the TSP, and the PM 2.5, as well as meteorological data stations at locations along the boundary of the project area.

One additional continuous monitor for NO2 and PM 2.5, that station representing residents or communities, so outside of the project area. And then another continuous PM 2.5 monitor at Calaway Park, as has been discussed earlier in this -- the hearing and with you along with that.

So there's visual inspections as well as part of that construction. So if -- if it is noticed that excessive dust is being generated, then those activities will be halted that are generating that dust until such time that mitigations can be put in place, so watering of the road. So watering can -- so I'm thinking of the haul roads, the roads that the trucks run back and forth on. They can limit that dust generation.

So those activities would be suspended until that -- until those dust-generating pieces can be mitigated and brought back under control.
Q. Okay. In the modelling that was done for the dust and the wind, were chinook winds taken into consideration in the modelling? Because, obviously, we -- and we
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experience that all the time, the chinook winds where we are. Was that taken into consideration in the model1ing.
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Williams, this is Reid Person.

The way these transport and dispersion models work is we have to follow regulatory guidance which we call the Alberta Environment and Parks Air Quality Mode1 Guideline. And there they direct you to use a long enough period of meteorological data to account for the sufficient number of combinations of wind speed, wind direction and temperatures that you're confident you've identified the worst-case or -- appropriate worst-case conditions for simulating effects on air quality.

And to this end, they've recommended, for this type of assessment, that we actually model five years of meteorological data. And to put that into context, we've looked at a little more than 43,000 hours of different meteorological conditions, and many of those do include high-wind speed events or high-wind speed conditions representative of chinook conditions.
Q. We just experienced a lot of wind lately, so $I$ just wanted to bring that up.

Has Alberta Transportation had any other construction project in recent years where you can talk where you've had to employ, shut down a project or
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 Cross-examined by Mr. Williamsemploy mitigation that you can, as a case -- as an experience that the community could understand where you've got a project going, you've got a dust problem, is there anything that comes recently that you can express or share an opinion on?
A. MR. SVENSON: Mr. Chair -- thanks for that question, Mr. Williams.

Absolutely, yes. Alberta Transportation -- like, this is nothing new for Alberta Transportation. We successfully incorporated things like sediment and erosion control, vegetation regrowth, weed management, we've incorporated these things into all of our projects and maintenance activities for decades.

While we may not have had a project exactly like this, exactly like the SR1 project, we have successfully managed different types and forms of sediment throughout the province at different scales varying from really small projects or maintenance activities to extremely large projects and activities that include hundreds of kilometres of open ground.

So each project is unique and some have challenging conditions. While that's the case, the strategies that are employed in all of these are -- are very much similar.

So recent -- I guess recent projects that you may
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be familiar with, there are sediment and monitoring and mitigation pieces that go into the Calgary Ring Road operation, specifically the -- where did I have that, give me one second -- so South Stoney Trail over the Bow River as well as the West Calgary Ring Road projects, they all utilize different aspects of sediment management, dust management, including watering tackifiers, track walking, interim seeding. So that's another one. If sediment -- or if a soil pile is going to be exposed for a longer period, you can seed it so it keeps that dust down; straw rolls, energy dissipation techniques, silt fences, wattles. These are all items that can be used that are in the toolbox that can be pulled out, used at any one project for sure.
Q. Okay.
A. MR. SVENSON: And have you --

COURT REPORTER: Excuse me, can I ask who was speaking?
A. MR. SVENSON: Sorry, that was Mark Svenson.

THE CHAIR: Please, folks, if you can, if you're not on the panel live screen, it's difficult for the court reporter. So just identify yourself. Thank you very much.
Q. MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you for the answer to that
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question.
The next one is, have you -- when you look at -- when we analyze the situation and we think of the dust potential that might impact our business, in talking to our insurers over the last few years about business interruption loss, our concerns -- what happens is -- business interruption loss only comes into play when the perils match something to our property or equipment breakdown, and that's when it kicks in.

Whenever we have an event - and it came up with the smoke, business interruption loss, you cannot get -- the insurer will not pay you for forest fire smoke.

And so, in this case, because the project is manmade and it's in construction, if we are closed for a day due to ambient air or air quality, we would -our insurer would not cover us for business interruption loss because this is a construction project.

So my question is, will Alberta Transportation, Alberta Environment carry an insurance policy for business interruption loss for stakeholders close by, and if so, can Calaway Park/Calalta Waterworks be named in that policy if there was a -- if we, for some
reason, caused the damage for the construction and post-construction of the dust air quality? Anyone from the AT.

MR. KRUHLAK:
Mr. Chairman, it's Ron Kruhlak.
I guess I would first just comment. I'm not sure anybody on the panel can speak to what liability coverage the province of Alberta carries on its activities.

Perhaps, Mr. Williams, we would just simply undertake to provide you with a response.

MR. WILLIAMS: That would be -- that would be fine.

UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT/AE WILL
CARRY AN INSURANCE POLICY FOR BUSINESS
INTERRUPTION LOSS FOR STAKEHOLDERS
CLOSE BY; IF SO, CAN CALAWAY
PARK/CALALTA WATERWORKS BE NAMED IN
THAT POLICY
Q. MR. WILLIAMS: I guess just in closing and, Mr. Chairman, in essence of my time, I'11 just say that we've had good dialogue on this topic area with Mr. Hebert, and we just would want to ensure that the condition of approval is that the final mitigation points that we're working on be ironed out prior to the project starting construction, that we would just ask
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that the Board undertakes that, to employ that as a condition of approval.

And that would be all $I$ have at this point.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Williams. Thank you very much, and thanks, panel.

Mr. Wagner, are you online and did you have any questions of the Alberta Transportation witness panel? MR. WAGNER: I am online, Mr. Chair, and I can ask my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Please proceed.
MR. WAGNER CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Can I get document manager to bring up two documents. Document Number 371, which would be a PowerPoint presentation, and Document 325.

It appears as though my screen is frozen again, Mr. Chair, so should I maybe --

THE CHAIR:
That's fine. I don't think it -- it's fine the way it is, Mr. Wagner. You can just proceed. Your audio is coming through clearly. Thank you.
MR. WAGNER:
Thank you. If it does change, I am in the country, as $I$ mentioned before, so if quality dips, please let me know.

THE CHAIR: Mr. Wagner, are you ready to ask your first question?
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Q. MR. WAGNER: Yes, I'm ready to go, and all my questions relate to wildiffe, just to give AT a heads-up. And I'd like to bring up Slide Number 20 on Document Number 371.

Does AT recognize this billboard which was shown at the open house in Springbank in 2018?
A. MR. TERRY: Mr. Chairman, Eliot Terry. Yes, we do.
Q. So I'd like to bring up Document 325, page Number 62, paragraph 218.

THE CHAIR:
What is it once again, Mr. Wagner? That was Exhibit --

MR. WAGNER:
It's Exhibit Number 325. I believe it's page 62.

THE CHAIR: That's PDF page 62? Thank you.
Q. MR. WAGNER:

Page 62, please. And just scroll down a bit to 218. That is not the -- oh, sorry. It's 217. Paragraph 217, the AT, if I can just paraphrase, they recognize that the wildiffe suitability habitat is a higher sustainability.

My question is, is this a new position for AT as opposed to the billboard which I showed prior?
A. MR. TERRY: Mr. Chairman, Eliot Terry.

So I think the best way to clarify or answer Mr. Wagner's question is to bring up the elk
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suitability maps that were on the storyboard presented at the open house. So if I could call up Exhibit 32, PDF page 39.

MS. FRIEND: This is Laura. We don't have Exhibit 32 pre-loaded -- oh, maybe she's got it. There we go.
A. MR. TERRY: Very good. Thank you.

Okay. So I believe what Mr. Wagner is referring to in terms of the -- one of the points that was made on that storyboard at the open house, and it was focusing on the area that would be permanently lost due to the project's structure, so that's the diversion channel and the dam itself.

And so I think, unfortunately, what that bullet did was sort of cast that the whole Springbank local assessment area was very low quality habitat for elk, and that wasn't certainly the intent.

You can see from this figure here -- maybe I'11 just back up to explain what you're seeing.

So this is the habitat suitability maps that were used to conduct the wildiffe assessment. These maps are representative of a widely used and common habitat-based approach to determine project effects. And what you're seeing here is basically categories of relative value, so the red polygons are high, the
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orange are moderate, and then the yellow are low. These are relative values that are trying to describe the expected use of the area by elk.

They don't try to predict numbers. They're basically a relative ranking of where we would expect to see elk.

So if we could actually zoom in to the northwest corner of the reservoir where Mr. Wagner's property is. So that's fine.

So you can see here again, in Mr. Wagner's quarter sections, there is an abundant supply of both high, moderate and low suitability habitat on his property.

THE CHAIR: Excuse me, excuse me, Mr. Terry. I wonder if you could just high1ight where you're talking about on this map as Mr. Wagner's property, just for the transcript.
A. MR. TERRY: Yes, sorry.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
A. MR. TERRY: So it would be west of Highway 22 in the northwest corner where we were previously talking about. The fingers of the PDA.
Q. MR. WAGNER:

There we go, Mr. Terry. I think everybody is referring to it as the fingers.
A. MR. TERRY: Right, sorry. So, again, the point is that -- and, of course, all of this is
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described in the metrics in Exhibit 32 in terms of the areas that are affected, and so it's not just low suitability elk habitat. There is -- obviously if you look at the diagonal purple lines in the figure, those are part of the construction footprint, they're temporary workspaces that will be reclaimed, but they will affect high and moderate and low elk habitat. So I think that's really the only clarification that Alberta Transportation would like to make.

It's -- the area isn't all low elk suitability habitats. I think when you look at the map closely and then you combine it with the remote camera program that was completed over a full year and we determined that elk were the second most abundant species observed on our cameras, and, in fact, eight out of the ten cameras are 80 percent, I think we would be all in agreement that elk are relatively abundant in the Springbank local assessment area.
Q. Just as a follow-up question of this, there's large sections of the dam footprint here that have no colouring on them.

Does that correspond to AT's understanding that those are not suitable?
A. MR. TERRY: Right.
Q. [Indiscernible]
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A. MR. TERRY: Yeah, good question, Mr. Wagner.

So the grey areas, what you're looking at there, is largely the effect of the assumption in the model about animals, in this case, elk, avoiding roads. And so when you put some of the disturbance buffers on Highway 22, Highway 1, and even the township roads, your township road buffers were smaller.

But because the area is heavily roaded, you basically get a merging of all the setback buffers, and that starts to produce a lot of these grey areas.

So, again, it's not habitat. The model is predicting, relative to the other feeding patches that you would expect to see elk, they're going to be farther away from the road -- I've just been told to slow down -- so it's not -- again, it's not that we wouldn't see elk in the grey areas, it's just relative to the other categories, they would be less likely to occur compared to the red and orange areas.
Q. Move on. In 2016, between seven and nine grizzly bears were spotted within the SR1 area. Does AT recognize
A. MR. TERRY: Mr. Chairman, Eliot Terry.

Yes, Mr. Wagner, we do. The assessment focused on grizzly bears as well, and we also provided suitability maps for grizzly bears. Again, we don't try to predict
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the numbers of bears. We assess their quality of their habitat. And for context, we recognize grizzly bears do occur. We also detected them in our remote monitoring program.

But it's important to probably point out too that, you know, the Springbank 1 ands just west of Highway 22 occur in the grizzly bear support zone, which is identified in the provincial grizzly bear recovery plan. And the bears that were seen in Springbank, again, following the recovery plan zones, the support zones are really designed to help manage grizzly bears that typically have been living mostly in the recovery zone, which is west of the Springbank study area, that have home ranges that do overlap into some of the private agricultural and ranchlands on the east slopes.

So, again, there -- recognized that there are bears that occur, and, of course, there will be management during the project to deal with bears.
Q. Thank you for that answer. Does AT recognize the link between grizzly bears and the primary food supply of
A. MR. TERRY: Yes. We're aware that grizzly bears do prey on elk calves.
Q. I have a condition that I'd like to bring forward.

As a condition of approval, in the interest of
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human safety and wildiife security, would AT consider making the SR1 footprint a no hunting area?
A. MR. HEBERT: Thank you, Mr. Wagner. And, Mr. Chairman, as we indicated previously, the land use principles proposed for the project contemplate that individuals could practice Treaty rights, which include hunting, so $I$ believe we're not $i n$ a position to accept that condition.

But I would note that in the management of spaces and wildiffe in the province, that there are conservation objectives that have to be met, and that's certainly at the forefront of the work that Alberta Environment and Parks does relative to their responsibilities as it pertains to wildiffe management.

So I would submit to the Panel that considerations relative to the extent of hunting are best addressed through the conservation practices that are employed by Alberta Environment and Parks.

UNDERTAKING - WOULD AT CONSIDER MAKING
THE SR1 FOOTPRINT A NO HUNTING AREA -
REFUSED
MR. WAGNER:
I have no further questions,
Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Wagner.
So, witness pane1, I do believe we have questions
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from Board counsel and staff.
Ms. Vance, do you have any questions?
MS. VANCE:
Thank you, Mr. Chair, I do.
MS. VANCE QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. They're a little scattered because this topic encompasses so many different aspects.

So I'll start with my wildiffe question, which may or may not be for Dr. Terry.

So I'm thinking about the underpass for wildlife under Highway 22. This came up a little bit yesterday. This is a brand new underpass, I understand. And I understand that part of the remote camera monitoring wil1 include monitoring that underpass. You know, I think the goal, correct me if I'm wrong, is to just see how it's being used; right?

And so my question comes because there is no current underpass. I guess the first part of my question is, you know, is there a baseline to compare the camera monitoring to?
A. MR. TERRY: Thank you. That's a good
question.
So we do have baseline work in terms of the distribution of cameras in the local assessment area. We don't have a camera right at that specific point in time at the moment, but ideally we would be putting
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those up prior to construction and getting as much pre-construction data as possible.
Q. So I guess the question is, how do you assess whether this underpass is effective if you -- you know, it's a brand new feature on the landscape as it were? How can you tell -- like, if there's a camera and it does not record activity, how can you tell whether that's because there's no activity or whether it's because the animals are avoiding it?
A. MR. TERRY: Right. So, I mean, there's a couple of things there. So in terms of actually determining the effectiveness of the underpass, so one of the ways -- this will assume that they do detect the animals; right?

So we're basically going to be looking at their approach to the area and whether they continue to cross it. So we'll look at the number of attempts. You know, did they look at it and turn around, get deflected, or did they actually pass all the way through.

To your other point that, okay, what if we don't see any of them, we're going to have to basically look at the data from the other cameras in context of the year, the location, look at some of the other factors that may have influenced why they're not using it.
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Q. Okay.
A. MR. TERRY: Yeah.
Q. That's really helpful. Thank you.
A. MR. TERRY: You're welcome.
Q. I think my next question, couple questions, relate to air quality.

And the first one is my common sense question, which is if I'm a human being somewhere near there, and I understand part of AT's commitments include a community liaison -- maybe it's a different community 1iaison, but there's some kind of liaison complaint process for people, receptors in the area.

And so given that PM 2.5 is so sma11, I think using Dr. Noble's comparison of a human hair being 70 and PM 2.5 being, you know 2.5 , would I know that this stuff is in the air and that I'm breathing it? Would I know to complain about that? Or is that something that I would rely on monitoring for?

THE CHAIR: You're directing this to Ms. Noble, Ms. Vance?

MS. VANCE:
We11, I mean, to whoever can answer that question, really.
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Vance, we're just conferring here. I suspect we'11 have an individual ready just momentarily.
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Q. And there may be no technical response, but I thought I would ask.
A. MR. HEBERT: No, that's completely fair. Our air expert is preparing.
A. MR. PERSON: Sorry, we're kind of struggling with the question as it's kind of open-ended. Perhaps could you maybe rephrase it?
Q. Would a human being in the vicinity of the project know if I, for instance, am inhaling PM 2.5? Would I know that in order to complain about it?
A. MR. PERSON: Maybe another way to look at it -sorry, this is Mr. Person -- a certain amount of particulate matter is ubiquitous. And so by that I mean it's everywhere all the time. So people are inhaling a certain amount of particulate matter no matter where you are, inside your house, outside, because essentially it's in all the air.

Now, the -- it's more a matter of at what level does it potentially have a potential to cause an adverse effect.
Q. Yes, that's a better question. So would I know that I'm breathing in PM 2.5 that has the potential to cause an adverse effect upon me?
A. MR. PERSON: You know, I guess based upon a human's -- you now, their senses, their sense of, you
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know, touch, sight, smell, it's not a good indicator of particulate matter concentrations. I think the individual response of each person is different, and that's -- perhaps I'11 ask my colleague Ms. Noble to explain that.
A. MS. NOBLE: So the short answer is that at the concentrations that we're looking at, 27 micrograms per cubic metre $I$ would not expect that you would be able to sense that just breathing, and hence air monitoring becomes important.
Q. Thank you. That's a great answer.

Okay. My next questions have to do with -- they actually have to do with the draft federal conditions.

Maybe, document manager, the shortcut will be to bring up Exhibit 219, which I believe is AT's response to the potential conditions from the federal regulator. And this I think -- we will see the table where it has the condition, and then it has AT's response, and I think we'11 go to page 14 , please. So, yeah, maybe just a bit larger. Could you zoom in just a little on
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I'11 just read the condition: (as read)
"The proponent shall develop, prior to construction and in consultation with relevant authorities and implement during all phases of the designated project, measures to maintain baseline air quality and prevent exceedance of the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards."

And the way that I understand the next two columns is that AT is proposing to strike out "maintaining baseline air quality" -- I apologize -- "baseline air quality for the construction." They said -- the right-hand column says: (as read)

> "Managing air quality to maintain baseline air quality during construction is not feasible."

So the -- I -- the question is, so that deals with the construction phase, and I think the strikeout is

So I'm wondering, is it feasible to maintain baseline air quality for other phases of the project such as post-flood?
A. MR. HEBERT: One moment, Mr. Chairman.
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A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, it's Mr. Person.

The proposed change to the wording with regard to post-flood operations was intended to reflect that over the vast majority of the time, we do expect post-flood operations to result in air quality equivalent to baseline conditions; but the wording has changed to recognize the fact that post-flood events under some conditions and for a relatively short duration, we do predict and recognize the effect that conditions can deviate from baseline.
Q. Thank you. Two rows down relating to Condition 6.4.3, and I will not read this one unless anybody particularly wants me to, the change in the centre column which reflects Alberta Transportation's recommendations, includes adding -- adding a phrasing relating to post-flood operations, monitoring TSP and PM 2.5 continuously for post-flood operations if determined necessary in consultation with stakeholders and regulatory agencies.

And I do recognize, of course, these are draft conditions. This is not necessarily going to be a condition one way or another. And I guess my question is how do you know -- how do stakeholders, how does AT or Alberta Environment and Parks know when it is necessary?

AMICUS
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A. MR. SPELLER: Mr. Chairman, Ms. Vance, its Wayne Speller.

So Alberta Transportation's commitment in this space has changed since this February submission. Mr. Hebert spoke about it in his opening. Instead of it being monitoring post-flood operations and determined necessary, it's now become after each flood event, there will be 16 months of monitoring conducted for TSP and PM 2.5.

So this has actually been modified within Alberta Transportation's list of commitments since this was filed in February.
Q. Okay. I appreciate that. I thought I had read 16 months somewhere, and I definitely did. Thank you for the clarification.

I may have one more. Let me just have a look.
Okay. So this question relates to vegetation and cover crops. So my understanding of a cover crop is that it's a crop, essentially planted to mitigate, you know, soil erosion through wind.

And so at the same time, I know there's discussion in the documents about native seed mixes to reestablish the native grasslands. And my question is how will the cover crops interact with the native seed mixes; for example, will they be competing with each other?
A. MR. DE CARLO: Mr. Chairman, Nick De Carlo here. I can speak to this.

The cover crops, as long as they're managed well, they should not interfere with the native seed mix.

And the important thing is that the cover crops are cut prior to maturing so that the seed set doesn't mature, and those seeds are subsequently able to compete with the native plants as they establish.
Q. And perhaps a bit of a silly question, but would you have to then replant the cover crops since they're not producing their own seeds, or would that become moot after the native seed takes hold?
A. MR. DE CARLO: Mr. Chairman, Nick De Carlo again.

It would become moot depending on how the native vegetation is establishing. So the cover crop would be intended to be sown because the vegetation is not establishing as rapidly as desired. And, in the future, if the problem was detected again, it could be reapplied.
Q. Okay. Thank you so much.

I believe those are all my questions. Thank you very much for your time.

THE CHAIR: I guess it does help if I unmute. I'm sorry.

Thank you, Ms. Vance.
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Mr. Kennedy, did you have any questions for the witness panel?

MR. KENNEDY: I have no questions, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Dr. Heaney, do you have questions for the Pane1?

MR. HEANEY:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do.
MR. HEANEY QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. So I want to just explore a couple of things to make sure that my thinking on them is correct.

So let's start with early release to late release, and I don't want to belabour this, but -- so those are the bookends.

And my understanding is the actual time of release, how long -- you know, how long it takes to get the water out of the reservoir, is likely going to be, let's call it more of a continuum, that it will be based on the particular flood conditions in the river, things like that.

I see you nodding, Mr. Wood. Is that a yes?
A. MR. WOOD: Yes, Dr. Heaney, that's correct.
Q. Okay. So then I want to go to Dr. Whitson, I believe. And I had a question for him.

In your sediment study, am I correct to assume that -- or from your take, as we go from early to late,
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the area and depth of sediment will be wider and deeper, but it will also be finer textured and it will be a better parent material for supporting plant growth in the future? Have I got that right?
A. MR. WHITSON: Mr. Chair, in some ways I think you might have a couple of things mixed together.

When you say "early to late," I'm not sure if you're referring to the very recent revised early/late release modelling where there's two scenarios, one is much shorter than the other, or if you're referring to the original 2018 EIA analysis where it was, I think around -- for the design flood, it was somewhere in the order of 60 days or 67 days. But I'm not sure if you're referring to those two different -- two different events, but then there's the issue of the sediment.

Both the -- for the most recent sediment modelling, $I$ only focused on the late release design flood; I didn't look at the early design flood version. So I know the sediment has changed very much between the 2018 EIA and these more recent versions.

Now, we have a much more spatially diverse sediment pattern, sand in a small portion of the total, clay around the outer perimeter, and then primarily silty material. So that's the big change between 2018
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and now. In terms of the spatial extents for the very recent early/late release modelling they're not too much different in the scheme of things.
Q. Okay. So but in terms of the part of the question that dealt with the longer the water stays in the reservoir, areas under that water, the sediment will be finer, in general?
A. MR. WOOD: Dr. Heaney, this is Matt Wood. You are correct. As the water is held, the heavier particles settle out first. And so the longer it's held, it's the finer particles.

So in the later release scenario, when that water is left, you're left with more fines on the top than you would have been in the early release.

And if I may, I would like to repeat something that I mentioned earlier about early and late release. I know there has been a lot of confusion around this. The plan is -- the early release is the operational scenario. The later release was looked at for environmental impacts.
Q. Okay. Like, release could be delayed under certain circumstances?
A. MR. WOOD: Yes. Absolutely it could be.
Q. Okay. Because what I'm -- wanting -- exploring a bit is what are some of the tradeoffs, right?
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So back to -- maybe Dr. Whitson or Mr. De Carlo, the effects of that sediment being finer on vegetation -- reestablishment of vegetation, where would that be a better medium for reestablishing vegetation?
A. MR. DE CARLO: Mr. Chair, Nick De Carlo here. Dr. Heaney, there is a tradeoff. The finer material that would be deposited in a late sediment or a late release, is better; it's a better parent material, as you've mentioned, because it's got better water-holding capacity, but the tradeoff comes in the depths of sediment between the early and late.

So if it's delayed to a late release, you're going to have a greater extent of deeper sediments, so that may result in more vegetation loss.
Q. And I think you answered my next question there. So there's a tradeoff between it's a better medium, but you're going to lose more of your existing vegetation.

So just continuing along the vegetation ine, you're going to lose -- in any event, you're going to lose some vegetation because it's covered with sediment.

The question $I$ have is both loss of vegetation and differences in species' ability to tolerate flooding and what effect that might have on, you know, the areas
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which you've defined as 1 ess than 10 centimetres where there might be some potential for vegetation regrowth.

So species' differentiation and because of drowning or would you -- or time -- the time element in terms of drowning of existing vegetation.
A. MR. DE CARLO: Mr. Chairman, Nick De Carlo again.

You're correct. It's a combination of both the sediment and the length of time that water is standing in the reservoir. So the longer the length of the period, the greater the potential for the soils to become anoxic, and also the plants to be robbed of oxygen, which would lead to mortality.

The differences, at a broad scale, would be between wetland plants and upland plants. Wetland plants have a greater ability to tolerate anoxic conditions because they grow in these situations and experience them more regularly. And the early release is more aligned to the conditions that wetland plants would naturally experience in the prairie region.

The upland plants, on an early release, we may still see some mortality but it would be less so because of the shorter duration of flooding within the reservoir.
Q. Okay. So do you have -- or did you do any work to establish if there were species' differences in the
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upland community and, you know, which ones would be more susceptible to death by drowning?
A. MR. DE CARLO: Again, Nick De Carlo speaking Mr. Chairman.

We did do that in, $I$ believe it's Exhibit 49, the EIS where we looked at various dominant plants and their abilities to tolerate different flooding extents.

Now, it's not a complete analysis due to limitations in the available scientific information for different plants and the timelines. Some of the information is broad in nature.
Q. Okay. And so just one last question, then. So is it fair to assume that the plant community post-flood -and let's keep the construction area out of this -that the plant community post-flood is going to be somewhat simplified?
A. MR. DE CARLO: Mr. Chairman, Nick De Carlo again. Yes, $I$ think that's a reasonable conclusion, although I would add that we would expect, over time, that native plants can disperse to the reservoir, and we are also communicating with Indigenous groups on changes to the seed mix and those could boost the complexity.
Q. Okay. And then just one last question about the -- going back to the sediment for a second.

The finer -- the existing soils there are a
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finer-textured soil, and you mentioned -- you did mention water-holding capacity. So are we -- would there be a shift towards more drought-tolerant species in the sediment area once its revegetated?
A. MR. DE CARLO: Mr. Chairman, Nick De Carlo.

I think that is a possible outcome. Dr. Whitson can speak more to the distribution of soil types within the reservoir, but a change from, for example, a loam to a silt/clay mixture could have altered moisture-holding capacity which would influence vegetation.
A. MR. WHITSON: Mr. Chairman, this is Dr. Whitson. I would just like to add one more bit of information, nuance, in that those fine-textured soils will remain underneath the flood sediments. And so it's an interesting landscape situation where you have a fluvial veneer deposited over a clay-textured basement, essentially.

So, to some degree, even if there's a slight shift in the flood sediment towards coarser textures, you've a -- as kind of a groundwater -- a downward flow barrier. So there's a little bit of an extra reserve of water built into this situation.
Q. Point well taken, Ivan.

So just then the -- I think -- just let me check quickly. I think that --

Oh, yeah, one more question, and this may be Mr. De Carlo or Dr. Whitson.

Do you expect the -- when the sediment is, you know, less than 20 to 30 centimetres deep, do you expect then, once the cover is established, that they'11 be able to draw on nutrient reserves in the -- in the underlying soil, the original soil?
A. MR. DE CARLO: Mr. Chairman, Nick De Carlo again. Yes, I would expect that in time.

As a generality, the rooting zone is recognized as 0 to 30 centimetres. That's where the bulk of the root material is -- exists. So deeper than 20 centimetres would be in the main rooting zone, and they'd be able to access that moisture.

MR. HEANEY
Okay. Thank you. Those are my questions.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Dr. Heaney.
Mr. Ceroici, do you have questions for the witness panel?

MR. CEROICI: Yes, I do, Mr. Chair. Thank you.
MR. CEROICI QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. I just have a couple of questions on air, a follow-up to some of Mrs. Vance's questions relating the impact
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assessment agency recommendations.
So there is -- you know, AT has indicated that they will be establishing some air monitoring stations in the area, and IAAC was suggesting that be done with Health Canada and Environment and Climate Change Canada. But given that at the end of -- the project is constructed, it will be turned over to Alberta Environment for, essentially, managing, and given Alberta Environment's experience, would they be involved as well in establishing what this program would look like?

For example, where the station would be located, the type of monitoring, the type of mitigation that might be contemplated and how to -- you know, how to essentially establish the success of that?
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Ceroici, yes, they would.
Q. Okay. And then my -- another question. With respect to these --

THE CHAIR: Mr. Ceroici, sorry to interrupt.
Mr. Wiebe, I thought I noticed Mr. Whitson has been given host. Is there something going on or is it al1 good?
A. MR. WHITSON: Mr. Chair, I just closed a little screen that was open on my computer screen. I don't know why it was there, but $I$ hope that solves whatever
problem that was.
THE CHAIR:
Yes. Mr. Wiebe, is it all good on the zoom front here? And, if so, could Mr. Ceroici be put up on the speaker view, please?

MR. WIEBE:
Yeah, for sure. It has frozen on me, and the list has been slow to update, and that's why $I$ haven't gotten the people up as quick.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. I kind of thought maybe something was going on there, so...

MR. WIEBE:
Yeah, yeah. Yeah, that's weird. I'm going to --

THE CHAIR:
Okay. I'11 let you work in the background, and for now Mr. Ceroici will have a smaller icon, which maybe he'11 appreciate anyway, I don't know. But for now, Mr. Ceroici, sorry, and, Mr. De Carlo, continue. Thank you.

MR. CEROICI: No problem.
Q. Again, with respect to the monitoring, obviously it's indicated that it will be installed before construction commences.
A. MR. HEBERT: Mr. Ceroici, yes, the monitoring baseline that could be useful later on for comparing any possible monitoring results?
would occur before the start of construction for the purpose you described.
Q. Okay, but that would be, like, a period -- a long enough period that it could be used as an effective baseline?
A. MR. HEBERT: One moment, sir.

So, Mr. Chairman, again, not to pre-judge the outcome of the regulatory process, but

Alberta Transportation's intent would be to get that monitoring as soon as possible.
Q. Okay. Thanks. And one last question relating to our favorite topic, the early release.

But from an air quality perspective, so, again, my understanding is that in the early release process we're dealing more with coarser sediments, so is it fair to say that that would result in less potential for wind, you know, carrying of suspended particles?
A. MR. HEBERT: One moment, sir.
A. MR. WOOD: Mr. Chair, it's Matt Wood. While my colleagues are conferring, I just wanted to highlight that the contrast between the two is not that stark.

While it is -- it is likely, as the setting happens, you're going to get fine materials on the top, I just wanted to provide clarity so that the impression
isn't that it's very -- very coarse material versus very fine material. There is some difference, but it's not too great.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Vespa that was Mr. Wood.
A. MR. PERSON: And this is Mr. Person.

And to supplement Mr. Wood's answer, a good way to look at this would be what we called "Case 4" in our sensitivity analysis, reflects the late release flood, so a -- but the assumptions around a larger or largest around of fine sediment. But what we called "Case 3" reflects the same sediment area but with a more coarse textured general sediment.

So I think the difference between the early and the late release scenario could be interpreted as comparing the results between Bookcase 3 and Case 4 as kind of bookends.
Q. MR. CEROICI

Okay. Sort of a continuum.
Yes.
Okay. Thank you, that's all of my questions.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Ceroici.
Ms. Roberts, do you have questions?
MS. ROBERTS:
I just have a vegetation question.
MS. ROBERTS QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. So based on our discussion, I understand that there won't be disturbance of sediment unless it's required
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for drainage. So if and when seeding is needed, will that seed be surface applied? Will there be any kind of cover overtop of it? I'm just wondering about germination of these seeds.
A. MR. DE CARLO: Yes, it's Mr. De Carlo here, Mr. Chair.

There are various options available, including a drill seed, a hand broadcast, hydroseeding, and the option selected will vary based on the time of seeding and type of seed that is being applied. Soil contact is important, and it can also be applied with tackifiers, so there is an opportunity to do them in conjunction.

MS. ROBERTS: Okay. Thank you. That's a11.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Roberts.
I have a couple of questions.
THE CHAIR QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. So we're hearing that the early release more recently modelled is, of course, different than the later release modelling done for dust vegetation impacts for sedimentation.

So can we assume then that the EIA results, then, are sort of the worst-case scenario for a lot of those factors associated with sedimentation because the water would have been in the reservoir longer, and perhaps
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for dust as well, because there would be more sedimentation and more available for uptake through drying and then wind -- wind action. Is that a reasonable assumption, or do $I$ have that wrong?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, it's Dave Brescia. Perhaps I'11 start this and indicate that the -certain aspects of the effects on vegetation considered both the early and late release scenario using the updated modelling, and that's the information that was presented in -- I'11 just -- Exhibit 218 in Information Request 4-01. So it considers both the early and late release of the updated modelling to provide those bookends.
Q. Thank you. And so -- and I believe it was Mr. Whitson, spoke about the sort of land quality or the soil quality and ability for it to sustain vegetation post-flood depending on, of course, the deposition of the sedimentation.

So in terms of earlier, other topic areas where we spoke about land use, grazing, and grazing for fire suppression, now, if there's sedimentation, probably fire isn't going to be an issue but grazing may be. So to what extent is the overal 1 land use being contemplated in terms of -- or perhaps changes in that initial land use plan based on whether or not grazing
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is going to be sustainable in that entire reservoir area over the longer term, in particular, I suppose, post-flood?
A. MR. HEBERT: One moment, Mr. Chair.
A. MR. BRESCIA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, this is Mr. Brescia. So in the land use principles, the grazing consideration is for the purposes of controlling and managing the vegetation.

So it would be applied in response to the vegetation conditions that would be on site and in consultation or decision through the land use advisory committee as to whether that would be necessary or not.
Q. So I would take it that it is a bit of a wait and see currently as of today. There would be a lot of grazing available, obviously, given the current land use, but post-flood those decisions and the amount of 1 and available will need to be made based on whether or not -- or to the extent that there's vegetative capability for grazing. Is that fair?
A. MR. BRESCIA: Mr. Chairman, that would be a fair statement.
Q. Okay. And in terms of, you know, the reseeding, a little bit of a follow-up to Ms. Roberts' question, and perhaps it's a bit of the old farmer in me, but I haven't heard a lot about -- well, I've heard of
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different seeding techniques, including direct drilling -- or direct seeding, but it seems to me that depending on sediment thickness, there could be advantages of sort of more traditional tillage to incorporate some sediment at least with soil and then reseeding. Has that even been considered, or is there a reason that that would be inappropriate?
A. MR. DE CARLO: Mr. Chairman, it's Mr. De Carlo here.

You are correct. A lot of the activities when it comes to managing revegetation can be viewed in a farming manner, and there may be instances where it would be appropriate to till and reintroduce some of the lower soils' properties.

They can also be beneficial for reducing wind erosion, and I think it would be, at least partially dependent on how the vegetation has been affected. Is it fully removed, partially removed? Some activities could interfere with revegetation, particularly if it was done in an area that is currently native.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And one last quick question. In terms of the tackifiers, and, you know, I guess many of us may have experienced these being used in roadsides in particular, you know, steeper embankments, they have these tackifiers that seem to be sprayed.
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What is the -- and this would be, of course, on more level ground, but the effect of length of time that those are effective, essentially, for, in particular, if they're going to be used not so much for the seeding process but perhaps seeding as well, but for dust suppression? Do they need to be reapplied, and is there some -- it's just basically visual inspection? Is it working? Had they been -- has it deteriorated and need to be reapplied?
A. MR. DE CARLO: Mr. Chairman, it's Mr. De Carlo again.

Available information that we've been able to obtain indicates that the persistence and the viability of the tackifiers ranges from approximately 3 months to 18 months, and this is going to be influenced by environmental conditions as well.

It could be reapplied later, and yes, so $I$ would expect that there would be a need to re-examine to see how that is functioning and how the vegetation is establishing.
A. MR. SVENSON: Mr. Chair, this is Mark Svenson.

Just to supplement a little bit, Transportation has used hydroseeding and tackifiers and items such as that in numerous projects throughout the province, and, yes, depending on the environmental conditions, the
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site-specific conditions, those -- a tackifier may have to be reapplied after a number of months.

And typically it is a visual thing. You can tell if it's starting to break down, and you start to have those -- those dust -- or dust being generated, and then it would be reapplied if vegetation has not had a chance to establish at that point.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And one final quick question related to air, and Ms. Vance had asked, you know, a good question about whether or not we can detect whether or not we're inhaling PM 2.5 and, if so, how much if it was at higher elevations. I think $I$ heard that we likely cannot detect that, so that's the reason for monitoring.

But my question is, if there are -- if there is an abundance, higher than expected levels of PM 2.5, are those typically almost always associated with the larger dust that would be detectible?

In other words, there's dry conditions, things are blowing, and there's a lot of dust around, and some of that is PM 2.5 and some is larger, but it's clear that something is happening out there in terms of air quality; or is it the case that you can have an abundance of PM 2.5 exceedances perhaps, without those other dust particles that would be easy to identify, so
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that you could be unknowingly essentially inhaling PM 2.5 in levels -- at levels that you really wouldn't want to be?
A. MS. NOBLE: This is Tania Noble. I appreciate the opportunity to provide some clarity.

So as I mentioned PM 2.5 at those levels on their own you might not be able to detect.

However, with regards to this project, as we note, the source is fugitive dust, and we've looked at -- as you note, PM 2.5 doesn't occur on its own. There's a range of particulate including PM 10 and TSP. The TSP guidelines that were used to assess the air quality, although not directly related to human health, are related to nuisance levels.

And so if you go back and look at the results provided in Exhibit 237, what you'11 notice is that the TSP levels are above nuisance levels long before the PM 2.5 concentrations approach the Canadian ambient air quality standards.

So, based on that, you would certainly be able to
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24-hour average exposure. Short-term concentrations higher than that would not necessarily result in a 24-hour concentration.

I think in terms of what you might experience, you could probably think about it in terms of a typical construction site where, as you go by, you can certainly notice the nuisance aspects of it, and noticing the nuisance aspects wouldn't necessarily imply that there is an uncceptable health risk.
A. MR. PERSON: And, Mr. Chairman, this is Mr. Person.

Just to supplement that. With fugitive dust in general, the majority of the dust is actually coarser material. So it is generally within the size fractions larger than 2.5 -- or at a relative proportion basis, the amount of the particulate is smaller than 2.5. It is quite small.
Q. Thank you for the clarification. I guess my question was related to people's ability to perhaps recognize when a risk may occur. And I hear that the risk level of PM 2.5 may not be above air quality standards if the nuisance fugitive dust is noticed, but it may well be.

So, at the very least, I would assume that, under the plans that were submitted or the conditions that were submitted by Mr. Secord, as an example, for people
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to have an ability to a complaint line or whatever you might call it, if there is fugitive or nuisance dust, that would be at least a trigger for follow-up based on the fact that, you know -- it could be the case that PM 2.5 levels are also higher than maybe either expected or desirable.
A. MR. PERSON: Mr. Chairman, one other point.

The recommended --
COURT REPORTER: Who's speaking, please?
A. MR. PERSON: It's Mr. Person.

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
And a little bit louder if
possible. Thanks.
A. MR. PERSON: Sure.

Mr. Chairman, the monitoring station locations have been recommended or sited in locations generally in between the project and nearest receptors. And so information collected from those monitoring stations would be intended to provide a conservative representation or conservative indicator of potential effects or exposure at those locations and provide useful information to understand if the mitigation is effective and, if not, to adapt it.

THE CHAIR: Thank you. Those are all my questions. Thank you very much.

I do have a closing comment, but first I would ask Alberta Transportation, Mr. Kruhlak, or -- I presume, but it may be Mr. Barbero or Mr. Fitch, if you plan on redirect, and if you do, we may break first, but is there a redirect desire?

MR. BARBERO:
Mr. Chair, it's Michael Barbero here. I hit the space bar first.

No, no redirect from Alberta Transportation, sir.
THE CHAIR: Okay. Well, then, I would like to thank Alberta Transportation and the panel today, Mr. Hebert, and your colleagues, but also panel members that may not be here today because they served on other topic areas for, you know, your professional approach, and providing, you know, answers to all the questions that were asked and/or taken as undertakings.

So thank you very much on behalf of the Panel.
A. MR. HEBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope we've answered all your questions appropriately.

THE CHAIR: Thank you.
(PANEL STANDS DOWN)
THE CHAIR:
So, clearly, I think an appropriate time for a break. We are going to be tight on time, I think.

So if it's all right with everyone, I think if we can go for -- maybe come back -- it's already after
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noon but if we get back at quarter to \(1,12: 45\), if that works for everyone for grabbing a bite, getting back to the hearing, I'd appreciate that. So let's break now
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5 (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 12:55 P.M.)
6 The Chair: We can do a bit of clean up first, because I did want to have the document managers up and that's where the spotlight would have been quite handy because that was the whole point.

But first, before we do that, City of Calgary, I understand, Ms. Senek, you have some transcript corrections to be made and entered into exhibit?

MS. SENEK:
Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I circulated a letter this morning to all counsel with two minor transcript corrections to -- I believe it was Day 2, March 23rd, that I don't think should be controversial, and I would suggest that could be entered as an exhibit.

THE CHAIR: Are there any objections to Ms. Senek's request and changes?

MR. SECORD:
No --
MS. FRIEND:
This is Laura, and that would be Exhibit Number 399.

THE CHAIR:
Sorry, Mr. Secord, were you going to weigh? Were there any objections?

REPORTING GROUP

MR. SECORD:
No, no, no. No objections.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Senek. Was that all?

MS. SENEK:
That was everything. Thank you.
EXHIBIT 399 - CITY OF CALGARY TRANSCRIPT CORRECTIONS

THE CHAIR:
Before we get onto document managers, we had Mr. Kennedy do a bit of canvassing for final argument times.

And Ms. Senek, City of Calgary, I'm not sure if you have yet replied or gotten back. Did you plan on making final argument, and if so, what time were you hoping to have?

MR. MERCER:
Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. It's David Mercer here from the City of Calgary.

We submitted, maybe a little bit late, back to Mr. Kennedy, but we were expecting it would be 40 minutes max.

THE CHAIR:
40. Okay. Thank you.

And, Mr. Wagner, I don't know if you were able to get back to Mr. Kennedy or if you received that communication. Were you planning on making final argument?

MR. WAGNER: I didn't actually see that communication, Mr. Chair. And given that my lack of
knowledge on the way these proceedings work, I'm not exactly sure of the content of a final argument.

So maybe if I could get a couple of minutes of Mr. Secord's time at some point in the next day, that I could get a bit of a rundown on what I'm supposed to be providing.

THE CHAIR:
Right. Oh, I'm getting some feedback here through some mic.

So, Mr. Wagner, if we slotted you in for a half an hour, or you may not take that long, and you don't have to take the time, but would that be fair, just so I can schedule the day for now.

MR. WAGNER:
I think that's entirely fair. I just -- given my lack of expertise in the area, I need to probably get an idea of what \(I\) should be doing, so.

THE CHAIR:
That's totally fair.
And I guess the Panel's view, after hearing some requests, is that we would -- and we quickly caucused over the lunch break on this -- we would like to see final argument and reply, if possible, the same day.

And the way that we might be able to make that happen is to have the final arguments during the day, and if we had a tally of -- we were able to make it 8:30 to 5 for final argument with two hours for Alberta Transportation, two hours for SCLG, 30 minutes
to Calalta, 30 minutes to Stoney Nakoda, 40 minutes City of Calgary, 40 minutes for Calgary River Communities Action Group, 30 minutes perhaps for Mr . Wagner and that would take us a full day, almost exactly actually.

What I'd like to throw out there, I guess, for feedback is if we were able to finish final then from 8:30 to 5 , we could have perhaps even an hour and a half break, people could grab a bite to eat, stretch your legs, have a coffee and allow Transportation at least a few minutes.

They may not be able to do all those things, but it would help them prepare a reply. They've requested between, I think, it's 60 minutes and 90 minutes for reply. And we could do that at say 6:30 and then we would be done for -- the hearing would then close, of course, at that time.

Any objections or suggestions?
MR. SECORD: Just one thing, sir. Obviously, the SCLG have been pretty active as an intervener with quite a number of expert witnesses. We have five topic blocks, and so we were hoping to, you know, get three hours.

But, perhaps, you know 30 minutes per topic block would give us two and a half hours. And, of course, AT
does have a reply so, you know, they can respond to arguments that we make. We don't get a reply, so we would like to get a little more -- a little more time if we could, and I guess that would be my request.

THE CHAIR: Right. We'11 -- the Panel will caucus over -- hopefully a quick afternoon break. You're essentially asking for another half hour.

You know, I do think that you're right, Mr. Secord, you did weigh in on every topic block, to be sure.

You know, my sense is that, you know, for example, Topic Block 5, there was a lot of questioning, as were a couple of other topic blocks, but not all perhaps had the same weighting, in my view, but we'11 take that under consideration.

In terms of if we're able to finish around 5:00, and that might mean even a shorter lunch break that day then, I suppose, but coming back that evening, is that agreeable to parties?

MR. SECORD:
Sure. I mean, I did mention to
make work, we will make work.
THE CHAIR: \(\quad\) And we'11 -- we do want to be fair as well, Mr. Secord obviously.

Mr. Kruhlak?
MR. KRUHLAK:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess I appreciate Mr. Secord pointing out our opportunity to reply, but, technically, we're to be meeting new issues. And I guess I had earlier suggested to Mr. Kennedy three hours in a similar amount to my friend Mr. Secord, but if -- we're, of course, in the Board's hands as to your direction.

I appreciate we want to try to manage it, but if we're looking at reducing that, I guess -- I think Alberta Transportation would be sort of seeking equal time to make sure we address all of those issues to sort of the same degree. So, you know, I guess I'm saying if SCLG is seeking two and a half hours, then I think that would probably be appropriate for the proponent.

And reply, I guess we could consider it later in the day, but our preference would be if the Board would be open to giving a reply -- a briefer reply the next morning, that would give us a chance to, more reasonably, digest and organize what we hear from on that date.

So those would be my two requests for your consideration, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIR:
And fair requests, both
Mr. Kruhlak and Mr. Secord. We'11 have a quick caucus in the afternoon here and come back with a decision for next Tuesday and/or perhaps a short morning on Wednesday. So we'11 take that under advisement. Thank you.

Ms. Friend -- or sorry, any other parties in terms of weighing in on the matter?

Hearing none. We'11 get back to you after afternoon break.

Ms. Friend, any word?
MR. FRIEND:
No, unfortunately, I don't have an update.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. Well, just before we get started then and, obviously, we're running a little bit behind now. We were trying to catch some time over the lunch break, but I've gone to -- perhaps other folks could as well, if you're not on gallery view, perhaps you could go to gallery view instead of speaker view because it is -- we don't have our zoom host to get this stuff organized for us, and you may notice a couple of new faces. We do have one of our document managers that the camera just doesn't seem to want to
work, but I did want to take an opportunity to thank these folks.

NRCB is a relatively small organization and, you know -- and, as such, kind of operate like a small firm, when there's a big task in front of us, typically, people just step up and get the job done, and that's been the case for this hearing. So, pretty significant, you know, as it turns out, two-week plus hearing in a new format, and I think it's gone, in our view, pretty seamlessly.

And part of that is due to the fact that we've had staff that have -- that are not familiar with the hearing process and are -- because they're on the operations side of the business, by and large, they haven't done this task before.

And it's a bit of a pressure cooker for folks that are coming into something like this live, as you can imagine, and with folks wanting documents up, and, of course, we all want them up as quickly as we can, it keeps the questioning going, and, in my view, they've
can assure you, they all have their own names, thank goodness. So thank you, Ms. Kaminski, and Ms. Cundliffe. So Ms. Kaminski's in Lethbridge, Ms. Cundliffe works out of our corporate services HR out of Edmonton. Ms. Decosemo, so her camera is not working, but, Nora, is your audio working?

MS. DECOSEMO
Yes, it is, Mr. Chair. Wel1, thank you very much, Ms. Decosemo.

Ms. Taylor. Where's Ms. Taylor now? There she is now? There she is. Right on the top of my screen, at 1east. Thank you, Ms. Taylor.

And we had Ms. Gagnon who's not with us today, she's off today; and Ms. Leshchyshyn was in kind of standby to be a pinch-hitter if necessary.

So a big thank you to all you folks, and to Ms. Friend who has been doing, as a lot of you folks would know, an enormous amount of work behind the scenes all through this hearing and has really made this thing tick. So, Ms. Friend and document managers, a big thanks from the Panel and I think on behalf of all the hearing participants. So job well done. Thank you.

MS. FRIEND:
Thank you very much. It was a p1easure.

Thank you. And so I think we can get started now. If I can figure out where we're at. My information tells me that City of Calgary was not planning on providing direct on Topic 5 , but just a quick check (a) to make sure \(I\) have it right, and (b) to make sure you haven't changed your mind.

MS. SENEK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sorry, it's Ms. Senek. We're not providing any direct on this topic.

THE CHAIR:
Okay, thank you.
And Mr. Cusano?
MR. CUSANO:
Yes, sir, your assumption is correct.

THE CHAIR:
So next up, then, and I believe Ms. Louden, Mr. Rae, you are providing some direct on Topic Area 5. So the floor is yours. Who do we have with us? I'm just looking quickly because my screen is not working quite right, so.

MS. LOUDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR: There you are. I thought I had confirmation you were here, Ms. Louden.

MS. LOUDEN: Yes. I had a mute issue for a second there --

THE CHAIR: We've all had them, so. Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Louden, the floor is yours. Thank you. Please proceed.

MS. LOUDEN: Thank you. Before we jump to our witness panel for today, I just wanted to quickly request, I guess, perhaps some clarity on when we might expect a response from Alberta Transportation regarding the undertaking that was given yesterday during cross-examination, particularly regarding the Highway 22 and the high load corridor issue.

MR. KRUHLAK:
Ms. Louden, it's Ron Kruhlak speaking. I know we're endeavoring to complete a number of undertakings and have them go out in the next probably 30 to 45 minutes.

I'11 make an enquiry, if you just bear with me for half a moment whether or not that undertaking has been included in that batch.

MS. LOUDEN:
Sure. Thank you.
MR. KRUHLAK: I'11 have an enquiry made and see at what state that particular undertaking is at.

MS. LOUDEN: Thank you, Mr. Kruhlak.

So the Stoney Nakoda's witness panel today for Topic 5 includes Ms. Adena Vanderjagt. She's manager of Consulting Indigenous Services at MNP and she was contracted by the Stoney Nakoda Nations as part of their review of the SR1 project application.

Ms. Vanderjagt, are you around? Are you here?

MS. VANDERJAGT:
Yes, I'm here.
MS. LOUDEN :
I would suggest that now is the appropriate time for Ms. Vanderjagt to be sworn or affirmed.

ADENA VANDERJAGT (For Stoney Nakoda Nations), affirmed MS. LOUDEN EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. Ms. Vanderjagt, your \(C V\) is on the record as Exhibit 344. Can you confirm that your CV is accurate?
A. Yes, I confirm.
Q. And can you confirm that you were contracted by the Stoney Nakoda Nations to complete a review of the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada's environmental assessment report and potential conditions, as well as portions of Alberta Transportation's environmental impact statement relating to the SR1 project?
A. I can confirm.
Q. Can you provide a brief summary of your education and experience?
A. Yes. So my name is Adena Vanderjagt and I'm a manager with MNP Indigenous Services team specializing in The Duty to Consult.

I have a bachelor of science in geography from the University of Calgary. That was completed in 2006, and

I have 12 years' experience working in the field.
I have specialty in environmental assessment reviews through the lens of Indigenous rights, how the rights are integrated, considered, assessed and mitigated.

I've worked extensively with Métis governments, First Nations, and industry proponents. Through this work, I've conducted environmental assessment reviews using this unique lens for projects regulated provincially, federally, including Impact Assessment Agency of Canada projects, Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission projects, and Canadian Energy Regulator projects.

I've also executed and supported numerous traditional land use studies or Indigenous rights assessments for clients across Canada, including Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia.
Q. And can you just provide a brief outline of what your role was in preparing evidence on behalf of Stoney Nakoda Nations?
A. Yes. I supported the Stoney Nakoda Nations' review of the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada's environmental assessment report and potential conditions.

As part of this, \(I\) also reviewed relevant sections of the environmental impact statement as was filed with
the Impact Assessment Agency on March 29th, 2018.
And the findings of my review was compiled by the Stoney Nakoda Nations into a letter, which is listed as Exhibit 288.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Vanderjagt. You may now proceed to provide your direct evidence.
A. Thank you. Hello, and thank you to the Stoney Nakoda Nations for allowing me to participate, and thank you to the Panel and panel participants as well.

Throughout my statement, I will refer to the Stoney Nakoda Nations. This refers to the three distinct nations, Wesley First Nation, Bearspaw First Nation and Chiniki First Nation.

So my review was not conducted as a typical third-party review, which considers the validity of the biophysical or socioeconomic conclusions within the environmental impact statement and how those are characterized in the environmental assessment report and how they're addressed by the potential condition.

Instead, my review, as is typical for MNP's Duty to Consult Services, was focused on whether the project is likely to cause potential impacts on Stoney Nakoda Nations' established Section 35 rights.

The chief and councils of the Stoney Nakoda Nations have the authority to protect the collective
rights and interests of the Stoney Nakoda Nations, as recognized by Treaty 7 and the Natural Resources Transfer Act, 1930, or the NRTA, and protected by Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, which are collectively known as Section 35 rights. Therefore, the results of my review were used in formulating Exhibit Number 288.

As part of my review, \(I\) will refer to Exhibit Number 288, Number 310, Number 35, and Number 294 and 292; however, I will not require these exhibits as visual aids for the duration of my statement.

As the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada and Alberta Environment and Parks coordinated the federal and provincial EA processes to acceptance of the single EIS by the proponent to satisfy both the provincial and federal requirements and information sharing during the technical review of the EIS, my review of the EA report, EIS, and potential conditions can be considered relevant to the application.

So as part of the review, I identified six key considerations, and I'11 be going through each of them. So, one, that there was a narrow legislative view of rights; two, that there were gaps in the Stoney Nakoda Nations' land use as presented; three, that there was a
lack of consideration of perceptions and subsequent avoidance behaviours; four, that there were issues with mitigation; five, the overall significance, determination; and six, the conditions approval as they are proposed.

The first topic \(I\) will discuss is the narrow legislative view of rights. As per the EA report, the Impact Assessment Act came into force on August 2019 and CEAA 2012 was repealed. In accordance with the transitional provisions of the Impact Assessment Act the environmental assessment for the project continued under CEAA 2012. While this fact is not disputed, there have been Supreme Court of Canada decisions and the implementation of the new impact assessment agency's practitioners guide, which signals a change in direction for environmental assessments moving forward.

This change of direction includes direct consideration of Indigenous rights rather than consideration of the exercise of that right through the narrower lens of current use of 1 ands and resources for traditional purposes.

This expansion of the assessment was illustrated in Exhibit Number 288 from the Clyde River ham1et Supreme Court decision, which indicated: (as read)
"The consultation -- the consultative
enquiry is not properly into environmental effects per se. Rather, it enquires into the impact on the right itself."

This was selected as a plain reading representative quote because the Clyde River decision predated the Impact Assessment Act and it signals that the context and scope of what was being considered by proponents and the Crown in relation to rights was being further explored.

Within the Stoney Nakoda Nations' submission, an example was provided: (as read)
"SNN Section 35 right to hunt includes much more than just the activity of hunting. Nation members indicate that hunting is a central part of SNN culture. It is grounded in respect for both land and animals and it is essential to be out on the 1 and to access traditional sites both for the exercise of the right to hunt as well as passing down this knowledge to younger generations."

This means that in order to accurately assess impacts of the project on Aboriginal and Treaty rights, a term that
is used within the EA report, there must be both a consideration of the exercise of the right, for example, hunting, trapping, fishing, and gathering, as well as consideration of impacts to the cultural, social, and ceremonial components of those rights.

This can mean looking at the potential impacts to Stoney Nakoda Nations' rights. It should not be only tied to the biophysical components but expanded beyond a species lens and instead explore the conditions necessary for the exercise of the right and the preferences of the Stoney Nakoda Nation members in the exercise of those rights.

It also means interweaving information on Stoney Nakoda Nations' systems for self-governance and self-determination with respect to the management of those traditional 1 ands and resources to ensure consideration of Stoney Nakoda Nations' laws, customs, and structures is appropriately contemplated.

The second topic I'11 discuss, which is reflected within Exhibit Number 288, is gaps in the report of aspects for consideration in relation to that land use.

The reason this topic was explored was because even if Alberta Transportation did not expand their assessment to consider the broader aspects of

Stoney Nakoda Nations' rights that we just discussed, the assessment of current use of 1 and and resources for traditional purposes within the EIS was not fulsome on its own. This is evidenced by Stoney Nakoda Nations' Exhibit Number 310, as well as through data collected for NGTL CER projects, both 2021 and Edson, which provided additional traditional knowledge and use site information located within the project development area.

The previously collected 1 and and resource use information identifies general hunting, fishing, berry, plants, and medicine gathering overlapping with the project development area. In addition, the project development area intersects ceremonial areas, camping areas, sacred sites, a family camp, and a burial ground at the western tip of the bottom of the PDA.

Additionally, specific traditional knowledge collected for this project identify -- marked Stoney Nakoda Nations place names, as well as 30 SNN specific-use sites within the SR1 project development area as described in Exhibit Number 310. resource use could be the amount of land outside of the proposed 1 and use area will be inaccessible. This inaccessible nature of the land could be through legal mechanisms, such as the granting of the disposition or
similar. Increased safety restrictions that limit access or the use of firearms or preference-based avoidance from Stoney Nakoda Nations harvesters.

In order to understand the amount of 1 and that was effectively lost to Stoney Nakoda Nations, the proponent, the Government of Alberta, or the impact assessment agency could calculate the amount of land that would be inaccessible through the mechanisms above and that does not intersect with the land use area. This would allow Stoney Nakoda Nations to understand the portion of their traditional territories which can no longer be accessed in the exercise of their Section 35 rights.

The third topic within the submission was related to Stoney Nakoda Nations' preference and subsequent avoidance behaviours which can result from increased negative perceptions.

Many of the biophysical sections of the EIS, including the atmospheric, environment, hydrology, surface water quality, terrestrial landscape, fish and
consideration of current use of 1 ands and resources for traditional purposes do not consider the perception of Stoney Nakoda Nations members and how this can result in increased avoidance behaviours.

The reason this should have been considered is perceptive effects can extend beyond the identified extent of the direct effect. For example, a perceived temporary displacement due to a temporary feature will require the harvester or land user to go elsewhere in the exercise of their Section 35 rights for the duration of that activity.

Once established at this new location and assuming a new location is available, there may be reluctance by Stoney Nakoda Nations harvests to reestablish at the original locale. This would result in a permanent loss of that area. It could also result in increased costs to frequent different areas through items such as fue1, which could prohibit some Nation members from exercising their Section 35 rights.

Additionally, the perception of the original locale as being disturbed or damaged may contribute to an ongoing avoidance of that area for the exercise of Section 35 rights beyond when it is available once again. different species as the area matures, which may not hold equal value to Stoney Nakoda Nations.

Additionally, the effects duration for perception may vary from those identified for the direct effects as
perceptions may persist beyond the construction activities or flood events. This aspect was not considered within the EA report or the EIS. These examples illustrate why preference avoidance and perceptions should have been considered.

The fourth topic that \(I\) will touch upon from the review is mitigation. The issues found within the review of mitigation are twofold.

One, because potential impacts to Stoney Nakoda Nations' Section 35 rights were not assessed fully as part of the EIS through consideration of the full scope of Stoney Nakoda Nation rights, no mitigation has been developed in partnership with Stoney Nakoda Nations to address those specific impacts.

And, two, some of the proposed mitigation for the project-related impacts may result in unanticipated impacts to Stoney Nakoda Nations, and this also was not considered.

For the first of these issues, as impacts to Stoney Nakoda Nations' Section 35 rights were not considered in relation to preference-based impacts which could result in avoidance behaviours or a quantification of 1 and to which Stoney Nakoda Nations has a right of access which may be impaired by the project or the social or ceremonial cultural aspects of the

Stoney Nakoda Nations' rights -- because these were not contemplated, mitigation for these impacts was not developed.

For example, the project conditions do not contemplate offsetting land lost outside of the land use area, which could speak to the portion of the project development area which can no longer be accessed for the exercise of Section 35 rights.

Another issue with mitigation, as stated previously, was that some of the proposed mitigations for the project-related impacts could result in unintended impacts to Stoney Nakoda Nations. For example, within atmospheric conditions, one such mitigation identified is the reestablishment of vegetation cover on the deposited sediment post-construction.

The inter \(\begin{gathered}\text { uption time between existing vegetation }\end{gathered}\) and reestablishment should have been considered in terms of an interruption in the exercise of rights. This
 Stoney Nakoda Nations harvesters and 1 and users from this locale which they may or may not return to.

Another mitigation proposed which may have unintended impacts on Stoney Nakoda Nations' Section 35 rights is the usage of chemical dust suppressants which
would be applied to haul roads as an alternative option to watering and applied on an as-needed basis during high wind conditions. This could result in negative perceptions to Stoney Nakoda Nations' harvesters and land users which could result in avoidance of the area.

Additionally, a further mitigation of herbicide/weed control being used to promote successful revegetation of traditional plants is incongruent with the Stoney Nakoda Nations' Section 35 right. Perception of contamination will render the successfully revegetated traditional plants unusable for traditional purposes as real or perceived contamination of replanted species means those species cannot be used.

The fifth topic \(I\) will touch upon and is related to --

THE CHAIR:
Sorry, Ms. Vanderjagt, I'm just making sure that Ms. Vespa -- you're speaking fairly quickly, but just making sure it's all good there.

You're good, Ms. Vespa?
THE COURT REPORTER: If she could slow down a bit, that would be helpful, but \(I\) am --

THE CHAIR:
Yes, keeping up.
Just a little bit maybe. Thanks a lot.
A. I'11 try my best.

THE CHAIR: Al1 right, yes. Thank you.
A. The fifth topic \(I\) will touch upon and related to mitigation is issues identified in our review with the potential conditions of approval. The concerns with the potential conditions can be categorized as:

One, since the assessment of potential impacts to Stoney Nakoda Nations' Section 35 rights and development of mitigation was incomplete, there is also an incomplete consideration of potential conditions to address these impacts or implement mitigations.

And two, reasonable capacity must be included as a condition of approval to ensure Stoney Nakoda Nations' participation in all the identified opportunities for involvement.

Conditions of approval should be drafted in order to allow Stoney Nakoda Nations a meaningful voice in the construction and operation of the project.

One example of a condition resulting from an assessment of potential impacts to Stoney Nakoda Nations' Section 35 rights could be a calculation of 1and impacted outside of the land use area and application of an appropriate condition of approval to offset that loss of 1 and.

In relation to reasonable capacity, the conditions of approval outline many opportunities for Stoney Nakoda Nations' involvement. A condition of
approval must be applied that requires a provision of reasonable capacity funding to support involvement in these additional opportunities or it is rendered meaningless, because Stoney Nakoda Nations does not have internal capacity to support this level of post-approval involvement.

An example of why Stoney Nakoda Nations' involvement is critical would be the fish through web sampling. Stoney Nakoda Nations' involvement would ensure that fish of importance to Stoney Nakoda Nations are considered. As for culturally considered species, proxies are not appropriate.

Finally, the last topic \(I\) will touch upon is the overall significance determination. Residual environmental effects from the project in relation to Section 5 of CEAA 2012 to current use of 1 and and resources or traditional purposes by Indigenous people were identified as part of the assessment process. However, the agency concluded that considering the implementation of key mitigation and follow-up program significant adverse environmental effects, as defined under CEAA 2012.

The rationale used to identify a lack of significance does not correlate to the exercise of
rights specifically.
Within Exhibit Number 35 at page 14.84, the EIS determined that: (as read)
"The effects of the project on TLRU will not result in the long-term loss of availability of traditional use resources or access to 1 ands currently relied on for traditional use practices or the permanent loss of traditional use sites and areas in the RAA."

This dismisses the importance of specific sites in the exercise of harvesting rights, as well as the current levels of development which exist within the regional assessment area.

This assertation is made without a quantitative calculation of unoccupied Crown land or private land to which Stoney Nakoda Nations has a right of access, and, instead, relies on the assumption that, because of the availability of traditional use resources within the regional assessment area, this would not constitute a 1ong-term loss.

However, availability of resources does not correlate with the ability to exercise a right, as there numerous other factors including the availability of the land in question, and the preferences of 1 and users
which can inform potential avoidance behaviours. Therefore, the significance determination should include consideration on how Stoney Nakoda Nation Section 35 rights may be more vulnerable to the effects of the project when they are added to or interact with the existing displacement within the baseline conditions.

Previous Stoney Nakoda Nation's experience and previous work on projects north and south of the project development area have shown that unoccupied Crown 1 and and private land to which Stoney Nakoda Nations has a right of access to is limited. This has resulted in Stoney Nakoda Nation's harvesters and 1 and users already being displaced.

Even the minimal loss presented by the project is a meaningful change which must be quantified, considered, mitigated and discussed as part of the EA report and potential conditions. Additionally, the determination of significance does not account for the location sensitivity of cultural activities.

In previous work completed by the Stoney Nakoda Nations, it was noted by participants that ceremonial, cultural, or sacred places are immovable. This is reflected in Exhibit 294 and 292.

Once the site is disturbed or destroyed, it is culturally lost. This is reflected in Exhibit Number

294 and 292 as well. This does not appear to have been considered by the significance determination by Alberta Transportation and must be incorporated into the significance determination by the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada within the EA report. The process of identifying significance should be iterative and include input from the Stoney Nakoda Nations.

As the Stoney Nakoda Nations were not fully involved in the assessment of potential impacts to their Section 35 rights, nor in the development of mitigation, the process for determination of significance currently includes gaps.

As discussed in the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada's Practitioner's Guide to the Impact Assessment Act, aspects of Stoney Nakoda Nation's Section 35 rights should have been considered as part of the assessment and link back to criteria which can help define the severity of impact, including a discussion of how the project may impact Stoney Nakoda Nations' ability to continue customs, traditions, and practices that are integral to the Stoney Nakoda Nation's distinct culture.

A discussion of how existing exercise of Section 35 rights may be more vulnerable to the effects of the project when the effects are added to an interaction with the baseline condition and a discussion of how the
project may impact Stoney Nakoda Nation's system for self-governance and self-determination with respect to the management of traditional land and resources, taking into consideration Stoney Nakoda Nation's laws, customs, structures, and structures of the community.

Thank you for your time, Pane1 members and participants. And thank you to Stoney Nakoda Nations for providing me with the opportunity to review these filings on their behalf.

This concludes the information related to my review.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Much appreciated.
And, Ms. Louden, there is no other direct you have at this time?

MS. LOUDEN: That is correct, sir.
THE CHAIR:
Okay.
Thank you, and Mr. Secord, did you have any cross?
MR. SECORD: No, sir. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Mr. Williams?
MR. WILLIAMS: No, no cross.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Wagner?
MR. WAGNER:
Sorry, Mr. Chair, no questions.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Senek, City of Calgary?
MS. SENEK: No questions. Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Mr. Cusano.

MR. CUSANO
No thank you, sir.
THE CHAIR:
And Mr. Kruhlak?
MR. KRUHLAK:
Yes, sir, I'11 have some questions.

Are we now fully operating? I'm now sort of set up at Mr. Svenson's station, so I'11 go under an alias.

THE CHAIR:
I see that, Mr. Svenson. I think we're good.

Did we lose Mr. Kruhlak?
Mr. Wiebe, I think you're back; is that right?
MR. WIEBE:
Yeah, technical difficulties have been resolved.

THE CHAIR:
Great. Now, can you -- should we just continue this way for now then, and can get Mr. Kruhlak back into the meeting, he can just join back afterwards then?

MR. WIEBE:
Yes. He can just join again.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. And can you get us back to your normal great job of getting the speakers and panels identified on the --

MR. WIEBE:
Oh yeah, absolutely.
THE CHAIR:
Great. Thanks a lot, Mr. Wiebe.
MR. KRUHLAK:
I take it we have the ability to pu11 up documents.

THE CHAIR: We do. Ms. Tay1or, I think -- do

I have that right? Ms. Taylor, you're on this afternoon?

MS. TAYLOR:
Yes, I am, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Ready to go?
MS. TAYLOR:
I am.
THE CHAIR:
Great. Thank you.
Okay, Mr. Kruhlak, the floor is yours.
MR. KRUHLAK: With all of that, sir, I'm just asking if I could maybe take two minutes before I just start. Just grabbing some other material and checking on something. Would that be all right?

THE CHAIR:
Yes, take a couple of minutes.
Thank you.
And, Mr. Kruhlak, that will give you -- or, sorry, Mr. Wiebe, that will give you a chance to get the panel view up.

My apologies, Ms. Vanderjagt, am I pronouncing that properly?

So, Mr. Wiebe, if we could have Ms. Vanderjagt and Ms. Kruhlak up on speaker view if you could.

Mr. Wiebe, maybe at the break, Mr. Kruhlak may want to sign back in because, for whatever reason, he was out and then he couldn't get back in while you were gone, so.

MR. WIEBE:
No worries. We'11 get that
addressed.
THE CHAIR: Thank you.
MR. KRUHLAK: Mr. Chairman, I'm back if it's now appropriate to proceed.

THE CHAIR: Yes, please proceed. Thank you.
MR. KRUHLAK CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. Ms. Vanderjagt, good afternoon.
A. Good afternoon.
Q. Looking at your CV that you were referred to, I take it you started doing some work for the Stoney Nakoda Nations in 2019?
A. Yes. MNP, as a whole, does work with the Stoney Nakoda Nations, but I myself personally in 2019.
Q. And that was on the TransMountain project?
A. Yes.
Q. And you weren't asked to provide any assistance on this project, SR1?
A. The only assistance \(I\) was asked to provide was the review of the environmental assessment report, the review of the potential conditions, and the --

COURT REPORTER: Sorry, we lost the end of your answer there. You said "the review of the potential conditions" and then we lost your answer.
A. And the submission of the same.
Q. MS. KRUHLAK:

You didn't prepare the interim
traditional land use report that was submitted by the Stoney Nakoda Nations in these proceedings?
A. No, I did not.
Q. And you referred to the other reports from MNP dealing with the NOVA gas transmission project, the pipeline that are filed as part of the Stoney Nakoda Nations' submissions. But you weren't involved in those projects at all, were you?
A. No, I was not.
Q. Is it fair to say you've not conducted any site visits of the Springbank area, the project development area, as part of your evidence?
A. Yes, that's fair.
Q. And what did you -- and maybe I'11 just back up.

You've essentially reviewed with us this afternoon -- you've taken us through your, I guess, this letter, Exhibit 288; that's correct?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. And this letter indicates that it was signed by Dean Cherkas who was director of consultation with Stoney Tribal Administration, but then do I take to understand that you actually wrote this letter?
A. We contributed to the letter. We conducted a review of the EA report, and the potential conditions which will be submitted to the Impact Assessment Agency, and that
review contributed to this letter.
Q. So for purposes of your submissions to the Board, you've not prepared any independent report that's been tendered to the NRCB?
A. No, that's correct.
Q. Now, in preparing this assessment, have you reviewed the reply document, Exhibit 324 , that was prepared by Alberta Transportation in responding to some of the concerns of the Stoney Nakoda Nations?
A. Yes, I did review that.
Q. Okay. I'11 take you to that shortly.

So in your review, Exhibit 288, you identified that -- as I understand it, there's some deficiencies in the materials of Alberta Transportation because they failed to include sufficient input from the Stoney Nakoda Nations. Do I have that right?
A. Yes, and that there wasn't fulsome consideration of the Stoney Nakoda Nations' rights.
Q. Could I have pulled up, please, document manager, Exhibit -- just give me a moment here -- Alberta

Transportation reply, which is Exhibit 324 ?
And if you could turn, please, to PDF 8. If you could scroll down. I'd just like to review with you Ms. Vanderjagt paragraph 14.

So it says: (as read)
"Under cover letter dated December 4, 2017, AT provided the traditional land and resource use (the TLRU) sections of the October 2017 EIA and requested comments by January 5, 2018. In a letter dated January 15, 2018, Rae and Company wrote to CEAA and provided some comments on the original EIA. All questions and concerns listed in this letter have been responded to by AT."
Do you see that?
A. Yes, I see.
Q. And it says "refer to the SCRT." Did you review that?
A. No, I did not.
Q. And as the document here I'm referring to, this appendix, is largely taken from the record of consultation. Did you review that in preparing your letter and report today?
A. I did not.
Q. If I take you to paragraph 15: (as read)
"Under cover letter dated January 26, 2018, AT notified Stoney Nakoda Nation that project timelines had been extended by 60 days to undertake further
Indigenous engagement activities. AT
proposed holding a full day TLRU
workshop to gather feedback from
Stoney Nakoda Nation to incorporate into the revised EIA. Under cover dated February 6, 2018, the revised draft TLRU sections were provided for comment.

TLRU workshops were held with Stoney Nakoda Nation on February 12th, 2018, and March 20th, 2018.

Stoney Nakoda Nation did not provide permission to use the information collected at these workshops for the EIA."

Were you aware that?
A. I did review this document, so I was aware, yes.
Q. Did you make enquiries why that information wasn't provided?
A. No, I did not.
Q. So if that information was provided, would it address some of the gaps you referred to in your letter report,
A. I'm not aware of what information would have been included in what was not provided, but there is potential that it could have addressed Item Number 2, which is gaps in the Stoney Nakoda Nations' land use.

But, again, I'm not aware of what the information is that was not provided.
Q. Paragraph 16, if I could scroll over there, reads much of seeking the additional information and addressing it.

And then if I could just take you to paragraph 17, and I won't take you through entire appendix which cites different interactions between AT and the Stoney Nakoda Nations, but paragraph says: (as read) "AT sent a letter dated January 28, 2019, requesting information to assist in responding to CEAA ( \(\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{A}\) ) information requests..."

And it lists several IRs:
"...Stoney Nakoda Nation did not respond to this request for information. Below is an excerpt from the January 28th, 2019, 1etter."

And then the balance of this paragraph quotes from the 1etter seeking input on Number 1. It says: (as read)
"Please provide your views on the nature and extent of Stoney Nakoda Nations' Aboriginal and Treaty rights and how the project may adversely impact these rights."
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & & Do you see that? \\
\hline 2 & A. & Yes, I see that. \\
\hline 3 & Q. & And Number 2: (as read) \\
\hline 4 & & "Please discuss potential effects of the \\
\hline 5 & & project on cultural and experiential \\
\hline 6 & & values, including changes to cultural or \\
\hline 7 & & spiritual connections to the land and \\
\hline 8 & & water, and changes in cultural land use \\
\hline 9 & & and experience of traditional use. For \\
\hline 10 & & example, cultural identity, \\
\hline 11 & & intergeneration transfer of knowledge, \\
\hline 12 & & governance, quiet enjoyment of the \\
\hline 13 & & 1and." \\
\hline 14 & & Do you see that? \\
\hline 15 & A. & Yes, I see that. \\
\hline 16 & Q. & And: (as read) \\
\hline 17 & & "Please discuss the importance of \\
\hline 18 & & country foods in the project area to the \\
\hline 19 & & Stoney Nakoda Nations, including what \\
\hline 20 & & country foods within the project area \\
\hline 21 & & are relied on and how country foods \\
\hline 22 & & within the project area contribute to \\
\hline 23 & & physical, mental, and spiritual \\
\hline 24 & & wellbeing." \\
\hline 25 & & Do you see that? \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. So you'd agree, Ms. Vanderjagt, that had some of this information been provided, it might well have addressed some of the gaps or deficiencies you identified in this 1etter report dated -- or Exhibit \(288 ?\)
A. Yes, I do agree that had this information been provided, it would have addressed many of the issues. Unfortunately, I'm not speaking to this specific instance because I'm not aware of the capacity provided by Alberta Transportation to Stoney Nakoda Nations.

But in many cases, these asks are put forth by proponents without sufficient capacity provided to the Nations in order to provide that information back or there may be other contributing factors.
Q. Fair enough. And you weren't advised that there was actually funding available for the Stoney Nakoda Nations to complete this work? They were given a budget and advanced monies, and there were still monies available to them that they did not request?
A. I have no insight into the financial status or agreements.
Q. I'd just 1 ike to return to your Exhibit 288 for a moment. In discussing the significance determination, you mentioned on PDF 5 of this exhibit -- and I don't know that we need to bring it up this moment -- Zoom
host, you could probably take down this document that I had -- yes, thanks -- that you indicated previous SNN experience in previous work on projects north and south of the project area is shown on unoccupied Crown land and private land to which the SNN has a right of access is limited. Do you recall explaining that to the Board?
A. Yes.
Q. And I take it what you're referring to there is the NOVA Gas pipeline projects?
A. Yes.
Q. And you're aware those projects were on Crown land?
A. They were -- there was portions of the projects on Crown land and portions of the project not as well.
Q. And are you aware that essentially almost all of this project is on private land? There's a very small portion of Crown land?
A. Yes, I am aware.
Q. You make reference to perceptions and avoidance. You didn't conduct an avoidance survey, did you?
A. No, not for this project.
Q. And you'd agree with me that the interim land use assessment that was tendered by the Stoney Nakoda Nations made no reference to avoidance?
A. Yes, I agree.
Q. Now, zoom host, could I ask you to pull up this letter that we've been talking about, Exhibit 288, please?

Now, this is the letter that you read from, Ms. Vanderjagt.

Could I ask you to turn to, zoom host, the maps starting at PDF 9?

So this is what I believe, Ms. Vanderjagt -you're looking at a map that depicts burial grounds and medicine-gathering sites by the Stoney Nakoda Nations; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And I take it you prepared this map?
A. MNP prepared this map, yes.
Q. And it shows -- if the green area, as I see on this, is the project site, there's a very small intersection at the far western tip, southwestern tip of the project development area and the identification here, burial grounds; correct?
A. Yes, correct.
Q. Okay. If I could then turn to the next PDF, 10, please?

This map was also prepared by MNP?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is -- I take it this is the first that I -that you're aware of that this information was
transmitted to Alberta Transportation under -- with the -- under this report dated February 26, 2021?
A. Yes. It was previously collected information that was provided in that submission.
Q. I'm just a little confused when I look at this map. Under the legend, Ms. Vanderjagt, it says "SNN TLU. NGTL 2021." I just thought that acronym for NGTL appears to be the NOVA Gas line. Isn't that it?
A. Yes, that's correct. The previously collected data that's displayed was collected for that project, and if you refer back to the one before, the previously collected data \(I\) believe was from the west path project.
Q. So this is data collected from other projects, it's just superimposed over the project development area?
A. Yes. It was to illustrate gaps in the un -traditional land use information collected.
Q. And just so I'm -- make sure I understand. So the information \(I\) see here, is this supported by site assessment reports?
A. Not for the Springbank project.
Q. Okay. Ms. Vanderjagt, was MNP also responsible for preparing the -- the review of the environmental impact assessment that was tendered as part of the Stoney Nakoda's submissions?

1 A. We were not.
Q. Okay. So the response that is within Alberta Transportation's response document, Exhibit 324 to the concerns raised, that didn't involve MNP at all?
A. No, we only supported the development of Exhibit Number 288.

MR. KRUHLAK: Mr. Chairman, if you just give me a moment, I'm just going to check my notes before I wrap up.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, sir.
MR. KRUHLAK:
Zoom host, you can remove that exhibit that's on the screen. Thank you.
Q. Ms. Vanderjagt, I also see that you've, in your report, suggested some mitigation and steps that could be taken to address what you identified, some of the deficiencies?
A. Yes.
Q. And in that regard, are you aware of the efforts to create a future land use plan that can attempt to safeguard traditional uses on the land by Indigenous
A. Yes, I am aware of that plan.
Q. Have you reviewed the draft guiding principles and direction for land use?
A. I have not.
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Q. I'd also like to refer you to the opening statement that was tendered by Alberta Transportation, which is Exhibit 353.

Are you aware that Alberta Transportation has already undertaken to facilitate additional site visits to the Stoney Nakoda Nations before constructions to review habitations and camping areas and ceremonial and sacred sites that were identified in the interim traditional land use report?
A. I am aware through viewing the hearing that that is something that's been undertaken.
Q. And as you sometimes carry out consultation work for proponents, you would agree with me that's certainly a sound and reasonable approach at this stage?
A. It is a reasonable approach for AT to take. It's also reasonable for Stoney Nakoda to continue to oppose the project despite those attempts.
Q. Regardless of what is -- what efforts are made, it should continue to oppose the project, is that what you're saying?
A. No. I'm saying that the procedural aspects of consultation aside, there may still be objections that cannot be addressed through process alone.
Q. Okay. But you've suggested in your report some appropriate mitigation?
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1 A. Yes.
Q. And you would also recognize that in this same Exhibit 353, Alberta Transportation's already endeavored to assist the Stoney Nakoda Nations in completing and finalizing their traditional land use assessment and invites them to submit the final report for response, review, and to address appropriate mitigation?
A. Yes, I'm aware of that.
Q. Thank you, Ms. Vanderjagt, I think those are my questions of you.

MR. KRUHLAK:
Just before I conclude, I will just advise Ms. Louden that I believe that undertaking you requested should be -- have been sent to you. If not by now, it should be momentarily. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Kruhlak. That is all the questions from Alberta Transportation then?

MR. KRUHLAK: That's correct, sir.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
Ms. Vance, do you have any questions from the

MS. VANCE:
I don't. Thank you, sir.
THE CHAIR:
MR. KENNEDY: And me neither, thank you.
THE CHAIR:
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7 THE CHAIR: Ms. Vanderjagt. Thank you very much. And thank you, Ms. Louden. Do you have --

MS. LOUDEN :
Yes, thank you, sir.
Sorry, I was going to ask if you have any redirect.

MS. LOUDEN:
I do not. And my apologies, my video says "unable to start," so you cannot see me, but we do not have any redirect.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. And do you -- I can hear you fine, so that's good. Thank you, Ms. Louden. And I would like to thank -- this is your last opportunity, on the direct at least, on -- for the topics, so thank you, Mr. Rae, and your pane1 members for participation at the hearing. All did a great job. And a special thanks to Elders Holloway, Wesley, and Snow for their participation and also their prayers. So thank you very much, and please pass along the Panel's thank yous to them as well.
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MS. LOUDEN:
We will do so. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Okay. We can then move on to SCLG with Mr. Secord. Or I'm assuming it's Mr. Secord, un1ess it's Ms. Okoye.

MR. SECORD :
Sure. I've got one preliminary matter, and then Ms. Okoye will be doing the direct.

I sent to Ms. Friend transcript corrections from Dr. Fenne11. You will recall yesterday that he had an undertaking to review the transcript and make any corrections as a result of that clay/till correction to Slide 14 in his PowerPoint. I just wonder whether those transcript corrections could be marked as an exhibit?

THE CHAIR:
Everyone has received those, and if so, any objections?

MR. BARBERO: Mr. Chair, Michael Barbero, McLennan Ross. We've received them just in the last few minutes, so I've not a chance to review them, but no objection to them going in as an exhibit, sir.

THE CHAIR:
Any other objections? Not other, but any objections? Thank you.

Okay. Thank you. Ms. Friend, what number would that be?

MS. FRIEND:
Okay. The next number is 400

THE CHAIR:
We've made it to 400.
MS. FRIEND:
Is that a good thing or not?
THE CHAIR:
I'm not sure, actually.
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MR. SECORD:
I'11 turn it over Ms. Okoye. And I think we may be splitting our panel up, but, Ms. Okoye, over to you.

THE CHAIR:
And, Ms. Okoye and Mr. Secord, you had 60 minutes. Is that still your intention to have this completed within the 60 minutes? I think \(I\) have that right.

MR. SECORD:
Ms. Okoye?
MS. OKOYE:
Yes. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair.
Yes, that is the intention, but there is a slight modification to that.

Dr. Osko has a family emergency, a medical emergency that he needs to attend to, so we are proposing, if that's okay with you, to have him give his evidence and then get cross-examined, and then he can proceed, and then we can deal with the rest our witness pane1, if that's acceptable.

MR. BARBERO:
Mr. Chair, Michae1 Barbero, Alberta Transportation. Yes, of course, we're happy to accommodate that, absolutely.

MS. OKOYE:
Okay, thank you.

Thank you. Please proceed on that basis, thank you.

MS. OKOYE:
Thank you. So I'11 first propose that we -- Dr. Terry. Dr. Terry, I believe you want to be affirmed?
T. OSKO (For SCLG), affirmed

MS. OKOYE EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. MS. OKOYE: So Dr. Osko is a professiona1 agrologist and a wildlife ecologist, and he reviewed the project's potential to introduce weeds, the impacts of weeds on 1 and use and the necessity for weed management in the project area.

Dr. Osko, I'm referring you to your CV filed as Exhibit 274 and your report filed as 273. Were these documents prepared by you or under your direction or control?
A. Yes, they were.
Q. Are there any changes that you would like to make to the documents at this time?
A. No.
Q. Are they accurate to the best of your knowledge and
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> belief?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you adopt them as your evidence, part of your evidence in this proceeding?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Do you acknowledge that you have a duty to provide opinion evidence to the Board that is fair, objective, and non-partisan?
A. Yes.
Q. Please provide the Board with a brief summary of your professional qualifications and experience.
A. Certainly. I have a PhD from the University of Alberta in wildlife ecology and management in addition to master's and bachelor's degrees in agriculture, specializing in rangeland management and animal science.

I've operated a consulting business since 1994, through which I have developed, coordinated, and executed applied research programs for energy-related construction and reclamation producing best practices for industry.

I've completed studies of long-term vegetation responses to industrial disturbances, reclamation treatments, and wildlife grazing, and I have completed wildiffe habitat studies.

I have developed various forest reclamation monitoring protocols, contributed to the forested -- contributed to forested land management, completed rangeland vegetation surveys and management plans, and conducted pre-disturbance land assessment and clubroot management surveys on agricultural lands.

I've previously collaborated with various government agencies, industry partners, NGOs, and First Nations groups.

I have previously appeared as an expert witnesses on noxious weeds and invasive speeds before the Alberta Surface Rights Board and the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada Joint Review Panel.

I also continue to operate a small farm with my family since 1998.

As mentioned, a full copy of my CV has been included at Exhibit 274.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Osko. Could you please provide the Board an overview of your evidence and findings in this matter.
A. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair and Pane1 members, and I appreciate the accommodation you've given me to be cross-examined immediately.

I'd like to begin by making some general observations about weeds and how the issue of weeds and
invasive species seems to be generally treated in Alberta

Weed prevention and management is much more difficult than most people typically consider. The evidence for that is weeds seem to be everywhere. So I doubt that there is a major project in Alberta where the proponents have not promised to meet the Alberta Weed Control Act regulations or to follow standard weed management practices such as using licensed herbicide applicator.

The question, then, is how has that worked out. Well, just as I -- as I just said, weeds seem to be everywhere. So promising to adhere to provincial weed regulations has not prevented weeds from showing up on major projects in Alberta, and it's doubtful that it has prevent weeds from escaping the boundaries of those projects.

The facts that weeds seem to be everywhere probably contributes to the general lack of seriousness given to that issue. So I'd like to state upfront that intentions for control and management of weeds, but I would like to refer here to a few of the replies provided by AT in my evidence report that support the notion that weeds are generally not taken that

So I'm referring here to Exhibit 325, PDF page 57, in paragraph 203, AT states that had I -- (as read)
"Had Dr. Osko completed a baseline
study, that (I) would know that weeds are already present in the LAA and RAA." The fact of the matter is that \(I\) knew full well that weeds existed in the LAA and the RAA by examining AT's baseline study, and I quoted data from their baseline study in my report.

But the point is not whether weeds already exist within the LAA and RAA but whether the project will exacerbate or multiply the existence of weeds in those areas and impose additional weed management burdens to adjacent landowners and municipalities as well as additional ecological burdens to sensitive 1 andscapes.

And the evidence that weeds are not taken that seriously is that no one would make a similar argument for any other parameter. For example, no one would dismiss the pollution potential of an additional industry discharging into a river by saying that the river is already polluted, yet it seems okay to argue that since weeds already exist in an area, we can introduce another potential source of weeds onto the landscape. That argument does not follow.

This argument was repeated in the context of releasing weed seeds from the water -- with water from the reservoir in paragraph \(207(i i)\) on page 295. AT states: (as read)
"AT does not accept that the released water, a source of which is the Elbow River, will be an additional source of weed seed distribution when returned to the Elbow River. Released water will likely contain weed seeds when diverted. Many of the weeds observed in the PDA during baseline project surveys are also capable of wind and animal dispersal and are likely currently present downstream of the PDA."

So the last sentence is pretty much the same argument I described above, which, again, is a non sequitur.

But I'd like to focus on the first two sentences where AT argues that since weeds came in with the river water, it is perfectly fine to release them with the river water. Now -- and my question, is there any other potentially harmful material to which this argument would apply?

For example, if a couple of barrels of aviation
fue1 dislodged from a forest refue1 cash by flood waters ended up in the reservoir, AT would not simply toss them over the dam under the pretense that it came in with the river water and therefore they can go back in the river. But even natural materials such as driftwood would not managed in this way. Uprooted trees and other debris would not be collected from reservoir and tossed back into the river, yet somehow it's acceptable to release noxious and prohibited noxious weeds now under AT or perhaps AEP control back into the river.

Finally in paragraph 204 on page 57, AT seems to argue that I'm expecting too much as an EIA process stating: (as read)
"With respect \(\operatorname{Dr}\). Osko fails to account for the context of the EIA and the level
of detail that goes into such a
document. The EIA sets out standard
practices at a level of detail that is
commensurate with an environmental
impact assessment. Refinement and
further development of the exact
approaches to be taken were not
evaluated beyond consideration of the
potential effects."
So I'd like to channel a little bit of Ms. Beckmann's
presentation from Tuesday here where she argued that the EIS did not provide enough information for the Stoney Nakoda people to adequately assess the effects of the project on their particular concerns of interest.

In much the same way \(I\) found there to be much too little information for me to be confident in AT's conclusions regarding the effects of the SR1 project on weed introduction and dispersal.

So based on AT's argument in paragraph 204, weed concerns actually may not be taken seriously enough by the EIA process, if not by AT. In any case, I'm puzzled that, on the one hand, there was insufficient information presented within the EIA for a third-party assessor to be confident that potential impacts regarding weeds were adequately assessed and mitigated while, on the other hand, the proponent can confidently state that impacts are minimal based on the same insufficiency of information.

When it comes to weed management, most actions tend to be reactive rather than preventative, even though prevention has been proven to produce better results at less costs.

AT has recognized that the project has the potential to introduce weeds in several ways and alter native vegetation communities.

AT has also proposed some measures to prevent introduction of weeds onto the project area, but most of the proposed mitigations focused on reactive management of weeds once they've established.

The most glaring omission in AT's proposed mitigations was any measures whatsoever for the prevention of weed dispersal beyond the project area. For example, AT stated that vehicles and equipment would be weed free upon arrival to site but did not mention anything about cleaning the vehicles leaving the site, even though they acknowledge that the soils that they'11 be disturbing will contain weed seeds or other bad parts.

Mr. De Carlo confirmed yesterday that there were no plans as yet for cleaning vehicles or equipment leaving the site.

Another serious concern that was sparsely addressed was the post-flood sediments where weed invasions could potentially explode. AT proposed very little to prevent this specific threat, including such passive potential strategies as doing nothing and waiting to see what happens, which belies a sense that AT does not really know what to do about the flood sediments. Being ill-prepared for the eventuality of explosive weed invasion will quite certainly result in spread of the
problem to adjacent lands.
Finally, AT mentioned monitoring and adaptive management as part of their mitigation strategy.

As Dr. Fenne11 remarked on Tuesday, monitoring is not mitigation, and by the time you detect things, it can be too late. Waiting to see what happens before applying the weed management practice of the day can predictably result in the problem getting out of hand and escaping beyond an agency's designated jurisdictional boundary.

Proactively researching and preparing preemptive plans will reduce that risk, yet most of what I've read and heard so far points to the wait-and-see option, notwithstanding some of the clarifications \(I\) heard this morning.

I gave an overview of the economic and ecological consequences of weeds in my report. The consequences of weed invasion can range from a mere nuisance, such as weeds in your lawn or garden, to wholesale alteration of ecosystems where changes to vegetation communities and soils prevent return to pre-existing natural condition within reasonable human timeframes.

Of relevance to this project is the ecological context within which the project will exist.

The project is situated along a major river that
provides valued fisheries and other important ecological goods and services.

The project is also situated within an area of high conservation value lands, including diminishing fescue grasslands of a type that do not occur elsewhere in Canada, thereby increasing the cultural as well as the ecological value of these lands.

Such context raises the importance of weed and invasive species' prevention and management for this project in comparison to other projects situated in less restricted to the LAA.

The project is likely to result in perpetual discharge or dispersal of small quantities of weeds and invasive plant propagules during dry operations interspersed with bursts of greater dispersals during
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construction and post-flood events.
In any case, weed dispersals from the project area can be expected to be in excess of the base line conditions resulting in increased ecological burden to adjacent lands and increase financial burden to their occupants or stewards.

AT, having concluded that weed impacts would be restricted to the LAA, leaves the impression that those imposed burdens will be of no concern to AT.

My report introduced concepts for comprehensive weed management that integrate preventative and control measures based on weed species' ecological and dispersal mechanisms. Specifically, knowledge of dispersal mechanisms can inform both search efforts for the control of existing weeds as well as the development of interventional practices to disrupt dispersal mechanisms and prevent weed spread.

These can and need to be applied at both the local and regional scales to adequately prevent weed invasions, reduce the impacts of invasions when they do occur, and increase the resiliency of already invaded lands to future invasions.

Many resources exist from organizations within Alberta and from other jurisdictions that can be modelled for adoption for this project.

As I mentioned earlier, \(I\) do not doubt it in the least AT's good intentions for management and control of weeds and invasive species; however, merely adhering to standard practice will result in increased weed establishment and spread beyond the project boundaries.

Should the SR1 project be approved, it represents an opportunity to do better in protecting Alberta lands from invasive species.

Given the context of the specific location, it would be a shame that AT did not demonstrate leadership in establishing a better than standard practice for the protection of 1 ands on behalf of Albertans.

That concludes the summary of my evidence.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Osko. I believe you have been following the proceedings to date, including reviewing transcripts of proceedings from cross-examination of pane1 members?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any comments to make regarding AT panel experts' responses to cross-examination questions?
A. Yes, \(I\) have a number of responses or comments.

So, first, regarding weed-free materials.
The AT panel stated yesterday that it is not possible to acquire weed-free aggregate. That is probably true with respect to certified weed-free
material. However, I understand the M.D. of Ranch1and Number 66 has a gravel pit inspection program which demonstrates that diligence and responsible selection of material sources, the lowest risk for weed introduction, is still an obvious option. I would recommend that AT entertain such options.

Regarding the flood berm construction materials, Mr . Wood stated yesterday that most of the materials for construction at the floodplain berm will be sourced locally there, which contradicts the written statement regarding such materials in the project description, which is Exhibit 20 , PDF page 85 which states: (as read)
"The berm will be constructed from soil
material excavated from the diversion channe1 and hauled to site."

So there may be an appendix somewhere indicating this change, but \(I\) could not locate it. Furthermore, I did not come across any figures that identify or source the location local to the berm. So this is frustrating in that it's difficult to assess something that is different from what is stated in the written materials.

In addition, using a source local to the berm location would likely raise some additional questions for me that \(I\) can't look into now because \(I\) don't know anything about that source, its location or what's to be
done at the borrow site.
The next comment is with respect to the discharge of weeds with river water and the reservoir relative to the Weed Control Act. And I just want to return to this briefly.

It just seems to me that having taken custody of weed seeds with the diverted water, the operator has also taken responsibility for them. As such, it would be an abdication of that responsibility to just release them from the reservoir with the diverted water.

I understand that filtration raises design concerns in the flood discharge situation, not to mention the impact on fish, but, nevertheless, this seems to be the one that needs to be considered.
Q. Thank you, Doctor.
A. There's one more.
Q. Okay.
A. Finally, I'd just like to address some of Mr. De Carlo's responses regarding potential weed dispersal from the project area during cross-examination yesterday which seemed to affirm to me that any mitigation of potential weed escape from the project was willfully omitted. Furthermore, his comments implied abdication of responsibility for escape of weeds from the site.

I'd just like to use an illustration. Alberta Transportation has stated in their assessments that weed seeds will be present in the existing topsoil seed bank. AT has stated that they are going to place that weed-seed-bearing soil on the slopes of a 4-kilometre long earthen dam. It further stated that there is erosion risk to the surface soil applied to that dam.

Finally, they'11 replace drainage ditches at the bases of that dam to collect runoff water coming off of the slopes, and they' 11 discharge that water into the downstream system. So it's perfectly obvious that weed-seed-1aden soil will wash into these drainage ditches from the dam slopes and be discharged into the river and be transported who knows, how far, or where.

So based on the reference in my report, weed seeds occur in soil at an abundance of about 30,000 to 80,000 seeds per metre squared, but that number can easily double.

According to Exhibit 180, PDF page 190, the surface area of the off-stream dam was at least 585,000 metres squared. This area would yield a conservative potential estimate of about 18 to 47 billion weed seeds.

So if only 10 percent of those seeds eroded from the dam slopes and entered the drainage system, that
would be in the neighbourhood of 2 to 5 billion weed seeds entering the river system. Introduction of new weeds onto the downslopes, which is entirely plausible, would prolong this discharge.

So this is precisely why \(I\) recommended in my report that water discharging from the low-level outlet be filtered. And I'm guessing that a filtration system that operates during -- only during non-flood conditions would not be an impossible design feat. Yet Mr. De Carlo stated yesterday that AT cannot be responsible for managing surrounding properties, even though it is clearly obvious that they will potentially be pumping out weed seeds by the billions onto lands outside of the PDA by a multiple of vectors.

It seems to me that if the project will result in the weed establishment and dispersal above the baseline conditions, the project operator should acknowledge responsibility for management of those escaping weeds. Instead, according to Mr. De Carlo, AT will place all trust for prevention of weed dispersal in a management plan for onsite weeds that does not yet exist.

It is hard for me to understand how one can place such confidence in a non-existing plan. And I suppose that that summarizes the entirety of my assessment in a nutshel1.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Osko.

Dr. Osko is available for cross.
Can you hear me very well, Ms. Vespa?
THE CHAIR:
Yes. Thank you, Mr. Osko.
Ms. Okoye.
I'm making the assumption that Stoney Nakoda,
Calalta and Mr. Wagner have no questions at this time?
MR. WILLIAMS:
That's correct for Calalta.
This is Sara Louden. That is correct. We have no questions.

MR. WAGNER:
Scott Wagner.
THE CHAIR:
Correct, Mr. Chair. This is

MS. SENEK:
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Cusano?
MR. CUSANO:
No questions, sir, thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Barbero?
MR. BARBERO:
Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation will have a few questions. Given that Mr. Osko needs to leave quickly, if I could have one minute just to focus in on only the most important ones?

THE CHAIR:
Take that. I just have -- we'11 see if the Board has any questions in the meantime, if you don't mind?

MR. BARBERO:
Yes, of course, sir. Thank you.
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THE CHAIR: I don't believe so. Ms. Vance, did you have any questions?

MS. VANCE: If I could ask a really quick one.
MS. VANCE QUESTIONS THE WITNESS:
Q. Dr. Osko, one of the recommendations you make is Recommendation 5. I couldn't tell you what the PDF page is because I have the hard copy. But I'11 just read it to you. One of the recommendations is: (as read)

> "To instill a filtration system on the
> low-level outlet to filter weed seeds
> from the outlet discharge."

I believe we had some questions and responses from Ms. Okoye and AT yesterday, and I just wanted to put the question out there. Is, you know, the competition appears to be between a filter that would prevent weed seeds but not fish, and I'm just wondering if you know of such a thing?
A. No, I think in -- no, I don't know of such a thing. I think that would be a tradeoff decision that would have to be made. But as Ms. Okoye mentioned yesterday, the bulk of the dam's operations would be during non-flood conditions, so a possible tradeoff would be to have a filtration system that's operable during those times, and that would be removed -- I mean, you would have
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some lead time knowing that a flood is coming, so you'd have time to remove the filter if that is necessary. MS. VANCE: Okay. Thank you very much. That's the only question \(I\) had.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Vance.
Mr. Barbero -- we're jumping a little bit, but just to accommodate Mr. Osko. Thank you. Mr. Barbero.

MR. BARBERO:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'11 be brief.

MR. BARBERO CROSS-EXAMINES THE WITNESS:
Q. Sir, you made a number of recommendations and design operation changes in relation to the issue of weeds in your report; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And, sir, you understand that Alberta Transportation has filed a reply submission? It's made a number of commitments in that. Do you understand, sir?
A. Yes, yes.
Q. Sir, on the issue of the filtration, you understand there's an undertaking that has been given and will be responded to from Alberta Transportation?
A. Yes, I heard that yesterday, yes.
Q. And, sir, just while I've got you on that topic, do you have any sense of the minimum size of the mesh that would be required to allow for effective filtration as
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you envision?
A. Yeah, sorry, no, I don't.
Q. Very good, sir. Sir, I just want to confirm that you understand, sir, that Alberta Transportation intends to address weeds in its sediment management?
A. Yes, I understand that there's an intention to do so, yes.
Q. And, sir, you also understand that

Alberta Transportation intends to involve an experienced ecologist in those plans and exercises?
A. Yes.
Q. Very good, sir. And, sir, my last question for you, you have recommended that Alberta Transportation provide a containment system to prevent soil-borne weed seeds from being introduced into the Elbow River. And, sir, I just want to -- I just want to understand that. I think your concern there with soil-borne weeds being introduced into the river during construction? Is that the gist of that?
A. Yes, that's correct. So based on my understanding of the construction of a floodplain berm, and not having the information that there is a local borough site until yesterday, I made these -- and because AT committed to containing all the construction within the PDA boundary, the only assumption \(I\) had left was that
the material was going to be somehow transported across -- and the river is going to be diverted so that other construction can be underway.

So the only assumption \(I\) could reach was that material from the diversion channel would be hauled across the river and the floodplain to construct the floodplain berm. So if that was the case, my concern was that soil falling off of the truck containing seeds could end up in the river, and then the seeds would be washed eventually away downstream.
Q. I think, sir, you now understand that AT has no intention of hauling soil across the Elbow River?
A. Yes, that is my understanding other than across the bridge on Highway 22.
Q. Fair enough, sir, yes.

MR. BARBERO:
Sir, those are my questions, and I hope everything is okay with you and your family, sir.
A. Thank you, I appreciate that very much.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Osko, I've canvassed the Pane1, and I don't think we have any questions.

But, Mr. Kennedy, I did not hear from you. Do you have any questions.

MR. KENNEDY:
I do not. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. So, Mr. Osko, I think, after Ms. Vance's question, the Pane1 is good. And us
too wish you the best and our best regards with whatever you're dealing with. So take care, and thank you very much.
A. Excellent. Thank you.

MS. OKOYE:
Thank you, Dr. Osko, and take care.
(WITNESS STANDS DOWN)
MS. OKOYE:
So go to the remainder of our panel. We have Dr. Brian Zelt and Cliff Wallis and Dr. Klepacki. Dr. Klepacki had been previously affirmed, so he will be acknowledging that he is under affirmation. So probably we'11 start off with Dr. Brian Zelt.

I think Dr. Brian Zelt wants to be sworn, if that's okay.
B. ZELT, C. WALLIS, D. KLEPACKI_(For SCLG), affirmed, previously affirmed

MS. OKOYE EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Okay, so, Dr. Ze1t --

THE CHAIR: Ms. Okoye, sorry to interrupt. We do have our host -- Zoom host from MNP is having difficulty. We're all up and running, which is all good, but I'm not sure if everyone has switched to gallery view or not, but that is the best view because
if you've got a speaker view -- let me see. Speaker view, it looks like it is working again now. Sorry. So he's back online.

So if something happens where you have some people up in speaker view and going "why or these people there" or it's just a blank box, it's because it may happen again. Mr. Wiebe is having some technical difficulties on his end. So then just switch over to gallery view, and it's probably the best way to kind of continue on with the hearing.

Sorry for the interruption. I was on gallery view myself because of it, but it's been switched over, so thank you very much and continue. Thank you.

MS. OKOYE:
Thank you.
Q. Okay, Dr. Zelt, I'm referring you to your CV which was filed as Exhibit 270 and your report filed as Exhibit 269. And you also have submitted an opening statement that had been shared to counsel and everybody. Were these documents prepared by you under your direction or control?
A. MR. ZELT: Yes, they were.
Q. Are there any changes that you would like to make to the documents?
A. MR. ZELT: Not at this time. I'll address some of the -- what's in the report in my presentation.
Q. Are the documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MR. ZELT: Yes, within what I will discuss in my presentation.
Q. Do you adopt your report as part of your evidence in this proceeding?
A. MR. ZELT: Sorry, say that again?
Q. Do you adopt your report as part --
A. MR. ZELT: Oh, yes.
Q. -- of your evidence in this proceeding?
A. MR. ZELT: Yes.
Q. And do you acknowledge that you have a duty to provide opinion evidence to the Panel that is fair, objective, and non-partisan?
A. MR. ZELT: Yes.
Q. Please provide a brief summary of your professional qualifications and experience.
A. MR. ZELT: My background is a PhD in mechanical engineering. Studied at the University of Alberta. I studied turbulent fluid mechanics and specifically studying dispersion of -- dispersion and a boundary layer. My background for the last 30 years has been in air dispersion modelling, developing models, reviewing, providing this kind of peer review and/or expert testimony, and performing health, risk
and environmental risk assessments. I guess that's a nutshel1.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

Document manager, if it's possible, could you pull up the opening statement or the presentation by Brian Zelt.

Dr. Zelt, could you please proceed.
A. MR. ZELT: Thank you. So I thought it would be good just to go through basically the gist of what I prepared in my report. I was -- so I'm going to try and stick to my notes, otherwise I'll drift off and blab away.

So I was engaged by the SCLG to review the air quality assessment of the proposed diversion project. My role was to objectively review the assessment to identify gaps in the air quality assessment or any unresolved questions related to the terms of reference or the expected content, and also to review whether the methodology used in the assessment was up to common standards and/or reasonable assumptions were made in the -- in the assessment.

So it's -- you have to be careful when you're reviewing assessments to review that they're reasonable assumptions, not necessarily my particular assumptions. So I tried to keep that in mind more for most of the
things, although I did interject one personal one that I will get to at the end.

Next slide, please.
Q. So, Dr. Ze1t, can you just call the slide number please, so people can follow.
A. MR. ZELT: I didn't number the slides.
Q. Okay, you can just say --

THE CHAIR: Or perhaps. Mr. Ze1t, on the screen there you will see "2 out of 14."
A. MR. ZELT: Okay. There we go. Yeah, thank you --

THE CHAIR:
-- thank you.
A. MR. ZELT: Thank you.

So on this slide, I'm presenting the 1 in 200-year flood. This is my re-estimate of what the original predictions of what the air quality assessment was presented, and I believe that was in Exhibit 67 of the origina1 EIA.

So on the review of that assessment, I found some things that \(I\) thought weren't correct, but in order to actually affirm or verify whether those were actually important, it would be necessary to redo some of the calculations rather than just discuss it. So in redoing those calculations, \(I\) have to verify that \(I\) can actually reasonably duplicate what they did, and this
graph is my graph of the results using more or less much more simplified methods than what they used, but basically duplicates what they did in the report.

In doing so, verifies that I'm using basically the same methods to get the same results so that I can extrapolate from there by changing some of the inputs.

One of the concerns about the original report was that it assumes that all of the controls are effective all the time and, as we've heard, that they're going to apply those controls immediately.

However, the tackifiers, as they have been called, that might be applied to either grow with -- if it's put on seeds or just to reduce this -- particulate emissions tend to degrade with time. If you read the fine print on the tackifiers, which I originally did on looking up the ones that were introduced or referenced by AT, and I further contacted a company, and they basically said independently the same sort of thing. The tackifiers degrade to about 80 percent after one to two months, and after three months, they're down to about 60 percent.

That means in order to maintain the original controls that are -- would be depicted in the figure here and in the AT's assessment of air quality, they would have to start repeating the tackifier and/or
controls after a couple of months or a few months at the expense of 200 to -- depending on the size that they're doing, \(\$ 200,000\) to half a million dollars each time they do that.

So the original assumption in the AT's assessment of 86 , or somewhere around there, percent efficiency degrades actually fairly quickly.

I also contacted a company and just enquired how long does it take to do an area, and they indicated that it would probably take up to two weeks to -- to apply tackifier over a large area on the -- such as the 100 or 1 to 200-year flood. So given that -- depending on when it's recognized that there is an issue, there would be a time delay between the recognition that there's an issue and when the tackifier would be applied to actually start those controls. Even if it was seeding, it takes time for some germination.

Next slide, please. That would be 3 out of 14.
So my primary concerns when I looked at the assessment, there are essentially five -- four concerns one is essentially a -- would be my preference when I would do that. I noted an errata that I noticed when I was looking at the results, that they used a PM 2.5 over TSP ratio. And in their final assessment of their
emissions, it was half of that value. AT has subsequently either found it on their own or acknowledged that error and has reassessed the air quality with the proper value, so the original assessment was at least half too low for the PM 2.5 assessment.

My review here that I'm presenting is basically based on the original assessment, and most of the things that \(I\) noted in the first assessment were not changed in the second assessment, so there's still the same objection, so I didn't bother updating my assessment to reflect some of the changes, although I recognize that they did expand their assessment from the original one.

So my concerns, when I reviewed it, was the selection of the surface roughness that they used. Surface roughness is an air dispersion modelling parameter that reflects the turbulence intensity near the ground due to the wind blowing past it, and they used a value of .005, and I'11 discuss that in a minute.

They also used a meteorological dataset. In the "biz" you would say it's the MM5 mode1, a meteorological mode1 dataset, which is a required mode1 dataset or recommended according to the air quality
mode1 guideline, and I'11 discuss that, you know, further.

The area of emissions, they assumed that the area where there would be emissions was only the area where it is greater than 10 percent -- or 10 centimetres' thickness. There's been some discussion about that, and we'11 discuss that again more in the following slides.

They used a particulate size distribution based on the alluvial particles gathered from the side of the Elbow River, and then they subsequently ignored part of that and used a generic value, and we'11 discuss more of that in a minute; and then the friction velocity at the end.

Next slide, please. That would be Number 4.
So one of the important aspects of fugitive emissions is how are the ability of the wind to kick up particles near the ground. The wind profile and as it approaches the ground is impacted by the roughness of the ground and the turbulence intensity, or how much turbulence there is in the air increases as you get closer to the ground.

So as the size of the roughness increases, such as if there are buildings or trees or grass or bushes or whether it's perfectly smooth, affects how turbulent
it's going to be near the ground. So the greater the size of the obstacles near the -- or the roughness near the ground the more turbulence there is. The characterization used by AT's assessment is not appropriate. It wasn't selected appropriately given the circumstances.

So if you're following a very simplistic approach for a fugitive dust analysis, you would look at the size of the particles and only look at the small plot of 1 and where you're looking at and characterize the surface with that roughness. So, for instance, this .005 metres.

However, the wind profile doesn't actually behave that way. It looks at the wind up -- wind of that, and you need to look at a little bit of a broader and more objective point of view and look at, say, the surrounding 3 kilometres around the facility and look at what the roughness is and characterize that.

So, for instance, in the winter when things are snow covered, you get a very low -- because it's fairly smooth when things get covered in snow, and you get a roughness -- typically around 001 is what is often used. And in the summer when everything is in green leaves and trees and the grass is tall, you get a much larger surface roughness.

So this graph here is depicting "U*" which is an indication of roughness. And on the bottom is wind speed. And essentially shows that in a typical year, you would get all those blue dots. And the line slope is an indication of what the surface roughness is in terms of the line. So it gets complicated, but if you look at the red 1 ine versus the dotted 1 ine, the dotted line is the line that they are suggesting as the "Z nought." That characterizes the turbulence intensity, which ends up being even more smoother than what you would find in winter.

I'm arguing, and based on my 30 years of modelling, that the turbulence that you're actually seeing is going to be reflective of a bit more of a broader aspect and not the simplistic picture that they've presented here.

So that means that the turbulence that impacts the ground is going to kick up more dust than what has been predicted in the AT's assessment.

So it becomes key on the inputs and is one of the - - a principal factor and biassing the predictions lower than what they -- what they should have.

Next slide, please, 5 out of 14 . So one of the things I note in my assessment and I think there has been some discussion back and forth is that they have
claimed that they used the MM5 as required by the Alberta ambient air -- Alberta air quality modelling guidelines, which is true.

The MM5 has been selected as the regulatory data to be used. It provides consistency for the regulators and reviewers alike to use the same dataset when you're reviewing air quality impact assessments.

It also removes some of the toggles and switches that some consultants try to use to try and get the results for their clients as low as possible by selecting the air quality model or meteorological mode1, such as using the WRF, which may arguably be more accurate but isn't consistent with what everybody else is doing.

So WARF -- WRF, sorry, WRF, is another version and will probably be the new standard in the next round of things, but the Alberta Government has adopted to use the MM5 mode1.

So when you're looking at the meteorology from the MM5 mode1, you get a graph that looks like this complicated graph here. So the green boxes is called a "box and whisker graph," and this is showing the months of -- for the five years of data. And for each of the months, it shows a box that shows the 25 percent; the median, 50 percent; and 75 percent. Then it shows the

1 percent and 99 percent, which is that long whisker. And then the dot, dot, dots are the outliers, which are the wind speeds that are exceeding the 99.9 th.

So the big thing to see here is relatively that the MM5 data is quite low. So one of the crucial part -- points that is often missed in air quality dispersion models is verification and validation. And in this case, validation or verification -verification is looking at did they use the right equations. Validation is essentially looking at the physics and did they use the right data and did they compare those predictions to actual data.

So what \(I\) present in my report is that they used the MM5 data, as they should have, but they did not compare and determine whether there are consequences to using that data by actually looking out the window to see whether it was raining, as -- to use a rule of thumb for meteorologists. So it's helpful just to model it, but occasionally you have to actually go out and look and see and measure and use the data.

So in this case, within less than 5 kilometres away, I believe, is the Springbank airport. So according to the air quality modelling guidelines, it's not within the fenceline of the project, so it shouldn't be used for the modelling. However, it
provides a great reference for whether the MM5 data is representative of the actual site.

So the red boxes are the winds from the Springbank airport summarized in the same sort of way, and the thing to note here is that the red boxes are all substantially higher, taller, longer than the green boxes, which means that the wind speeds are higher, substantially higher, so you see the peak. All the peaks of the green are -- the 99th percentiles only going up to less than 10 metres per second, whereas the 99th percentiles of the reds exceed 12 to 13 , and the peaks go well above that into 20 metres per second.

That corresponds to the wind profiles and to how much turbulence is generated near the ground level.

So if the turbulence near the ground level is not represented accurately with the meteorology, then the emissions aren't going to be there.

So in the case so far that we've looked at, in the previous slide, the \(Z\) naught, the characterization of how much turbulence in a wind profile wasn't done correctly in my mind, our opinion, and here the wind speeds are not done -- selection.

So although they presented the air quality -- did the -- according to the air quality guideline, they didn't take the extra step to validate it to find out
whether it was important or valid, and they could have submitted a revised emissions profile that took this into account while still using the green wind speeds. They could have adjusted the data, or they could have characterized their data saying that "we're low by X amount or 50 percent" or changed it; however, they have not done that to date.

One of the consequences of using that green line also is that there are very few high wind speeds less than -- or 3 percent greater than 7 metres per second, so when they're using their wind adjusted emissions profile, it ends up -- and then using the -- say the 99th percentile of the results or the 98th percentile of the results for PM 2.5, it's essentially removing the top two -- top 1, 2, and sometimes the top 3 of their emissions profile so they're only using the very bottom part of the emissions and basically skipping out most of the emissions.

Excuse me. I'm sorry, I should be sticking to my notes so I'm quicker.

So, in short, I guess the higher wind speeds are both more realistic, and the emissions are -- ends up being quite a bit higher than they have done.

Next slide, please. So this is Slide Number 6.
So in this graph, what I looked at was that -- or

I'm showing here is the black line is the project area. The brown blob in the middle is the area from the original assessment. That was greater than 10 centimetres, which they are claiming -- or AT's assessment has claimed has the area only of which where they get to the particulate emissions from.

However, we know from, for instance, the 2013 flood that the broader area is going to be covered with some kind of a sediment. And as we've heard, the larger particles are the ones that settle out first, and the finer particles, the silts and potentially clays, are going to be settling out on top of that.

So whether you're in the heavy sediment area or the other area, the entire area is going to be covered in a layer of fines.

In the heavier sediment area, depending on where the water is flowing from, some of that may be swept off as it's draining. So likely, in all reality, the entire area will be a mix of areas that are probably likely all fines, either clays and/or very fine sediments, silts, and there -- it could be some areas that are more sandy and larger particles.

The difference between the two is that the winds and turbulence near the ground tends to kick up small particles, and they bounce across the ground, and as
they bounce, they stir up the other particles and introduce more dust into the wind, which then gets carried away.

Some soils tend to compact and coagulate, such as those soils with a very high clay content, but also -- so that impedes the ability for lower winds to create emissions into the air. But for strong winds, the winds can break that up and bounce those larger particles around, so you -- it's a bit of give and take. So unfortunately there's a bit of -- a large amount of uncertainty in the total amount of particles that could actually occur.

So when I was looking at the assessment, in my view, I thought the 10 centimetres was a bit arbitrary, especially after reading the soils report where they looked at 3 centimetres; and their soil expert and understanding of erosion, whether he's an air quality expert or not, their expert in soils was looking at -they consider 3 centimetres -- there will be particles on -- throughout that entire area, much larger than what -- than what was originally assessed, is part of the -- part of the issue, and I'11 discuss that a little bit more. But there will be patches, either higher or lower. There will be some areas grasses covered. There may be some areas where they're poking
through .
Next slide, please.
When I read the assessment, the original
assessment by AT, they used a general characterization of the particles that was based on the Elbow River or a side of the Elbow River which is -- essentially it would be alluvial in characterization and, in my mind, not characteristic of the sediments that would be settled in a reservoir drawdown after it's been sitting, either short or especially long. They'11 both end up with the very fines set on top, such as -- just as an example off the internet of the 2013 here where it was just flooded and drained right away. So you end up with that sort of very fine layer, and you can see some caking going on, so there would be some clays involved here.

So \(I\) couldn't find a good sample at first, and then \(I\) found a study that looked at actually the Elbow down the Elbow River corridor and was focusing on the G1enmore Reservoir.

So the Glenmore Reservoir actually ends up being a fairly good surrogate for particulates, sediments that are settling out of the fines, because it's essentially the same thing, although it does sit longer; however, they -- so this reference characterized the particles
along the Elbow River at different locations upstream and downstream of Glenmore and also in the Glenmore, and it was a study of the sediments in the G1enmore Reservoir.

This particular graph is an extraction from that -- that reference. I did not exhaustively go through them all. They're all very similar for the particles on the bottom of the Glenmore Reservoir. And they did make specific note that the Elbow River upstream characterization, such as almost the same as what they used in AT's assessment, is not representative of a quiescent reservoir and drawdown because it's the alluvial in nature. The wind -- the flowing water removes all those sediments, and it's not until you get a quiet reservoir where you get to the settling out of these high fines.

So the difference is, is in the peak of that blue line that I've shown here on this graph, which shows that the particle sediment size is actually quite smal1. Most of it is 1 ess than PM 10 for these fines. So in this particular case, you're getting about 78 percent of PM 10 out of the total particulates, and the -- in particular, the PM 2.5 is about 23 percent.

AT's assessment just characterized the sediments as basically sandy loam and then did not do a sieve
analysis. A sieve meaning -- S-I-E-V-E -- meaning particle size -- actual particle sizes as shown in this -- that blue line. They just characterized it as MS or medium sandy loam, whereas this graph shows that clearly these fines would be characterized as FS, where meaning fines or very fine.

The AT assessment further went on in their assessment and then used generic PM 2.5 profiling, which used a PM 2.5 value of ratio from the TSP of being 7.5, which they have defended as being an appropriate choice based on AP-42. The AP-42 is a US EPA document for emission factors, which is a method for creating emissions when you basically don't have any other data to validate your -- your choices.

However, in this case, especially -- and maybe AT didn't originally didn't know about this study. However, the -- in this case, we can clearly see that any characterization of the fines shows that it has a very high PM 2.5 content. So, again, an emissions of PM 2.5 substantially higher than what was characterized in the AT.

So both the PM 2.5 fraction plus the difference between FS and MS results in much higher emission rates.

THE CHAIR: Excuse me. Sorry to interrupt.

Ms. Okoye, just sort of as a reminder, you -- SCLG had requested an hour for direct. Just sort of -- just maybe a bit of a heads up. We're approaching one hour, and, you know, I've accounted for some time for the cross on Mr. Osko. We're -- it appears to be on slide of 7 of 14 , and we have Mr . Wallis and Klepacki yet, and we're five minutes away from your allotted time.

So I'm just wondering. I guess, you know, we -for sure it's important and we want you to be heard, but it seems like quite a miscalculation in terms of what you have asked for time and been approved for time versus what it appears that you might need. And I know your friend Mr . Secord doesn't like to sit long or past 5 , but we're going to be potentially sitting well past 5. So just a heads up. Thanks.
Q. MS. OKOYE: Okay. Dr. Brian, if we can speed up a little bit.
A. MR. ZELT: I'll talk faster.
Q. No, not talk faster because that's not good for the court reporter.
A. MR. ZELT: No, I'm -- correct.

So the -- it was important to go through these first ones a little bit slower, and the remaining ones are -- we can go a little bit faster. So I just wanted to check my -- no, so we can jump to the next slide,
please.
So one of the missing slides, this is Slide 8 of 14. One of the missing slides and one of the important assessments to be done in an air quality assessment that is called for in air quality modelling guidelines, either 2013 or 2020 draft, is to look at the maximum release case. Whether you're -- especially in this kind of a situation where you're applying controls that are not arbitrary but are somewhat subjective in nature, how bad could things be. So this looks at the AT's assessment without controls.

\section*{(UNRELATED INTERRUPTION)}
A. MR. ZELT: I'm not sure where that came from.

So this was -- would have been AT's original assessment without controls for PM 2.5 indicating that there is a substantial area that approaches into the First Nations lands, and the blue line, cyan line, which goes into Calgary well above the PM 2.5 objectives for, in this case, 99th percentile PM 2.5 for the 200.

Near the site the concentrations are substantially higher. This draws the importance of having to put controls in place for any fugitive dust emissions but in particular, this case, because it's such a large area, that the controls would have to be managed very
carefully and diligently and continuously after the initial application to make sure that things aren't there. However, they didn't in my mind, do the proper calculation of the emissions, so the actual rates are somewhat higher than that.

So next slide, please.
And I will just summarize my slides, I guess, just in an effort of time; you can jump to the next slide again.

This is slide 10 of 14 . This is showing TSP. And in my reassessment, \(I\) used the broader area, in this case, the entire blue dotted area, indicating beyond the 3-centimetre area, thickness of where the sediments would be, which may be indicative of some level of contamination and/or dust blowing off the wind, so, I mean, it can be argued whether what size is actually used.

However -- sorry. And also plus the area larger than 10 centimetres just to follow the -- what AT's assessment did. I assumed an extremely generous -- a 98th percentile reduction, even though it's going to be way less than that. So if fines are actually the top deposited layer, as indicated by the G1enmore Reservoir, we're going to end up with much more -- higher -- much higher particulate emissions.

If the 3-centimetre larger zone is included, even though some of it may be sparsely vegetated, likely it will be much less than 98 percent controls, so the concentrations would actually be higher than this.

So the potential here, and this graph is showing with controls, the TSP under dry conditions producing a very large dust storms given the right conditions.

Next slide, please.
If you look at the 1-in-10-year event, they're much smaller, but again showing the same sorts of things. The impacts are a lot larger than what were presented in the original ATs and even in the revised assessment.

Next slide, please. S1ide 2 of 14. If you look at natural mitigation measures or natural dry areas, so the reverse of that, this looks at the number of -using Canadian -- Environment Canada's meteorology for the months that we're primarily concerned with, June, July, August, and October, how many days of -- since the last rain. So we've got many days that can be very dry and over extended periods, so the potential for getting very dry. And we know from the wind meteorology we looked at before we have those high winds.

So, again, the -- diligence in being able to
maintain controls. But even with the controls, as is shown in the preliminary modelling presented here, which is obviously not exhaustive because I wasn't contracted to do the quality assessment, is -demonstrates that there is potential even with controls for emissions.

Last slide, please.
So just to quickly summarize. My concerns were raised with the roughness, the MM5 -- sorry -- the area, generic versus likely, particulates, and I won't get into the threshold velocities. And basically the impacts extend well beyond the project area, even with their controls, and a very conservative estimate of controls, which could be a lot worse than what they're -- what they're looking at.

I guess in conclusion, there are many uncertainties involved in fugitive dust modelling. I've been doing this for fugitive dust, as well as other modelling, for many different sites, small -excuse me -- and large. This large area source is particularly challenging because of the ability to try and control it versus something like a construction or a gravel pit, where it's much easier to apply controls and apply them regularly and quickly.

And it's really important to understand fully on

AT's understanding that -- of the potential for air quality consequences, and that there should be controls -- there should be controls -- well, sorry -- there are high consequences with zero controls, sorry, and there are also consequences even with effective controls. But with the effective controls, they do degrade with time and/or they take time to implement.

The actual validity of the modelling validating it with meteorology and characterizing the emissions wasn't performed, in my opinion, which we can see from the meteorology from the site. Actual meteorology is much different, so the emissions are much higher than what was presented. So best estimates of particle size and distributions which could vary across the site and none of that was considered or included in the modelling.

I think that summarizes my findings and review of the report.

Thank you very much, Pane1, and Chairman.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Zelt.

MS. OKOYE: And, Mr. Chair, thank you for the extra time. Probably we will need some extra time. I think the initial estimate that we had made, we had made estimates based on just our experts giving an

AMICUS
overview of their reports, but we didn't contemplate the additional time that they will require to respond to matters arising from cross.

So, so far what we have, we just have
Cliff Wallis, and I understand that he will take about 20 minutes, and Dr. K1epacki will take just about two and a half minutes, if that's okay with you. If you can just give us those extra time.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, and the PowerPoint from Mr. Zelt, I think, needs to be entered as an exhibit; is that correct?

MS. OKOYE: Yes, that's correct.
THE CHAIR:
That will be number 401,
Ms. Friend; is that right?
MS. FRIEND: Yes, that's correct.
THE CHAIR:
It's the only one I remember because we just had the big number 400 . EXHIBIT 401 - SCLG BRIAN ZELT POWERPOINT

THE CHAIR:
Let's break unti1 3:30, and then

MS. OKOYE:
MS. LOUDEN:
THE CHAIR:
MS. LOUDEN: Sorry, this is Sara Louden. I do
have a brief matter I'm hoping to speak to. I can do that after the break if that's preferable to you.

THE CHAIR: Yes, let's do that right after the break, sure.

MS. LOUDEN:
Thank you very much, sir.
(ADJOURNMENT)
THE CHAIR:
Okay, before we just get started, we have two things. I'd like to just chat quickly about final argument, and Ms. Louden had an issue to raise.

So Ms. Louden, do you want to go ahead? You had something to raise?

MS. LOUDEN: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm still getting the -- there we go. Sorry. Video issues.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I'11 be brief. I apologize for interrupting. I just thought it probably best to raise this sooner.

We have received the undertaking from Alberta Transportation and we have a few follow-up questions we are hoping to ask. I certainly don't intend to add to what might already be a long day, and it is only a few questions, Mr. Chairman, but I'm wondering if this might be able to be accommodated at some point.

THE CHAIR:
Yes. Now, I guess if you're
hoping to have those by -- you know, those questions answered before finals on what we hope to be on Tuesday, perhaps you can put those questions now.

Ms. Okoye, if you don't mind, we'11 just have a quick interruption here, get those questions on the record for -- and I assume they're for Alberta Transportation; is that right?

MS. LOUDEN: They are, yes, sir.
THE CHAIR:
Please get those on record and then we can move on. Thanks.

MS. LOUDEN:
First, I'm not sure, Mr. Chairman, if we can ask these directly to the Alberta Transportation panel or if they will just be, I guess additional undertakings; is that --

THE CHAIR: Well, no, I think at this point it would be undertakings. So just put them to Alberta Transportation so they can respond to them, but I don't think we can get the panel up at this point.

MS. LOUDEN:
Sure. So in Alberta
Transportation's opening statement on Topic 5 and then, again, in their response to one of my questions yesterday, they represented to the Board the entire Highway 22 is currently designated as a high load corridor.

So given the answer to the undertaking that we
have received this afternoon, would Alberta
Transportation like to correct their evidence in that regard? If no, we would request that they reconcile their responses of yesterday and their statement in the opening statement with the undertaking that has been provided.

UNDERTAKING - REFERRING TO THE SNN UNDERTAKING PROVIDED TO ADVISE WHETHER AT WOULD LIKE TO CORRECT THEIR EVIDENCE WITH RESPECT TO THE HIGH LOAD CORRIDOR AND/OR TO RECONCILE THEIR RESPONSES OF YESTERDAY AND THEIR STATEMENT IN THE OPENING STATEMENT WITH THE UNDERTAKING THAT HAS BEEN PROVIDED

MS. LOUDEN: The second question, on what basis was the portion of Highway 22 between Highway 1 and Highway 8 proposed to become a high load corridor? UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE SNN ON WHAT BASIS WAS THE PORTION OF HIGHWAY 22 BETWEEN HIGHWAY 1 AND HIGHWAY 8 PROPOSED TO BECOME A HIGH LOAD CORRIDOR

MS. LOUDEN :
Third, the undertaking response that we received states that that segment of Highway 22 was proposed as a future high load corridor in 2017 or 2018.

We are requesting a response as to why it has remained as simply a "proposed"; in other words, why this segment has not yet been designated.

UNDERTAKING - REFERRING TO THE
UNDERTAKING RESPONSE PROVIDED WITH
RESPECT TO THE HIGH LOAD CORRIDOR, TO
ADVISE WHY THE SEGMENT OF HIGHWAY 22
HAS NOT BEEN DESIGNATED THE SAME
MS. LOUDEN:
And, further, to that, what will
trigger that portion of Highway 22 becoming designated

MS. LOUDEN: We will do that right now.
Thank you very much, sir, for accommodating us.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Louden.

The Panel has decided on final argument, and that's assuming we get through today and all of the evidentiary portion. We have allocated Tuesday for final argument and Wednesday morning for Alberta Transportation reply. That reply would be 90 minutes.

But first for the final arguments, Alberta Transportation, we've -- somewhat of a compromise I think, for Transportation and SCLG requests. So 150 minutes for Alberta Transportation; 150 minutes for SCLG; Calalta, 30 minutes; Stoney Nakoda, 30 minutes; Calgary, 40 minutes -- City of Calgary, 40 minutes; Calgary River Communities Action Group, 40 minutes; Mr. Wagner, 30 minutes. That totals 470 minutes. Our days are approximately 410 minutes with an hour lunch, starting 8:30 to 5.

So, of course, that doesn't quite work, so we would like to start on Tuesday, April 6th at 8 a.m., so sign-in 7:30, start time 8 a.m., and that would take us to a 5:30 close. If some are a bit quicker, obviously we'11 close a bit quicker, but that would be 8:00 to 5:30 on Tuesday for final argument, based on those time allotments, and then Alberta Transportation reply on Wednesday, Apri1 7th at 9:00 a.m. to 10:30.

So 90 minutes on the Wednesday, and that would be a little bit of a later start, so sign-in at 8:30 for a

9:00 start Wednesday, Apri1 7th for Alberta Transportation reply.

MR. SECORD: Thank you, sir. Appreciated.
THE CHAIR: Okay. Thank you, everyone.

Ms. Okoye, please proceed. And with -- let's keep the times that we've just spoken to, because that is over, as we spoke about, but let's see if we can get the evidentiary portion wrapped up today. So please proceed.

MS. OKOYE:
Thank you, Mr. Chair, for that accommodation.
Q. Mr. Wallis, I'm referring you to your CV Exhibit 272, your report, Exhibit 271, and your opening statement which has been shared.

Were the documents prepared by you or under your direction and control.
A. MR. WALLIS: Yes, they were.
Q. I understand that you have some changes to make to your report?
A. MR. WALLIS: Just one minor. In my report at

Exhibit 271, PDF page 62, Stantec 2018 C, there's an Exhibit Number 48 there which should be numbered as Exhibit 35.
Q. With those changes, are the documents accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. MR. WALLIS: Yes, they are.
Q. Do you adopt them as part of your evidence in this proceeding?
A. MR. WALLIS: I do.
Q. Do you acknowledge that you have a duty to provide opinion evidence to the Panel that is fair, objective and non-partisan?
A. MR. WALLIS: I do.
Q. Can you please provide the Board with a summary of your professional qualifications and experience?
A. MR. WALLIS: Sure. Good afternoon, Mr. Chair, Pane1 members and other participants.

You have my CV, so I'll give just a brief overview.

I am a professional biologist registered in Alberta with over 50 years of experience. I also hold an authenticating wetland professional designation and I have appeared before federal, provincial, and municipal regulatory bodies on highway construction, coal mines, recreation developments, waste disposal, and dams.

I chaired expert panels for hearings on the Oldman and Pine Coulee dam projects, and was a member of the Oldman River Dam Environmental Advisory Committee.

I was also the environmental sector rep on the

Minister of Alberta Environmental Protection's Advisory Committee on revisions to the Water Act in the mid-1990s.

I've personally conducted biodiversity research in the project region since the 1970s, including the original environmental significant area study done in the Calgary region, and also through various studies in the Foothills Parkland.

I also provided input to studies on riparian poplars of southern Alberta rivers, including the biology and status of riparian poplars in southern Alberta and, most recently, visited the project site in November .
Q. Thank you, Mr. Wallis.

Document manager, can you please pull up Mr. Wallis's presentation.

Mr. Wallis, you can proceed.
A. MR. WALLIS: Great. I'11 first briefly go through a few of the materials from my report and try and be brief and interject that with a couple of responses to reply -- I mean to cross -- and most of my responses to cross will be at the end of going over my report materials.

So if we could have S1ide Number 2, please. So much of the Springbank SR1 project boundary is located
in one or more landscapes of conservation significance. Next slide, please.

In the Prairie Conservation Action Plans, the Prairie Conservation Forum identified the area as a high-valued landscape.

Next slide, please.
The Calgary Regional Planning Commission and Alberta government identified the Elbow River valley as an ESA, or environmentally significant area, and key wildifife and biodiversity area. In addition, some of the quarter sections in the footprint were also mapped for the Alberta government as aquatic environmentally significant areas. And this was before 2014.

Next slide, please.
This shows the environmentally significant areas identified in 2014 by the Alberta government, which is the darkest brown colour, and the next lower category I consider to be of regional environmental significance.

Next slide.
Much of the project area has also been identified as an area of high risk or sensitivity for wildiffe. 39 of the 46 quarter sections occurring in the project area are mapped as high sensitivity. While directed to renewable energy projects, this mapping highlights the importance of the areas for wildlife and notes
high-risk areas to be avoid by renewable developments. Next slide, please.

The Bow River Basin Council map, the Elbow River, has a high sensitivity watershed. Note also, the downstream areas on the Bow are similarly classified.

Next slide please.
South Saskatchewan Regional Plan mapped some of the project area as intact native grasslands.

Next slide, please.
And in that plan, there was guidance to implement guidelines to avoid conversion and maintain intact native grasslands on public land.

Alberta Transportation, in Exhibit 219, PDF page 12, notes that native vegetation cannot be left undisturbed in all cases. So \(I\) feel that this is in contravention of the SSRP guidance to maintain intact native grasslands.

Next slide, please.
In their 2016 overview of reclamation success, in the surrounding region of Foothills fescue, Foothills Parkland, and Montane Natural Subregions, Lancaster, et al. note the challenges.

Bradley and Neville also note that: (as read)
"Natural recovery has failed to restore
foothills fescue plant communities as
the native plants simply cannot compete with invasive non-native species.

Disturbed sites seeded with native plant cultivars have resulted in imited success in reducing non-native species invasion."

So, in my professional opinion, based on the overwhelming evidence to date, there's a high likelihood that reclamation for these foothills grassland habits will be unsuccessful in the project area. More than likely, non-native species will dominate for quite some time given their large presence in the surrounding environment.

Next slide, please.
Stantec acknowledges the importance of native fescue grassland and the potential of the project to remove native prairie including native fescue grassland.

In reply at Exhibit 325, PDF page 52, point 183 , they state: (as read)
"Reclaimed native grassland areas will
likely have reduced function and diversity compared to existing areas, but will remain dominated by native plants and provide wildlife habitat."

I have considerable difficulty with that
characterization and Stantec's in Exhibit 94, PDF page 150 , of the project area being native grassland following revegetation.

In the unlikely event that reclamation is successful, those grasslands will not have the full functionality and productivity for native plants and wildife, including invertebrate populations.

Next slide, please.
Over five kilometres of productive stream courses and numerous productive wetlands will be directly impacted and lost to constructed elements of the project.

You can see the darker meandering line of the Unnamed Creek starting at the Elbow River extending north and west through the dam in purple where it bifurcates and continues mostly inside the orange crosshatched SR1 construction area and erosion protection almost to the Springbank Road. This is not insignificant.

Stantec, in Exhibit 94, PDF page 114, also notes tributary streams intersected by the diversion channel.

Next slide, please.
Stantec notes in Exhibit 217, PDF page 24 that: (as read)

AMICUS
"Dry operations would result in the loss of over 52 percent of wetlands classed as either moderate or high value."

Despite proposed mitigation, there will be residual negative impacts of the project on valuable wetlands and streams through both sediment deposition during flood events and modification of stream flow or outright loss of these features under project components.

There may also be some impact related to activities to remove sediment just for drainage purposes, but I understand that they're not going to comply with the IAAC recommendation or condition to remove all the sediment following floods, and that's in line with my recommendation.

But the damage and destruction of the wetlands is in contravention of the primary and preferred response outlined here in Point 1 in Alberta's wetland policy. Next slide, please.

In reply at Exhibit 325, PDF 53, it states that: (as read)
"The 160 cubic metres per second flow rate is roughly equivalent to a 1 in 7 -year flood that will inundate the riparian areas of the floodplain while not inundating the upper terraces where development is present."
In this case, the proponent may be taking a narrower view of riparian habitats than the broader view of the valley bottom habitats influenced or created over time by a stream.

My comments pertain to that broader view in line with the Alberta Water Council definition of riparian lands, and agreed to by Mr. De Carlo yesterday.

Next slide, please.
This is a sample cross-section view of the Elbow showing differences in flood and -- and 760 cubic metres THE COURT REPORTER: Excuse me. Mr. Wallis --
A. MR. WALLIS:
Yes.

THE COURT REPORTER: -- you cut out there. You said "this is a cross-sample showing differences in flood -A. MR. WALLIS: I'11 repeat.

This is a sample cross-section of the Elbow showing differences in flood inundation at 160 cubic metres per second and 760 cubic metres per second flows
from Stantec's Exhibit 138, PDF page 84.
Note the extensive area that is inundated by a large magnitude flood -- still not as big as the 2013, which is in pink shading -- compared to the much smaller area inundated in the flow-regulated situation with the project operational, the light blue-green shading.

This impact is not neutral in direction as indicated by Stantec, not for hydrology and certainly not for biodiversity and ecological processes of the riparian environment.

Next slide, please.
This table just shows some of the impacts described by Bradley, et a1. in their 1991 paper, reduce flooding, and then the effects of that: The reduced downstream flows, reduced meandering, and sediment depletion, all important for ecological function.

Next slide, please.
I have an extensive section in my report and appendices that clearly shows the importance of riparian habitats, the importance of high and low-magnitude floods, as well as the impact of flow modification on these productive areas.

In Exhibits 93 and 94, various statements are
misleading with respect to the impact on riparian ecology, particularly the reference to there being little impact on median flows, which then implied ecosystem function is maintained.

While important to riparian habitat maintenance, median flows are not a major ecosystem shapers for downstream riparian habitats. It seems that the focus of many of Alberta Transportation's statements is perhaps from a hydrologist's perspective and is on the channels and banks and not on the broader riparian environment influence and created by a stream over 1ong periods of time.

Rood and Bradley note for the Bow River downstream of Calgary the impacts of dams on riparian systems extend downstream as far as the river flow is altered, distance of tens or hundreds of kilometres. Every system is different and responds uniquely to alterations caused by that flow regulation, but the causes of change are similar: Peak flow reduction and reduction in sediment.

The other major lesson is that effects take time to develop and show up in the ecosystem. The lack of meaningful analysis on the downstream riparian habitats is an omission from the assessment.

Next slide, please.
Q. Mr. Wallis, just not to distract you from what you are saying, just to warn you that we've got about ten more minutes left.
A. MR. WALLIS: Yes. So at least Stantec acknowledges some of the ecologically important processes and values of high-magnitude floods, but they do note, and it's important to remember this when I'm going my response to cross, that the geomorphology of the Elbow will be simplified because the creation of new side channels or activation of abandoned channels will be reduced. Discharge was not chosen to maintain river processes and does not represent an ecological threshold. And lastly, changes to ecological function associated with limiting flows cannot be mitigated.

Next slide, please.
So Stantec in Exhibit 138, PDF 475 further muddies the waters with its characterization of the effects on cottonwood recruitment by stating only part of the cottonwood story.

So they only look at the smaller floods as being
existing channels attributed to smaller and more frequent floods. The SR1 project is planned to operate in a way that eliminates most of both types of recruitment and habitat regeneration that occurs with floods.

Next slide, please.
So we know that there's additional storage being looked at from Mr. Frigo's testimony, and the end result is the downstream effects of SR1 on riparian lands are not dealt with directly or cumulatively when we're talking below the Glenmore Dam.

Exhibit 324, PDF page 46 notes: (as read)
"Some flood risk reduction for
communities along the Bow River and
South Saskatchewan downstream of the
Elbow River confluence by removing up to
600 cubic metres per second from flood peaks generated from the Elbow communities receiving this
benefit -- sorry -- communities
receiving this benefit include the
Siksika Nation and even as far as the
City of Medicine Hat."
Next slide, please.
The capture of all flood events over 160 cubic
metres per second on downstream habitats and the lack of attention to it and the ecological functions of flood events is a significant omission.

With respect to upland habitats and wetlands, cumulative effects are not being addressed adequately due to the lack of consideration to the degree to which Foothills parkland natural subregion habitats has already been heavily modified, as noted by Mr. De Carlo at Exhibit 394, transcript PDF page 243.

Every incremental loss of native habitat is a significant loss for the natural subregion, and we seldom lose ecosystems in the loss of habitats in one major project. It is the "death by a thousand cuts," which gets us past ecological thresholds.

Next slide, please. So Stantec notes construction of the project would result in significant effect on soil quality or quantity resulting in a reduction of agricultural land capability. And we've already gone over that. Next slide, please.

So there's a number of conclusions. Mitigation will not eliminate all the effects. Some of the adverse effects contravene the spirit and intent of the wetland policy, and guidance on intact grasslands in the SSRP.

There will be significant adverse effects on biodiversity during construction and operation inside
and outside of flood events. And impacts on native habitats and landscapes of environmental significance and downstream riparian habitats. Due to the capture of the most significant flood events.

The degradation of upland and wetland habitats from sedimentation during flood events and the destruction of habitats in various permanent components of the project, and those all weigh against project approval from a biodiversity perspective.

Last slide, please.
Given the impacts on intact native grassland, wetlands and streams and 1 andscapes of environmental significance, \(I\) recommend that the project not be approved in its current configuration. My professional recommendation also is that the project not be approved in its current configuration as it will impact downstream riparian habitats with its current operating mode.

If the project is approved, consideration should be given for allowing larger events to pass.

That concludes my opening statement. I have one more thing, yes.
Q. Sorry, Mr. Wallis, I thought you were going to conclude.
A. MR. WALLIS: Yeah, no. Usually you introduce,
so \(I\) was just waiting.
Q. That's fine. You can continue with your comments on cross --
A. MR. WALLIS: Sure.
Q. -- and cross responses. And just to remind you that we're nearing the time, so --
A. MR. WALLIS: Yes.

So I'm going to focus on downstream impacts discussion in cross that Mr. De Carlo and Mr. Brescia discussed, and the revised sediment modelling that Mr. Whitson examined on.

Mr. Hebert states in his opening statements that the approach comprehensively assesses impacts, considers and confirms mitigation. I respectfully disagree.

The terms of reference, Exhibit 1, PDF page 4 outline the scope, the project description. PDF page 5 in Point \(F\) notes that:
"The proponent should discuss cumulative environmental impacts in the region."

The vegetation section, Exhibit 1, PDF 16, notes that:
"The proponent should consider potential
loss of riparian habitats."
And in Point D:
"Implications of vegetation changes for
other environmental resources."
The wildlife section at PDF page 17 in Point C notes:
"It should consider habitat change, for
example, riparian, and the impact to
local and regional ecosystems."
This is no small matter, and the lack of a fulsome appraisal of the downstream impacts and potential mitigation is, quite frankly, disturbing, because we have great expertise on this subject in Alberta.

Mr. Brescia at Exhibit 395, transcript PDF 247 noted that the RAA complied with the federal government guidance, but they still didn't look at any effects downstream of the Glenmore Reservoir, and they used a 15-kilometre arbitrary buffer, and that's not consistent with the terms of reference for this project or guidance from Canada. Especially when you consider the downstream effects could be felt for dozens, if not hundreds, of kilometres.

And it's August the 10th, 2016, guidance for SR1.
CEAA stated -- it's in the documentation but not an exhibit: (as read)
"In scoping the potential changes to the environment that may occur, proponents should consider water quality and quantity and spatial extent of potential
environmental effects."
So you've got to take into account the appropriate spatial extent of potential environmental effects. I don't think that was done for the riparian downstream habitats.

And I have a specific section, 6.1.8, which is riparian wetland and terrestrial, where they talk specifically again about water, quantity that are impacting ecosystems, so if there's any impacts through that method.

So I note that the project approach in Exhibit 21, PDF page 23 say that the regional assessment area is defined for each valued component. Depending on physical and biological conditions.

And the Canada's assessing cumulative effects guidelines in 2012 said that the spatial boundaries for cumulative effects assessment should be based primarily on the valued components' geographic range and the zone of influence of the project for that valued component.

It is my position that AT failed to follow the federal guidance and terms of reference in adequately defining the boundaries.

I was pleased to see that Mr. De Carlo agreed with the Alberta Water Council riparian definition at transcript Exhibit 395, PDF page 219.

The desired outcomes for riparian lands in the Bow Basin management plan are stated on PDF 101 of Exhibit 271 in the appendices of my report. Two of these are: (as read)
"Existing riparian land, including
associated upland areas, are kept intact
or restored. Ecological function
appreciated and valued. And core
ecological functions of healthy riparian
1ands are maintained."
I don't think that is the case given the proposed operation of SR1 and represents a major gap.

In my opinion, most of the hydrological processes needed for fully functioning riparian ecosystems will be adversely impacted with related effects on vegetation and associated wildlife.

So two of our best researchers, Dr. Stewart Rood and John Mahoney, who works for Alberta Environmental Protection, have looked at the Bow River, and they were part of a team that looked after the 2013 floods, and they went through the science of river conservation, and a group of experts did a thorough analysis for rivers in southern Alberta. And their conclusion was that 85 percent of the natural flow should be retained in the river to sustain the natural river and ecosystem. SR1
further taxes an already stressed riparian system and works against the ecological requirements for riparian habitats as well as the desired outcomes for riparian lands described in the Bow Basin management plan. This emphasizes the need for better consideration of the effects and cumulative effects and potential mitigation over a much larger area than the RAA used in the SR1 process.

And I can conclude now if you like. I won't go into the sediment modelling. I think we heard sufficient from Dr. Whitson, but I'm prepared to answer questions now.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Wallis. Next to Dr. Klepacki. I understand you just have few statement to make. So if you can proceed.
A. MR. KLEPACKI: Yes. Thank you very much. In the interest of time, Mr. Chair --

THE CHAIR:
Excuse me, Ms. Okoye, this may have been done, but it's been a long day, a long week, but has he been re-affirmed as still being under oath already?

MS. OKOYE:
Yes, he --
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Sorry.
MS. OKOYE: He has already been done. But when he's done, we can mark Mr. Wallis's presentation as an exhibit.

THE CHAIR:
And that as well. Thank you.
Sorry.
A. MR. KLEPACKI: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is my last presentation, and that's no April Fool's joke.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and Pane1 members.
In the presentation \(I\) was going to present but will forego, which is in Exhibit 263, PDF 10, I tried to show how the Stantec sampling of large mammals didn't match the anecdotal sightings of area residents and so compiled and mapped sightings by the residents as supported by photographs.

The result of this shows the reservoir footprint is regularly visited by the Jumping Pound elk herd, cougars, and sometimes by grizzlies and their cubs. Many of us that reside in the Bragg Creek, Redwood Meadows, and Springbank area have an emotional attachment to these animal neighbours, and I'd like to say something about this now.

How do we measure the value of these members of the Jumping Pound elk herd and the predators they support?

It seems the issues of value and costs are pervasive in this project. What is the net present value for the folks who have resided on this land for
four, five, and six generations or, in the case of our Stoney Nakoda neighbours, for time immemorial. Their loss is their intimate relationship with the river and these landscapes and the ability of their grandchildren to have these same relationships.

Part of the problem is that we have different currencies. When we had our acreage in West Bragg Creek, we had the magical experience of waking up one foggy August morning to find 88 members of the Jumping Pound elk herd enjoying our yard. It was a moment of expansive connection.

This feeling of intimacy with our landscape and its loss is not quantified and summed into the undiscounted \(\$ 27.5\) miliion per year. That includes preserving the fine homes and controlled river along Elbow Drive and Sifton Boulevard. It's not just the loss of 1 andscape and the uncertainty of what happens to our wildife neighbours that moves us to oppose this project. We also oppose the inequity of protection, quote unquote, for upstream residents versus those downstream of G1enmore.

Bragg Creek berm elevations are below the 23 flood level according to the AMEC designs of 2017. We still don't know what, if any, additional flood measures are planned for Redwood Meadows. And Springbank residents
downstream from SR1 will always have to worry about river flood levels above 450 or 600 cubic metres per second, according to the whim of Alberta Environment and Parks and City of Calgary operations.

I am sure Allan Markin and Ken Needs were not thinking inequity when they identified the Springbank site in their helicopter ride up the Elbow River in late 2013, and that is a large reason why we are attending this hearing.

And then there's drought. While we hear the City of Calgary has plans to mediate drought with water from the Bow River, what happens to us who drink the waters of the Elbow and live upstream of the City's pipeline network?

Again, it's not just the human residents of the Elbow watershed I am concerned about. One of the reasons I supported MC1 was the likelihood of drought mediation issues and the possibility of a cold water bottom release dam with fish migration infrastructure to ensure cold clear water for the inhabitants of the Elbow River, including our animal neighbours, that depend upon these waters and fish.

I will mourn the loss of the cold water ecosystem downstream from SR1 when it is washed with warm water at two or three times summer flows every ten years or
so.
I appeal to the Board to calculate their decision in these currencies as well as dollars, currencies that include our grandchildren's opportunities to have an Elbow River with the beauty and ecological integrity that drew 2 million visitors to its upper watershed last year.

It is painful to witness river segments irreparably humanized like the now riprap culvert-like segments at Bragg Creek.

Currencies that are founded and open discussion, which we haven't seen much of in this project, I fee1 constantly reminded of this shortfall, such as the TSEMA (phonetic) paper mentioned yesterday. This turns out to be an AEP and City of Calgary-funded report on a brand-new and incompletely calibrated computer mode1, as the caveat in its conclusion state, and it has not received the scrutiny of peer review necessary for reliable science.

In conclusion, in bringing this back to our wildiffe neighbours, last night \(I\) heard what \(I\) thought was an excellent talk on CBC ideas by environmentalist Graham Sau1. He was searching for the common thread that lies in the hearts of people like myself, Mary Robinson, Brian Copithorne, Barbara Teghtmeyer,

Karen Massey, and maybe Mr. Wagner would sign on to this cadre.

Graham Saul concluded in his CBC lecture that we al1 share a sense that we are destroying our ecological 1ife support systems.

I don't know if my neighbours subscribe to the environmentalist labe1, but you have heard their passionate stance for the river, this landscape, and these animal inhabitants.

After 30 years of close relationship with the Elbow River and several years of these studies, and recognizing Mr . Wallis and other experts' view that no dams are best, my belief is that projects are inevitable. MC1 is the least environmentally destructive means to this end.

In this hearing, I think we all ask you to consider the long-term health of the river and its ability to maintain both beauty and services to all residents of the watershed, both human and nonhuman.

Please look beyond the focus of maintaining waterfront and floodplain properties for the Elbow River residents south of the G1enmore Dam and include -- sorry, downstream of the G1enmore Dam, and include these less tangible costs to all of us upstream residents.

I thank you, Mr. Chair, and Board members for this opportunity to appeal to emotion and not the usual equations and charts.

And along this same line, \(I\) wish you all, in these hearings, a peaceful and restful holiday weekend. Thank you very much.

MS. OKOYE:
Thank you, Dr. K1epacki.
Mr. Chair, that concludes the evidence of the SCLG Panel for Topic 5 and they are available for cross.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Okoye and pane1 members.

MS. OKOYE:
I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I think I forgot to have Mr. Wallis's presentation entered as an exhibit.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, we're going to do that.
Absolutely.
And that would be 402. Is that right, Ms. Friend?
MS. FRIEND:
Yes, that's correct.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you.
MS. OKOYE:
Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Ms. Louden?
MS. LOUDEN: Yes, Mr. Chair. We do not have any questions.
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THE CHAIR:
MR. WAGNER:
THE CHAIR:
MR. MERCER: of Calgary. Thank you for the opportunity, Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Cusano?
MR. CUSANO:
No thank you, sir.
THE CHAIR:
MR. BARBERO: does has some questions for this panel, sir.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Please proceed.
MR. BARBERO:
Mr. Chair, as a preliminary matter, I'11 be asking some questions of Dr. Zelt and Dr. Klepacki. Mr. Kruhlak will be asking a few questions of Mr. Wallis.

MR. BARBERO CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Dr. Zelt, sir, are you there?
A. MR. ZELT:
Yes, I'm here.
Q. Sir, you probably don't remember this, but we've been to a couple of these together, sir. I'm usually sitting beside Mr. Fitch or Mr. Kruhlak. This is the first time I've had an opportunity to question you,
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sir, so I'm looking forward to it.
I think the most recent one we were at, sir, was Bashaw Oil, an AER proceeding up in Drayton Valley. It might jog your memory.

Sir, I just wanted to ask you quickly and, in light of the time, a few questions about what \(I\) heard today, and I want to start by just confirming a few things.

You would agree, sir, that Alberta Transportation used an acceptable regulatory model in relation to the
A. MR. ZELT: Correct. Correct.
Q. And like you, sir, Alberta Transportation did conclude that there was potential for fugitive dust; correct?
A. MR. ZELT:

Alberta Transportation did determine that there was a level of dust. In my mind, it was biased very low.
Q. Right. And that's fine, sir. But we can also agree that both your report and Alberta Transportation concluded that there would be need for mitigation; correct?
A. MR. ZELT: Correct. There is -- there is need for immediate and ongoing mediation.
Q. Very good, sir. Now, I want to ask you quickly a
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question about your report. So if we could -- well, sir, in the interest of time \(I\) don't know that we need to bring it up but you tell me if we do.

Your report, which is Exhibit 267 at page 17, sir, you state the following: (as read)
"This assumption -- "
I'm sorry, sir, I think I've given you the wrong -- wrong quote. One moment. Here we are, sir.

So again, 267 page 17, you write, sir, under the heading "Distribution": (as read)
"The size distribution of particles assumed in Exhibit 67 is based upon generic particulate emissions."

And then, sir, you site US EPA 1998.
Now, sir, I would like to show you another document and that is Exhibit 67 at page 382, please, zoom host. And, again, zoom host, that was PDF page 382. And if we could just focus in on Number 5, please. A little bit more, please.

So, Dr. Zelt, this is the Alberta Transportation

Transportation actually used US EPA Section 13.2.5. Do you see that, sir?

Sir, I don't know if you are trying to speak. I don't hear you.
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A. MR. ZELT: Yes, I do. Sorry, I was trying -- the mute wasn't working.
Q. Right. Okay. Thank you, sir.

So is there an error in your report, sir?
A. MR. ZELT: The various US EPA documents are quite similar. The document that you're referring to there, 2006, was an update of some of the particulate emissions where they reduced some of the levels down and used the final value of .05 .

I can't remember, I'd have to double-check whether this particular reference for the '98 is actually the same. You can -- so I can jump ahead to what I think you're going to ask, but I'll let you continue.
Q. Thank you, sir. I looked at the references in your report, and I think you've only cited the EIA, Exhibit 66. I did not see any reference to any of these supplemental information requests or responses. Do I have it right, sir, that you didn't review any of those?

And, zoom host, we can take this document down.
A. MR. ZELT: No, I did -- I did review the supplemental information, as I indicated in my discussion.

My review, as I stated, they didn't take many of the factors into consideration. And in my view, it was
tit against tat, and there's no point in going back and forth over the same type of discussion.

So the reference that you brought up of whatever it is -- yes, it's a 2006 document, but it doesn't -- it doesn't answer the question of using the wrong particulate distribution. It doesn't validate with the actual values, so.
Q. Well, sir, let's deal with that right now.

The document that I showed you and took you to Number 5 of was not an SIR, sir.
A. MR. ZELT: Was -- pardon?
Q. It was not an SIR. Do you appreciate that, sir?
A. MR. ZELT: Correct.
Q. Okay. Thank you. So, sir, are you a hydrologist?
A. MR. ZELT: No, I'm not a hydrologist.
Q. Sir, you write at your report, PDF page 16: (as read)
"The deposits from the reservoir would not be expected to be the same as along
a flowing river."
Do you recall writing that, sir?
A. MR. ZELT: Yes, I do.
Q. Sir, you understand that the flows going into SR1 during operation are coming directly out of the Elbow River?
A. MR. ZELT: Yes. And as I indicated in my
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report, and in my discussion using the reference of -I don't have her name right here on hand, the investigation of the sediment deposits, as determined in the G1enmore Reservoir, concluded the same thing as several other references, that the deposition particulates along the riverbank are not representative of a quiescent slow deposition that you'd find in a reservoir and reservoir drawdown.
Q. Yes, sir, you cited the Yang paper 2018 which you said you found on the Internet. That's the one, sir?
A. MR. ZELT: Yes.
Q. Thank you. Sir, we were talking briefly about tackifiers and you indicated you'd made some telephone calls. I'm wondering if you heard the evidence earlier today from our vegetation expert Mr. Nick De Carlo regarding the durations for which tackifier has effectiveness?
A. MR. ZELT: I heard that and that seemed to be in direct contradiction to the reference that AT had supplied in -- it might have been the original EIA where they were talking about tackifiers. And when you look up the details of that tackifier and when I made a cal1 to a local company and enquired about costs to get a general idea and to ask about the longevity of tackifier or particulate suppression, he provided
basically the same types of delay.
So the one to two-month effectiveness down to 80 percent and longer, 60 percent, which you find in the literature review, seem to be in direct difference to what you had provided or your testimony that was provided today, although the testimony that you're referring to didn't provide any statistical or other percent. They just indicated three months to a year and a half.
Q. Right. Dr. Ze1t, let me ask you this, sir: Where in your report is any of that evidence about you making phone calls regarding tackifier?
A. MR. ZELT: It might not have been in the report.
Q. Sir, did you prepare any addendums to your report that are yet to be filed?
A. MR. ZELT: I did not.
Q. Thank you, sir. Are you aware at Exhibit 78, PDF page 654, application rates of tackifier are provided for, including weights per hectare and weights to be
A. MR. ZELT: If I'm aware of what, sorry? The rates are to be determined; is that what you're asking?
Q. No, sir. I'm asking if you're aware of the content at
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Exhibit 78, PDF page 654, that provides weights to hectare for application of tackifier, including weights to be applied in windy conditions. Are you aware of those numbers and that cite, sir?
A. MR. ZELT: I can't remember the details. I don't have it in front of me. I reviewed some of the information about different applications of the tackifier.
Q. Thank you, Dr. Ze1t. Those are my questions for you.

MR. BARBERO:
Mr. Chair, if I could have one moment and I'11 review my notes and turn to Dr. Klepacki.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, please do so.
MR. BARBERO:
Thank you, sir.
A. MR. ZELT: Thank you.

MR. BARBERO:
Mr. Chair?
THE CHAIR:
Yes.
MR. BARBERO:
My 30 seconds is up, so I'm back, sir.

THE CHAIR:
Welcome back.
MR. BARBERO :
I'm all about efficiency today, sir.
Q. Dr. Klepacki, hello, sir.
A. MR. KLEPACKI: Good afternoon.
Q. Sir, I wanted to thank you for those words and for your
involvement these last few days, sir. I have very much enjoyed our interactions, and I hope I haven't been too tough on you, sir. So with that, I would thank you and we have no questions for \(\operatorname{Dr}\). Klepacki.

Mr. Chair, Mr. Kruhlak will now have a few questions for Mr. Wallis.
A. MR. KLEPACKI: Have a very good weekend. Thank you very much.

MR. BARBERO: Thank you, sir.
MR. KRUHLAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
MR. KRUHLAK CROSS-EXAMINES THE PANEL:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Wallis.
A. MR. WALLIS: Good afternoon, Mr. Kruhlak.
Q. Nice to see you again.
A. MR. WALLIS: Good to see you. Looking well.
Q. Likewise.

Sir, it's fair to say you've devoted your career to planning, protecting natural areas from development and identifying areas of conservation significance; is that a fair capsulation?
A. MR. WALLIS: Well, it's a large part of my work. As I've noted in my CV, we've worked for virtually every industry, every level of government and real estate developers on development projects, so I would say \(I\) have a pretty diverse background and
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understanding of things.
Q. I recall one of our last hearings dealt with a wind project, and I think you had advocated for the movement of a couple of turbines to avoid some sensitive areas and take advantage of more disturbed areas, if you recall that.
A. MR. WALLIS: Yeah. Every project is different and has different -- some are good, some are bad, and some, well they just need a lot more work.
Q. And in looking at your report, and I don't know if I need to bring it up, but you had mentioned that you identify high value landscapes in one of your -- one of your figures. It was actually Figure 6 in your report?
A. MR. WALLIS: Correct.
Q. And is it fair to say that -- you've identified the entire sort of area west of Calgary, south of Highway 1 would fit into this type of description.
A. MR. WALLIS: Certainly a big part of it, yes.

And for obvious reasons.
Q. So as you're aware, Alberta Transportation is looking
to construct a flood mitigation project on the Elbow River, and that would require undertaking some activity within this, as described, sensitive area. Is that fair?
A. MR. WALLIS: Yeah, definitely.
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Q. And if you're seeking to construct an off-stream structure, such as SR1, one needs some unique topography to be able to actually be able to divert water from a river naturally and have it exit that holding reservoir naturally after a flood situation. You would be dictated by unique topography is my question.
A. MR. WALLIS: If you were definitely going to build that project, yes. You can't build it on a mountaintop.
Q. And you might not be able to move it as easily as one of those wind turbines that we maybe talked about a couple of years ago?
A. MR. WALLIS: Yeah. And sometimes they prove difficult to move too.
Q. Now, I also note in your -- and you made I think reference to Alberta Transportation's reply submission at Exhibit 325. And at PDF 53, Alberta Transportation actually agreed with you, recognizing that floods are essential to maintain long-term riparian function.

That was a quote \(I\) think they recognized that you cited and agreed with.
A. MR. WALLIS: Yes. We just have a disagreement about the extent of that flooding, so yes.
Q. And you would agree with me that if you built any sort
of flood mitigation or reduction facility on a river, you're going to have some impact on riparian areas?
A. MR. WALLIS: Absolutely.
Q. You know, in the interest of time, Mr. Wallis, I'm just going to take you to your executive summary. If I could ask that your report, Exhibit 271 , be brought up. And the executive summary is at PDF 3.

And I enjoyed reading your report, and in particular, I found your executive summary quite concise at hitting the high points, which I interpret to be that if -- if the project's approved and the mitigation is proposed by Alberta, they would help reduce residual or long-term effects, but they won't prevent immediate and lasting damage of -- that you've classified as "environmental significance." Is that a fair recap of your walk through the various issues?
A. MR. WALLIS: Yeah, if you include the downstream riparian habitats as those areas of environmental significance, yes.
Q. And if I was to ask you -- you make these findings and then you leave the Panel with two recommendations.

MR. KRUHLAK:
And it's right at the bottom of the page, document manager, the recommendations.
Q. And if you could just carry over to the next page. And
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your two recommendations are, firstly: (as read)
"My professional recommendation is that
the project not be approved in its
current configuration and operating mode which captures al1 floods above 160 cubic metres per second."

And you go on to say: (as read)
"If the project is approved, consideration should be given for
allowing larger flood events to pass."
Mr. Wallis, you're aware that in fact larger floods can pass the SR1 project as it's proposed, those exceeding 600 metres cubed per second?
A. MR. WALLIS: Yeah, actually more. But if you look at the record, only the 2013 flood would have passed. All of those other flood events in the historic record would have been attenuated down to the lower level, which doesn't allow those larger flood events to pass.

So, you know, yeah, we're arguing details, I would say, about, you know, what is the frequency of larger flood events you might allow to pass, what's the time scale that you might do that, because you're not going to perhaps allow people to be flooded out while there's a long-term strategy to get people out of floodplains.

You know, there's a big discussion to have around this, and people have already started to have that discussion, but they haven't settled on anything yet. And there are mitigation options, but it's looking at the cumulative effects of everything in the system, all of the dams on the Bow, proposed projects on the Highwood, and this one.

So in its -- if you approve it in its current operating mode, you're just adding to the loading in the system and not fixing the system. We're already seeing stresses on the Bow. I live close to the Bow, in fact, I was affected by the 2013 flood. My power went out. Fortunately that was the only effect because of how close we were to the river. But the problem is the cottonwoods are senescing and dying. It was fortunate the 2013 flood came through. I've been waiting for it. My professor in university, Dr. Hamill, said we were going to get one, and that was back in the late 1960s. So I've been waiting for it, and finally it happened.

But everybody is trying to engineer the rivers and prevent that from happening. And I think in the long run, it goes against, like I said, the Bow Basin management plan and everything we're trying to do with riparian habitats, which is to prevent any further net
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loss of those habitats. This project adds to that.
So it's a complicated thing, and that's why I say there's consideration that needs to be given for allowing larger flood events to pass. It's the question of the how much. So arguing over the details -- I guess we shouldn't do it here, but it's this bigger context \(I\) wanted to really put in place. I'm not arguing that some won't pass anyways, but that might mean some significant damage to the ecosystem in the meantime while we're waiting for it to happen.
Q. Appreciate that, Mr. Wallis, I know this is an area you're very passionate about, and there's a cost and benefit to all of these structures, and you're reminding us that there's also a benefit associated with flooding. Is that fair?
A. MR. WALLIS: Correct. And riparian systems.

You know, all of the documentation \(i n\) my report talks about those benefits. They themselves help with flood control. So, you know, at the same time we're engineering all these structures -- there was a geomorphologist back in the 1940s in Florida that talked about all these engineering projects for flood control, straightening out river channels and that, and they said all it was doing is guaranteeing lots of work for decades to come for engineers, and now they're
spending billions of dollars putting those bends back in the river, restoring the riparian habitats because they know it's the cheapest way to achieve their objectives for society.
Q. Mr. Wallis, I'm just going to take you to your last recommendation to the Board and that is: (as read)
"If the project is approved, immediate sediment removal following floods should not be a condition of the approval."

And I think I heard you say that you recognize now that that is not the plan, to actively remove sediment, and you would be in agreement with that approach?
A. MR. WALLIS: Yes, I would. Definitely I thought it was unwarranted coming from the Impact Assessment Agency of Canada as a condition.
Q. Mr. Wallis, you just bear with me for a moment. I'm just going to check if there's another question.

Thank you very much, Mr. Wallis. Those are all my questions. Keep well.
A. MR. WALLIS: You too, and have a great Easter

MR. KRUHLAK:
THE CHAIR:

Does that conclude the
Thank you.

Alberta Transportation cross-examination?
MR. KRUHLAK: It does, sir. Thank you.

Thank you very much.
So we'11 move to Board staff and Panel questions. Ms. Vance.

MS. VANCE:
Thank you. I have no questions.
Thank you.
6 THE CHAIR:
Mr. Kennedy?
MR. KENNEDY: And I have no questions. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Ceroici?
MR. CEROICI:
I don't have any questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIR:
Dr. Heaney?
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14 Q. Just one question about permanent wetland lost, and we
don't have to get into the numbers. It's for Mr. Wallis. And, you know, what \(I\) would like is a bit of a sense, are there opportunities to offset those wetlands in the region?
A. MR. WALLIS: Well, there's the promise of the opportunity. My experience is that -- and, in fact, some monies have been spent taking perfectly good functioning saline wetlands and converting them into duck ponds using the compensation money under the Alberta wetland policy.

So in some cases I think they've been able to do
some good work, but \(I\) think not all of that compensation money is replacing like with like and, in fact, is damaging some pretty significant habitats in the process.

MR. HEANEY:
Okay. Thank you very much.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Roberts?
I have no more questions for you.
Sorry, Dr. Heaney, that was your question?

MR. HEANEY:
Yeah.
THE CHAIR:
Ms. Roberts?
MS. ROBERTS:
Yeah, I believe that Mr. Kruhlak kind of probably had discussion with Mr. Wallis on where I was going to go.

MS. VANCE QUESTIONS THE PANEL:
Q. So I'11 just put out there what my question was, Mr. Wallis, and if you believe that you've already answered it to Mr. Kruhlak, that's just fine.

What I was wondering is your opinion on how society balances ecological benefits from floods with
A. MR. WALLIS: Well, there's actually a very good report by Alberta WaterSMART in 2016 which made recommendations related to climate vulnerability and
sustainable water management, and of course they said -- one of the things was to pursue more extensive relocation and buyouts in the Bow River and Elbow River floodplains to reduce risk. And they note the benefits of that is that it's the most effective and the only permanent solution. We still encourage people to live in risk areas, because there's always a bigger, badder flood that comes through, and so it's a time thing.

We've developed in these areas over the last century. We're not going to fix our problems right away, but \(I\) think we have to have this bigger overall strategy, so that's what I'm talking about. Maybe we have some flood control projects in the interim, but that shouldn't encourage people to stay where they are or to develop more in there or to develop more extensive infrastructure in those areas.

The process of the City of Calgary, these teams of scientists is to try and figure out ways of over the long term moving people out of those risk areas and protecting some of the highest-value assets. So it's a very complicated thing, and I appreciate that. My job is, from a biodiversity point of view, to make sure people are aware of the risks there and the values of those riparian areas. But, yeah, you know, I don't envy the politicians on this matter, but \(I\) sense that
we should be learning from other jurisdictions who have gone more to natural models and getting people out of those higher-risk areas rather than spending billions of dollars building.

And I worked in China, and I know now the rivers in some places are above the river -- bottom of the rivers are above the surrounding landscape, and when they have big floods and those dykes get breached, it's a huge catastrophe.

So, you know, we can continue down this same road, building infrastructure and not doing the bigger work, but I think if we don't do the two together, we're going to be facing bigger problems in the future.

MS. ROBERTS: Thank you. Appreciate that.
That's all, Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Ms. Roberts.
And thank you, Mr. Wallis, Mr. Zelt, Mr. Klepacki. And send our best regards to Mr. Osko. But thank you, pane1, for your presentations and your answers under cross-examination today. And, Ms. Okoye and Mr. Secord, we'd like to pass along our thanks to all of your panel members over the course of the last two weeks in terms of their presentations and participation in these -- in the evidentiary portion of the hearing. So thank you very much.

1 MR. SECORD
2 MS. OKOYE:
THE CHAIR:
recall -- well, I do recall. I don't think they had requested time, but \(I\) just wanted to check again with Mr. Williams.

MR. SECORD: Just one item, sir. I have no redirect.

THE CHAIR:
Oh. Look at that, I just --
MR. SECORD:
Just in case you were wondering.
I just moved my sticky too. Look at that. I should have moved it so darn quick.

MR. SECORD:
Okay.
THE CHAIR:
I had to make it, so I checked on the redirect. Sorry, Mr. Secord. Mr. Williams, Calalta, did you have any direct on Topic Area 5?

MR. WILLIAMS:
No, I have no direct.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Williams.
And, Mr. Wagner?
MR. WAGNER:
I do.
S. WAGNER (Spokesperson), previously sworn
A. And if I could get Document Number 371 brought up please.

I apologize. There is a howling wind out here today, and there may be whistling in the background. THE CHAIR: Loud and clear, Mr. Wagner.
A. It just comes and goes. I just wanted to indulge the Pane1 for a second, and that is, I talked about grass fires. Right now, there is a grass fire west of Cochrane, and that -- and in the last week, there was a serious grass fire that I'm sure everybody noted in southern Alberta. Both were, my understanding, created by man.

Can I go to Slide Number 20, please.
So I brought this slide up earlier in the day, but as you will note in my submission, \(I\) believe the most significant threat to wildlife is not necessarily from construction nor dam flooding but from unfetterred hunting. Hunting will have an effect on the elk herds. And by the GOA's own acknowledgement this morning, that will also affect the grizzly bear population, which is an endangered species.

The first picture that I'm showing here is of the a public forum and specifically targeting the elk herds that we have in the area. And I might note that it's not just one elk herd as being propagated. There's actually \(I\) believe two or maybe even three elk herds,
and one of those is actually stationed on the east side of 22 , and we haven't seen those elk on this side of the highway for years.

Furthermore, the GoA is communicating that the SR1 would be a park-like setting. I believe that that's a miscommunication, and \(I\) would contend that this is a totally incompatible park and hunting. So with this designation, you're going to increase the risk to human and wildlife to an -- unacceptable levels. I don't understand it.

To note, parks such as Kananaskis have no hunting.
The second picture. I'd like to go to the next. And Dr. Klepacki talked about elk herds and pictures and things that he's very interested in. This was taken last spring in 2020, and you can see the elk calves running around in the background and playing. We don't often see the elk herds that open at that time of year. This was very unique. Usually they hide their calves at that. It's about 300 metres from our house. and we've been quite protective of that elk herd and the calving especially, and this provides them with a safe location for calving for the two to three months of that time of year when it's very sensitive.

The next slide, please.
This is a slide that was taken down our laneway. It was actually taken by a contractor, because we don't often see things like this because they move around quite a bit. This is a grizzly with three cubs. Three cubs is not very common. It shows the health of the sow. And at the same time that this picture was taken I put a map to the right of this. There's two purple dots. The top purple dot is where that location is where the -- this sow and three cubs were.

At the same time, down at the bottom there, there was another purple location, and there was a sow with two cubs, and they were digging mole hills at the time. And they were almost the -- well, they were basically the same time frame, so they were two separate sows in our area with twins and triplets.

The green dot that \(I\) have here is the next picture.

And may I get the next slide, please?
And I talked about this in my submission. This is a sow that actually drug an elk, a full grown elk. I just can't believe the power of this majestic animal drug it about 100 yards into the bush. And this picture was taken from about the road, the 22 highway. And it's feeding its two cubs off of that elk. Not a
normal situation in the spring. A full grown elk, but it was a roadkill, and mom was feeding her cubs.

I would very much like to see the NRCB require the GoA to have a better methodology to protecting wildifife within the SR1. I'm not hearing that from the GoA. Ideally, have the GoA designate this as a no hunting park. That would be the absolute best, I think, for human and wildiffe in this location.

I also believe that it would be incumbent upon the GoA to increase monitoring of the lands. They said that they're not going to do much around wildife. And for the first five years there's going to be a lot of public interest in the area, and if we were to get some extra monitoring in that time frame, it would probably eliminate a lot of the short-term abuses and allow time for a better pl an to be developed; and hopefully with that \(p l a n\), they would engage the community in that plan.

Thank you very much for your time. I am open for questions.
THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Wagner. So.
So, Ms. Louden, do you have any cross-examination?
MS. LOUDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. No, we do not have any questions.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Secord?
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1 MR. SECORD:
2 THE CHAIR:

7 THE CHAIR:
8 MR. CUSANO:
9 THE CHAIR:
10 MR. KRUHLAK:

MR. WAGNER:
MR. FITCH:

THE CHAIR: there --

No questions, sir. Thank you.
Mr. Williams?
No questions.
Mr. Mercer, City of Calgary?
No questions from the City of
Calgary. Thank you, Chairman.
And, Mr. Cusano?
No thank you, sir.
Mr. Kruhlak, Mr. Barbero?
Mr. Chairman, it's Ron Kruhlak. No, we don't have any questions.

Thank you very much, Mr. Wagner.
Thank you, Mr. Kruhlak.
Mr. Chair, it's Gavin Fitch. I just wanted to raise the marking of some additional exhibits, namely some responses to undertakings. So within the past hour or two we have sent three batches of undertakings to the Board and the participants. The first is a response to Undertaking 42. And I'm wondering if we can get that response marked as the next exhibit, please?

Right is that now specifically with Mr. Wagner's? I was just wondering if we could finish with Mr. Wagner before we take those on, or is
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1 MR. FITCH:
Oh, sorry. I forgot that you may have questions of Mr. Wagner. My apologies.

6 THE CHAIR: some of the housekeeping, so -- but we do want to get to that, Mr. Fitch, so thank you.

MR. WAGNER:
Everybody is being very kind to me, Gavin, so probably okay.

THE CHAIR:
Yeah, we probably won't be long. But Alberta Transportation has no questions. So, Mr. Kennedy, did you have any questions?

MR. KENNEDY: I have no questions. Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
And, Ms. Vance?
MS. VANCE:
No questions, thank you.
THE CHAIR:
Mr. Ceroici?
I have no questions. Thank you.
Ms. Roberts?
I have no questions.
Dr. Heaney?
I have no questions. Thank you, Mr. Wagner, for sharing some of those shots of the grizzlies.

MR. WAGNER:
Yeah, it's -- I have to say,
they're not easy to film without trail cams. They are very elusive.

THE CHAIR: I can imagine. And thank you as well, Mr. Wagner I have no questions, and so therefore, I would imagine you don't have any redirect.

MR. WAGNER: I do not have a redirect. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
So thank you, Mr. Wagner.
So we do have --
MR. WAGNER:
And -- sorry, Mr. Chair. I'd ask for a contact for Mr. Secord to just help me through the summation. I was wondering if -- Mr. Secord, I think you have a way of getting ahold of me. If you wouldn't mind doing that.

MR. SECORD: Yes, so I'm -- I'11 send you an email, and we can get in touch over the weekend, over the long weekend, okay.

MR. WAGNER:
Sure. Might avoid disaster on my summation, so...

THE CHAIR:
We11, and, Mr. Wagner, I think Mr. Barbero was complimenting Mr. Klepacki on his last direct, which in some respects might have sounded a bit like a final argument, but that might be something you want to pay attention to as well if you're preparing finals.
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MR. WAGNER: Thank you.
THE CHAIR: Just in terms of process and style. Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Wagner. So, Mr. Fitch, yeah, I think we do have some housekeeping to do on undertakings. Please proceed.

MR. FITCH:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. So the first document we'd like to mark as the next exhibit would be the response of Alberta Transportation to Undertaking Number 42.

MS. FRIEND:
So this is Laura, and that would be Exhibit 403.

EXHIBIT 403 - AT RESPONSE TO
UNDERTAKING 42
MR. FITCH:
Thank you. Next there is a response to a number of undertakings; namely 14, 16, \(17,18,20,24,25,26,27,32,33,35,36,37,38,39\), 40, 41, and 43. If we could mark that document as the next exhibit?

THE CHAIR:
And, Ms. Friend, did you get those numbers? I have them, but did you --

MS. FRIEND:
THE CHAIR:
MS. FRIEND:
EXHIBIT 404 - AT RESPONSE TO
UNDERTAKINGS 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 24, \(25,26,27,32,33,35,36,37,38,39\), 40, 41, AND 43

MR. FITCH:
Thank you. And, finally,
Mr. Chair, the third document we would like to have marked is Alberta Transportation's response to Undertaking 45.

MS. FRIEND: And that exhibit number will be 405.

EXHIBIT 405 - AT RESPONSE TO UNDERTAKING 45

MR. FITCH:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Ms. Friend. That is it from me.

THE CHAIR:
Did Alberta Transportation have rebuttal on the entire Topic Number 5, rebuttal evidence?
MR. FITCH:
Not to my knowledge, but I'11 let Mr. Kruhlak speak.

MR. KRUHLAK:
No, Mr. Chairman, thank you. We do not have any rebuttal evidence on this topic.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. Then I think we are --
MR. WILLIAMS:
Mr. Chair, can I just ask one question? It's Bob Williams here.

THE CHAIR:
MR. WILLIAMS: insurance question we had, and I don't know if it was
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given an undertaking number. Mr. Kruhlak was going to look into that.

THE CHAIR: Just get Mr. Kruhlak here. Do you
recall if that was one of the numbers that was submitted just under Exhibit 403?

MR. KRUHLAK:
I couldn't answer that at this moment. We'd have to check.

Mr. Williams, we'11 make sure we get that back to you directly in addition to providing it to the Board, if it's not already filed.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, we just haven't received anything yet. So as long as it's done prior to our final arguments on Tuesday, that would be appreciated.

MR. KRUHLAK: Mr. Williams.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you.
THE CHAIR:
You will have it before then,

Thank you, Mr. Williams.
Okay. With that, I think we are -- just a couple of quick housekeeping and closing comments and we'11 have -- I think the Panel and myself will have more of a closing comment and some thank you next week, but I would like to quickly report we did have -- we started the day with a bit of a, you know, a worry and a scare about a virus. We have had our website folks, Box
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Clever and MNP who provide our IT support, go through our entire website, exhibit list, and have found nothing. So both MNP and Box Clever did that simultaneous 7 y.

We wanted to give some assurance that the exhibits are fine. We went through today, and none of the document managers over the last two weeks, including today, have themselves encountered any viruses either, so I think we are good to go there.

So our apologies for, you know, raising the issue and having a bit of a scare there, but we don't think if there were issues with viruses, that it had originated with our website, and if they have, they're certainly not there now.

So, as you're preparing, if you need to get to those exhibits and access, I guess our point is you should feel free to do so.

Ms. Vespa, thank you very much for an extremely long day. Great job. And enjoy your weekend. And also please send our thank you to Ms. DiPaolo. And who will we see next week? Do you know? You're up again. Okay. Al1 right, well, thank you very much.

And thank you panel. I'd like to thank Ms. Vance and Mr . Kennedy for all the support that we get from you two folks. Much appreciated.

And thank you to all the legal counsel that are in support of all the panels that we talked about earlier. Very much appreciated. You know, the evidentiary portions, the direct, the cross-examinations were professionally done, professionally handled and professionally stick-handled by you folks. The dialogue was respectful and professional, and it's much appreciated, so thank you on behalf of the Panel to all of you folks.

So Monday -- or, sorry, Tuesday we'11 have a -over the long weekend some of us will be a little busier than others, I get that, preparing for Tuesday. Tuesday sign-in at 7:30 a.m. and a start of 8:00 a.m. on Tuesday. Then it will be a reasonably long day, but I think it's doable. And then we'11 break overnight and have Alberta Transportation return for an 8:30 sign-in but 9:00 hearing start on Wednesday, Apri1 7th.

So with that, thank you very much. Everyone have a nice long Easter weekend, a COVID weekend. I get it. Hopefully you'll find a way to connect with friends and family in a safe way despite COVID. So all the best, take care, and we'11 see you next week.

PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO APRIL 6, 2021, AT 8:00 A.M.
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & EXHIBIT 398 - AID TO CROSS SCLG TO AT TOPIC 5 & 2219 \\
\hline 2 & AIR QUALITY AND COMMUNITY LOCATIONS & \\
\hline 3 & & \\
\hline 4 & EXHIBIT 399- CITY OF CALGARY TRANSCRIPT & 2322 \\
\hline 5 & CORRECTIONS & \\
\hline 6 & & \\
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\hline 13 & EXHIBIT 403-AT RESPONSE TO UNDERTAKING 42 & 2478 \\
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\hline 16 & 17, 18, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, & \\
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\hline 18 & & \\
\hline 19 & EXHIBIT 405 - AT RESPONSE TO UNDERTAKING 45 & 2479 \\
\hline 20 & & \\
\hline 21 & & \\
\hline 22 & & \\
\hline 23 & & \\
\hline 24 & & \\
\hline 25 & & \\
\hline & AMICUS REPORTING GROUP & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN}

UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT WILL COMMIT TO
MITIGATE AIRBORNE DUST WITHIN 24 HOURS OF THE ISSUE OR A COMPLAINT ARISING (SEE TRANSCRIPT FOR FURTHER DESCRIPTION)

UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT WILL COMMIT TO
BASELINE MONITORING TO MEASURE INCREASES IN INSECT ACTIVITY AND DEVELOP A MITIGATION PLAN FOR SAME UNDERTAKING - TO CONFIRM THAT THE PROJECT OPERATOR2263

OR PROPOSED INDEPENDENT AUTHORITY WILL WORK WITH LOCAL RESIDENTS IN ROCKY VIEW COUNTY TO MONITOR AIR QUALITY WITH LIVE READINGS AT LOCATIONS IDENTIFIED BY THE SPRINGBANK COMMUNITY, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, RANGE ROAD 33 NEAR SPRINGBANK HIGH SCHOOL AND SOCCER PARK; ELBOW VALLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, AND HIGHWAY 8 AREAS (SEE TRANSCRIPT FOR FURTHER DESCRIPTION)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & UNDERTAKING - FOR THE PROPONENT TO ADVISE IF IT & 2264 \\
\hline 2 & WILL CREATE A MECHANISM TO NOTIFY CYCLISTS OF & \\
\hline 3 & RESERVOIR OPERATIONS THAT IMPACT SPRINGBANK ROAD & \\
\hline 4 & AND AIR QUALITY WARNINGS (SEE TRANSCRIPT FOR & \\
\hline 5 & FURTHER DESCRIPTION) & \\
\hline 6 & & \\
\hline 7 & UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT WILL AS A CONDITION & 2265 \\
\hline 8 & OF APPROVAL INCLUDE AN ELK MONITORING AND & \\
\hline 9 & MANAGEMENT PLAN THAT ENGAGES LOCAL LANDOWNER & \\
\hline 10 & REFUSED & \\
\hline 11 & & \\
\hline 12 & UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT WILL RETAIN AN & 2266 \\
\hline 13 & EXPERT ON TOXICOLOGY TO DETERMINE THE IMPACTS OF & \\
\hline 14 & THE POST-FLOOD SEDIMENT AND FLOODWATER QUALITY & \\
\hline 15 & CONSIDERING THE MORTALITY OF WILDLIFE AND PLANTS & \\
\hline 16 & WITHIN THE RESERVOIR AND/OR PROVIDE A WRITTEN & \\
\hline 17 & RESPONSE RELATIVE TO THE SHARING OF THOSE RESULTS & \\
\hline 18 & (SEE TRANSCRIPT) & \\
\hline 19 & & \\
\hline 20 & UNDERTAKING - (SEE TRANSCRIPT) & 2268 \\
\hline 21 & & \\
\hline 22 & & \\
\hline 23 & & \\
\hline 24 & & \\
\hline 25 & & \\
\hline & REPORTING GROUP & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & UNDERTAKING - TO PROVIDE AN ANSWER TO THE & 2269 \\
\hline 2 & QUESTION: "HOW THOSE COSTS AND THE BENEFIT COSTS & \\
\hline 3 & RELATED TO EXHIBIT 159, TABLE 49, PDF PAGE 231. & \\
\hline 4 & IS THIS NOT THE SAME COST, JUST ON AN ANNUALIZED & \\
\hline 5 & BASIS & \\
\hline 6 & & \\
\hline 7 & UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE IF AT/AE WILL CARRY AN & 2280 \\
\hline 8 & INSURANCE POLICY FOR BUSINESS INTERRUPTION LOSS & \\
\hline 9 & FOR STAKEHOLDERS CLOSE BY; IF SO, CAN CALAWAY & \\
\hline 10 & PARK/CALALTA WATERWORKS BE NAMED IN THAT POLICY & \\
\hline 11 & & \\
\hline 12 & UNDERTAKING - WOULD AT CONSIDER MAKING THE SR1 & 2288 \\
\hline 13 & FOOTPRINT A NO HUNTING AREA - REFUSED & \\
\hline 14 & & \\
\hline 15 & UNDERTAKING - REFERRING TO THE SNN UNDERTAKING & 2421 \\
\hline 16 & PROVIDED TO ADVISE WHETHER AT WOULD LIKE TO & \\
\hline 17 & CORRECT THEIR EVIDENCE WITH RESPECT TO THE HIGH & \\
\hline 18 & LOAD CORRIDOR AND/OR TO RECONCILE THEIR RESPONSES & \\
\hline 19 & OF YESTERDAY AND THEIR STATEMENT IN THE OPENING & \\
\hline 20 & STATEMENT WITH THE UNDERTAKING THAT HAS BEEN & \\
\hline 21 & PROVIDED & \\
\hline 22 & & \\
\hline 23 & & \\
\hline 24 & & \\
\hline 25 & & \\
\hline & AMICUS REPORTING GROUP & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1 UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE SNN ON WHAT BASIS WAS THE ..... 2421
224226 RESPONSE PROVIDED WITH RESPECT TO THE HIGH LOAD7 CORRIDOR, TO ADVISE WHY THE SEGMENT OF HIGHWAY 22
 HAS NOT BEEN DESIGNATED THE SAME

10 UNDERTAKING - TO ADVISE WHAT WILL TRIGGER THE2422 PORTION OF HIGHWAY 22 BETWEEN HIGHWAY 1 AND HIGHWAY 8 PROPOSED TO BECOME A HIGH LOAD CORRIDOR UNDERTAKING - REFERRING TO THE UNDERTAKING RESPONSE PROVIDED WITH RESPECT TO THE HIGH LOAD CORRIDOR, TO ADVISE WHY THE SEGMENT OF HIGHWAY 22

SUBJECT PORTION OF HIGHWAY 22 BECOMING DESIGNATED OR IN SERVICE AS A HIGH LOAD CORRIDOR
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2341:6, 15, 19; & 43,000 [1] - 2276:17 & 7.5 [1] - 2411:10 & 2205:5; 2216:17; & 2429:15; 2435:5 \\
\hline 2342:10, 20; 2343:8, & 45 [4]- 2331:13; & 70 [1] - 2291:14 & 2231:2; 2232:11; & acknowledging [1] - \\
\hline 24; 2344:9; 2345:6, & 2479:6, 10; 2486:19 & 705 [1] - 2271:5 & 2253:5; 2293:8; & 2392:11 \\
\hline 19; 2347:2; 2348:3; & 450 [1] - \(2446: 2\) & 75 [1] - 2403:25 & 2297:7; 2305:8, 15; & acquire [1] - 2382:24 \\
\hline 2349:10, 15, 22; & 46 [2] - 2427:22; & 75th [1] - 2198:20 & 2314:12; 2316:7, 20; & acreage [1] - 2445:7 \\
\hline 2424:23; 2478:16; & 2436:12 & 760 [2] - 2432:16, 25 & 2322:20; 2323:21, 23; & acronym [1] - 2363:7 \\
\hline 2479:1; 2486:16 & 47 [1] - 2385:22 & 78 [3] - 2410:22; & 2324:7, 12; 2325:16; & Act [9]-2335:3; \\
\hline 353 [2] - 2365:3; & 470 [1] - 2423:13 & 2456:18; 2457:1 & 2415:25; 2419:24; & 2336:8, 10; 2337:7; \\
\hline 2366:3 & 475 [1] - 2435:16 & 7:23 [3] - 2199:18; & 2460:3, 11; 2466:25 & 2349:15; 2373:8; \\
\hline 36 [3]-2478:16; & 48 [3] - 2198:19; & 2200:10 & Aboriginal [2] - & 2384:4; 2426:2 \\
\hline 2479:1; 2486:16 & 2205:4; 2424:22 & 7:30 [2] - 2423:18; & 2337:25; 2358:23 & acting [1] - 2304:21 \\
\hline 37 [3] - 2478:16; & 49 [9] - 2205:5; & 2482:13 & absolute [1] - 2474:7 & action [4] - 2247:23; \\
\hline 2479:1; 2486:16 & 2239:21; 2241:22, 25; & 7th [3] - 2423:23; & absolutely [6] - & 2261:21; 2274:4; \\
\hline 371 [3] - 2281:13; & 2257:21; 2260:3; & 2424:1; 2482:17 & 2277:8; 2300:23; & 2311:3 \\
\hline 2282:4; 2470:24 & 2269:1, 18; 2303:5 & & 2351:21; 2369:24; & Action [4] - 2193:23; \\
\hline \(38[3]-2478: 16 ;\)
\(2479 \cdot 1 \cdot 2486: 17\) & & 8 & 2449:16; 2461:3 & 2324:3; 2423:12; \\
\hline 2479:1; 2486:17 & 5 & & abundance [3] - & 2427:3 \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
380[5]-2210: 17 \\
2211: 17 ; 2232: 7,
\end{array}
\] & & \begin{tabular}{l}
8 [10] - 2222:7; \\
2261:0. \(2263 \cdot 18\)
\end{tabular} & \[
2315: 16,24 ; 2385: 16
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
actions [4] - \\
2261.23. 2274.5, 7 .
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \[
25
\] & \[
2201: 8 ; 2219: 3,14
\] & 2355:22; 2413:2; & \[
\text { 2284:11; 2285:14, } 17
\] & \[
2377: 19
\] \\
\hline 382 [2] - 2452:16 & 2244:2; 2253:23; & 2421:17, 20; 2423:17; & abuses [1] - 2474:15 & activation [1] - \\
\hline 39 [8] - 2231:7, 11; & 2323:24; 2324:8; & 2487:19 & accept [5] - 2219:1; & 2435:10 \\
\hline 2233:24; 2283:3; & 2325:12; 2330:4, 16; & 80 [3] - 2285:16; & 2265:6; 2267:8; & active [3] - 2214:15; \\
\hline 2427:22; 2478:16; & 2331:22; 2346:16; & 2397:19; 2456:3 & 2288:7; 2375:5 & 2245:7; 2324:20 \\
\hline 2479:1; 2486:17 & 2356:5; 2360:24; & 80,000 [1] - 2385:16 & acceptable [5] - & actively [1] - 2465:11 \\
\hline 390 [6] - 2200:18; & 2386:1; 2388:6; & 84 [1] - 2433:1 & 2221:24; 2261:12; & activities [21] - \\
\hline 2201:9, 17; 2204:3; & 2402:23; 2404:21; & 85 [6] - 2243:17; & 2369:21; 2376:8; & 2230:15, 19; 2236:9; \\
\hline 2485:19, 23 & 2412:14; 2420:20; & 2253:13; 2255:8; & 2451:10 & 2244:19, 24; 2268:15; \\
\hline 394 [1]-2437:9 & 2423:15; 2439:17; & 2256:19; 2383:12; & acceptance [1] - & 2274:20; 2275:14, 20; \\
\hline 395 [4] - 2369:4; & 2449:9; 2452:18; & 2442:24 & 2335:15 & 2277:13, 19; 2280:8; \\
\hline 2440:10; 2441:25; & 2454:10; 2470:17; & 86 [1] - 2398:6 & access [13] - 2232:2, & 2313:10, 18; 2342:2; \\
\hline 2486:7 & 2479:14; 2485:17, 21; & 88 [1] - 2445:9 & 9; 2233:4; 2263:23; & 2348:19; 2356:25; \\
\hline 396 [5] - 2200:15, 23; & 2486:1 & 8:00 [3] - 2423:20; & 2305:16; 2337:20; & 2431:9 \\
\hline 2206:17; 2485:17 & 50 [3] - 2403:25; & 2482:13, 24 & 2340:2; 2342:24; & ACTIVITY [2] - \\
\hline 397 [6]-2201:4, 7; & 2406:6; 2425:16 & 8:28[1] - 2194:10 & 2347:7, 17; 2348:11; & 2260:25; 2487:10 \\
\hline 2204:12, 17; 2206:17; & 50-year [2] - & 8:30 [5] - 2323:24; & 2361:5; 2481:16 & activity [10] - \\
\hline 2485:21 & 2241:15; 2242:24 & 2324:8; 2423:15, 25; & accessed [2] - & 2214:18; 2230:25; \\
\hline 398 [4] - 2219:12; & 52 [2]-2429:18; & 2482:16 & 2340:12; 2343:7 & 2260:16, 18; 2290:7; \\
\hline 2222:2; 2486:1 & 2431:2 & & accommodate [2] - & 2337:14; 2341:7; \\
\hline 399 [3] - 2321:23; & 53 [3]-2431:19, 24; & 9 & 2369:24; 2389:7 & 2459:23 \\
\hline 2322:5; 2486:4 & 2460:18 & & accommodated [1] - & actual [10] - 2201:25; \\
\hline 3:30 [1] - 2418:20 & 57 [2]-2374:2; & 9 [6] - 2193:4 & 2419:24 & 2203:17; 2298:14; \\
\hline 3:50 [1] - 2208:2 & 2376:11 & 2239:21; 2241:25 & accommodating [1] & 2404:12; 2405:2; \\
\hline 4 & 585,000 [1] - 2385:20 & 2321:1; 2362:6;
2484:3 & 2422:2 & 2411:2; 2414:4; \\
\hline & 5:30 [3] - 2206:19; & 2480[3]-2324:14; & - 2372:22; 2424:11 & adapt [1] - 2318:23 \\
\hline 4 [21] - 2218:23; & 2423:19, 21 & 2423:5, 24 & accordance [2] - & adaptable [1] - \\
\hline 2223:19; 2225:11, 13; & 5:44 [2] - 2207:8 & 93 [1]-2433:25 & 2204:16; 2336:9 & 2235:10 \\
\hline 2226:12; 2232:21, 24 ; & & 94 [3]-2430:1, 20; & according [8] - & adaptive [5] - \\
\hline 2233:18-20; 2234:4; & 6 & 2433:25 & 2215:6; 2385:19; & 2209:8, 12, 16; \\
\hline 2235:16, 24; 2236:5, & & 98 [1] - 2415:3 & 2386:19; 2399:25; & 2246:25; 2379:2 \\
\hline 8; 2309:7, 15; 2356:1; & 6 [5] - 2219:6; & 98th [2] - 2406:13; & 2404:23; 2405:24; & adaptively [1] - \\
\hline 2400:15; 2439:16 & 2357:5; 2406:24; & 2414:21 & 2445:23; 2446:3 & 2249:11 \\
\hline 4-01 [1] - 2311:11 & 2459:13; 2482:24 & 99 [1] - 2404:1 & accordingly [1] - & add [10] - 2199:3; \\
\hline 4-kilometre [1] - & 6.1.8 [1] - 2441:6 & 99.9th [1] - 2404:3 & 2204:25 & 2243:7; 2255:16; \\
\hline 2385:5 & 6.3 [2]-2293:24 & 99th [4]-2405:9, 11; & account [5] - 2276:9; & 2257:17; 2260:22; \\
\hline 40 [11] - 2247:10; & 6.4.3 [1] - 2295:11 & 2406:13; 2413:19 & 2348:18; 2376:14; & 2264:3; 2303:19; \\
\hline 2322:18; 2324:1; & 60 [7] - 2299:13; & 9:00 [3] - 2423:23; & 2406:3; 2441:2 & 2304:13; 2419:21 \\
\hline 2423:11; 2478:17; & 2324:14; 2356:24; & 2424:1; 2482:17 & accounted [1] - & added [2] - 2348:5; \\
\hline 2479:2; 2486:17 & 2369:9; 2397:21; & & 2412:4 & 2349:24 \\
\hline 400 [6] - 2241:17; & 2456:3 & A & accumulated [1] - & addendums [1] - \\
\hline 2368:25; 2369:1, 4; & 600 [3] - 2436:17; & & 2228:7 & 2456:15 \\
\hline 2418:17; 2486:7 & 2446:2; 2462:13 & A.M [2] - 2194:10; & accurate [7] - & adding [3]-2295:15; \\
\hline 401 [3] - 2418:13, 18; & 62 [5] - 2282:9, & 2482:24 & 2203:21; 2332:10; & 2463:9 \\
\hline 2486:9 & 14-16; 2424:21 & a.m [6] - 2206:19; & 2370:25; 2394:1; & addition [7] - \\
\hline 402 [3] - 2449:17, 21; & 654 [2] - 2456:19; & 2423:17, 23; 2482:13 & 2403:13; 2424:24; & 2219:19; 2242:21; \\
\hline 2486:11 & 2457:1 & abandoned [1] - & 2483:4 & 2339:12; 2371:13; \\
\hline 403 [4] - 2478:11; & 66 [2]-2383:2; & 2435:10 & accurately [2] - & 2383:22; 2427:10; \\
\hline 2480:5; 2486:13 & 2453:16 & abdication [2] - & 2337:24; 2405:16 & 2480:9 \\
\hline 404 [3] - 2478:23; & 67 [4] - 2299:13; & 2384:9, 24 & achieve [2] - 2252:9; & additional [27] - \\
\hline 2486:15 & 2396:17; 2452:12, 16 & abilities [1] - 2303:7 & 2465:3 & 2200:24; 2226:1, 14, \\
\hline 405 [3] - 2479:8; & 6:30 [1] - 2324:15 & ability [14] - 2301:24; & acknowledge [6] - & 16, 18-19; 2234:23; \\
\hline 2486:19 & 6th [1]-2423:17 & 2302:15; 2311:16; & 2328:22; 2371:6; & 2237:16; 2258:21; \\
\hline 41[3]-2478:17; & & 2317:19; 2318:1; & 2378:11; 2386:17; & 2262:21; 2275:5; \\
\hline 2479:2; 2486:17 & 7 & 2347:23; 2349:19; & 2394:12; 2425:5 & 2338:21; 2339:7, 21; \\
\hline 410 [1] - 2423:14 & & 2351:23; 2400:17; & acknowledged [1] - & 2346:3; 2358:4; \\
\hline 42 [4]-2475:19; & 7 [4] - 2258:13; & 2408:6; 2416:21; & 2399:3 & 2365:5; 2374:14, 16, \\
\hline 2478:9, 13; 2486:13 & 2335:2; 2406:10; & 2445:4; 2448:18; & acknowledgement & 20; 2375:7; 2383:23; \\
\hline 43 [3] - 2478:17; & 2412:6 & 2483:7 & [1] - 2471:17 & 2418:2; 2420:14; \\
\hline 2479:2; 2486:17 & 7-year [1] - 2432:3 & able [25] - 2199:11; & acknowledges [2] - & 2436:7; 2445:24; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2367:13; 2476:2; & approaching [2] - & 16, 19; 2408:20; & 2347:15 & 2452:12 \\
\hline 2481:10 & 2250:3; 2412:3 & 2413:16, 25; & assess [10]-2221:2, & assumes [1] - \\
\hline apologize [4] - & appropriate [29] - & 2414:11-13, 18; & 13, 19; 2236:14; & 2397:8 \\
\hline 2253:17; 2294:13; & 2224:15; 2231:17; & 2416:10, 12, 20; & 2287:1; 2290:3; & suming [9] - \\
\hline 2419:17; 2471:1 & 2252:14; 2255:23; & 2426:6; 2427:4, 9-10, & 2316:12; 2337:24; & 2209:5; 2214:1; \\
\hline appeal [2] - 2447:2; & 2256:6; 2257:20; & 20-21, 23; 2428:8; & 2377:3; 2383:20 & 2215:7; 2224:17; \\
\hline 2449:2 & 2260:22; 2262:16, 22; & 2429:10; 2430:2, 17; & assessed [5] - & 2227:14; 2247:9; \\
\hline appear [2] - 2218:8; & 2263:3, 5; 2264:3; & 2433:2, 5; 2441:12; & 2239:4; 2333:4; & 2341:8; 2368:4; \\
\hline 2349:1 & 2265:18; 2268:15; & 2443:7; 2444:10, 17; & 2342:10; 2377:15; & 2423:2 \\
\hline appeared [3] - & 2271:9; 2276:12; & 2459:16, 23; 2464:11; & 2408:21 & assumption [10] - \\
\hline 2246:10; 2372:10; & 2313:13; 2319:22; & 2471:23; 2473:16; & assesses [1] - & 2228:8; 2286:3; \\
\hline 2425:18 & 2326:18; 2332:4; & 2474:13 & 2439:13 & 2311:4; 2330:12; \\
\hline appendices [2] - & 2345:21; 2346:12; & areas [62] - 2208:11; & assessing [1] - & 2347:18; 2387:6; \\
\hline 2433:21; 2442:3 & 2353:4; 2365:25; & 2210:25; 2233:12; & 2441:15 & 2390:25; 2391:4; \\
\hline appendix [3] - & 2366:7; 2401:5; & 2234:1, 17, 20; & Assessment [14] - & 2398:5; 2452:6 \\
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\hline application [9] - & 2267:19; 2280:23; & 2301:25; 2311:19; & assessment [89] - & 2268:12; 2329:1 \\
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\hline 2216:16; 2256:10 & 2440:14 & argues [1] - 2375:20 & 2398:5, 20, 25; & 2383:6; 2385:4; \\
\hline apply [11] - 2209:7, & Area [2] - 2330:16; & arguing [4] - & 2399:5, 8-10, 12-13; & 2386:10, 19; 2388:14; \\
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\hline 2350:12; 2422:22; & 2309:11; 2312:2; & 2246:6 & associated [13] - & atmospheric [2] - \\
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\hline 2196:21; 2209:17; & 2344:5; 2345:20; & aside [1] - 2365:22 & 2442:6, 16; 2464:14 & ATTACHMENT \({ }^{\text {[ }}\) ] - \\
\hline 2230:23; 2283:23; & 2347:14, 20; 2348:9; & aspect [3] - 2246:17; & association [1] - & 2200:17; 2201:8; \\
\hline 2290:16; 2316:18; & 2354:11; 2359:18, 20, & 2342:2; 2402:15 & 2236:10 & 2485:18, 22 \\
\hline 2319:13; 2365:14; & 22; 2361:4; 2362:14, & aspects [11] - & assume [6] - & attachment [1] - \\
\hline 2401:7; 2439:13; & 17; 2363:15; 2370:16; & 2278:6; 2289:6; & 2290:13; 2298:24; & 2444:18 \\
\hline 2441:11; 2465:12 & 2374:23; 2378:2, 7; & 2311:7; 2317:7; & 2303:13; 2310:22; & attempt [1] - 2364:19 \\
\hline approaches [6] - & 2380:3, 14; 2381:2; & 2338:22, 25; 2342:25; & 2317:23; 2420:6 & attempted [1] - \\
\hline 2221:2, 12, 19; & 2384:20; 2385:20; & 2349:15; 2365:21; & assumed [6] - & 2243:14 \\
\hline 2376:22; 2400:19; & \[
2398: 9,11 ; 2400: 3
\] & 2400:16 & 2208:20; 2226:7, 9; & attempts [2] - \\
\hline 2413:16 & 2407:1, 5, 8, 13-14, & assertation [1] - & 2400:3; 2414:20; & 2290:17; 2365:17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

NRCB 1701, Volume 9, April 1, 2021
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline attend \({ }_{[1]}\) - 2369:17 attending [1] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { balance [1] - } \\
& 2358: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
17-18, 20, 23 \\
Bearspaw [1]
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { better [17]-2209:24; } \\
\text { 2225:22; } 2270: 8,13 ;
\end{gathered}
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\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2323:5; 2327:17; } \\
& \text { 2328:16; 2344:20, 23; }
\end{aligned}
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\hline audio [2] - 2281:19 & 2369:22; 2387:18, 25; & 2421:21 & 17; 2302:14; 2308:21; & biz [1] - 2399:23 \\
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\hline authority [4] - & base [3] - 2204:22; & 13, 25; 2231:1; & 2448:20 & 2315:20; 2399:19; \\
\hline 2261:3; 2268:6, 18; & 2232:17; 2381:3 & 2246:2; 2372:24 & biased [1] - 2451:18 & 2414:15 \\
\hline 2334:25 & baseball [2] - & begun [1] - 2245:19 & biassing [1] - & blown [1] - 2256:25 \\
\hline AUTHORITY [2] - & 2218:4; 2222:4 & behalf [7] - 2319:16; & 2402:21 & blue [7] - 2242:13; \\
\hline 2263:10; 2487:13 & based [33] - 2208:25; & 2329:21; 2333:19; & bifurcates [1] - & 2402:4; 2410:17; \\
\hline automated [1] - & 2219:8, 23; 2225:18; & 2350:9; 2382:12; & 2430:16 & 2411:3; 2413:17; \\
\hline 2203:15 & 2226:3, 9; 2283:23; & 2450:6; 2482:8 & big [10] - 2299:25; & 2414:12; 2433:6 \\
\hline availability [4] - & 2292:24; 2298:18; & behave [1] - \(2401: 13\) & 2328:5; 2329:16, 21; & blue-green [1] - \\
\hline 2347:6, 19, 22, 24 & 2309:24; 2310:9; & behaviours [5] - & 2404:4; 2418:17; & 2433:6 \\
\hline available [16] - & 2311:25; 2312:17; & 2336:2; 2340:16, 25; & 2433:3; 2459:18; & Board [27] - 2193:1; \\
\hline 2202:15; 2248:23; & 2316:20, 25; 2318:3; & 2342:22; 2348:1 & 2463:1; 2469:8 & 2196:23; 2202:19; \\
\hline 2249:9; 2255:3; & 2340:2; 2342:21; & behind [2]-2327:18; & bigger [7] - 2242:14; & 2213:14, 21; 2240:11; \\
\hline 2303:9; 2310:7; & 2377:9, 17; 2381:12; & 2329:18 & 2435:22; 2464:7; & 2262:20; 2270:18; \\
\hline 2311:2; 2312:15, 17; & 2385:15; 2390:20; & belabour [1] - & 2468:7, 11; 2469:11, & 2281:1; 2289:1; \\
\hline 2314:12; 2341:9, 19; & 2399:8; 2400:9; & 2298:12 & 13 & 2326:21; 2355:2; \\
\hline 2360:16, 19; 2387:2; & 2402:12; 2409:5; & belief [4] - 2371: & biggest [1] - 2197:23 & 2361:7; 2366:21; \\
\hline 2449:9 & 2411:11; 2417:25; & 2394:2; 2424:25; & billboard [2] - & 2371:7, 10; 2372:12, \\
\hline average [2] - & 2423:21; 2429:7; & 2448:13 & 2282:5, 22 & 19; 2387:23; 2420:22; \\
\hline 2222:21; 2317:1 & 2441:17; 2452:12 & belies [1] - 2378:22 & billion [2] - 2385:22; & 2425:9; 2447:2; \\
\hline aviation [1] - & baseline [21] - & below [6] - 2198:22; & 2386:1 & 2449:1; 2465:6; \\
\hline 2375:25 & 2260:15; 2265:14, 20; & 2239:1; 2241:18; & billions [3] - & 2466:2; 2475:18; \\
\hline avoid [4]-2428:1, & 2289:18, 22; 2294:6, & 2358:16; 2436:11; & 2386:13; 2465:1 & 2480:9 \\
\hline 11; 2459:4; 2477:18 & 12-13, 17, 23; 2295:6, & 2445:22 & 2469:3 & Board's [4] - \\
\hline avoidance [12] - & 10; 2307:23; 2308:5; & benchmark [1] - & biodegradeable [1] - & 2211:19; 2229:5; \\
\hline 2336:2; 2340:3, 16, & 2348:6; 2349:25; & 2271:6 & 2248:22 & 2241:21; 2326:11 \\
\hline 25; 2341:18; 2342:4, & 2374:4, 9; 2375:12; & bends [1] - 2465:1 & biodiversity [7] - & Bob [2] - 2194:5; \\
\hline 22; 2344:5; 2348:1; & 2386:16 & beneficial [2] - & 2265:14; 2426:4; & 2479:22 \\
\hline 2361:19, 24 & BASELINE [2] - & 2238:10; 2313:15 & 2427:10; 2433:10; & bodies [1] - 2425:19 \\
\hline avoiding [2] - & 2260:24; 2487:9 & BENEFIT [1] - & 2437:25; 2438:9; & Bookcase [1] - \\
\hline 2286:4; 2290:9 & basement [1] - & 2269:17 & 2468:22 & 2309:15 \\
\hline aware [28] - 2217:5, & 2304:17 & benefit & biological [1] - & bookends [3] - \\
\hline 15, 18; 2218:14; & bases [1] - 2385:9 & 2211:19; 2237:25; & 2441:14 & 2298:13; 2309:16; \\
\hline 2287:22; 2357:14, 22; & Bashaw [1] - 2451:3 & 2258:10, 22; 2259:17; & biologist [1] - & 2311:13 \\
\hline 2358:1; 2360:9; & Basin [4] - 2428:3; & 2260:1; 2269:1; & 2425:15 & boost [1] - 2303:22 \\
\hline 2361:12, 15, 18; & 2442:2; 2443:4; & 2436:20; 2464:13 & biologists [3] - & borne [2] - 2390:14, \\
\hline 2362:25; 2364:18, 22; & 2463:23 & benefits [3] - & 2244:20, 24; 2245:12 & \\
\hline 2365:4, 10; 2366:9; & BASIS [2] - 2269:20; & 2464:18; 2467:20; & biology [1] - 2426:11 & borough [1] - \\
\hline 2456:18, 22-23, 25; & 2421:19 & 2468:4 & biophysical [3] - & 2390:22 \\
\hline 2457:3; 2459:20; & basis [9] - 2213:3; & berm [8] - 2383:7, 9, & 2334:16; 2338:8; & borrow [1] - 2384:1 \\
\hline 2462:11; 2468:23 & 2215:5; 2221:8; & 13, 19, 22; 2390:21; & 2340:18 & bother [1] - 2399:11 \\
\hline B & 2317:15; 2344:2; & 2391:7; 2445:22 & birds [2] - 2265:16; & 2239:13; 2258:14; \\
\hline & 2370:2; 2421:15 & beside [1] - 2450:24 & 2340:21 & 2339:15; 2402:2; \\
\hline bachelor [1] - & batch [1] - 2331:16 & best [24]-2196:3, & bit [55] - 2194:13; & 2406:17; 2410:8; \\
\hline 2332:24 & batches [1] - & 20; 2206:7; 2221:25; & 2197:14; 2206:21; & 2432:9; 2446:19; \\
\hline bachelor's [1] - & 2475:17 & 2259:6; 2282:24; & 2223:15; 2232:16; & 2461:23; 2469:6; \\
\hline 2371:14 & BE [1] - 2280:17 & 2288:16; 2344:24; & 2238:21; 2250:9; & 2473:11 \\
\hline background [8]- & beach [1] - 2218:5 & 2370:25; 2371:20; & 2253:8; 2262:5; & Boulevard [1] - \\
\hline 2261:25; 2273:19; & bear [6] - 2270:21; & 2392:1, 25; 2393:9; & 2270:10, 13; 2274:16; & 2445:16 \\
\hline 2307:13; 2394:18, 22; & 2287:7; 2331:14; & 2394:1; 2417:14; & 2282:17; 2289:10; & bounce [3] - \\
\hline 2458:25; 2471:2; & 2465:16; 2471:18 & 2419:18; 2424:25; & 2293:20; 2297:9; & 2407:25; 2408:1, 8 \\
\hline 2472:16 & bearing [2] - & 2442:17; 2448:13; & 2300:24; 2304:13, 23; & boundaries [4] - \\
\hline bad [3] - 2378:12; & 2255:18; 2385:5 & 2469:18; 2474:7; & 2312:13, 23-24; & \[
2373: 16 ; 2382: 5
\] \\
\hline 2413:10; 2459:8 & bears [11] - 2286:19, & 2482:21; 2483:6 & 2314:22; 2318:12; & 2441:16, 22 \\
\hline badder [1] - 2468:7 & 24-25; 2287:1, 9, 11, & bet [1] - 2250:15 & 2321:6; 2322:8, 16; & boundary [5] - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2275:4; 2379:10; & 2426:18; 2455:12 & caking [1] - 2409:15 & capability [2] - & categorized [1] - \\
\hline 2390:25; 2394:22; & bring [15] - 2238:24; & Calalta [7] - 2194:5; & 2312:19; 2437:18 & 2345:4 \\
\hline 2426:25 & 2239:21; 2241:12; & 2324:1; 2387:7; & capable [1] - & ategory [1] - \\
\hline Bow [14] - 2278:5; & 2253:7, 18; 2276:22; & 2423:10; 2470:16 & 2375:13 & 2427:17 \\
\hline 2428:3, 5; 2434:13; & 2281:12; 2282:3, 9, & CALAWAY [1] - & capacity [9] - & caucus [2] - 2325:6; \\
\hline 2436:14; 2442:2, 19; & 25; 2287:24; 2293:15; & 2280:16 & 2301:11; 2304:2, 10; & 2327:4 \\
\hline 2443:4; 2446:12; & 2360:25; 2452:3; & Calaway [2] - & 2345:10, 23; 2346:2, & caucused [1] - \\
\hline 2463:6, 11, 23; & 2459:11 & 2275:8; 2279:24 & 5; 2360:9, 12 & 2323:18 \\
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\hline 2389:17 \({ }^{\text {committed [5] - }}\) & completely [4] - & 2334:16; 2377:7; & 2436:16 & 2403:5 \\
\hline committed [5] - & 2238:6; 2247:7; & 2437:20 & confused [1] - & consistent [3]- \\
\hline 2259:15; 2268:5; & 2248:3; 2292:3 & CONDITION \({ }_{[1]}\) & 2363:5 & 2215:4; 2403:13; \\
\hline 2274:23; 2390:24 & completing [1] - & 2265:10. & confusion [3] 2202:19-2238: & \[
2440: 14
\] \\
\hline 2258:5; 2312:12 & \({ }_{\text {complexity }}[1]\) - & 2227:17; 2259:4 & 2300:17 & constantly [1] - \\
\hline Committee [2] - & 2303:22 & 2260:13; 2261:2; & conjunction [1] & 2447:13 \\
\hline 2425:24; 2426:2 & complicated [4] - & 2262:6; 2263:20; & 2310:13 & constitute [2] - \\
\hline common [6] - & 2402:6; 2403:21; & 2264:16; 2267:8, 22; & connect [1] - & 2263:1; 2347:20 \\
\hline 2221:23; 2283:22; & 2464:2; 2468:21 & 2280:23; 2281:2; & 2482:20 & Constitution [1] - \\
\hline 2291:7; 2395:19; & complied & 2287:24; 2288:8; & connection & 2335:4 \\
\hline \[
2447: 23 ; 2473: 6
\]
\[
\text { commonly }[1] \text { - }
\] & 2440:11 complimenting [1] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2293: 18 ; 2294: 1,21 ; \\
& \text { 290: } 2 \text {; }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
2445: 11
\] & construct [3] 2391.6. \(2459 \cdot 2\) \\
\hline 2255:4 & 2477:21 & 2345:11, 17, 21, 25; & 2359:7 & 2460:1 \\
\hline communicating [2] - & comply [2] - 2228:2; & 2349:25; 2379:21; & consequence [1] - & constructed [3] - \\
\hline 2303:21; 2472:4 & 2431:11 & 2431:12; 2465:9, 15 & 2264:23 & 2306:7; 2383:13; \\
\hline communication [2] & componen & Condition [3] - & consequences [7 & 2430:11 \\
\hline \[
2322: 22,25
\] communities [8] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2441:13, } 19 \\
& \text { components [5] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2265:13; 2293:24; } \\
& 2295: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & 2379:17; 2404:15; 2406:8; 2417:2, 4 & construction [42] 2267:24; 2268:14; \\
\hline 2267:24; 2275:7; & 2338:5, 8; 2380:17; & conditions [60] & conservation \({ }^{66]}\) & 2274:6, 17, 24; \\
\hline 2377:25; 2379:20; & 2431:8; \(2438: 7\) & 2203:17; 2212:4; & 2288:11, 17; 2380:4; & 2275:12; 2276:24 \\
\hline 2428:25; 2436:14, 19 & components' [1] - & 2213:9; 2225:4; & 2427:1; 2442:21; & 2279:16, 19; 2280:1 \\
\hline Communities [3] - & 2441:18 & 2233:13; 2239:8 & 2458:19 & 25; 2285:5; 2290:1 \\
\hline 2193:22; 2324:3; & comprehe & 2249:11; 2257:15; & Conservation [3] & 2294:3, 14, 17, 20 \\
\hline 2423:12 & 2381:10 & 2258:25; 2264:13; & 2193:1; 2427:3 & 2303:14; 2307:19, 22 ; \\
\hline community [13] - & comprehensively \({ }_{[1]}\) & 2266:3; 2267:13; & conservative [7] & 2308:1; 2317:6; \\
\hline 2258:4; 2261:6; & - 2439:13 & 2269:6; 2276:13, 18, & 2226:23; 2227:12; & 2342:1; 2343:16; \\
\hline 2262:10, 15; 2267:25;
2277:2; 2291:10; & compromise [1] - & 20; 22777:22; 2293:13, & 2239:15; 2318:19; & 2345:16; 2371:20; \\
\hline 2277:2; 2291:10; & 2423:7 & 16; 2295:6, 8-9, 21; & 2385:21; 2416:13 & 2381:1; 2383:7, 9 ; \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2303: 1,13,15 ; \\
& 2350.5: 2474 \cdot 17
\end{aligned}
\] & computer \({ }^{\text {[2] - }}\) - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2298: 18 ; 2302: 16,18 ; \\
& 2312: 10: 2314: 16,25
\end{aligned}
\] & conservatively [1] - & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2390: 18,21,24 ; \\
& 2391: 3 ; 2416: 22 ;
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline COMMUNITY [4] - & concentrated [1] - & 2315:1, 19; 2317:24; & \(\mathrm{CONSIDER}_{[1]}\) - & 2425:19; 2430:17 \\
\hline 2219:14; 2263:14; & 2228:19 & 2332:15; 2333:23; & 2288:19 & 2437:15, 25; 2471:15 \\
\hline 2486:2; 2487:16 & concentration [4] & 2335:19; 2336:4; & consider [16] - & constructions [1] - \\
\hline compact [1] - 2408:4 & 2272:3, 17; 2316:25; & 2338:9; 2343:4, 13; & 2198:10; 2224:16 & 2365:6 \\
\hline company [3] - & 2317:3 & 2344:3; 2345:3, 8, 14, & 2262:19; 2263:3; & Consult [2] - \\
\hline 2397:17; 2398:8; & concentrations [16] - & 23; 2348:6, 17 & 2288:1; 2326:20; & 2332:23; 2334:21 \\
\hline 2455:23 & 2224:14; 2225:3, 6 , & 2353:20, 23; 2354:24; & 2338:25; 2340:23; & consultants [1] - \\
\hline Company [1] - & 14, 16; 2226:4; & 2381:4; 2386:9, 17; & 2373:4; 2408:19; & 2403:9 \\
\hline 2356:7 & 2272:17; 2273:11, 18; & 2388:23; 2415:6; & 2427:18; 2439:22 & cons \\
\hline compare [4]-- & 2293:2, 7; 2316:18, & 2441:14; 2456:21; & 2440:3, 16, 24; & 2226:13; 2227:24; \\
\hline 2227:11; 2289:18;
2404:12, 15 & 21; 2317:1; 2413:21; & 2457:3 & 2448:17 & 2294:3; 2295:18; \\
\hline 2404:12, 15 compared [5] - & 2415:4 \({ }^{\text {concept }[1]}\) - & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { conduct }[2]- \\
2283: 21 ; 2361: 20
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { conside } \\
& 2429: 25
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2312:11; 2336:25 } \\
& \text { 2354:20; 2356:17 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 2224:14; 2225:3; & 2221:10 & conducted [11] - & consideration [27] - & 2365:12, 22 \\
\hline 2286:18; 2429:22; & concepts [1] - & 2217:15; 2222:8; & 2222:20; 2275:24; & consultative [1] \\
\hline 2433:4 & 2381:10 & \[
2236: 9 ; 2296: 8 ;
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 276: 2312: 7 ; \\
& 20515.0207
\end{aligned}
\] & 2336:25 \\
\hline 2307:23; 2309:15 & 2378:17; 2381:9; & 2354:10, 23; 2372:5; & 2336:1, 18-19; & 2371:17 \\
\hline comparison [3] - & 2390:17; 2391:7 & 2426:4 & 2338:2, 4, 17, 22; & Consulting [1] - \\
\hline 2205:2; 2291:14; & Concerned [1] - & conferring [3] - & 2339:21; 2340:22; & 2331:23 \\
\hline 2380:10 & 2194:3 & 2274:16; 2291:24; & 2342:11; 2345:8; & consumed [1] - \\
\hline compensation \({ }^{[2]}\) & concerned \([2]\) & 2308:20 & 2348:3; 2350:4; & 2230:20 \\
\hline 2466:23; 2467:2 compete [3]- & \[
2415: 18 ; 2446: 16
\] & confidence [1] - & 2355:17; 2376:23; & contact [2] \\
\hline 2249:3; 2297:8; & 2262:10, 15; 2264:24; & confident [3] & 2443:5; 2453:25 & \\
\hline 2429:1 & 2268:21; 2279:6; & 2276:11; 2377:6, 14 & 2462:9; 2464:3 & 2397:17; 2398:8 \\
\hline competing [1] - & 2345:3; 2355:9; & confidently [1] - & considerations [3] - & contain [2] - \\
\hline 2296:25 & 2356:9; 2364:4; & 2377:16 & 2288:15; 2335:22; & 2375:10; 2378:12 \\
\hline \({ }_{2388: 15}^{\text {competition [1] - }}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
2377:4, 10; 2384:11; \\
2397.7. \(2398 \cdot 19\)
\end{tabular} & configuration [3] \(2438 \cdot 14\) 16. \(2462 \cdot 4\) & 2380:19 & containing [2] 2390.24-2391:8 \\
\hline compiled [2] - & 2399:15; 2416:8 & CONFIRM \({ }^{27]}\) - & 2222:5, 25; 2224:23; & containment [1] - \\
\hline 2334:2; 2444:11 & concise [1] - & 2263:8; 2487:12 & 2228:6; 2233:13; & 2390:14 \\
\hline complain [2] & 2461:10 & confirm [18]- & 2247:19; 2265:7; & contamination \\
\hline 2291:17; 2292:10 & conclu & 2201:23; 2212:23; & 2267:20; 2311:7; & 2344:10, 12; 2414:15 \\
\hline complaint [3] & 2263:6; 2366:12; & 2214:2; 2216:22; & 2313:6; 2333:4; & contemplate [4] - \\
\hline 2259:6; 2291:11; & 2422:17; 2438:24; & 2217:22; 2219:18; & 2335:19; 2337:8; & 2230:7; 2288:5; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 13, 22; 2263:21, 23, } \\
& \text { 25; 2268:2 } \\
& \text { CYCLISTS } \\
& \text { 2264:6 - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2297: 1,13 ; 2301: 6 ; \\
& \text { 2302:6; 2303:3, 17; } \\
& 2304: 5 ; 2305: 10 ; \\
& \text { 230:5; 231:8; }
\end{aligned}
\] & ```
    delayed [2] -
2300:21; 2301:13
    delivered [1] -
2211:16
``` & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2287:11 } \\
& \text { designs [1] - } \\
& 2445: 23 \\
& \text { desirable }
\end{aligned}
\] & ```
    developments [2] -
2425:20; 2428:1
    deviate [1] - 2295:10
    devoted [1] -
``` \\
\hline D & deal [4]-2259:2; & 2382:10 & desire [1] - 2319:5 & diagonal [1] - 2285:4 \\
\hline dam [14] - 2242:12; & 2454:8 & & & \\
\hline 2283:13; 2285:20; & dealing [3] - & de & \[
2443: 3
\] & dia \\
\hline 2376:3; 2385:6, 9, 13, & 2308:15; 2354:4 & 2242:13 & despite & 2218:5; 2222:4 \\
\hline 20, 25; 2425:23; & 2392:2 & dependent & 2365:17; 2431:4; & dictated [1] - 2460:6 \\
\hline 2430:15; 2446:19; & deals [1] - 2294:19 & 2313:17 & 2482:21 & dictionary [1] - \\
\hline 2471:15 & dealt [6] - 2237:19; & depicted [1] - & destroyed [1] - & 2211:18 \\
\hline Dam [4] - 2425:24 & 2247:3; 2254:16; & 2397:23 & 2348:24 & difference [7] - \\
\hline 2436:11; 2448:22 & 2300:5; 2436:10; & depicting [1] - & destroying [1] - & 2208:6; 2309:2, 13; \\
\hline dam's [1] - 2388:22 & 2459:2 & 2402:1 & 2448:4 & 2407:23; 2410:17; \\
\hline damage [4]-2280:1; & Dean [1] - 2354:20 & depictio & destruction [2] - & 2411:22; 2456:4 \\
\hline 2431:15; 2461:14; & death [2] - 2303:2; & 2219:5, 25; 2243:16 & 2431:15; 2438:6 & differences [6] - \\
\hline 2464:9 & 2437:13 & depicts [1] - 2362:8 & destructive [1] - & 2301:24; 2302:13, 25; \\
\hline damaged & debris [1] - 2376:6 & depletion [1] - & 2448:15 & 2432:16, 21, 24 \\
\hline 2341:17 & decades [2] - & 2433:17 & detail [3] - 2209:24; & different [35] - \\
\hline damaging [1] - & 2277:13; 2464:25 & deposit [2] - & 2376:16, 18 & 2201:24; 2202:17; \\
\hline 2467:3 & December [1] - & 2241:23; 2273:6 & detailed [4] - & 2208:7; 2219:7; \\
\hline dams [4] - 2425:2 & 2356:1 & deposited [9] - & 2220:25; 2221:12, 18; & 2220:14; 2224:24; \\
\hline 2434:14; 2448:13; & decide [1] - 2212:10 & 2226:7; 2230:20 & 2380:16 & 2257:15; 2270:25; \\
\hline 2463:6 & decided [1] - 2423:1 & 2243:21; 2245:24 & details [5] - 2267:12; & 2276:18; 2277:16; \\
\hline Daniel [1] - 2193:9 & decides [1] - & 2257:8; 2301:8; & 2455:22; 2457:5; & 2278:6; 2289:6; \\
\hline Danielle [1] - 2194:8 & 2212:14 & 2304:17; 2343:15 & 2462:20; 2464:6 & 2291:10; 2293:3; \\
\hline dark [1] - & decision [7] - & 2414:23 & detect [5] - 2290:13; & 2299:14; 2300:3; \\
\hline darker [1] - 2430:1 & 2203:18; 2312:1 & depositio & 2315:10, 13; 2316:7; & 2303:7, 10; 2310:19; \\
\hline darkest [1] - 2427:17 & 2327:5; 2336:24; & 2262:12; 2273:13 & 2379:5 & 2313:1; 2341:13, 22; \\
\hline darn [1] - 2470:12 & 2337:6; 2388:20; & 2311:17; 2431:6; & detected & 2358:8; 2383:21; \\
\hline data [50]-2197:17, & 2447:2 & 2455:5, 7 & 2287:3; 2297:18 & 2410:1; 2416:19; \\
\hline \[
25 ; 2198: 8 ; 2199: 3 ;
\] & decisio & depositions [1] - & detectible [1] - & 2417:13; 2434:17; \\
\hline 2201:19, 21, 23, 25; & 2312:16; 2336:13 & 2257:1 & 2315:18 & 2445:6; 2457:7; \\
\hline 2202:3, 9-10, 14-16, & DECOSEMO [1] - & deposits & deteriorated [1] - & 2459:7 \\
\hline 20-21, 23; 2203:11, & 2329:7 & 2242:20; 2243:8; & 2314:9 & differentiation [1] - \\
\hline 15, 19-20, 24; 2204:2, & Decosemo & 2454:17; 2455:3 & determination [11] - & 2302:3 \\
\hline 22; 2209:1; 2275:3; & 2193:16; 2329:5, 9 & depth [6] - 2243:2 & 2208:24; 2336:4; & difficult [5] - 2229:1; \\
\hline 2276:9, 16; 2290:2, & decrease [2] - & 2244:3; 2249:23; & 2338:15; 2346:14; & 2278:22; 2373:4; \\
\hline 23; 2338:21; 2339:5; & 2272:18; 2273:11 & 2253:12; 2257:5; & 2348:2, 17; 2349:2, 4, & 2383:20; 2460:15 \\
\hline 2363:9, 12, 14; & deem [1] - 2221:24 & 2299:1 & 11; 2350:2; 2360:23 & difficulties [2] - \\
\hline 2374:9; 2403:4, 23; & deep [2]-2242:20; & depths [6] - 2208:18; & determine [6] - & 2351:11; 2393:8 \\
\hline 2404:5, 11-12, 14, 16, & 2305:6 & 2228:9; 2240:6; & 2222:9; 2266:6; & difficulty [2] - \\
\hline 20; 2405:1; 2406:4; & deeper [3] - 2299:2; & 2254:1; 2256:20; & 2283:23; 2404:15; & 2392:23; 2429:25 \\
\hline 2411:14 & 2301:14; 2305:14 & 2301:11 & 2451:17 & digest [1] - 2326:24 \\
\hline dataset [8] - 2203:8, & defended [1] - & describe [1] - 2284:2 & DETERMINE [1] - & digging [1] - 2473:13 \\
\hline 10-11, 22; 2399:22, & 2411:10 & described [10] - & 2266:25 & diligence [2] - \\
\hline 24-25; 2403:6 & deficiencies [3] - & 2199:5; 2205:9; & determined [9] - & 2383:3; 2415:25 \\
\hline date [5] - 2215:10; & 2355:13; 2360:4; & 2244:11; 2285:1; & 2226:3; 2255:2; & diligently [1] - \\
\hline 2326:25; 2382:15; & 2364:16 & 2308:2; 2339:20; & 2256:15; 2285:13; & 2414:1 \\
\hline 2406:7; 2429:8 & define [1] - 2349:17 & 2375:18; 2433:14; & 2295:18; 2296:7; & diminishing [1] - \\
\hline Dated [1] - 2483:8 & defined [3] - 2302:1; & 2443:4; 2459:23 & 2347:3; 2455:3; & 2380:4 \\
\hline dated [8] - 2215:14; & 2346:22; 2441:13 & DESCRIPTION [5] & 2456:24 & DiPaolo [1] - \\
\hline 2356:1, 6, 21; 2357:4; & defining [1] - & 2259:24; 2263:19; & determining [1] - & 2481:20 \\
\hline 2358:10; 2360:5; & 2441:22 & 2264:9; 2487:6, 20 & 2290:12 & dips [1] - 2281:23 \\
\hline 2363:2 & definitely [5] - & description [4] - & develop [5] - & direct [21] - 2260:17; \\
\hline Dave [9] - 2234:9; & 2247:18; 2296:14 & 2202:9; 2383:11; & 2260:17; 2294:2 & 2276:8; 2313:1; \\
\hline 2237:5, 8; 2243:25; & 2459:25; 2460:8; & 2439:17; 2459:17 & 2434:22; 2468:15 & 2330:4, 8, 15; 2334:6; \\
\hline 2254:9, 19; 2256:14; & 2465:13 & design [28] - 2199:6; & DEVELOP [2] - & 2336:17; 2341:3, 25; \\
\hline 2257:18; \(2311: 5\) & definition [2] - & 2230:8, 18; 2231:4, & 2261:1; 2487:10 & 2350:13; 2367:19; \\
\hline David [2] - 2193:21; & 2432:12; 2441:24 & 12; 2234:12; 2238:2, & developed [7] - & 2368:7; 2412:2; \\
\hline 2322:15 & deflected [1] - & 5, 13, 19; 2240:16; & 2235:6; 2342:13; & 2455:19; 2456:4; \\
\hline days [13]-2231:7 & 2290:19 & 2241:7, 9; 2242:8, 18; & 2343:3; 2371:18; & 2470:16, 18; 2477:22; \\
\hline 11; 2233:24; 2238:14; & degradation [1] - & 2243:19; 2244:1; & 2372:1; 2468:9; & 2482:4 \\
\hline 2247:10; 2264:23; & 2438:5 & 2245:4; 2247:25; & 2474:16 & directed [1] - \\
\hline 2299:13; 2356:24; & degrade [3] - & 2254:2; 2255:7; & developers [1] - & 2427:23 \\
\hline 2415:19; 2423:14; & 2397:14, 19; \(2417: 7\) & 2299:12, 18-19; & 2458:24 & directing [2] - \\
\hline 2458:1 & degraded [1] - & 2384:11; 2386:9; & developing [1] - & 2251:18; 2291:19 \\
\hline De [24] - 2208:22; & 2223:9 & 2389:11 & 2394:23 & direction [11] - \\
\hline 2297:1, 13; 2301:1, 6; & degrades [1] - & designate [1] - & development [20] - & 2221:14; 2261:14; \\
\hline 2302:6; 2303:3, 17; & 2398:7 & 2474:6 & 2216:23; 2217:1; & 2276:11; 2326:11; \\
\hline 2304:5; 2305:4, 10; & degree [4]-2201:13; & designated [5] - & 2339:8, 12-13, 19 & 2336:16; 2364:24; \\
\hline 2307:16; 2310:5; & 2304:19; 2326:16; & 2294:5; 2379:9; & 2343:7; 2345:7; & 2370:19; 2393:20; \\
\hline 2313:8; 2314:10; & 2437:6 & 2420:23; 2422:3, 10 & 2347:13; 2348:9; & 2424:16; 2433:8 \\
\hline 2378:14; 2384:19; & degrees [1] - & DESIGNATED [2] - & 2349:10; 2354:11; & directly [7] - 2204:5; \\
\hline 2386:10, 19; 2432:13; & 2371:14 & 2422:8, 14 & 2362:17; 2363:15; & \[
2316: 13 ; 2420: 12
\] \\
\hline 2437:8; 2439:9; & delay [4] - 2209:22; & designation [2] - & 2364:5; 2376:21; & 2430:10; 2436:10; \\
\hline 2441:23; 2455:15 & 2234:25; 2398:14; & 2425:17; 2472:8 & 2381:15; 2432:6; & 2454:23; 2480:9 \\
\hline DE [13] - 2205:22; & 2456:1 & designed [1] - & 2458:18, 24 & director [1] - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline E & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2209:18; 2259:8; } \\
& \text { 2290:12; 2455:17; }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2436:3 } \\
& \text { Eliot [3] - 2282:7, 23; }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2376:2 } \\
& \text { ends }[5]-2248: 2 ;
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
2306:9 \\
Environmental [3] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline & 2456:2 & 2286 & 2402:10; 2406:12, 22; & 2425:24; 2426:1; \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { EA [8] - 2335:15, 18; } \\
& 23367 ; 2338: 1 ;
\end{aligned}
\] & effects [39]--
2271:25; 2276:13; & elk [37]-2264:17,
20-21, 25; 2265:3, 7 ; & Energy [1] - 2333:12 & environmental [34] \\
\hline 2342:3; 2348:16; & 2283:23; 2301:2; & 2282:25; 2283:16; & energy [3] - 2278:12; & 2224:25; 2226:8; \\
\hline 2349:5; 2354:24 & 2311:7; 2318:21; & 2284:3, 6; 2285:3, 7, & 2371:19; 2427:24 & 2239:3; 2300:20; \\
\hline early [30] - 2206:24; & 2337:2; 2341:2, & 10, 14, 17; 2286:4, & energy-related [1] - & 2314:16, 25; 2332:14, \\
\hline 2231:8; 2233:23, 25; & 24-25; 2346:15, 22; & 13, 16; 2287:21, 23; & 2371:19 & 16; 2333:2, 8, 22, 25; \\
\hline 2237:25; 2238:3, 8-9, & 2347:4; 2348:4; & 2444:14, 21; 2445:10; & engage [2] & 2334:17; 2336:11, 16; \\
\hline 13, 15, 18; 2239:2, 4; & 2349:23; 2359:4; & 2471:16, 22, 24-25; & 2268:19; 2474:17 & 2337:2; 2346:15, 22; \\
\hline 2241:3; 2298:11, 25; & 2376:24; 2377:3, 7; & 2472:2, 13, 15, 17, & engaged [1] - & 2353:19; 2363:23; \\
\hline 2299:7, 19; 2300:14, & 2433:15; 2434:21; & 21-22; 2473:21, 25; & 2395:13 & 2376:19; 2395:1; \\
\hline 16, 18; 2301:12; & 2435:17; 2436:9; & 2474:1 & engagement [2] - & 2425:25; 2426:6; \\
\hline 2302:17, 20; 2308:12, & 2437:5, 21-22, 24; & Elk [1] - 2264:22 & 2265:5; 2356:25 & 2427:18; 2438:2, 12; \\
\hline 14; 2309:13; 2310:18; & 2440:12, 17; 2441:1, & ELK [1] - 2265:10 & engages [1] - & 2439:20; 2440:1; \\
\hline 2311:8, 11 & 3, 15, 17; 2442:15; & elsewhere [2] - & 2264:18 & 2441:1, 3; 2461:15, \\
\hline early/late [2] - & 2443:6; 2461:13; & 2341:5; 2380:5 & ENGAGES [1] - & 19 \\
\hline 2299:8; 2300:2 & 2463:5 & elusive [1] - 2477:2 & 2265:12 & environmentalist [2] \\
\hline earthen [1] - 2385:6 & efficiency [2] - & email [3]-2207:8, & engineer [1] - & \[
-2447: 22 ; 2448: 7
\] \\
\hline earthworks [1] - & 2398:6; 2457:21 & 15; 2477:16 & 2463:21 & environmentally [4] \\
\hline 2252:18 & effort [4] - 2234:24 & embankment [1] - & engineering [4]- & - 2427:9, 12, 15; \\
\hline easier [1] - 2416:23 & 2235:2; 2267:12; & 2228:19 & 2258:8; 2394:19; & 2448:14 \\
\hline easily [2] - 2385:17; & 2414:8 & embankments [1] - & 2464:20, 22 & envision [1] - 2390:1 \\
\hline 2460:11 & efforts [12] - & 2313:24 & engineers [1] - & envy [1] - 2468:25 \\
\hline east [4] - 2216:24; & 2232:21; 2233:6, 17; & emergency [4] - & 2464:25 & EPA [4]-2411:12; \\
\hline 2261:11; 2287:15; & 2234:14, 19; 2236:5, & 2255:17; 2258:3; & enjoy [1] - 2481: & 2452:14, 22; 2453:5 \\
\hline 2472:1 & 10, 16; 2268:17; & 2369:16 & enjoyed [2] - 2458:2; & equal [2]-2326:14; \\
\hline Easter [2] - 2465:20; & 2364:18; 2365:18; & emission [4]- & 2461:8 & 2341:23 \\
\hline 2482:19 & 2381:14 & 2214:11; 2411:12, 23 & enjoying [1] - & equations [2] - \\
\hline easy [2] - 2315:25; & EIA [15] - 2299:11 & emissions [31] - & 2445:10 & 2404:10; 2449:3 \\
\hline 2477:1 & 21; 2310:22; 2356:4, & 2209:3, 10; 2212:17, & enjoyment [1] - & equipment [6] - \\
\hline eat [1] - 2324:9 & 8; 2357:4, 13; & 19; 2219:20; 2225:1; & 2359:12 & 2231:25; 2233:3; \\
\hline ecological [19] - & 2376:12, 15, 17; & 2397:14; 2399:1; & enormous [1] - & 2244:6; 2279:9; \\
\hline 2374:16; 2379:16, 23; & 2377:11, 13; 2396:18; & 2400:3, 17; 2405:17; & 2329:18 & 2378:8, 15 \\
\hline 2380:1, 7; 2381:4, 12; & 2453:15; 2455:20 & 2406:2, 11, 16-18, 22; & enquired [2] - & equivalent [2] - \\
\hline 2433:10, 17; 2435:12; & eight [1] - 2285:15 & 2407:6; 2408:7; & 2398:8; 2455:23 & 2295:5; 2432:2 \\
\hline 2437:2, 14; 2442:7, 9; & EIS [10]-2303:6; & 2411:13, 19; 2413:23; & enquires [1] - 2337:3 & equivalents [1] - \\
\hline 2443:2; 2447:5; & 2335:16, 18-19; & 2414:4, 25; 2416:6; & enquiries [1] - & 2198:18 \\
\hline 2448:4; 2467:20 & 2339:3; 2340:18; & 2417:10, 13; 2451:12; & 2357:16 & eroded [1] - 2385:24 \\
\hline ecologically [1] - & 2342:3, 11; 2347:2; & 2452:13; 2453:8 & enquiry [3] - & erodible [2] - \\
\hline 2435:5 & 2377:2 & emotion [1] - 2449:2 & \[
2331: 14,18 ; 2337: 1
\] & 2248:19; 2254:23 \\
\hline ecologist [2] - & either [10]-2196:18; & emotional [1] - & ensure [9] - 2228:21; & erosion [39 \\
\hline 2370:13; 2390:10 & 2318:5; 2397:12; & 2444:17 & 2232:2; 2233:4; & 2208:2, 9, 15, 25; \\
\hline ecology [2] - & 2399:2; 2407:20; & emphasized [1] - & 2267:20; 2280:22; & 2210:25; 2211:1; \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 2371:13; 2434:2 } \\
\text { economic [1] - }
\end{gathered}
\] & 2408:23; 2409:10;
2413:6; 2431:3; & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
2211: 22
\] \\
emphasizes [1] -
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2338: 16 ; 2345: 11 ; \\
& 2346: 10: 2446: 20
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
2214: 22,25 ; 2233: 5
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { economic [1] - } \\
& \text { 2379:16 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2413:6; 2431:3; } \\
& \text { 2481:8 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { emphasizes [1] - } \\
& \text { 2443:5 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2346:10; 2446:20 } \\
& \text { entered [5] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 14 ; 2234: 1,23 ; \\
& 2235: 9,22 ; 2236: 3,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline ecosystem [6] - & ELBOW [2] - & employ [3] - & 2321:12, 18; 2385:25; & 12, 15, 21; 2237:7, \\
\hline 2434:4, 6, 22; & 2263:17; 2487:18 & 2276:25; 2277:1; & 2418:10; 2449:13 & 11, 14, 17, 19; \\
\hline 2442:25; 2446:23; & Elbow [39]-2198:3; & 2281:1 & entering [1] - 2386:2 & 2244:17; 2245:6; \\
\hline 2464:9 & 2201:19; 2217:24; & employed & entertain [1] - 2383:6 & 2246:6, 9-10, 17, 20; \\
\hline ecosystems[5] - & 2238:25; 2240:14; & 2277:23; 2288:17 & entire [13]-2214:16; & 2248:5, 18; 2255:9; \\
\hline 2379:20; 2437:12; & 2256:18; 2257:10, 14; & empty [1] - 2246:1 & 2234:17; 2243:8; & 2277:11; 2296:20; \\
\hline 2440:5; 2441:9; & 2261:8; 2375:7, 9; & enacted [1] - & 2312:1; 2358:7; & 2313:16; 2385:7; \\
\hline 2442:14 & 2390:15; 2391:12; & 2213:13 & 2407:14, 19; 2408:20; & 2408:17; 2430:17 \\
\hline Edge [1] - 2217:23 & 2400:11; 2409:5, & encompasses [1] - & 2414:12; 2420:22; & ERRATA [2] - \\
\hline edges [1] - \(2243: 9\) & 18-19; 2410:1, 9 ; & 2289:6 & 2459:16; 2479:14; & 2369:4; 2486:7 \\
\hline Edmonton [2] - & 2427:8; 2428:3; & encountered [1] - & 2481:2 & errata [1] - 2398:23 \\
\hline 2193:2; 2329:5 & 2430:14; 2432:15, 23; & 2481:8 & entirely [3] - 2237:9; & error [8] - 2197:15; \\
\hline Edson [1] - 2339:6 & \[
2435: 9 ; 2436: 16,18
\] & encourage [2] - & \[
2323: 13 ; 2386: 3
\] & \[
2198: 14 ; 2202: 11,19
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { education [1] - } \\
& 2332: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & 2445:16; 2446:7, 13, & \[
\text { 2468:6, } 14
\] & entirety [3] - & 23; 2203:9; 2399:3; \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2332:19 } \\
& \text { effect }[17
\end{aligned}
\] & 16, 21; 2447:5;
2448:11, \(22 ; 2454\) & end [17] - 2194:24;
2210:10; 2243:13; & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2230:12; 2263:1; } \\
& \text { 2386:24 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2453:4 } \\
& \text { ESA [1] - } 2427: 9
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 2215:14, 16; 2216:15; & 2459:22; 2468:3 & 2250:4; 2276:14; & entities [1] - 2256:22 & escape [2] - 2384:22, \\
\hline 2221:7; 2227:14; & Elders [1] - 2367:22 & 2306:6; 2353:21; & entrained [1] - & 25 \\
\hline 2228:1; 2286:3; & element [1] - 2302:4 & 2391:9; 2393:8; & \[
2248: 6
\] & escaping [3] - \\
\hline 2292:20, 23; 2295:9; & ELEMENTARY \({ }_{[2]}\) - & 2396:2; 2400:14; & environment [5] - & 2373:16; 2379:9; \\
\hline 2301:25; 2314:2; & 2263:17; 2487:19 & 2409:11, 13; 2414:24; & 2340:19; 2429:13; & 2386:18 \\
\hline 2341:3; 2437:16; & Elementary [2] - & 2426:22; 2436:8; & 2433:11; 2434:11; & especially [7] - \\
\hline 2463:13; 2471:16 & 2217:24; 2261:8 & 2448:15 & 2440:23 & 2268:1; 2408:15; \\
\hline effective [10]- & elements [2] - & endangered [1] - & Environment [16] - & 2409:10; 2411:15; \\
\hline 2214:13; 2290:4; & 2248:15; 2430:11 & 2471:19 & 2209:6; 2215:20; & 2413:7; 2440:16; \\
\hline 2308:4; 2314:3; & elevated [1] - & endeavor [1] - & 2216:8; 2221:23; & 2472:23 \\
\hline 2318:23; 2389:25; & 2245:25 & 2251:3 & 2234:16; 2276:7; & essence [1] - \\
\hline 2397:8; 2417:6; & elevations [2] - & endeavored [1] - & 2279:22; 2288:13, 18; & 2280:20 \\
\hline 2468:5 & 2315:12; 2445:22 & 2366:4 & 2294:9; 2295:24; & essential [2] - \\
\hline effectively [1] - & eliminate [2] - & endeavoring [1] - & 2306:5, 8; 2335:14; & 2337:19; 2460:20 \\
\hline ```
2340:5
    effectiveness [5] -
``` & \[
\begin{gathered}
2437: 21 ; 2474: 15 \\
\text { eliminates [1] - }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2331:11 } \\
& \text { ended [2] - 2292:6; }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2415:17; 2446:3 } \\
& \text { Environment's [1] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & essentially [18] 2217:16; 2292:17; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2296:19; 2304:18; & evidenced [1] - & 2208:10 & 2200:16; 2201:7; & pertise [2] - \\
\hline 2306:8, 15; 2314:3; & 2339:4 & excuse [9] - 2273:21; & 2219:13; 2269:17; & 2323:14; 2440:9 \\
\hline 2316:1; 2325:7; & evidentiary [4] - & 2278:18; 2284:13; & 2322:5; 2369:4; & experts [2] - \\
\hline 2354:15; 2361:15; & 2423:3; 2424:8; & 2406:19; 2411:25; & 2418:18; 2449:21; & 2417:25; 2442:22 \\
\hline 2398:20, 22; 2402:3; & 2469:24; 2482:3 & 2416:20; 2432:18; & 2478:12, 24; 2479:9; & experts' [2] - \\
\hline 2404:10; 2406:14; & evolving [1] - 2227:6 & 2443:18 & 2485:17, 21; 2486:1, & 2382:20; 2448:12 \\
\hline 2409:6, 23 & EX [4] - 2200:18; & executed [2] - & 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 19 & explain [5] - 2204:1; \\
\hline establish [5] - & 2201:9; 2485:19, 23 & 2333:14; 2371:19 & Exhibits [1] - & 2208:6; 2253:8; \\
\hline 2297:8; 2302:25; & exacerbate [1] - & executive [3] - & 2433:25 & 2283:19; 2293:5 \\
\hline 2306:15; 2307:22; & 2374:13 & 2461:5, 7, 9 & EXHIBITS [1] - & explained [2] - \\
\hline 2315:7 & exact [4] - 2203:7; & exercise [16] - & 2485:15 & 2204:6; 2227:22 \\
\hline established [6] - & 2256:15; 2262:17; & 2202:21; 2252:18; & exhibits [8] - & explaining [1] - \\
\hline 2221:22; 2247:1; & 2376:21 & 2336:19; 2337:21; & 2194:17; 2195:10; & 2361:6 \\
\hline 2305:7; 2334:23; & exactly [4] - 2277:14; & 2338:2, 10, 12; & 2252:22; 2253:17; & explanation [1] - \\
\hline 2341:8; \(2378: 4\) & 2323:2; 2324:5 & 2340:12; 2341:6, 18; & 2335:11; 2475:16; & 2204:8 \\
\hline establishes [2] - & examination [8] - & 2343:8, 19; 2346:25; & 2481:5, 16 & explode [1] - \\
\hline 2214:24; 2341:21 & 2205:15; 2331:8; & 2347:12, 23; 2349:22 & exist [6] - 2347:13; & 2378:19 \\
\hline establishing [6] - & 2382:16, 20; 2384:21; & exercises [1] - & 2374:11, 23; 2379:24; & explore [2] - 2298:9; \\
\hline 2297:15, 17; 2306:3, & 2465:24; 2469:20; & 2390:10 & 2381:23; 2386:21 & 2338:9 \\
\hline 10; 2314:20; 2382:11 & 2474:22 & exercising [1] - & existed [1] - 2374:8 & explored [2] - \\
\hline establishment [2] - & examinations [1] - & 2341:14 & existence [1] - & 2337:10; 2338:23 \\
\hline 2382:5; 2386:16 & 2482:4 & exhaustive [1] - & 2374:13 & exploring [1] - \\
\hline estate [1] - 2458:24 & examine [1] - & 2416:3 & existing [13] - & 2300:24 \\
\hline estimate [4]- & 2314:18 & exhaustively [1] - & 2301:18; 2302:5; & explosive [1] - \\
\hline 2385:22; 2396:15; & examined [3] - & 2410:6 & 2303:25; 2343:17; & 2378:24 \\
\hline 2416:13; 2417:24 & 2369:19; 2372:23; & Exhibit [112] - & 2348:6; 2349:22; & exposed [6] - \\
\hline estimated [2] - & 2439:11 & 2197:19; 2198:18, 23; & 2379:21; 2381:15; & 2222:19; 2224:8; \\
\hline 2237:15; 2258:17 & EXAMINES [24] - & 2200:14, 23; 2201:4, & 2385:3; 2386:23; & 2245:25; 2255:10; \\
\hline estimates [3] - & 2197:5; 2201:10; & 17; 2204:3, 12, 17; & 2429:22; 2436:1; & 2256:24; 2278:10 \\
\hline 2241:14; 2417:14, 25 & 2206:1; 2270:16; & 2205:4; 2210:17; & 2442:5 & exposure [13] - \\
\hline et [4]-2218:25; & 2281:11; 2332:8; & 2211:17; 2215:22; & exists [1] - 2305:14 & 2222:20; 2223:11; \\
\hline 2428:22; 2433:14; & 2353:6; 2370:11; & 2219:12; 2222:2; & exit [1] - 2460:4 & 2224:15; 2225:8, 17, \\
\hline 2435:21 & 2389:10; 2392:19; & 2225:2; 2226:17; & expand [2] - & 20; 2226:2, 5, 15; \\
\hline evaluated [5] - & 2450:19; 2458:11; & 2229:5; 2231:9; & 2338:24; 2399:13 & 2317:1; 2318:21 \\
\hline 2222:16; 2223:4; & 2484:6, 13-15, 23-24; & 2232:7, 19; 2239:17, & expanded [1] - & exposures [2] - \\
\hline 2240:20; 2259:8; & 2485:2, 4, 7 & 21; 2241:12, 22, 25; & 2338:8 & 2226:11 \\
\hline 2376:23 & examining [1] - & 2243:17; 2253:8; & expansion [1] - & express [1] - 2277:5 \\
\hline evaluation [2] - & 2374:8 & 2255:8; 2256:19; & 2336:22 & extend [3]-2341:2; \\
\hline 2199:6; 2233:9 & example [18] - & 2257:21; 2258:12; & expansive [1] - & 2416:12; 2434:15 \\
\hline evening [2] - & 2296:25; 2304:8; & 2260:3; 2269:1; & 2445:11 & extended [2] - \\
\hline 2199:17; 2325:18 & 2306:12; 2317:25; & 2282:12; 2283:2, 5; & expect [11] & 2356:23; 2415:21 \\
\hline event [21] - 2225:5; & 2325:11; 2337:12; & 2285:1; 2293:15; & 2195:15; 2284:5; & extending [1] - \\
\hline 2226:6; 2227:15; & 2338:2; 2341:3; & 2303:5; 2311:10; & 2286:13; 2293:8; & 2430:14 \\
\hline 2230:8, 17; 2232:23; & 2343:4, 13; 2345:17; & 2316:16; 2321:23; & 2295:4; 2303:19; & extensive [6] - \\
\hline 2233:19; 2236:7; & 2346:7; 2359:10; & 2332:10; 2334:4; & 2305:5, 7, 11; & 2242:22; 2257:11; \\
\hline 2237:20; 2241:15; & 2374:19; 2375:25; & 2335:7, 9; 2336:23; & 2314:18; 2331:6 & 2433:2, 20; 2468:2, \\
\hline 2244:5; 2255:15; & 2378:8; 2409:12; & 2338:20; 2339:5, 20; & expectations [1] - & 16 \\
\hline 2264:10; 2279:11; & 2440:4 & 2347:2; 2348:23, 25; & 2262:15 & extensively [1] - \\
\hline 2296:8; 2301:20; & examples [1] - & 2354:17; 2355:7, 12, & expected [8] - & 2333:6 \\
\hline 2325:24; 2415:9; & 2342:4 & 20-21; 2357:21; & 2259:10; 2284:3; & extent [16] - 2223:3; \\
\hline 2430:4 & excavated [1] - & 2360:5, 22; 2362:2; & 2315:16; 2316:22; & 2242:19; 2243:13; \\
\hline events [22] - & 2383:14 & 2364:3, 6; 2365:3; & 2318:6; 2381:3; & 2255:15, 20; 2262:18; \\
\hline 2230:17; 2240:18; & excavation [1] - & 2366:3; 2370:18; & 2395:18; 2454:18 & 2272:12; 2288:16; \\
\hline 2241:16; 2243:4; & 2274:21 & 2372:17; 2374:2; & expecting [2] - & 2301:14; 2311:23; \\
\hline 2255:18; 2276:19; & excavator [1] - & 2383:12; 2385:19; & 2322:17; 2376:12 & 2312:18; 2341:3; \\
\hline 2295:7; 2299:15; & 2252:15 & 2393:16; 2396:17; & expedited [1] - & 2358:22; 2440:25; \\
\hline 2342:2; 2381:1; & exceed [4] - 2240:18, & 2424:12, 21-23; & 2196:13 & 2441:3; 2460:24 \\
\hline 2431:7; 2436:25; & 24; 2405:11 & 2428:13; 2429:18; & expense [2] - & extents [6] - 2240:5; \\
\hline 2437:3; 2438:1, 4, 6, & exceedance [2] - & 2430:1, 20, 24; & 2261:17; 2398:2 & 2242:6; 2243:6, 11; \\
\hline 20; 2462:10, 16, 19, & 2225:25; 2294:7 & 2431:19, 24; 2433:1; & experience [18] - & 2300:1; 2303:7 \\
\hline 22; 2464:4 & exceedances [2] - & 2435:16; 2436:12; & 2223:10; 2276:1; & extra [7] - 2269:23; \\
\hline eventuality [1] - & 2226:9; 2315:24 & 2437:9; 2439:16, 21; & 2277:2; 2302:17, 19; & 2304:23; 2405:25; \\
\hline 2378:24 & exceeded [1] - & 2440:10; 2441:11, 25; & 2306:9; 2317:4; & 2417:23; 2418:8; \\
\hline eventually [1] - & 2198:20 & 2442:3; 2444:8; & 2332:20; 2333:1; & 2474:14 \\
\hline 2391:10 & exceeding [2] - & 2452:4, 12, 16; & 2348:7; 2359:9; & extraction [1] - \\
\hline everywhere [4] - & 2404:3; 2462:12 & 2453:16; 2456:18; & 2361:3; 2371:11; & 2410:5 \\
\hline 2292:14; 2373:5, 13, & Excel [2] - 2199:1; & 2457:1; 2460:18; & 2394:17; 2425:10, 16; & extrapolate [1] - \\
\hline 18 & 2206:17 & 2461:6; 2478:11, 22; & 2445:8; 2466:20 & 2397:6 \\
\hline EVIDENCE [1] - & excellent [3] - & 2480:5 & experienced [3] - & extremely [3] - \\
\hline 2421:9 & 2271:15; 2392:4; & exhibit [23] & 2276:21; 2313:23; & 2277:19; 2414:20; \\
\hline evidence [24] - & 2447:22 & 2200:11, 24-25; & 2390:10 & \[
2481: 18
\] \\
\hline 2333:19; 2334:6; & excerpt [1] - 2358:17 & 2219:11, 23; 2220:9; & experiential [1] - & \\
\hline 2354:12; 2369:19; & excess [4] - 2243:22; & 2229:11; 2253:19; & 2359:5 & F \\
\hline 2371:3, 7; 2372:19; & 2254:4; 2255:10; & 2321:12, 18; 2360:24; & expert [11]-2266:6; & \\
\hline 2373:5, 24; 2374:17; & 2381:3 & 2364:12; 2368:14, 20; & 2270:20; 2292:4; & faces [1] - 2327:24 \\
\hline 2382:13; 2394:5, 10, & excessive [1] - & 2418:10; 2440:21; & 2324:21; 2372:10; & facilitate [1] - 2365:5 \\
\hline 13; 2421:2; 2425:2, 6; & 2275:13 & 2444:1; 2449:14; & 2394:25; 2408:16, 18 ; & facilities [2] - \\
\hline 2429:8; 2449:8; & exchange [1] - & 2475:21; 2478:7, 18; & 2425:22; 2455:15 & 2217:19; 2218:25 \\
\hline 2455:14; 2456:11; & 2196:17 & 2479:7; 2481:2 & EXPERT [1] - & facility [2]-2401:17; \\
\hline 2479:15, 19 & exclusively [1] - & EXHIBIT [23] - & 2266:24 & 2461:1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline facing [1] - 2469:13 & 2404:24 & findings [4] - 2334:2; & 2475:14; 2476:1, 5; & 2465:8; 2467:20; \\
\hline fact [13] - 2194:20; & fences [1] - 2278:12 & 2372:19; 2417:18; & 2478:6, 14; 2479:3, & 2469:8 \\
\hline 2217:23; 2245:3; & Fennell [10] - & 2461:20 & 11, 16 & floodwater [1] - \\
\hline 2285:15; 2295:7; & 2197:13; 2198:6; & fine [25] - 2201:16; & five [11] - 2198:18; & 2266:7 \\
\hline 2318:4; 2328:11; & 2199:4; 2202:22; & 2206:9; 2229:2; & 2276:15; 2324:21; & FLOODWATER [1] - \\
\hline 2336:12; 2374:7; & 2203:10; 2204:4, 13, & 2254:14; 2280:12; & 2336:3; 2398:20; & 2267:1 \\
\hline 2462:11; 2463:12; & 24; 2368:9; 2379:4 & 2281:17; 2284:9; & 2403:23; 2412:7; & floodwaters [2] - \\
\hline 2466:20; 2467:3 & Fennell's [2]- & 2304:14; 2308:24; & 2430:9, 21; 2445:1; & 2238:18; 2244:7 \\
\hline factor [1] - 2402:21 & 2197:20; 2198:16 & 2309:2, 10; 2367:17; & 2474:12 & floor [4] - 2251:5; \\
\hline factoring [1] - & fescue [5] - 2380:4; & 2370:6; 2375:21; & fix [1] - 2468:10 & 2330:16; 2331:1; \\
\hline 2254:11 & 2428:20, 25; 2429:16 & 2397:15; 2407:20; & fixed [3] - 2211:25; & 2352:7 \\
\hline factors [10] - & few [23]-2224:4; & 2409:14; 2411:6; & 2234:11; 2235:3 & Florida [1] - 2464:21 \\
\hline 2208:14; 2247:18; & 2238:17; 2240:19; & 2439:2; 2445:15; & fixing [1] - 2463:10 & flow [9]-2304:22; \\
\hline 2273:9, 15; 2290:24; & 2250:4; 2264:13; & 2451:19; 2467:18; & Fleck [1] - 2193:13 & 2431:7; 2432:1; \\
\hline 2310:24; 2347:24; & 2269:23; 2279:5; & 2478:21; 2481:6 & flip [1] - 2241:20 & 2433:5, 23; 2434:15, \\
\hline 2360:14; 2411:12; & 2324:11; 2368:19; & fine-textured [1] - & FLOOD [1] - 2266:25 & 18-19; 2442:24 \\
\hline 2453:25 & 2373:23; 2387:19; & 2304:14 & flood [132] - 2205:3; & flow-regulated [1] - \\
\hline facts [1] - 2373:18 & 2398:1; 2406:9; & finer [9]-2226:6; & 2209:23; 2210:21; & 2433:5 \\
\hline failed [3] - 2355:15; & 2419:20, 22; 2426:19; & 2299:2; 2300:6, 11; & 2211:3, 10; 2224:18, & flowchart [2] - \\
\hline 2428:24; 2441:20 & 2443:14; 2450:17; & 2301:2, 7; 2303:25; & 21; 2225:4; 2226:5; & 2238:23; 2239:8 \\
\hline fails [1] - 2376:14 & 2451:6; 2458:1, 5 & 2304:1; 2407:11 & 2229:25; 2230:8, 18; & flowing [3] - \\
\hline fair [25] - 2205:19; & field [2] - 2218:4; & finer-textured [1] - & 2231:5, 12, 24; & 2407:17; 2410:14; \\
\hline 2223:17; 2292:3; & 2333:1 & 2304:1 & 2232:24; 2233:1, \(21 ;\) & 2454:19 \\
\hline 2303:13; 2308:16; & fields [2] - 2218:15; & fines [11] - 2300:13 & 2234:12; 2236:8; & flows [8] - 2238:25; \\
\hline 2312:19; 2323:11, 13, & 2222:4 & 2407:15, 20; 2409:11, & 2237:12, 20; 2238:2, & 2432:25; 2433:16; \\
\hline 16; 2326:2; 2327:3; & fifth [3] - 2344:14; & 23; 2410:16, \(20 ;\) & 5, 13, 19; 2240:14-16, & 2434:3, 6; 2435:14; \\
\hline 2354:10, 13; 2360:15; & 2345:1; 2398:21 & 2411:5, 18; 2414:22 & 25; 2241:1, 7-9, 11, & 2446:25; 2454:22 \\
\hline 2371:7; 2391:15; & figure [8] - 2197:15; & fingers [2] - 2284:21, & 13-14; 2242:6, 8-9, & fluid [1] - 2394:20 \\
\hline 2394:13; 2425:6; & 2242:2; 2245:5; & 23 & 11, 14, 18, 24; & fluvial [1] - 2304:17 \\
\hline 2458:17, 20; 2459:15, & 2283:18; 2285:4; & finish [3] - 2324:7; & 2243:11, 19; 2244:1, & flying [1] - 2212:12 \\
\hline 24; 2461:16; 2464:15 & 2330:2; 2397:23; & 2325:16; 2475:24 & 5; 2245:4; 2246:13; & focus [7] - 2225:12; \\
\hline fairly [6] - 2262:6; & 2468:18 & Fiona [1] - 2193:10 & 2247:7, 16; 2248:1; & 2375:19; 2387:21; \\
\hline 2273:6; 2344:17; & Figure [7] - 2198:17, & fire [6] - 2257:25; & 2249:16, 22; 2254:2, & 2434:7; 2439:8; \\
\hline 2398:7; 2401:20; & 19, 22-23; 2205:4; & 2279:13; 2311:20, 22; & 14; 2255:7; 2257:10; & 2448:20; 2452:18 \\
\hline 2409:22 & 2459:13 & 2471:6, 8 & 2260:14; 2262:14; & focused [4] - \\
\hline falling [1] - 2391:8 & figures [5] - 2198:2 & firearms [1] - 2340:2 & 2266:7; 2267:8; & 2286:23; 2299:18; \\
\hline familiar [4] - & 2205:6, 8; 2383:18; & fires [1] - 2471:6 & 2294:24; 2295:3, 7 , & 2334:21; 2378:3 \\
\hline 2217:10, 13; 2278:1; & 2459:13 & firm [1] - 2328:5 & 16-17; 2296:6; & focuses [1] - \\
\hline 2328:12 & file [2] - 2194:20 & firmer [1] - 2232:16 & 2298:18; 2299:12, 19; & 2259:11 \\
\hline family [5] - 2339:14; & 2200:2 & first [39] - 2196:3, 7; & 2303:13, 15; 2304:15, & focusing [2]- \\
\hline 2369:16; 2372:15; & filed [11] - 2252:23; & 2213:17; 2234:19; & 20; 2309:8; 2311:17; & 2283:11; 2409:19 \\
\hline 2391:17; 2482:21 & 2296:12; 2333:25; & 2246:20; 2248:2; & 2312:3, 16; 2342:2; & foggy [1] - 2445:9 \\
\hline far [13]-2234:18; & 2354:6; 2370:17; & 2270:23; 2271:11; & 2376:1; 2378:18, 23; & folder [3] - 2207:11, \\
\hline 2240:5, 15; 2241:23; & 2389:16; 2393:16; & 2272:10; 2280:5; & 2381:1; 2383:7; & 16, 20 \\
\hline 2248:1; 2261:13; & 2456:16; 2480:10 & 2281:25; 2289:17; & 2384:12; 2386:8; & folks [17] - 2195:7; \\
\hline 2362:16; 2379:13; & files [2]-2194:22; & 2291:7; 2293:25; & 2388:22; 2389:1; & 2206:25; 2250:19; \\
\hline 2385:14; 2405:18; & 2239:20 & 2300:10; 2319:1, 4, 7; & 2396:15; 2398:12; & 2257:14; 2278:21; \\
\hline 2418:4; 2434:15; & filings [1] - 2350:9 & 2321:6, 10; 2336:6; & 2407:8; 2431:6; & 2327:19; 2328:2, 16, \\
\hline 2436:22 & fill [2] - 2242:20, 22 & 2342:19; 2362:24; & 2432:3, 16, 21, 24; & 18, 22; 2329:16; \\
\hline farm [1] - 2372:14 & filled [3] - 2231:6; & 2370:3; 2375:19; & 2433:3; 2436:13, 17, & 2444:25; 2480:25; \\
\hline farmer [1] - 2312:24 & 2243:3; 2247:8 & 2382:22; 2398:21; & 25; 2437:2; 2438:1, 4 , & 2481:25; 2482:6, 9 \\
\hline farming [1] - 2313:12 & filling [1] - 2247 :7 & 2399:9; 2407:10; & 6; 2445:22, 24; & follow [13]-2246:21; \\
\hline faster [3]-2412:18, & fills [1] - 2242:15 & 2409:17; 2412:23; & 2446:2; 2459:21; & 2276:6; 2285:19; \\
\hline 24 & film [1] - 2477:1 & 2420:11; 2423:6; & 2460:5; 2461:1; & 2305:24; 2312:23; \\
\hline favorite [1] - 2308:12 & filter [3]-2388:11, & 2426:18; 2450:25; & 2462:10, 15-16, 18, & 2318:3; 2346:20; \\
\hline feasible [2] - & 16; 2389:2 & 2471:20; 2474:12; & 22; 2463:12, 16; & 2373:8; 2374:25; \\
\hline 2294:18, 22 & filtered [1] - 2386:7 & 2475:19; 2478:7 & 2464:4, 18, 22; & 2396:5; 2414:19; \\
\hline feat [1] - 2386:9 & filtration [6] - & First [7] - 2258:5; & 2468:8, 13 & 2419:20; 2441:20 \\
\hline feature [2] - 2290:5; & 2384:11; 2386:7; & 2333:7; 2334:12; & Flood [1] - 2193:23 & follow-up [6] - \\
\hline 2341:4 & 2388:10, 24; 2389:19, & 2372:9; 2413:17 & flooded [2] - & 2285:19; 2305:24; \\
\hline features [1] - 2431:8 & & firstly [1] - 2462:1 & 2409:13; 2462:24 & 2312:23; 2318:3; \\
\hline February [6] - & final [22] - 2227:2; & fish [23] - 2237:25; & flooding [7] - & 2346:20; 2419:20 \\
\hline 2203:4; 2296:4, 12; & 2267:21; 2280:23; & 2238:10; 2244:6, 10, & 2301:24; 2302:22; & following [19] - \\
\hline 2357:5, 8; 2363:2 & 2315:8; 2322:9, 12, & 20, 24; 2245:1, 7, 13, & 2303:7; 2433:15; & 2210:21; 2225:4; \\
\hline federal [8] - 2267:19; & 22; 2323:2, 20, 22, & 16-17, 20; 2246:19; & 2460:24; 2464:15; & 2234:20; 2237:20; \\
\hline 2293:13, 16; 2335:14, & 24; 2324:7; 2366:6; & 2248:6; 2267:10; & 2471:15 & 2244:7, 12; 2246:7, \\
\hline 17; 2425:18; 2440:11; & 2398:25; 2419:9; & 2340:20; 2346:8, 10; & floodplain [7] - & 17, 22; 2252:19; \\
\hline 2441:21 & 2423:1, 4, 6, 21; & 2384:13; 2388:17; & 2383:9; 2390:21; & 2254:2; 2287:10; \\
\hline federally [1] - & 2453:9; 2477:23; & 2446:19, 22 & 2391:6; 2432:4; & 2382:14; 2400:7; \\
\hline 2333:10 & 2480:13 & fisheries [1] - 2380:1 & 2435:24; 2448:21 & 2401:7; 2430:3; \\
\hline feedback [6] - & finalizing [2] - & Fisheries [1] - & floodplains [2] - & 2431:13; 2452:5; \\
\hline 2267:20; 2268:9, 11; & 2268:18; 2366:5 & 2238:12 & 2462:25; 2468:4 & 2465:8 \\
\hline 2323:8; 2324:7; & finally [7] - 2346:13; & fishing [2] - 2338:3; & floods [24] - & food [1] - 2287:20 \\
\hline 2357:2 & 2376:11; 2379:2; & 2339:10 & 2197:23; 2198:12, & foods [3] - 2359:18, \\
\hline feeding [3]- & 2384:18; 2385:8; & fit [1] - 2459:17 & 18-19; 2228:10, 13; & \\
\hline 2286:12; 2473:25; & 2463:20; 2479:3 & Fitch [7] - 2193:19; & 2241:3, 18; 2243:1; & Fool's [1] - 2444:5 \\
\hline 2474:2 & finals [2] - 2420:2; & 2223:12; 2319:3; & 2431:13; 2433:23; & foot [1] - 2244:15 \\
\hline feet [1] - 2243:22 & 2477:25 & 2450:24; 2475:14; & 2435:6, 20, 25; & football [1] - 2218:4 \\
\hline felt [1] - 2440:17 & financial [2] - & 2476:8; 2478:4 & 2436:2, 5; 2442:20; & foothills [2] - \\
\hline fenceline [1] - & 2360:20; 2381:5 & FITCH [9]-2223:12; & 2460:19; 2462:5, 11; & 2428:25; 2429:9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Foothills [4] - & 2418:14; 2449:17; & furthermore [3] - & 2231:13; 2232:3 & grass [5] - 2400:24; \\
\hline 2426:8; 2428:20; & 2479:12 & 2383:17; 2384:23; & germination [2] - & 2401:24; 2471:5, 8 \\
\hline 2437:7 & friend [8] - 2199:15; & 2472:4 & 2310:4; 2398:17 & grasses [1] - \\
\hline footprint [5] & 2207:14; 2326:10; & future [10] - 2213:11; & gessner [1] - & 2408:24 \\
\hline 2285:5, 20; 2288:2; & 2327:13; 2329:20; & 2218:14; 2228:13, 25; & 2199:24 & grassland [6] - \\
\hline 2427:11; \(2444: 13\) & 2368:8; 2412:13; & 2297:18; 2299:4; & Gessner [1] - 2200:2 & 2429:9, 16-17, 20; \\
\hline FOOTPRINT [1] - & 2478:19 & 2364:19; 2381:22; & Gino [1] - 2193:23 & 2430:2; 2438:11 \\
\hline 2288:20 & FRIEND [28] - & 2421:24; 2469:13 & gist [2] - 2390:19; & grasslands [7] - \\
\hline FOR [12] - 2259:23; & 2199:20; 2200:4, 15; & & 2395:9 & 2296:23; 2380:5; \\
\hline 2261:1; 2263:18; & 2201:5; 2206:13, 15 & G & GIVEN [1] - 2487:1 & 2428:8, 12, 17; \\
\hline 2264:4, 8; 2280:14; & 20; 2207:2, 7, 10, 15, & & Given [1] - 2382:9 & 2430:5; 2437:23 \\
\hline 2369:4; 2486:7; & 19; 2216:19; 2219:12; & Gagnon [2] - & given [34] - 2204:10; & gravel [2] - 2383:2; \\
\hline 2487:5, 10, 20 & 2229:16, 20; 2283:4; & 2193:15; 2329:13 & 2231:23; 2236:24; & 2416:23 \\
\hline force [1] - 2336:8 & 2321:22; 2327:14; & gallery [5] - 2327:20; & 2239:15; 2240:3; & gravitational [1] - \\
\hline forecast [1] - & 2329:24; 2368:25; & 2392:25; 2393:9, 11 & 2245:17; 2250:19; & 2273:6 \\
\hline 2240:21 & 2369:2; 2418:15; & gap [3] - 2209:25; & 2263:25; 2270:25; & grazing [8] - \\
\hline forefront [1] - & 2449:18; 2478:10, 21, & 2210:3; 2442:12 & 2291:13; 2306:6, 8 & 2311:20, 22, 25; \\
\hline 2288:12 & 23; 2479:7 & gaps [9] - 2234:22; & 21; 2312:15; 2322:25; & 2312:7, 14, 19; \\
\hline forego [1] - 2444:8 & friends [1] - 2482:20 & 2335:24; 2338:20; & 2323:14; 2331:7; & 2371:24 \\
\hline foregoing [1] - & Frigo's [1] - 2436:8 & 2349:12; 2357:20, 25; & 2360:17; 2372:22; & Great [1] - 2351:22 \\
\hline 2483:3 & fringe [1] - 2435:25 & 2360:4; 2363:16; & 2373:20; 2387:19; & great [13] - 2206:11; \\
\hline forest [3] - 2279:13; & front [6]-2211:19; & 2395:16 & 2389:20; 2398:12; & 2207:23; 2293:11; \\
\hline 2372:1; 2376:1 & 2265:2; 2307:3; & garden [1] - 2379:19 & 2401:5; 2415:7; & 2309:3; 2351:13, 19 ; \\
\hline forested [2] - 2372:3 & 2328:5, 25; 2457:6 & gas [1] - 2354:5 & 2420:25; 2429:12; & 2352:6; 2367:21; \\
\hline forgot [2] - 2449:13; & frozen [2] - 2281:15; & Gas [2] - 2361:10; & 2438:11, 20; 2442:11; & 2405:1; 2426:18; \\
\hline 2476:1 & 2307:5 & 2363:8 & 2452:7; 2462:9; & 2440:9; 2465:20; \\
\hline form [2] - 2199:6; & frustrating [1] - & gather [1] - 2357:2 & 2464:3; 2480:1 & 2481:19 \\
\hline 2211:23 & 2383:19 & gathered [1] - & glaring [1] - 2378:5 & greater [11] - \\
\hline format [1] - 2328:9 & FS [2] - 2411:5, 23 & 2400:10 & Glenmore [13] - & 2208:18; 2225:21; \\
\hline forms [3] - 2214:15; & fuel [2]-2341:13; & gathering [3]- & 2409:20; 2410:2, 4, 8; & 2253:13; 2301:14; \\
\hline 2277:16; 2435:22 & 2376:1 & 2338:3; 2339:11; & 2414:24; 2436:11; & 2302:10, 15; 2380:25; \\
\hline formulating [1] - & fugitive [16] - & 2362:9 & 2440:13; 2445:21; & 2400:5; 2401:1; \\
\hline 2335:6 & 2271:17, 19; 2272:6, & Gavin [3] - 2193:19; & 2448:22; 2455:4 & 2406:10; 2407:3 \\
\hline forth [4] - 2275:18; & 16, 25; 2316:9; & 2475:14; 2476:10 & GoA [6] - 2471:21; & green [9] - 2362:14; \\
\hline 2360:11; 2402:25; & 2317:12, 22; 2318:2; & gee [1] - 2212:11 & 2472:4; 2474:4-6, 10 & 2401:23; 2403:21; \\
\hline 2454:2 & 2400:16; 2401:8; & general [14] - & GOA's [1] - 2471:17 & 2405:6, 9; 2406:3, 8; \\
\hline fortunate [1] - & 2413:23; 2416:17; & 2228:12; 2237:10; & goal [1] - 2289:14 & 2433:6; 2473:17 \\
\hline 2463:16 & 2451:11, 15 & 2261:25; 2272:22; & Goal [2] - 2236:3; & grey [5] - 2253:19; \\
\hline fortunately [1] - & full [16] - 2211:7, 12; & 2300:7; 2309:12; & 2237:11 & 2257:3; 2286:2, 10, \\
\hline 2463:13 & 2212:10; 2233:22; & 2317:13; 2339:10; & Goals [7] - 2232:21; & \\
\hline forum [1] - 2471:22 & 2257:24; 2265:19; & 2372:24; 2373:19; & 2233:17; 2234:4; & grizzlies [2] - \\
\hline Forum [1] - 2427:4 & 2271:20; 2285:13; & 2380:12; 2409:4; & 2235:16; 2236:5, 11 & 2444:15; 2476:24 \\
\hline forward [6]-2215:4; & 2324:4; 2342:11; & 2435:23; 2455:24 & goals [4]-2234:11; & grizzly [11] - \\
\hline 2270:22; 2287:24; & 2357:1; 2372:16; & generality [1] - & 2235:18, 21; 2236:1 & 2286:19, 24-25; \\
\hline 2336:16; 2422:21; & 2374:7; 2430:5; & 2305:12 & gods [1] - 2195:18 & 2287:2, 7-8, 11, 20, \\
\hline 2451:1 & 2473:21; 2474:1 & generally & Golder [1] - 2241:13 & 22; 2471:18; 2473:5 \\
\hline forwarded [1] - & full-time [1] - & 2204:21; 2219:24; & goodness [1] - & ground [18] - \\
\hline 2422:19 & 2257:24 & 2317:14; 2318:16; & 2329:2 & 2235:11; 2249:12; \\
\hline founded [1] - & full-year [1] - & 2373:1, 25 & goods [1] - 2380:2 & 2273:13; 2277:20; \\
\hline 2447:11 & 2265:19 & generate [2] - & governance [3] - & 2314:2; 2339:14; \\
\hline four [10]-2224:17 & fully [9]-2230:2; & 2261:21; 2274:21 & 2338:14; 2350:2; & 2399:19; 2400:18-20, \\
\hline 23; 2235:1, 17, 20, & 2234:13; 2253:5; & generated [4] - & 2359:12 & 22; 2401:1, 3; \\
\hline 25; 2336:2; 2398:20; & 2313:18; 2342:10; & 2275:13; 2315:5; & government [8] - & 2402:18; 2405:14; \\
\hline 2445:1 & 2349:8; 2351:5; & 2405:14; 2436:18 & 2202:16; 2255:23; & 2407:24 \\
\hline four-week [1] - & 2416:25; 2442:14 & generating [2] - & 2372:8; 2427:8, 12, & grounded [1] - \\
\hline 2235:1 & fulsome [3] - 2339:3; & 2275:14, 21 & 16; 2440:11; 2458:23 & 2337:17 \\
\hline fourth [1] - 2342:6 & 2355:17; 2440:6 & generation & Government [2] - & grounds [2] - \\
\hline fraction [1] - 2411:22 & function [7] - & 2274:19; 2275:19 & 2340:6; 2403:17 & 2362:8, 18 \\
\hline fractions [1] - & 2429:21; 2431:23; & generations [2] - & governments [1] - & groundwater [1] - \\
\hline 2317:14 & 2433:18; 2434:4; & 2337:23; 2445:1 & 2333:6 & 2304:22 \\
\hline frame [3] - 2213:9; & 2435:13; 2442:7; & generic [4] - & grab [1] - 2324:9 & Group [4] - 2193:23; \\
\hline 2473:15; 2474:14 & 2460:20 & 2400:12; 2411:8; & grabbing [3] - & 2194:3; 2324:3; \\
\hline frankly [1] - 2440:8 & functionality [1] - & 2416:10; 2452:13 & 2265:24; 2320:2; & 2423:12 \\
\hline free [5] - 2378:9; & 2430:6 & generous [1] - & 2352:10 & group [1] - 2442:22 \\
\hline 2382:22, 24-25; & functioning [3] - & 2414:20 & Graham [2] - & groups [3] - 2303:21; \\
\hline 2481:17 & 2314:19; 2442:14; & genesis [2] & 2447:23; 2448:3 & 2364:21; 2372:9 \\
\hline Free [1] - 2193:23 & \[
2466: 22
\] & 2202:18; 2204:23 & grandchildren [1] - & grow [2] - 2302:16; \\
\hline frequencies [1] -
2205:4 & functions [2]--
2437:2; 2442:9 & geocell [3]-2232:1 & 2445:4 \(\quad\) grandchildren's & 2397:12 \\
\hline frequency [5] - & funded [1] - 2447:15 & geographic [1] - & \[
2447: 4
\] & grown [2] - 2473:21; \\
\hline 2225:25; 2226:9; & funding [2] - 2346:2; & 2441:18 & granted [1] - 2213:23 & 2474:1 \\
\hline 2241:5, 13; 2462:21 & 2360:16 & geography [1] - & granting [1] - & growth [1] - 2299:3 \\
\hline frequent [2] - & funds [1] - 2255:24 & 2332:24 & 2339:25 & guaranteeing [1] - \\
\hline 2341:13; 2436:2 & FURTHER [5] - & geomorphologist [1] & graph [17] - 2198:17, & 2464:24 \\
\hline friction [1] - 2400:13 & 2259:23; 2263:19; & - 2464:21 & 19; 2239:22; 2240:8, & guess [37] - 2203:14; \\
\hline Friend [11] - & 2264:9; 2487:6, 20 & geomorphology [1] - & 12-13; 2397:1; & 2209:23; 2212:7; \\
\hline 2193:11; 2199:23; & furtherance [2] - & 2435:8 & 2402:1; 2403:20-22; & 2217:16; 2218:16; \\
\hline 2200:2; 2206:3; & 2232:21; 2236:5 & geotool [1] - 2231:20 & 2406:25; 2410:5, 18; & 2228:10; 2254:12; \\
\hline 2216:17; 2327:9; & furtherances [1] - & geotools [4] - & 2411:4; 2415:5 & 2277:25; 2280:5, 19; \\
\hline 2329:17; 2368:23; & 2233:17 & 2229:25; 2230:1; & graphs [1] - 2197:21 & 2289:17; 2290:3; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2292:24; 2295:22; & hamlet [1] - 2336:23 & 2412:9; 2443:10; & 21; 2445:10; 2471:24; & hockey [2] - 2218:5 \\
\hline 2297:23; 2313:22; & hand [8]-2254:25; & 2447:21; 2448:7; & 2472:22 & hold [4] - 2239:7; \\
\hline 2317:18; 2323:17; & 2255:6; 2294:14; & 2451:6; 2455:14, 18; & herds [5] - 2471:16, & 2297:12; 2341:23; \\
\hline 2324:6; 2325:4; & 2310:8; 2377:12, 16; & 2465:10 & 22, 25; 2472:13, 17 & 2425:16 \\
\hline 2326:5, 8, 13, 16, 20; & 2379:8; 2455:2 & hearing [22]- & hereby [1] - 2483:3 & holding [6] - \\
\hline 2331:5; 2354:16; & handheld [1] - & 2196:4, 11; 2239:9; & Heritage [1] - 2218:9 & 2252:16; 2301:10; \\
\hline 2395:1; 2406:21; & 2261:18 & 2275:9; 2310:18; & hiccup [2] - 2194:13; & 2304:2, 10; 2357:1; \\
\hline 2412:8; 2414:7; & handled [2] - 2482:5 & 2320:3; 2323:17; & 2195:15 & 2460:5 \\
\hline 2416:16; 2419:25; & hands [2] - 2325:24; & 2324:16; 2327:11; & hide [1] - 2472:18 & holiday [1] - 2449:5 \\
\hline 2420:13; 2464:6; & 2326:11 & 2328:7, 9, 13; & HIGH [6] - 2263:16; & Holloway [1] - \\
\hline 2481:16 & handy [1] - 2321:8 & 2329:19, 22; 2365:10; & 2421:10, 21; 2422:6, & 2367:22 \\
\hline guessing [1] - & happy [1] - 2369:23 & 2367:21; 2393:10; & 15; 2487:18 & home [1] - 2287:14 \\
\hline 2386:7 & hard [3] - 2210:18; & 2446:9; 2448:16; & High [2] - 2217:25; & homes [2] - 2223:7; \\
\hline guidance [19] - & 2386:22; 2388:7 & 2469:24; 2474:5; & 2261:7 & 2445:15 \\
\hline 2216:16; 2220:25; & harm [1] - 2222:12 & 2482:17 & high [32] - 2218:14; & hope [6] - 2243:14; \\
\hline 2221:1, 11-12, 18; & harm's [1] - 2236:25 & hearings [3] - & 2227:9; 2272:15; & 2306:25; 2319:17; \\
\hline 2223:1, 16; 2227:18; & Harmata [1] - 2194:8 & 2425:22; 2449:5; & 2276:19; 2283:25; & 2391:17; 2420:2; \\
\hline 2238:11; 2263:4; & harmful [1] - 2375:23 & 2459:2 & 2284:11; 2285:7; & 2458:2 \\
\hline 2276:6; 2428:10, 16; & harvester [1] - & hearts [1] - 2447:24 & 2331:9; 2344:3; & Hope [1] - 2217:6 \\
\hline 2437:23; 2440:12, 15, & 2341:5 & heavier [2] - 2300:9; & 2380:3; 2406:9; & hopefully [4] - \\
\hline 19; 2441:21 & harvesters [4] - & 2407:16 & 2408:5; 2410:16; & 2195:17; 2325:6; \\
\hline Guide [1] - 2349:14 & 2340:3; 2343:21; & heavily [2] - 2286:8; & 2411:19; 2415:23; & 2474:16; 2482:20 \\
\hline guide [2]-2211:23; & 2344:4; 2348:12 & 2437:8 & 2417:4; 2420:23; & hoping [7] - 2205:16; \\
\hline 2336:15 & harvesting [1] - & heavy [1] - 2407:13 & 2421:17, 24; 2422:11; & 2245:1; 2322:13; \\
\hline Guideline [3] - & 2347:12 & Hebert [22] -2209:4, & 2427:5, 21, 23; & 2324:22; 2419:1, 21; \\
\hline 2215:7; 2220:23; & harvests [1] - & 21; 2211:13; 2212:6; & 2428:1, 4; 2429:8; & 2420:1 \\
\hline 2276:8 & 2341:10 & 2213:3; 2216:22; & 2431:3; 2433:22; & horizontal [1] - \\
\hline guideline [17] - & HAS [2] - 2421:14; & 2219:10, 23; 2229:23; & 2435:6; 2459:12; & 2242:15 \\
\hline 2215:8, 13, 18; & 2422:8 & 2231:11; 2234:3; & 2461:10 & horizontally [2]- \\
\hline 2216:2, 5, 13; 2221:7; & Hat [1] - 2436:23 & 2251:23; 2259:1; & high-magnitude [1] - & 2242:17, 21 \\
\hline 2226:20-23, 25; & hatched [5] - & 2260:11; 2261:10; & 2435:6 & host [16] - 2231:3; \\
\hline 2227:7, 14, 19; & 2242:13, 16-17, 21, & 2264:15; 2268:23; & high-risk [1] - 2428:1 & 2239:17, 19; 2253:15; \\
\hline 2400:1; 2405:24 & 23 & 2280:22; 2296:5; & high-valued [1] - & 2306:21; 2327:22; \\
\hline guidelines [9] - & hate [1] - 2239:20 & 2319:11; 2439:12 & 2427:5 & 2361:1; 2362:1, 5; \\
\hline 2227:22; 2228:1; & haul [2] - 2275:17; & HEBERT [45] - & high-wind [2] - & 2364:11; 2392:22; \\
\hline 2316:12; 2403:3; & 2344:1 & 2205:21; 2211:15; & 2276:19 & 2452:16; 2453:20 \\
\hline 2404:23; 2413:5; & hauled [2] - 2383:15; & 2217:3, 8, 13, 18; & higher [22] - & hour [9] - 2222:21; \\
\hline 2428:11; 2441:16 & 2391:5 & 2218:1, 7, 12, 18, 21; & 2225:18; 2273:7; & 2323:10; 2324:8; \\
\hline Guidelines [1] - & hauling [1] - 2391:12 & 2219:1, 4, 7; 2227:20; & 2282:20; 2315:12, 16; & 2325:7; 2412:2; \\
\hline 2219:17 & head [1] - 2206:20 & 2230:3; 2231:15; & 2317:2; 2318:5; & 2423:14; 2475:17 \\
\hline guidepost [1] - & heading [1] - & 2234:7; 2251:17; & 2405:6-8; 2406:21, & hours [10] - 2259:5; \\
\hline 2235:3 & 2452:10 & 2255:12; 2256:5; & 23; 2408:24; 2411:20, & 2267:13; 2271:13; \\
\hline guideposts [1] - & heads [4] - 2266:12 & 2259:13; 2260:21; & 23; 2413:22; 2414:5, & 2276:17; 2323:24; \\
\hline 2234:11 & 2282:3; 2412:3, 15 & 2262:7; 2264:2, 19, & 25; 2415:4; 2417:13; & 2324:23, 25; 2326:9, \\
\hline guiding [1] - 2364:2 & heads-up [1] - & 22; 2265:22; 2266:10, & 2469:3 & \\
\hline & 2282:3 & 15; 2267:15; 2268:4; & higher-risk [1] - & HOURS [2] - \\
\hline H & health [17] & 2269:13; 2271:8; & 2469:3 & 2259:22; 2487:4 \\
\hline & 17; 2223:1, & 2288:3; 2291:23; & highest [2] - & house [5] - 2282:6; \\
\hline habitat [16] - & 2225:18, 21; 2271:3, & 2292:3; 2294:25; & 2225:13; 2468:20 & \[
2283: 2,10 ; 2292: 16
\] \\
\hline 2282:19; 2283:16, 20, & 5, 7, 25; 2274:2; & 2306:16; 2307:25; & highest-value [1] - & \[
2472: 20
\] \\
\hline 23; 2284:12; 2285:3, & 2316:13; 2317:9; & 2308:6, 18; 2312:4; & 2468:20 & housekeeping [4] - \\
\hline 7; 2286:11; 2287:2; & 2394:25; 2448:17; & 2319:17; 2484:9 & highlight [2]- & 2196:6; 2476:7; \\
\hline 2340:21; 2371:25; & 2473:6 & Hebert's [3] - & 2284:14; 2308:21 & 2478:5; 2480:20 \\
\hline 2429:24; 2434:5; & Health [1] - 2306:5 & 2210:15; 2232:20; & highlighting [1] - & HOW [1] - 2269:16 \\
\hline 2436:4; 2437:10; & health-based [1] - & 2235:5 & 2204:4 & howling [1] - 2471:1 \\
\hline 2440:3 & 2225:18 & hectare [2] - & highlights [1] - & HR [1] - 2329:4 \\
\hline habitat-based [1] - & healthy [1] - 2442:9 & 2456:20; 2457:2 & 2427:24 & huge [1] - 2469:9 \\
\hline 2283:23 & HEANEY \({ }_{\text {[11] - }}\) & hectares [2] - & Highway [18] - & human [14] - \\
\hline habitations [1] - & 2298:7; 2305:17; & 2244:2; 2253:23 & 2222:7; 2261:9; & 2222:15-17; 2224:7; \\
\hline 2365:7 & 2367:6; 2466:13; & held [3]-2300:9, 11; & 2263:24; 2284:19; & 2288:1; 2291:8, 14; \\
\hline habitats [23] - & 2467:5, 7, 10; & 2357:7 & 2286:6; 2287:6; & 2292:8; 2316:13; \\
\hline 2285:11; 2432:8; & 2476:22; 2484:17; & helicopter [1] - & 2289:10; 2331:8; & 2379:22; 2446:15; \\
\hline 2433:22; 2434:7, 23; & 2485:10 & 2446:7 & 2391:14; 2420:23; & 2448:19; 2472:8; \\
\hline 2437:1, 4, 7, 12; & Heaney [10] - 2193:9 & hello [3] - 2229:16; & 2421:16, 23; 2422:10; & 2474:8 \\
\hline 2438:2, 5, 7, 17; & 2298:5, 21; 2300:8; & 2334:7; 2457:23 & 2459:16 & human's [1] - \\
\hline 2439:23; 2441:5; & 2301:7; 2305:19; & help [8] - 2253:8; & highway [3] - & 2292:25 \\
\hline 2443:3; 2461:18; & 2367:5; 2466:12; & 2287:11; 2297:23; & 2425:19; 2472:3; & humanized [1] - \\
\hline 2463:25; 2464:1; & 2467:8; 2476:21 & 2324:13; 2349:17; & 2473:24 & 2447:9 \\
\hline 2465:2; 2467:3 & hear [11] - 2262:15; & 2461:12; 2464:18; & HIGHWAY [7] - & humans [3] - 2271:3; \\
\hline habits [1] - 2429:9 & 2270:5, 12, 20; & 2477:11 & 2263:18; 2421:19; & 2274:2; 2467:21 \\
\hline hair [1] - 2291:14 & 2317:20; 2326:24; & helpful [3] - 2291:3; & 2422:7, 13; 2487:19 & hundred [2] - \\
\hline half [11] - 2323:9; & 2367:16; 2387:3; & 2344:21; \(2404: 18\) & Highwood [1] - & 2205:17; 2242:7 \\
\hline 2324:9, 25; 2325:7; & 2391:21; 2446:10; & hence [1] - 2293:9 & 2463:7 & hundreds [3] - \\
\hline 2326:17; 2331:15; & 2452:25 & HERBERT [1] - & hills [1] - 2473:13 & 2277:20; 2434:16; \\
\hline 2398:3; 2399:1, \(5 ;\) & heard [21] - 2209:4; & 2266:3 & historic [4] - & 2440:18 \\
\hline 2418:7; 2456:9 & 2238:17; 2248:19; & herbicide [2] - & 2202:24; 2203:4; & hunt [2]-2337:13, \\
\hline HALLSON [2] - & 2267:19; 2271:21; & 2249:4; 2373:9 & 2462:17 & \\
\hline 2205:22; 2484:10 & 2312:25; 2315:12; & herbicide/weed [1] - & hit [1] - 2319:7 & hunting [12] - \\
\hline halted [1] - 2275:14 & 2379:13; 2389:22; & 2344:7 & hitter [1] - 2329:15 & 2288:2, 7, 16; \\
\hline Hamill [1] - 2463:18 & 2397:9; 2407:9; & herd [5] - 2444:14, & hitting [1] - 2461:10 & 2337:15; 2338:3; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2339:10; 2471:16; & images [1] - 2272:12 & importance [11] - & 2344:8 & inequity [2] - \\
\hline 2472:7, 11; 2474:6 & imagine [4] - & 2346:10; 2347:11; & incorporate [2] - & 2445:19; 2446:6 \\
\hline HUNTING [1] - & 2243:19; 2328:18; & 2359:17; 2380:8; & 2313:5; 2357:3 & inevitable [1] - \\
\hline 2288:20 & 2477:3, 5 & 2413:22; 2427:25; & incorporated [3] - & 2448:14 \\
\hline hydrologic [1] - & immediate [5] - & 2429:15; 2433:21; & 2277:10, 12; 2349:3 & influence [3] - \\
\hline 2431:22 & 2261:21; 2274:3; & 2435:22; 2471:21 & incorrect [4] - & 2304:10; 2434:11; \\
\hline hydrological [1] - & 2451:24; 2461:14; & important [19] - & 2199:3; 2204:22; & 2441:19 \\
\hline 2442:13 & 2465:7 & 2230:6; 2250:5; & 2205:1 & influenced [3] - \\
\hline hydrologist [2] - & immediately [3] - & 2287:5; 2293:10; & incorrectly [3] - & 2290:25; 2314:15; \\
\hline 2454:14 & 2237:12; 2372:23; & 2297:5; 2310:11; & 2197:25; 2198:4; & 2432:9 \\
\hline hydrologist's [1] - & 2397:10 & 2380:1; 2387:21; & 2203:9 & inform [2] - 2348:1; \\
\hline 2434:9 & immemorial [1] - & 2396:22; 2400:16; & increase [4] - & 2381:14 \\
\hline hydrology [2] - & 2445:2 & 2406:1; 2412:9, 22; & 2381:5, 21; 2472:8; & Information [1] - \\
\hline 2340:19; 2433:9 & immovable [1] - & 2413:3; 2416:25; & 2474:10 & 2311:10 \\
\hline hydroseeding [2] - & 2348:22 & 2433:17; 2434:5; & increased [8] - & information [43] - \\
\hline 2310:8; 2314:23 & Impact [14] - & 2435:5, 7 & 2222:10; 2260:18; & 2208:16; 2235:25; \\
\hline hyperlink [1] - & 2332:14; 2333:10, 22; & impose [2] - & 2340:1, 16, 25; & 2241:22; 2258:9; \\
\hline 2215:21 & 2334:1; 2335:13; & 2227:17; 2374:14 & 2341:12; 2381:4; & 2265:18; 2270:22; \\
\hline I & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(2336: 8,10 ; 233\) \\
2349 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} & posed [1] - 2381:9 & 2382:4 & 2303:9, 11; 2304:13; \\
\hline 1 & \[
2354: 25 ; 2372: 12
\] & 2386:9 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { increases [3] - } \\
& \text { 2260:15; 2400:21, } 23
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2311:9; 2314:12; } \\
& \text { 2318:18, 22: 2330:3: }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline IAAC [2] - 2306:4; & 2465:14 & impression [2] - & INCREASES [2] - & 2335:17; 2338:13; \\
\hline 2431:12 & impact [30] - 2223:9; & 2308:25; 2381:8 & 2260:25; 2487:9 & 2339:8, 10; 2350:10; \\
\hline icon [1] - 2307:14 & 2224:25; 2226:8; & IN [7] - 2260:25; & increasing [1] - & 2357:11, 16, 19, 22; \\
\hline ID [1] - 2201:20 & 2228:8; 2239:3; & 2263:11; 2280:17; & 2380:6 & 2358:1, 4, 11, 13, 16; \\
\hline idea [3] - 2207:23; & 2263:22; 2279:4; & 2421:12; 2422:14; & incremental [1] - & 2360:3, 6, 13; \\
\hline 2323:15; 2455:24 & 2305:25; 2332:17; & 2487:9, 14 & 2437:10 & 2362:25; 2363:3, 17, \\
\hline ideally [2] - 2289:25; & 2333:25; 2334:17; & inaccessible [3] - & incumbent [1] - & 19; 2377:2, 6, 13, 18; \\
\hline 2474:6 & 2336:14; 2337:3; & 2339:23; 2340:8 & 2474:9 & \[
2390: 22 ; 2453: 17,22 ;
\] \\
\hline ideas [1] - 2447:22 & 2340:6; 2349:18; & inappropriate [1] - & incurred [1] - & 2457:7 \\
\hline identification [1] - & 2350:1; 2358:24; & 2313:7 & 2255:14 & infrastructure [3] - \\
\hline 2362:17 & 2363:23; 2376:20; & incident [1] - & independent [2] - & 2446:19; 2468:16; \\
\hline identified [36] - & 2384:13; 2403:7; & 2198:21 & 2261:3; 2355:3 & 2469:11 \\
\hline 2213:12; 2220:4, 8 ; & 2431:9; 2433:8, 23; & INCLUDE [1] - & INDEPENDENT [2] - & infrequent [1] - \\
\hline 2223:6; 2224:6, 11; & 2434:1, 3; 2438:16; & 2265:10 & 2263:10; 2487:13 & 2435:25 \\
\hline 2225:2, 14; 2226:15; & 2440:4; 2461:2 & include [19] - & independently [1] - & inhabitants [2] - \\
\hline 2233:12; 2234:1, 23; & IMPACT [1] - 2264:7 & 2222:22; 2258:8; & 2397:18 & 2446:20; 2448:9 \\
\hline 2252:13; 2261:5; & impacted [6] - & 2261:17; 2264:16; & indicate [5] - 2213:8; & inhaling [4]-2292:9, \\
\hline 2275:1; 2276:12; & 2208:21; 2268:10; & 2265:3; 2267:23; & 2238:9; 2257:6; & 15; 2315:11; 2316:1 \\
\hline 2287:8; 2335:21; & 2345:20; 2400:19; & 2276:19; 2277:20; & 2311:6; 2337:15 & initial [7] - 2210:3; \\
\hline 2341:2, 25; 2343:14; & 2430:11; \(2442: 15\) & 2288:6; 2289:13; & indicated [19] - & 2214:13; 2235:6; \\
\hline 2345:2, 12; 2346:18; & impacting [1] - & 2291:9; 2348:2; & 2208:17; 2237:12; & 2237:20; 2311:25; \\
\hline 2351:20; 2355:12; & 2441:9 & 2349:6; 2355:15; & 2238:22; 2245:15; & 2414:2; 2417:24 \\
\hline 2360:4; 2364:15; & impacts [45] - & 2436:21; 2447:4; & 2247:24; 2249:1; & initiated [2]- \\
\hline 2365:8; 2380:18; & 2197:17; 2259:16; & 2448:23; 2461:17 & 2255:3; 2288:4; & 2234:20; 2248:1 \\
\hline 2427:4, 8, 16, 20; & 2262:11; 2266:6; & included [12] - & 2306:2; 2307:19; & initiating [1] - \\
\hline 2446:6; 2459:15 & 2268:16; 2300:20; & 2209:3; 2212:16; & 2336:24; 2361:2; & 2234:14 \\
\hline IDENTIFIED [2] - & 2310:20; 2334:22; & 2226:18; 2258:10, 22; & 2398:9; 2414:23; & input [5] - 2216:8; \\
\hline 2263:13; 2487:16 & 2337:24; 2338:4, 6 ; & 2262:13; 2331:16; & 2433:9; 2453:22; & 2349:7; 2355:15; \\
\hline identifies [2] - & 2342:9, 14, 16-17, 19, & 2345:10; 2357:23; & 2454:25; 2455:13; & 2358:20; 2426:9 \\
\hline 2261:20; 2339:10 & 21; 2343:2, 11-12, 24; & 2372:17; 2415:1; & 2456:8 & inputs [2] - 2397:6; \\
\hline identify [9] - & 2345:5, 9, 18; 2349:9; & 2417:16 & indicates [2] - & 2402:20 \\
\hline 2237:16, 22; 2278:23; & 2370:14; 2377:14, 17; & includes [8] - & 2314:13; 2354:19 & insect [2] - 2260:16, \\
\hline 2315:25; 2339:17; & 2380:20; 2381:7, 20 ; & 2202:16; 2265:4; & indicating [3] - & 18 \\
\hline 2346:24; 2383:18; & 2402:17; 2415:11; & 2295:15; 2331:22; & 2383:16; 2413:15; & INSECT [2] - \\
\hline 2395:16; 2459:12 & 2416:12; 2431:5; & 2336:17; 2337:13; & 2414:12 & 2260:25; 2487:9 \\
\hline identifying [2] - & 2433:13; 2434:14; & 2349:12; 2445:14 & indication [2] - & insects [1] - 2260:14 \\
\hline 2349:6; 2458:19 & 2438:1, 11; 2439:8, & INCLUDING [2] - & 2402:2, 5 & inside [4] - 2251:18; \\
\hline identity [1] - 2359:10 & 13, 20; 2440:7; & 2263:14; 2487:16 & indicative [1] - & 2292:16; 2430:16; \\
\hline IF [9] - 2259:20; & 2441:9; 2467:21 & including [29] - & 2414:14 & 2437:25 \\
\hline 2260:23; 2264:5; & IMPACTS [1] - & 2195:1; 2218:15; & indicator [2] - & insight [1] - 2360:20 \\
\hline 2265:9; 2266:23; & 2266:25 & 2223:7; 2258:4; & 2293:1; 2318:20 & insignificant [1] - \\
\hline 2280:13, 16; 2487:3, & impaired [1] - & 2259:11; 2261:6; & Indigenous [9] - & \[
2430: 19
\] \\
\hline \[
8
\] & 2342:24 & 2278:7; 2310:7; & 2303:21; 2331:23; & inspection [2] - \\
\hline Ifeoma [3] - 2194:3; & impart [1] - 2467:22 & 2313:1; 2316:11; & 2332:22; 2333:3, 15; & 2314:8; 2383:2 \\
\hline 2207:14; 2264:14 & impedes [1] - 2408:6 & 2333:10, 16; 2340:19; & 2336:18; 2346:17; & inspections [1] - \\
\hline ignored [2] - 2247:2; & impingement [1] - & 2347:24; 2349:18; & 2356:25; 2364:20 & \[
2275: 11
\] \\
\hline 2400:11 & 2223:3 & 2359:6, 19; 2378:20; & indiscernible [1] - & installation [3]- \\
\hline ii [1] - 2236:13 & implement [4] - & 2380:4; 2382:15; & 2285:25 & \[
2232: 1,13 ; 2233: 3
\] \\
\hline iii [2] - 2233:8; & 2294:4; 2345:9; & 2426:5, 10; 2429:17; & individual [2] - & installed [1] - \\
\hline 2234:5 & 2417:8; 2428:10 & 2430:7; 2442:5; & 2291:25; 2293:3 & 2307:19 \\
\hline ill [1] - 2378:24 & implementation [2] - & 2446:21; 2456:20; & individuals [1] - & instance [6] - \\
\hline ill-prepared [1] - & 2336:14; 2346:20 & 2457:2; 2481:7 & 2288:6 & 2245:9; 2292:9; \\
\hline 2378:24 & implemented [2] - & incompatible [1] - & indoor [1] - 2218:6 & 2360:9; 2401:11, 19 ; \\
\hline illustrate [2] - & 2210:22; 2237:12 & 2472:7 & indulge [1] - 2471:4 & 2407:7 \\
\hline 2342:4; 2363:16 & Implications [1] - & incomplete [2] - & industrial [1] - & instances [1] - \\
\hline illustrated [2] - & 2439:25 & 2345:7 & 2371:23 & 2313:12 \\
\hline 2272:12; 2336:22 & implied [2] - & incompletely [1] - & industry [5] - 2333:7; & instantaneous [1] - \\
\hline illustration [1] - & 2384:24; 2434:3 & 2447:16 & 2371:21; 2372:8; & 2240:14 \\
\hline 2385:1 & imply [1] - 2317:9 & incongruent [1] - & 2374:21; 2458:23 & instead [6] - 2296:5; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2327:21; 2334:20; & interrupt [4] - & ironed [1] - 2280:24 & JUST [1] - 2269:19 & [3]-2214:7; \\
\hline 2338:9; 2347:18; & 2219:22; 2306:19; & irreparably [1] - & Justin [1] - 2193:17 & 228:9; 2335:5 \\
\hline 2386:19 & 2392:21; 2411:25 & 2447:9 & & knows [2] - 2223:16; \\
\hline instill [1] - 2388:10 & interrupting [1] - & IRs [1] - 2358:14 & K & 2385:14 \\
\hline instituted [1] - & 2419:17 & IS [1] - 2269:18 & & KRUHLAK [38] - \\
\hline 2233:15 & INTERRUPTION [2] - & ISSUE [2] - 2259:22; & Kaminski [4] - & 2195:22, 24; 2196:12; \\
\hline insufficiency [1] - & 2280:15; 2413:12 & 2487:5 & 2193:14; 2328:23; & 2197:5; 2199:8; \\
\hline 2377:18 & interruption [10] - & issue [20] - 2196:24; & 2329:2 & 2213:1, 8, 18; \\
\hline insufficient [1] - & 2279:6, 12, 19, 23; & 2213:21; 2218:24; & Kaminski's [1] - & 2219:21; 2220:7, 15, \\
\hline 2377:12 & 2343:17, 19-20; & 2236:21; 2259:5; & 2329:3 & 21; 2280:4; 2326:5; \\
\hline INSURANCE [1] - & 2393:11; 2420:5 & 2261:20; 2299:15; & Kamp [2] - 2217:6; & 2331:10, 18; 2351:3, \\
\hline 2280:14 & intersect [1] - 2340:9 & 2311:22; 2330:22; & 2256:22 & 23; 2352:8; 2353:3, 6, \\
\hline insurance [2] - & intersected [1] - & 2331:9; 2343:9; & Kananaskis [1] - & 25; 2364:7, 11; \\
\hline 2279:22; 2479:25 & 2430:22 & 2372:25; 2373:20; & 2472:11 & 2366:12, 18; 2458:10; \\
\hline insurer [2] - 2279:13, & intersection [1] - & 2389:12, 19; 2398:13, & Karen [1] - 2448:1 & 2461:23; 2465:22, 25; \\
\hline 18 & 2362:15 & 15; 2408:22; 2419:9; & keep [8] - 2199:11; & 2475:10; 2479:18; \\
\hline insurers [1] - 2279:5 & intersects [1] - & 2481:10 & 2224:3; 2227:6; & 2480:6, 14; 2484:6, \\
\hline intact [6]-2428:8, & 2339:13 & issued [1] - 2203:3 & 2269:11; 2303:14; & 24; 2485:9 \\
\hline 11, 16; 2437:23; & interspersed [1] - & issues [14] - & 2395:25; 2424:5; & Kruhlak [37] - \\
\hline 2438:11; 2442:6 & 2380:25 & 2213:14; 2237:22; & 2465:19 & 2193:18; 2195:22; \\
\hline integral [1] - 2349:21 & intervals [4] - & 2326:8, 15; 2336:2; & keeping [1] - & 2196:9, 11; 2197:10; \\
\hline integrate [1] - & 2202:2; 2233:7; & 2342:7, 19; 2345:2; & 2344:22 & 2205:13; 2213:1; \\
\hline 2381:11 & 2236:18; \(2237: 15\) & 2360:7; 2419:15; & keeps [2] - 2278:11; & 2219:22; 2250:20; \\
\hline integrated [2] - & intervener [2] - & 2444:23; 2446:18; & 2328:20 & 2280:4; 2319:2; \\
\hline 2248:14; 2333:4 & 2198:16; 2324:20 & 2461:16; 2481:12 & Ken [1] - 2446:5 & 2325:21; 2326:4; \\
\hline integrity [1] - 2447:5 & interventional [1] - & IT [2] - 2264:5; & Kennedy [12] - & 2327:4; 2331:10, 20; \\
\hline intend [1] - 2419:21 & 2381:16 & 2481:1 & 2193:10; 2194:18; & 2351:2, 9, 15; 2352:7, \\
\hline intended [4] - & interweaving [1] - & Item [1] - 2357:24 & 2298:1; 2322:8, 17, & 14, 20-21; 2366:16; \\
\hline 2257:6; 2295:3; & 2338:13 & item [2]-2196:3; & 21; 2326:9; 2366:23; & 2450:17, 24; 2458:5, \\
\hline 2297:16; 2318:19 & intimacy [1] - & 2470:7 & 2391:21; 2466:6; & 13; 2467:12, 18; \\
\hline intends [2] - 2390:4, & 2445:12 & items [7] - 2196:6 & 2476:13; 2481:24 & 2475:9, 13; 2479:17; \\
\hline \[
9
\] intensity & intimate [1] - 2445:3 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2236:16; 2267:15, } 17 ; \\
& \text { 2278:13: 2314:23: }
\end{aligned}
\] & KENNEDY [8] - & 2480:1, 3, 17 \\
\hline 2399:18; 2400:20; & 2370:14; 2374:24; & 2341:13 & 2298:3; 2366:24; & 工 \\
\hline 2402:10 & 2377:24; 2408:2; & iterative [2] - 2235:2; & 2391:23; 2466:7; & \\
\hline intent [9]-2234:13, & 2438:25 & 2349:6 & 2476:14 & LAA [5] - 2374:6, 8, \\
\hline 25; 2246:8; 2249:21; & introduced [5] - & itself [4] - 2248:18; & kept [1] - 2442:6 & 12; 2380:21; 2381:8 \\
\hline 2254:10, 19; 2283:17; & 2380:13; 2381:10; & 2257:6; 2283:13; & key [5] - 2208:14; & label [1] - 2448:7 \\
\hline 2308:9; 2437:22 & 2390:15, 18; 2397:16 & 2337:4 & 2335:21; 2346:20; & lack [9] - 2322:25; \\
\hline intention [4] - & introduction [4] - & iv [2] - 2233:11; & 2402:20; 2427:9 & 2323:14; 2336:1; \\
\hline 2369:9, 14; 2390:6; & 2377:8; 2378:2; & 2234:5 & kick [3] - 2400:17; & 2346:24; 2373:19; \\
\hline 2391:12 & 2383:5; 2386:2 & Ivan [1] - 2304:25 & 2402:18; 2407:24 & 2434:22; 2437:1, 6 ; \\
\hline intentions [2] - & inundate [1] - 2432:3 & Iwanyshyn [1] - & kicks [1] - 2279:10 & 2440:6 \\
\hline 2373:22; 2382:2 & inundated [2] - & 2193:12 & kilometre [3] - & laden [1] - 2385:12 \\
\hline interact [2] - & 2433:2, 5 & & 2272:8, 21 & lag [1] - 2214:7 \\
\hline 2296:24; 2348:5 & inundating [1] - & J & kilometres [7] - & Lancaster [1] - \\
\hline interaction [1] - & 2432:5 & & 2273:18; 2277:20; & 2428:21 \\
\hline 2349:24 & inundation [1] - & January [8] - 2203:3, & 2401:17; 2404:21; & land [70] - 2258:5; \\
\hline interactions [2] - & 2432:24 & 6, 10; 2356:5, 21; & 2430:9; 2434:16; & 2288:4; 2311:15, 20, \\
\hline 2358:8; 2458:2 & invaded [1] - & 2358:10, 17 & 2440:18 & 23, 25; 2312:6, 11, \\
\hline interest [6] - & 2381:21 & jargon [1] - 2223:2 & kind [20] - 2206:24; & 15-16; 2333:15; \\
\hline 2287:25; 2377:4; & invasion [3] - & JF [2] - 2201:8; & 2228:23; 2241:19; & 2335:25; 2337:18; \\
\hline 2443:17; 2452:2; & 2378:25; 2379:18; & 2485:21 & 2242:12, 24; 2291:11; & 2338:21; 2339:2, 9 , \\
\hline 2461:4; 2474:13 & 2429:6 & job [7]-2328:6, 21; & 2292:5; 2304:22; & 21-24; 2340:4, 7, 9; \\
\hline interested [2] - & invasions [4]- & 2329:22; 2351:19; & 2307:8; 2309:16; & 2341:5; 2342:23; \\
\hline 2236:23; 2472:14 & 2378:18; 2381:20, 22 & 2367:21; 2468:21; & 2310:2; 2328:4; & 2343:5, 21; 2344:5; \\
\hline interesting [1] - & invasive [8] - & 2481:19 & 2329:14; 2393:9; & 2345:20, 22; 2346:16; \\
\hline 2304:16 & 2372:11; 2373:1; & jog [1] - 2451:4 & 2394:24; 2407:9; & 2347:16, 25; 2348:9, \\
\hline interests [1] - 2335:1 & 2380:9, 20, 24; & John [1] - 2442:18 & 2413:8; 2467:13; & 12; 2350:3; 2354:1; \\
\hline interfere [2] - & 2382:3, 8; 2429:2 & join [2] - 2351:15, 17 & 2476:9 & 2356:2; 2357:25; \\
\hline 2297:4; 2313:19 & inventories [1] - & Joint [1] - 2372:13 & Kiwanis [3] - 2217:6; & 2359:7, 13; 2361:4, \\
\hline intergeneration [1] - & 2265:15 & joke [2]-2195:18; & 2256:22; 2257:14 & 12, 14, 16-17, 22; \\
\hline 2359:11 & invertebrate [1] - & 2444:5 & Klepacki [14] - & 2363:17; 2364:19, 24; \\
\hline interim [5] - 2278:8; & 2430:7 & judge [1] - 2308:7 & 2241:2; 2392:10; & 2365:9; 2366:5; \\
\hline 2353:25; 2361:22; & investigation [1] - & July [4] - 2247:16; & 2412:6; 2418:6; & 2370:15; 2372:3, 5; \\
\hline 2365:8; 2468:13 & 2455:3 & 2249:13; 2415:19 & 2443:13; 2449:7; & 2401:10; 2428:12; \\
\hline interject [3] - 2213:2; & invite [4] - 2230:4; & jump [4] - 2331:3; & 2450:17; 2457:12, 23; & 2437:18; 2442:5; \\
\hline 2396:1; 2426:20 & 2231:16; 2256:5; & 2412:25; 2414:8; & 2458:4; 2469:17; & 2444:25 \\
\hline internal [2] - & 2271:8 & 2453:12 & 2472:13; 2477:21 & LANDOWNER \({ }_{[1]}\) - \\
\hline 2202:20; 2346:5 & invites [1] - 2366:6 & jumping [1] - 2389:6 & KLEPACKI [6] - & 2265:12 \\
\hline Internet [1] - 2455:10 & involve [2] - 2364:4; & Jumping [3] - & 2392:17; 2443:16; & Landowners [1] - \\
\hline internet [1] - 2409:12 & 2390:9 & 2444:14, 21; 2445:10 & 2444:4; 2457:24; & 2194:3 \\
\hline interpret [1] - & involved [7] - & June [10] - 2203:11; & 2458:7; 2485:6 & landowners [2] - \\
\hline 2461:10 & 2262:1; 2268:14; & 2204:24; 2231:7, 12; & knowing [1] - 2389:1 & 2264:18; 2374:15 \\
\hline interpretation [1] - & 2306:10; 2349:9; & 2233:23; 2243:20; & knowledge [10] - & lands [23] - 2245:9; \\
\hline 2209:1 & 2354:7; 2409:16; & 2247:6, 8-9; 2415:18 & 2323:1; 2337:22; & 2265:15; 2287:6; \\
\hline interpreted [1] - & 2416:17 & jurisdictional [1] - & 2339:7, 16; 2359:11; & 2336:20; 2338:16; \\
\hline 2309:14 & involvement \({ }^{\text {[7] }}\) - & 2379:10 & 2370:25; 2381:13; & 2340:22; 2347:7; \\
\hline interpreting [1] - & 2345:13, 25; 2346:2, & jurisdictions [2] - & 2394:2; 2424:25; & \[
2372: 6 ; 2379: 1
\] \\
\hline 2211:14 & 6, 8-9; 2458:1 & 2381:24; 2469:1 & 2479:16 & 2380:4, 7; 2381:5, 22; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2382:7, 12; 2386:13; & leadership [1] - & LIKE [1] - 2421:9 & 2263:11; 2265:12; & 2401:10; 2403:19; \\
\hline 2413:17; 2432:13; & 2382:10 & likelihood [2] - & 2487:14 & 2404:9, 16; 2408:13, \\
\hline 2436:10; 2442:1, 10; & learning [1] - 2469:1 & 2429:8; 2446:17 & locale [3] - 2341:11, & 18; 2416:15; 2451:1; \\
\hline 2443:4; 2474:10 & least [12] - 2313:5, & likely [23] - 2209:9; & 16; 2343:22 & 2458:15; 2459:10, 20; \\
\hline landscape [9] - & 16; 2317:23; 2318:3; & 2212:18; 2222:19; & locally [2] - 2268:9; & 2463:4 \\
\hline 2290:5; 2304:16; & 2324:11; 2329:12; & 2224:8; 2240:21; & 2383:10 & looks [6] - 2249:10; \\
\hline 2340:20; 2374:25; & 2367:19; 2382:2; & 2243:12; 2257:9; & locate [2] - 2195:10; & 2393:2; 2401:14; \\
\hline 2427:5; 2445:12, 17; & 2385:20; 2399:5; & 2286:17; 2298:16; & 2383:17 & 2403:20; 2413:10; \\
\hline 2448:8; 2469:7 & 2435:4; 2448:14 & 2308:23; 2315:13; & located [3] - & 2415:16 \\
\hline landscapes [7] - & leave [5] - 2199:8; & 2334:22; 2346:21; & 2306:12; 2339:8; & Lorelee [3] - 2194:7; \\
\hline 2374:16; 2380:11; & 2213:24; 2254:7; & 2375:10, 14; 2380:22; & 2426:25 & 2483:12 \\
\hline 2427:1; 2438:2, 12; & 2387:20; 2461:22 & 2383:23; 2407:18, 20 ; & location [22] - & lose [5] - 2301:18, \\
\hline 2445:4; 2459:12 & leaves [2] - 2381:8; & 2415:2; 2416:10; & 2202:4; 2203:15; & 20-21; 2351:9; \\
\hline laneway [1] - 2473:2 & 2401:24 & 2429:11, 21 & 2216:25; 2217:14, 20 ; & 2437:12 \\
\hline large [20]-2230:8; & leaving [2] - & likewise [1] - & 2220:13; 2222:3; & Ioss [24] - 2279:6, \\
\hline 2234:22; 2243:1; & 2378:10, 15 & 2458:16 & 2224:9; 2244:25; & 12, 19, 23; 2301:15, \\
\hline 2256:25; 2273:4; & lecture [1] - 2448:3 & limit [4] - 2225:8; & 2245:17; 2290:24; & 23; 2341:11; 2345:22; \\
\hline 2277:19; 2285:19; & left [8] - 2239:13; & 2274:18; 2275:18; & 2341:8; 2348:18; & 2347:5, 9, 21; \\
\hline 2328:14; 2398:11; & 2254:16; 2266:11; & 2340:1 & 2382:9; 2383:19, 23, & 2348:14; 2431:1, \\
\hline 2408:10; 2413:24; & 2300:13; 2390:25; & limitations [1] - & 25; 2472:24; 2473:9, & 2437:10-12; 2439:23; \\
\hline 2415:7; 2416:20; & 2428:14; 2435:3 & 2303:9 & 12; 2474:8 & 2445:3, 13, 17 ; \\
\hline 2429:12; 2433:3; & legal [3] - 2339:24; & LIMITED [2] - & LOCATIONS [4] - & 2446:23; 2464:1 \\
\hline 2435:24; 2444:9; & 2422:21; 2482:1 & 2263:15; 2487:17 & 2219:15; 2263:13; & LOSS [1] - 2280:15 \\
\hline 2446:8; 2458:21 & legend [2] - 2253:20; & limited [8] - 2199:4; & 2486:2; 2487:15 & lost [8] - 2283:11; \\
\hline largely [2] - 2286:3; & 2363:6 & 2226:4, 10; 2253:21; & locations [22] - & 2340:5; 2343:5; \\
\hline 2356:16 & legislative [2] - & 2261:6; 2348:11; & 2202:1; 2203:16; & 2348:25; 2353:21, 23; \\
\hline larger [23] - 2198:12; & 2335:23; 2336:7 & 2361:6; 2429:4 & 2217:6, 9; 2218:24; & 2430:11; 2466:14 \\
\hline 2273:5; 2293:20, 22; & legs [1] - 2324:10 & limiting [1] - 2435:14 & 2219:8, 24; 2222:18; & loud [1] - 2471:3 \\
\hline 2309:9; 2315:18, 21; & length [3]-2302:8; & limits [3]-2224:15; & 2223:5; 2224:7, & LOUDEN [27] - \\
\hline 2317:15; 2401:25; & 2314:2 & 2225:18; 2226:2 & 10-11, 13; 2225:7; & 2330:19, 22; 2331:3, \\
\hline 2407:10, 22; 2408:8, & lengthy [1] - 2262:6 & line [21] - 2242:11; & 2245:21; 2261:5; & 17, 20; 2332:3, 8; \\
\hline 20; 2414:18; 2415:1, & lens [4] - 2333:3, 9; & 2301:19; 2318:1; & 2275:3; 2318:15, 21; & 2350:15; 2367:10, 13; \\
\hline 11; 2438:20; 2443:7; & 2336:20; 2338:9 & 2363:8; 2381:3; & 2410:1 & 2368:1; 2387:9; \\
\hline 2462:10, 18, 21; & Leshchyshyn [2] - & 2402:4, 6-8; 2406:8; & long-term [7] - & 2418:23, 25; 2419:5, \\
\hline 2464:4 & 2193:16; 2329:14 & 2407:1; 2410:18; & 2347:5, 21; 2371:22; & 13; 2420:8, 11, 19; \\
\hline largest [4]-2197:22; & less [24] - 2203:22; & 2411:3; 2413:17; & 2448:17; 2460:20; & 2421:15, 22; 2422:9, \\
\hline 2198:18; 2241:11; & 2225:7; 2226:10; & 2430:13; 2431:13; & 2461:13; 2462:25 & 16, 23; 2449:24; \\
\hline 2309:9 & 2227:11; 2233:6; & 2432:11; 2449:4 & Iongevity [1] - & 2474:23; 2484:23 \\
\hline last [37] - 2194:20; & 2236:17; 2244:3; & lines [5] - 2198:25; & 2455:24 & Louden [16] - \\
\hline 2195:3; 2196:18; & 2248:19; 2286:17; & 2242:16; 2285:4 & look [49] - 2200:21; & 2194:1; 2330:15, 21; \\
\hline 2197:14; 2200:9; & 2302:1, 21; 2305:6; & link [3] - 2215:24; & 2204:12, 21; 2227:6; & 2331:1, 10; 2350:13; \\
\hline 2215:15; 2228:5; & 2308:16; 2377:22; & 2287:19; 2349:17 & 2228:18, 24; 2231:14; & 2366:13; 2367:9, 17; \\
\hline 2240:4; 2243:1; & 2380:10; 2397:1; & Lion's [1] - 2218:10 & 2236:20; 2240:2, 5, & 2387:9; 2418:25; \\
\hline 2258:24; 2274:15; & 2404:21; 2405:10; & list [3] - 2296:11; & 23; 2250:3; 2252:10; & 2419:9, 11; 2422:25; \\
\hline 2279:5; 2303:12, 23 ; & 2406:9; 2410:20; & 2307:6; 2481:2 & 2257:11; 2271:25; & 2449:23; 2474:22 \\
\hline 2308:11; 2313:21; & 2414:22; 2415:3; & listed [2] - 2334:3; & 2275:1; 2279:2; & louder [2] - 2270:10; \\
\hline 2346:13; 2367:18; & 2448:24 & 2356:9 & 2285:4, 11; 2290:17, & 2318:12 \\
\hline 2368:18; 2375:17; & lesson [1] - 2434:21 & listening [1] - & 22, 24; 2292:11; & low [16] - 2226:5; \\
\hline 2390:12; 2394:22; & Lethbridge [1] - & 2237:23 & 2296:16; 2299:19; & 2283:16; 2284:1, 12; \\
\hline 2415:20; 2416:7; & 2329:3 & lists [1] - 2358:14 & 2306:11; 2309:7; & 2285:2, 7, 10; 2386:6; \\
\hline 2438:10; 2444:4; & letter [19] - 2321:14; & literature [2] - & 2316:15; 2363:5; & 2388:11; 2399:5; \\
\hline 2447:7, 21; 2458:1; & 2334:3; 2354:17, 19, & 2208:13; 2456:4 & 2383:24; 2401:8, & 2401:20; 2403:10; \\
\hline 2459:2; 2465:5; & 22-23; 2355:1; & live [6] - 2261:5; & 15-17; 2402:7; & 2404:5; 2406:5; \\
\hline 2468:9; 2469:22; & 2356:1, 6, 10, 18, 21; & 2278:22; 2328:17; & 2404:20; 2413:6; & 2433:23; 2451:18 \\
\hline 2471:7; 2472:15; & 2357:20; 2358:10, 18, & 2446:13; 2463:11; & 2415:9, 14; 2435:20; & low-level [2] - \\
\hline 2477:21; 2481:7 & 20; 2360:5; 2362:1, 3 & 2468:6 & 2440:12; 2448:20; & 2386:6; 2388:11 \\
\hline lasting [1] - 2461:14 & level [18] - 2227:9; & LIVE [2] - 2263:12; & 2455:22; 2462:15; & low-magnitude [1] - \\
\hline lastly [1] - 2435:13 & 2262:16; 2272:15; & 2487:15 & 2470:9, 11; 2480:2 & 2433:23 \\
\hline late [24]-2194:20; & 2292:18; 2314:2; & lives [2] - 2223:13 & looked [23] - 2198:8; & low-recurrence [1] - \\
\hline 2196:18; 2215:15; & 2317:20; 2346:5; & livestock [1] - & 2200:9; 2201:17; & 2226:5 \\
\hline 2239:4, 14; 2254:3; & 2376:15, 18; 2386:6; & 2271:3 & 2216:4, 7, 10; & lower [6] - 2313:14; \\
\hline 2298:11, 25; 2299:7, & 2388:11; 2405:14; & living [1] - 2287:12 & 2226:23; 2227:8; & 2402:22; 2408:6, 24; \\
\hline 18; 2300:16; 2301:8, & 2414:14; 2445:23; & LOAD [4] - 2421:10, & 2231:9; 2276:17; & 2427:17; 2462:18 \\
\hline 12-13; 2309:8, 14; & 2451:17; 2458:23; & 21; 2422:6, 15 & 2300:19; 2303:6; & lowest [1] - 2383:4 \\
\hline 2311:8, 11; 2322:16; & 2462:18 & load [6] - 2206:9; & 2316:9; 2398:19; & Ltd [2] - 2194:5 \\
\hline 2379:6; 2446:8; & levels [13] - 2273:20; & 2331:9; 2420:23; & 2405:18; 2406:25; & Luigi [1] - 2193:22 \\
\hline 2463:19 & 2315:16; 2316:2, 6 , & 2421:17, 24; 2422:11 & 2408:16; 2409:18; & lunch [4]-2323:19; \\
\hline lately [1] - 2276:21 & 14, 17; 2318:5; & loaded [1] - \(2283: 5\) & 2415:23; 2436:8; & 2325:17; 2327:19; \\
\hline Laura [7] - 2193:11; & 2347:13; 2446:2; & loader [1] - 2252:15 & 2442:19; 2453:14 & 2423:14 \\
\hline 2199:20; 2207:8; & 2453:8; 2472:9 & loading [1] - 2463:9 & looking [37] - & \\
\hline 2229:16; 2283:4; & liability [1] - 2280:6 & loam [3] - 2304:8; & 2203:5; 2208:8; & M \\
\hline 2321:22; 2478:10 & liaison [4] - 2258:4; & 2410:25; 2411:4 & 2211:1; 2220:6; & \\
\hline lawn [1] - 2379:19 & 2291:10 & local [17] - 2261:4; & 2227:12; 2229:17; & M.D [1] - 2383:1 \\
\hline laws [2] - 2338:17; & licence [1] - 2256:17 & 2264:18; 2265:5; & 2239:20; 2240:13; & machine [1] - \\
\hline 2350:4 & licensed [1] - 2373:9 & 2268:1, 3, 6, 18-19; & 2242:3, 6; 2269:5; & 2252:14 \\
\hline layer [4] - 2394:22; & lies [1] - 2447:24 & 2283:15; 2285:18; & 2286:2; 2290:15; & Madam [1] - 2370:7 \\
\hline 2407:15; 2409:14; & life [2]-2259:10; & 2289:23; 2381:18; & 2293:7, 24; 2326:13; & magical [1] - 2445:8 \\
\hline 2414:23 & 2448:5 & 2383:19, 22; 2390:22; & 2330:17; 2338:6; & magnitude [3] - \\
\hline lead [2] - 2302:12; & light [2] - 2433:6; & 2440:5; 2455:23 & 2353:9; 2362:8; & 2433:3, 23; 2435:6 \\
\hline 2389:1 & 2451:6 & LOCAL [3] - & 2397:16; 2398:24; & Mahoney [1] - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2442:18 & manmade [1] - & matting [2] - 2232:1; & 2339:11; 2362:9 & 25; 2436:17; 2437:1; \\
\hline main [2] - 2305:15; & 2279:16 & 2233:3 & Medicine [1] - & 2446:2; 2462:6, 13; \\
\hline 2435:21 & manner [1] - \(2313: 12\) & mature [1] - 2297:7 & 2436:23 & 2472:19 \\
\hline maintain [10] - & manners [1] - 2255:5 & matures [1] - & medicine-gathering & metric [1] - 2225:20 \\
\hline 2294:6, 16, 22; & manual [2] - & 2341:22 & [1] - 2362:9 & metrics [1] - 2285:1 \\
\hline 2397:22; 2416:1; & 2201:25; 2203:15 & maturing [1] - & medium [3] - 2301:4, & mic [1] - 2323:8 \\
\hline 2428:11, 16; 2435:11; & map [13] - 2218:25; & 2297:6 & 17; 2411:4 & Michael [5] - \\
\hline 2448:18; 2460:20 & 2219:8; 2223:15; & max [1] - 2322:18 & meet [3] - 2235:8; & 2193:12, 19; 2319:6; \\
\hline maintained [2] - & 2256:19; 2284:15; & maximum [5] & 2274:2; 2373:7 & 2368:17; 2369:22 \\
\hline 2434:4; 2442:10 & 2285:11; 2362:8, & 2219:18; 2223:3; & meeting [2] - 2326:7; & micrograms [2] - \\
\hline maintaining [2] - & 12-13, 22; 2363:5; & 2225:15; 2413:6 & 2351:15 & 2271:13; 2293:7 \\
\hline 2294:12; 2448:20 & 2428:3; 2473:8 & MC1 [2]-2446:17; & Melissa [1] - 2193:20 & micron [1] - 2271:6 \\
\hline maintains [1] - & mapped [4] - & 2448:14 & Member [3] - 2193:8 & mid [3]-2198:1, 5; \\
\hline 2197:24 & 2427:11, 23; 2428:7; & McLennan [1] - & member [2] - 2271:9; & 2231:12 \\
\hline maintenance [5] - & 2444:11 & 2368:18 & \[
2425: 23
\] & mid-1990s [1] - \\
\hline 2234:15; 2258:16; & mapping [1] - & Meadows [2] - & members [19] - & 2426:3 \\
\hline 2277:13, 18; 2434:5 & 2427:24 & 2444:17; 2445:25 & 2262:8; 2265:22, 24; & mid-June [1] - \\
\hline majestic [1] - & maps [7] - 2208:4; & mean [17] - 2213:5, & 2319:11; 2337:15; & 2231:12 \\
\hline 2473:22 & 2220:14; 2283:1, & 14; 2214:9; 2220:16; & 2338:11; 2340:24; & mid-winter [2] - \\
\hline major [8]-2240:25; & 20-21; 2286:25; & 2224:1; 2232:3; & 2341:14; 2350:6; & 2198:1, 5 \\
\hline 2373:6, 15; 2379:25; & 2362:5 & 2254:6; 2290:10; & 2367:20; 2372:21; & middle [2]-2253:23; \\
\hline 2434:6, 21; 2437:13; & March [6] - 2198:24; & 2291:21; 2292:14; & 2382:17; 2425:12; & 2407:2 \\
\hline 2442:12 & 2203:4; 2215:21; & 2325:17, 20; 2338:6; & 2444:6, 20; 2445:9; & Middle [1] - 2217:24 \\
\hline majority [3]-2244:3; & 2321:16; 2334:1; & 2388:25; 2414:16; & 2449:1, 11; 2469:22 & midmorning [1] - \\
\hline 2295:4; 2317:13 & 2357:9 & 2426:21; 2464:9 & memory [1] - 2451:4 & 2250:2 \\
\hline MAKING [1] - & Mark [4] - 2232:8; & meandering [2]- & mental [1] - 2359:23 & midsummer [1] - \\
\hline 2288:19 & 2274:14; 2278:20; & 2430:13; 2433:16 & mention [4]-2304:2; & 2249:13 \\
\hline mammals [1] - & 2314:21 & meaning [4]- & 2325:20; 2378:9; & might [38]-2195:8, \\
\hline \[
2444: 9
\] & mark [6] - 2235:1; & 2231:1; 2411:1, 6 & 2384:12 & \[
11 ; 2200: 22 ; 2203: 16
\] \\
\hline man [2]-2267:13; & 2443:25; 2478:7, 17 & meaningful [3] - & mentioned [19] - & 2213:11; 2220:20; \\
\hline 2471:10 & marked [10] - & 2345:15; 2348:15; & 2198:4; 2240:9; & 2223:14; 2240:5; \\
\hline manage [4] - & 2199:12; 2200:10, 25; & 2434:23 & 2242:23; 2244:16; & 2263:25; 2279:4; \\
\hline 2249:11; 2268:16; & 2219:11, 23; 2220:9; & meaningless [1] - & 2252:7; 2253:22; & 2299:6; 2301:25; \\
\hline 2287:11; 2326:12 & 2339:17; 2368:13; & 2346:4 & 2274:19; 2281:22; & 2302:2; 2306:14; \\
\hline managed [6] - & 2475:20; 2479:5 & means [7] - 2337:24; & 2300:16; 2301:10; & 2316:7; 2317:4; \\
\hline 2257:19; 2277:16; & Markin [1] - 2446:5 & 2338:13; 2344:13; & 2304:1; 2316:6; & 2318:2; 2323:21; \\
\hline 2297:3; 2376:6; & marking [1] - & 2397:22; 2402:17; & 2360:24; 2372:16; & 2325:17, 22; 2331:5; \\
\hline 2413:25 & 2475:15 & 2405:7; 2448:15 & 2379:2; 2382:1; & 2360:3; 2397:12; \\
\hline management [48] & Mary [2] - 2252:22; & meantime [2] - & 2388:21; 2447:14; & 2412:12; 2419:22, 24; \\
\hline 2209:12, 14, 17; & 2447:25 & 2387:23; 2464:10 & 2459:11 & 2451:4; 2455:20; \\
\hline 2210:8; 2211:24; & mass [2]-2252:18; & measure [6] - & MERCER [3] - & 2456:13; 2460:11; \\
\hline 2214:6; 2230:22; & 2271:5 & 2209:8; 2232:15; & 2322:14; 2450:6; & 2462:22; 2464:9; \\
\hline 2248:14, 18, 25; & Massey [1] - 2448:1 & 2248:18; 2260:15; & 2475:5 & 2471:23; 2477:18, 22 \\
\hline 2249:1; 2255:22; & master [1] - 2235:9 & 2404:20; 2444:20 & Mercer [4] - 2193:21; & migration [1] - \\
\hline 2262:24; 2263:2; & master's [1] - & MEASURE [2] - & 2322:15; 2450:8; & 2446:19 \\
\hline 2264:17; 2268:7; & 2371:14 & 2260:25; 2487:9 & 2475:4 & migratory [1] - \\
\hline 2277:11; 2278:7; & match [2] - 2279:8; & measured [1] - & mere [1] - 2379:18 & \[
2340: 21
\] \\
\hline 2287:18; 2288:9, 14; & 2444:10 & 2203:20 & merely [1] - 2382:3 & million [5] - 2243:20; \\
\hline 2338:15; 2350:3; & material [19] - & measurement [1] - & merging [1] - 2286:9 & 2258:19; 2398:3; \\
\hline 2370:16; 2371:13, 15; & 2214:25; 2232:10; & 2203:21 & merits [1] - 2203:8 & 2445:14; 2447:6 \\
\hline 2372:3, 6; 2373:3, 9, & 2254:15; 2299:3, 25; & measurements [3] - & mesh [1] - 2389:24 & mind [12] - 2229:7; \\
\hline 22; 2374:14; 2377:19; & 2301:7, 9; 2304:21; & 2202:1; 2205:3; & met [1] - 2288:11 & 2250:2; 2255:19; \\
\hline 2378:3; 2379:3, 7 ; & 2305:14; 2309:1; & 2270:25 & meteorological [7] - & 2330:6; 2387:24; \\
\hline 2380:9; 2381:11; & 2317:14; 2352:10; & measures [9] & 2275:3; 2276:9, 16, & 2395:25; 2405:21; \\
\hline 2382:2; 2386:18, 20; & 2375:23; 2383:1, 4, & 2226:16; 2233:14; & 18; 2399:22, 24; & 2409:7; 2414:3; \\
\hline 2390:5; 2442:2; & 14; 2391:1, 5 & 2294:6; 2346:21; & 2403:11 & 2420:4; 2451:17; \\
\hline 2443:4; 2463:24; & materially [1] - & 2378:1, 6; 2381:12; & meteorologists [1] - & 2477:14 \\
\hline \[
2468: 1
\] & 2208:21 & 2415:15; 2445:24 & 2404:18 & mindful [1] - 2269:7 \\
\hline MANAGEMENT [1] - & materials [11] - & measuring [2] - & meteorology [7] - & mines [1] - 2425:20 \\
\hline 2265:11 & 2257:8; 2308:24; & 2202:14; 2209:17 & 2403:19; 2405:16; & minimal [2] - \\
\hline manager [11] - & 2355:14; 2376:5; & mechanical [2] - & 2415:17, 23; 2417:10, & 2348:14; 2377:17 \\
\hline 2206:22; 2216:20; & 2382:22; 2383:7, 11, & 2249:2; 2394:19 & 12 & minimize [1] - \\
\hline 2242:2; 2281:12; & 21; 2426:19, 23 & mechanics [1] - & method [4] - & 2244:18 \\
\hline 2293:14; 2331:22; & Matt [4] - 2229:3; & 2394:20 & 2221:23; 2255:2; & minimum [4]- \\
\hline 2332:21; 2355:19; & 2238:20; 2300:8; & mechanism [1] - & 2411:12; 2441:10 & 2271:2, 6; 2274:2; \\
\hline 2395:4; 2426:15; & 2308:19 & 2263:21 & methodology [2] - & 2389:24 \\
\hline 2461:24 & matter [24] - & MECHANISM [1] - & 2395:19; 2474:4 & Minister [1] - 2426:1 \\
\hline Manager [2] - & 2195:25; 2196:17; & 2264:5 & methods [12] - & Ministers [1] - \\
\hline 2229:7; 2328:25 & 2271:20, 22-23; & mechanisms [6] - & 2211:2; 2221:1, 12, & 2294:8 \\
\hline managers [7] - & 2272:4, 13, 17; & 2261:22; 2339:25; & 18, 22; 2226:19; & minor [2] - 2321:15; \\
\hline 2195:1; 2207:17; & 2273:2, 4; 2292:13, & 2340:8; 2381:13, 16 & 2230:6; 2233:15; & 2424:20 \\
\hline 2321:7; 2322:8; & 15-16, 18; 2293:2; & median [3] - & 2259:7; 2397:2, 5 & minute [5] - 2207:19; \\
\hline 2327:25; 2329:20; & 2316:21; 2327:10; & 2403:25; 2434:3, 6 & metre [8]-2244:2, 4; & 2229:18; 2387:20; \\
\hline 2481:7 & 2368:7; 2372:20; & mediate [1] - & 2253:1, 21; 2254:4; & 2399:21; 2400:13 \\
\hline managing [6] - & 2374:7; 2419:1; & 2446:11 & 2271:14; 2293:8; & minutes [39] - \\
\hline 2259:15; 2294:16; & 2440:6; 2450:16; & mediation [2] - & 2385:17 & 2205:17; 2250:5; \\
\hline 2306:8; 2312:8; & 2468:25 & 2446:18; 2451:24 & metres [17]-2239:1; & 2251:1; 2258:24; \\
\hline 2313:11; 2386:11 & matters [3] - & medical [1] - & 2240:18; 2385:21; & 2269:23; 2322:18 \\
\hline Manitoba [1] - & 2195:20; 2196:10; & 2369:16 & 2401:12; 2405:10, 12 ; & 2323:3, 25; 2324:1-3, \\
\hline 2333:17 & 2418:3 & medicine [2] - & 2406:10; 2432:1, 16, & 11, 14, 24; 2331:13; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\hline 2436:4 & 2304:13; 2305:3; & operational [6] - & 2409:3; 2413:14; & 2257:21; 2258:13; \\
\hline Oceans [1] - 2238:12 & 2308:6, 11, 18; & 2238:22, 24; 2239:8; & 2415:12; 2426:6; & 2260:3, 6-7; 2269:2; \\
\hline October [2] - 2356:4; & 2312:4; 2313:21; & 2255:13; 2300:18; & 2455:20 & 2282:9, 14-16; \\
\hline 2415:19 & 2315:8; 2318:7; & 2433:6 & originally [4] - & 2283:3; 2293:19; \\
\hline oddly [1] - 2236:22 & 2324:19; 2327:24; & OPERATIONS \({ }_{[1]}\) - & 2226:7; 2397:15; & 2347:2; 2374:2; \\
\hline OF [13] - 2259:22; & 2335:23; 2342:9; & 2264:6 & 2408:21; 2411:16 & 2375:3; 2376:11; \\
\hline 2264:6; 2265:10; & 2343:13; 2345:5, 17; & operations [19] - & originated [1] - & 2383:12; 2385:19; \\
\hline 2266:25; 2267:2, 5; & 2363:11; 2368:6; & 2234:15; 2235:22; & 2481:13 & 2388:7; 2424:21; \\
\hline 2322:5; 2421:11, 19; & 2374:18; 2377:12; & 2256:2; 2257:25; & Osko [18] - 2369:16; & 2428:14; 2429:18; \\
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\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 2377:20; 2381:11 } \\
\text { prevented [1] - }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2478:2 } \\
& \text { processes [8] - }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 7 ; 2379: 23-25 ; \\
& 2380: 3,10,14-15,17,
\end{aligned}
\] & proponent/ operator [1] - 2261:22 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2358: 2 ; 2360: 3,7,9 \\
& 12 ; 2363: 4 ; 2373: 24
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 2373:14 & 2273:12, 14; 2335:15; & 22; 2381:2, 25; & proponents [6] - & 2380:15; 2421:6; \\
\hline prevention [5] - & 2431:22; 2433:10; & 2382:5; 2383:11; & 2333:7; 2337:8; & 2426:9; 2455:25; \\
\hline 2373:3; 2377:21; & 2435:6, 12; 2442:13 & 2384:20, 23; 2386:15, & 2360:12; 2365:13; & 2456:5, 19 \\
\hline 2378:7; 2380:9; & produce [3] - & 17; 2395:14; 2404:24; & 2373:7; 2440:23 & provider [1] - \\
\hline 2386:20 & 2197:22; 2286:10; & 2407:1; 2416:12; & proportion [1] - & 2194:19 \\
\hline previous [6] - & 2377:21 & 2426:5, 12, 25; & 2317:15 & provides [8] - \\
\hline 2348:7, 20; 2361:2; & producing [3] & 2427:20, 22; 2428:8; & propose [1] - 2370:3 & 2220:25; 2221:11; \\
\hline 2405:19 & 2297:11; 2371:20; & 2429:10, 16; 2430:2, & proposed [27] - & 2241:22; 2380:1; \\
\hline previously [21] - & 2415:6 & 12; 2431:5, 8; 2433:6; & 2213:12; 2216:23; & 2403:5; 2405:1; \\
\hline 2197:4; 2205:23; & productive [3] - & 2436:2, 2437:13, 16; & 2217:1; 2258:25; & 2457:1; 2472:23 \\
\hline 2219:9; 2225:12; & 2430:9; 2433:24 & 2438:7, 13, 15, 19; & 2261:3; 2265:1; & providing [9]- \\
\hline 2234:10; 2244:11; & productivity [1] - & 2439:17; 2440:15; & 2288:5; 2295:2; & 2216:7; 2319:14; \\
\hline 2246:6; 2255:13; & 2430:6 & 2441:11, 19; 2444:24; & 2336:5; 2339:23; & 2323:6; 2330:4, 8, 15; \\
\hline 2268:5; 2284:20; & professional [12] - & 2445:19; 2447:12; & 2342:15; 2343:10, 23; & 2350:8; 2394:24; \\
\hline 2288:4; 2339:9; & 2319:13; 2370:12; & 2459:3, 7, 21; 2460:9; & 2357:1; 2378:1, 3, 5, & 2480:9 \\
\hline 2343:10; 2363:3, 9, & 2371:11; 2394:16; & 2462:3, 8, 12; 2464:1; & 19; 2395:14; 2421:17, & province [5] - \\
\hline 11; 2372:7, 10; & 2425:10, 15, 17; & 2465:7 & 24; 2422:2; 2431:4; & 2248:23; 2277:17; \\
\hline 2392:10, 18; 2470:23 & 2429:7; 2438:14; & PROJECT [2] & 2442:11; 2461:12; & 2280:7; 2288:10; \\
\hline prey [1] - 2287:23 & 2461:21; 2462:2; & 2263:9; 2487:12 & 2462:12; 2463:6 & 2314:24 \\
\hline primarily [3] - & 2482:7 & project's [3] - & PROPOSED [3] - & Province [1] - 2483:8 \\
\hline 2299:24; 2415:18; & professionally [3] - & 2283:12; 2370:14; & 2263:9; 2421:21; & provincial [5] - \\
\hline 2441:17 & 2482:5 & 2461:11 & 2487:13 & 2287:8; 2335:15; \\
\hline primary [3] - & professor [1] - & project-related [2] - & proposing [2] - & 2373:13; 2425:18 \\
\hline 2287:20; 2398:19; & 2463:17 & 2342:16; 2343:11 & 2294:12; 2369:18 & provincially [1] - \\
\hline 2431:16 & profile [6] - 2400:1 & projects [28] & protect [1] - 2334:25 & 2333:10 \\
\hline principal [1] - & 2401:13; 2405:20; & 2277:13, 18-19, 25; & protected [1] - & provision [1] - \\
\hline 2402:21 & 2406:2, 12, 16 & 2278:6; 2314:24; & 2335:3 & 2346:1 \\
\hline principles [3]- & profiles [1] - 2405:13 & 2333:9, 11-13; & protecting [4] - & provisions [1] - \\
\hline 2288:5; 2312:6; & profiling [1] - 2411:8 & 2339:6; 2348:8 & 2382:7; 2458:18; & 2336:10 \\
\hline 2364:23 & program [7] - & 2354:8; 2361:3, 10, & 2468:20; 2474:4 & proxies [1] - 2346:12 \\
\hline print [1] - 2397 & 2211:24; 2261:16; & 12-13; 2363:14; & Protection [1] - & public [6]-2215:16; \\
\hline private [6]-2218:14 & 2285:12; 2287:4; & 2373:15, 17; 2380:10; & 2442:19 & 2216:15; 2227:1; \\
\hline 2287:15; 2347:16; & 2306:10; 2346:20; & 2425:23; 2427:24; & protection [3] - & 2428:12; 2471:22; \\
\hline 2348:10; 2361:5, 16 & 2383:2 & 2448:13; 2458:24; & 2382:12; 2430:18; & 2474:13 \\
\hline proactively [1] - & programs [3]- & 2463:6; 2464:22; & 2445:19 & pull [12]-2199:15; \\
\hline 2379:11 & 2217:15, 19; 2371:19 & 2468:13 & Protection's [1] - & 2200:12; 2216:18, 20; \\
\hline problem [9]-22 & progress [1] - & prolong [1] - 23 & 2426:1 & 2222:3; 2224:1; \\
\hline 2277:3; 2297:18; & 2234:20 & prolonged [1] - & protective [2] - & 2257:22; 2258:11; \\
\hline 2307:1, 17; 2379:1, 8; & progresses [2] - & 2223:11 & 2227:7; 2472:22 & 2351:24; 2362:1; \\
\hline \[
2445: 6 ; 2463: 14
\] & 2235:7; 2246:8 & promise & protocols [1] - & 2395:4; 2426:15 \\
\hline problematic [1] - & progressive [1] & 2466:19 & 2372:2 & pulled [8]-2202:20; \\
\hline 2247:2 & 2246:16 & promised [1] - & prove [1] - 2460:14 & 2203:10; 2206:4; \\
\hline problems [2] - & prohibit [1] - & 2373:7 & proven [1] - 2377:21 & 2223:15; 2250:6; \\
\hline 2468:10; 2469:13 & 2341:14 & promisi & provide [43] - & 2278:14; 2355:19 \\
\hline procedural [2] - & prohibited [1] - & 2373:13 & 2197:11; 2201:23; & pulling [2]-2224:2; \\
\hline 2196:5; 2365:21 & 2376:9 & promote [1] - 2344:7 & 2205:5; 2211:23; & 2232:5 \\
\hline proceed [19] - & project [153] - & pronouncing [1] - & 2215:17; 2217:19; & pumping [1] - \\
\hline 2196:11; 2197:8; & 2216:10, 12, 16; & 2352:17 & 2221:14, 18; 2229:9; & 2386:13 \\
\hline 2251:15; 2270:7; & 2227:12, 15; 2228:4 & propagat & 2231:16; 2232:16; & purple [9]-2242:11; \\
\hline 2281:10, 19; 2331:2 & 2235:7; 2257:24; & 2471:24 & 2240:10; 2251:20; & 2243:6; 2285:4; \\
\hline 2334:5; 2353:4; & 2259:10; 2261:2, 13; & propagules [1] - & 2260:5; 2266:20; & 2430:15; 2473:8, 12 \\
\hline 2369:20; 2370:1; & 2262:12; 2267:10; & 2380:24 & 2271:9; 2280:10; & purpose [2] - \\
\hline 2395:7; 2424:5, 9; & 2268:8; 2274:3, 7; & proper [2] - 2399:4; & 2308:25; 2311:12; & 2220:18; 2308:2 \\
\hline 2426:17; 2443:15; & 2275:4, 7; 2276:24; & 2414:3 & 2316:5; 2318:19, 21 & purposes [8] - \\
\hline 2450:14; 2478:5 & 2277:3, 14-15, 21; & properly [3] - & 2332:19; 2333:18; & 2312:7; 2336:21; \\
\hline proceeding [5] - & 2278:14; 2279:15, 20; & 2231:21; 2337:1; & 2334:6; 2353:16, 18; & 2339:3; 2340:23; \\
\hline 2371:4; 2394:6, 10 ; & 2280:25; 2283:23; & 2352:18 & 2357:10; 2358:21; & 2344:12; 2346:17; \\
\hline 2425:3; 2451:3 & 2287:18; 2288:5; & properties [3] - & 2360:13; 2371:6, 10; & 2355:2; 2431:10 \\
\hline PROCEEDINGS [5] - & 2292:8; 2294:6, 23; & 2313:14; 2386:11; & 2372:18; 2377:2; & pursue [1] - 2468:2 \\
\hline 2194:10; 2320:5, 7; & 2306:6; 2316:8; & 2448:21 & 2390:14; 2394:12, 16; & put [19]-2199:22; \\
\hline 2321:5; 2482:24 & 2318:17; 2331:25; & propert & 2425:5, 9; 2429:24; & 2207:11, 16; 2215:4; \\
\hline proceedings [5] - & 2332:17; 2334:21; & 2252:24; 2279:9; & 2456:7; 2461:21; & 2239:17; 2264:15; \\
\hline 2323:1; 2354:2; & 2336:11; 2337:25; & 2284:8, 12, 15; & 2481:1 & 2275:15; 2276:16; \\
\hline 2382:15; 2483:5 & 2339:8, 12, 17, 19; & 2472:21 & PROVIDE [2]- & 2286:5; 2307:4; \\
\hline Proceedings [1] - & 2342:16, 24; 2343:4, & proponent [20] & 2267:4; 2269:15 & 2360:11; 2388:14; \\
\hline 2193:1 & 6, 11; 2345:16; & 2212:3; 2222:8; & PROVIDED [3] - & 2397:13; 2413:22; \\
\hline process [33] - & 2346:15, 21; 2347:4; & 2228:20; 2249:14 & 2421:8, 14; 2422:5 & 2420:3, 16; 2464:7; \\
\hline 2195:12; 2235:2, 4, 6; & 2348:5, 8, 14; & 2259:4; 2260:17; & provided [38] - & 2467:16; 2473:8 \\
\hline 2236:24; 2244:17; & 2349:19, 24; 2350:1; & 2263:21; 2264:16; & 2195:3; 2196:2, 14; & putting [3] - 2220:18; \\
\hline 2246:12, 16, 18, & 2353:14, 17; 2354:5, & 2265:13, 19; 2266:5; & 2204:2; 2212:24; & 2289:25; 2465:1 \\
\hline 23-24; 2247:13, 15, & 11; 2356:23; 2358:24; & 2267:22; 2294:2; & 2214:3; 2215:21; & puzzled [1] - 2377:11 \\
\hline 19; 2248:10, 13, 15; & 2359:5, 18, 20, \(22 ;\) & 2326:19; 2335:16; & 2222:25; 2223:15; & \\
\hline 2291:12; 2308:8, 14; & 2361:4, 14, 16, \(21 ;\) & 2340:6; 2377:16; & 2227:18; 2230:7; & Q \\
\hline 2314:5; 2328:13; & 2362:15; 2363:10, 13, & 2432:7; 2439:19, 22 & 2256:9; 2266:1; & \\
\hline 2346:18; 2349:5, 11; & 15, 21; 2365:17, 19; & PROPONENT [1] - & 2272:12; 2286:24; & Q.C [3]-2193:18, 22 \\
\hline 2365:23; 2376:12; & 2370:16; 2373:6; & 2264:4 & 2316:16; 2337:12; & qualifications [3] - \\
\hline 2377:11; 2443:8; & 2374:12; 2375:13; & proponent's [1] - & 2339:7; 2356:2, 7; & 2371:11; 2394:17; \\
\hline 2467:4; 2468:17; & 2377:4, 7, 23; 2378:2, & 2261:17 & 2357:6, 17, 19, 23; & 2425:10 \\
\hline
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recreation [1] - \\
2425:20 \\
recruitment [4] - \\
2435:18, 21, 23; \\
2436:4 \\
rectangular [2] - \\
2218:3, 11 \\
rectified [1] - \\
2206:25 \\
recurrence [1] - \\
2226:5 \\
red [6] - 2224:11; \\
2283:25; 2286:18; \\
2402:7; 2405:3, 5 \\
redirect [9]-2319:4, \\
8; 2367:12, 15; \\
2470:8, 15; 2477:5 \\
redistribution [1] - \\
2249:24 \\
redo [1] - 2396:22 \\
redoing [1] - 2396:24 \\
reds [1] - 2405:11 \\
reduce [8] - 2226:1, \\
15; 2379:12; 2381:20; \\
2397:13; 2433:15; \\
2461:13; 2468:4 \\
reduced [5] - \\
2429:21; 2433:16; \\
2435:11; 2453:8 reducing [3]- \\
2313:15; 2326:13; \\
2429:5 \\
reduction [7] - \\
2214:11; 2414:21; \\
2434:19; 2436:13; \\
2437:17; 2461:1 \\
Redwood [2] - \\
2444:17; 2445:25 reestablish [2] - \\
2296:22; 2341:10 reestablishing [1] - \\
2301:4 \\
reestablishment \([3]\) \\
- 2301:3; 2343:14, 18 refer [8] - 2234:4; \\
2272:13; 2334:10; \\
2335:8; 2356:13; \\
2363:11; 2365:1;
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline sake [1] - 2272:20 & 2449:8, 21; 2485:1, 6, & 2253:14; 2259:25; & 2245:4; 2253:9, 19; & 2477:15; 2481:20 \\
\hline saline [1] - 2466:22 & 17, 21; 2486:1, 9, 11 & 2261:2; 2263:20; & 2255:7; 2257:1; & sending [1] - 2195:7 \\
\hline SAME [4] - 2261:1; & scope [5] - 2255:17, & 2264:10; 2265:13; & 2258:21; 2261:12; & Senek [8] - 2193:20; \\
\hline 2269:19; 2422:8; & 19; 2337:8; 2342:11; & 2266:11; 2267:7; & 2262:3; 2283:18; & 2321:11; 2322:2, 10; \\
\hline 2487:10 & 2439:17 & 2268:23; 2269:21 & 2284:6, 10; 2286:13, & 2330:8; 2350:23; \\
\hline sample [5] - & scoping [1] - & 2321:21; 2322:1; & 16; 2289:14; 2290:22; & 2387:13; 2450:5 \\
\hline 2380:17; 2409:17; & 2440:22 & 2324:19; 2325:20; & 2293:17; 2298:20; & SENEK [5] - \\
\hline 2432:15, 21, 23 & Scott [4]-2193:12; & 2350:18; 2368:6; & 2302:21; 2312:13; & 2321:13; 2322:4; \\
\hline sampling [4] - & 2194:6; 2387:12 & 2369:5, 12; 2424:3; & 2314:18; 2322:24; & 2330:7; 2350:24; \\
\hline 2266:16, 18; 2346:9; & screen [14] - & 2470:1, 7, 10, 13; & 2323:19; 2328:24; & 2387:14 \\
\hline 2444:9 & 2194:15; 2199:22; & 2475:1; 2477:15; & 2331:18; 2351:7; & Senek's [1] - \\
\hline sand [1] - 2299:23 & 2245:5; 2251:6; & 2484:7, 13 & 2356:11; 2359:1, & 2321:20 \\
\hline Sandi [1] - 2193:8 & 2270:7; 2278:22; & Secord's [1] - 2323:4 & 14-15, 25; 2360:1; & senescing [1] - \\
\hline sandy [3] - 2407:22; & 2281:15; 2293:23; & section [7] - & 2362:14; 2363:19; & 2463:15 \\
\hline 2410:25; 2411:4 & 2306:24; 2329:11; & 2210:23; 2432:15, 23; & 2364:13; 2367:14; & senior's [1] - 2218:9 \\
\hline Sara [4] - 2193:21; & 2330:18; 2364:12; & 2433:20; 2439:21; & 2378:21; 2379:6, 13; & Seniors [1] - 2218:10 \\
\hline 2194:1; 2387:9; & 2396:9 & 2440:2; 2441:6 & 2387:23; 2393:1; & sense [12] - 2203:20; \\
\hline 2418:25 & scroll [3] - 2282:16; & Section [22] - & 2396:9; 2404:4, 17, & 2228:12; 2250:8; \\
\hline Saskatchewan [2] - & 2355:23; 2358:3 & 2220:24; 2334:23; & 20; 2405:8; 2409:14; & 2291:7; 2292:25; \\
\hline 2428:7; 2436:15 & SCRT [1] - 2356:13 & 2335:4; 2337:13; & 2411:17; 2417:11; & 2293:9; 2325:11; \\
\hline satisfy [1] - 2335:16 & scrutiny [1] - & 2340:12; 2341:6, 15, & 2424:7; 2430:13; & 2378:22; 2389:24; \\
\hline Saul [2]-2447:23; & 2447:18 & 19; 2342:10, 20; & 2441:23; 2452:23; & 2448:4; 2466:17; \\
\hline 2448:3 & se [1] - 2337:2 & 2343:8, 24; 2344:9; & 2453:16; 2458:14; & 2468:25 \\
\hline save [1] - 2200:12 & seamlessly [1] - & 2345:6, 19; 2346:16; & 2472:15, 17; 2473:4; & senses [1] - 2292:25 \\
\hline saw [2] - 2241:20; & 2328:10 & 2348:3; 2349:10, 15, & 2474:3; 2481:21; & sensitive [6] - \\
\hline 2257:9 & search [1] - 2381:14 & 22; 2452:22 & 2482:22 & 2262:10; 2374:16; \\
\hline scale [2] - 2302:13; & searching [1] - & sections [9] & SEE [7] - 2259:23; & 2380:11; 2459:4, 23; \\
\hline 2462:23 & 2447:23 & 2216:9; 2284:11 & 2263:18; 2264:8; & 2472:25 \\
\hline scales [2] - 2277:17; & season [1] - 2222:7 & 2285:20; 2333:24; & 2267:6; 2268:22; & sensitivity [6] - \\
\hline 2381:19 & Seasons [1] - 2218:4 & 2340:18; 2356:3; & 2487:5, 19 & 2225:10; 2309:8; \\
\hline scanned [2] - & second [24] - & 2357:6; 2427:11, 22 & seed [14] - 2278:11; & 2348:19; 2427:21, 23; \\
\hline 2199:21; 2206:6 & 2203:25; 2239:1; & sector [1] - 2425:25 & 2296:22, 24; 2297:4, & 2428:4 \\
\hline scare [2]-2480:24; & 2240:18; 2258:13; & security [2] - 2258:3; & 6, 12; 2303:22; & sensor [1] - 2202:13 \\
\hline 2481:11 & 2278:4; 2285:14; & 2288:1 & 2310:2, 8, 10; 2375:8; & sent [13] - 2199:18; \\
\hline scattered [1] - & 2303:24; 2330:23; & SEDIMENT [1] - & 2385:3, 5, 12 & 2200:2, 9, 20; 2206:4, \\
\hline 2289:5 & 2338:19; 2399:10; & 2267:1 & seeded [1] - 2429:3 & 19; 2207:13; 2358:10; \\
\hline scenario [25] - & 2405:10, 12; 2406:10; & sediment [102] - & seeding [9] - 2249:3; & 2366:14; 2368:8; \\
\hline 2209:3, 25; 2212:16; & 2421:15; 2432:1, 25; & 2208:18; 2209:14; & 2278:8; 2310:1, 9 ; & 2475:17 \\
\hline 2214:5, 21; 2219:19; & 2436:17; 2437:1; & 2210:3, 8; 2214:6, 14; & 2313:1; 2314:5; & sentence [2] - \\
\hline 2224:18, 22; 2226:5; & 2446:3; 2462:6, 13; & 2226:7; 2228:7, 17, & 2398:17 & 2231:22; 2375:17 \\
\hline 2231:8, 24, 2238:1, 5 , & 2471:5; 2472:12 & 20; 2230:22; 2239:11; & seeds [20]-2297:7, & sentences [1] - \\
\hline 9; 2239:2, 5, 11, 15; & secondly [1] - & 2240:5; 2241:24; & 11; 2310:4; 2375:2, & 2375:19 \\
\hline 2254:3; 2300:12, 19; & 2273:12 & 2242:20, 22; 2243:2, & 10; 2378:12; 2384:7; & separate [2] \\
\hline 2309:14; 2310:23; & seconds [1] - & 5, 8, 13, 21; 2244:9, & 2385:3, 15, 17, 23-24; & 2245:21; 2473:15 \\
\hline 2311:8 & 2457:18 & 15, 18, 25; 2245:6; & 2386:2, 13; 2388:11, & September [1] - \\
\hline scenarios [7] - & Secord [56] - 2194:3; & 2248:19; 2249:10, 14, & 17; 2390:15; 2391:8; & 2233:25 \\
\hline 2212:23; 2214:3; & 2195:3; 2196:20, 23; & 16, 19, 21, 23; & 2397:13 & sequential [1] - \\
\hline 2225:15; 2231:10; & 2197:12; 2198:6; & 2252:2, 7-8, 11, 16, & seeing [5] - 2207:10; & 2236:24 \\
\hline 2240:20; 2241:6; & 2199:8, 23; 2202:10; & 23; 2253:3, 20; & 2283:19, 24; 2402:14; & sequitur [1] - \\
\hline 2299:9 & 2205:14; 2206:8; & 2254:1, 4-5, 10, 13, & 2463:11 & 2375:18 \\
\hline scenes [1] - 2329:19 & 2207:5; 2209:13; & 20, 22; 2255:22; & seekin & series [1] - 2258:25 \\
\hline schedule [1] - & 2210:13; 2213:1, 18 ; & 2256:20, 25; 2257:5, & 2326:14, 17; 2358:4, & serious [2] - \\
\hline 2323:12 & 2215:19; 2216:19; & 19; 2259:16; 2262:12, & 20; 2460:1 & 2378:17; 2471:8 \\
\hline schedules [1] - & 2219:21; 2223:12; & 24; 2263:2; 2266:7; & seem [6] - 2313:25; & seriously [3] - \\
\hline 2272:20 & 2231:19; 2235:12, 15; & 2277:10, 17; 2278:1, & 2327:25; 2373:5, 12, & 2374:1, 18; 2377:10 \\
\hline scheme [1] - 2300:3 & 2239:25; 2242:10; & 7, 9; 2298:24; 2299:1, & 18; 2456:4 & seriousness [1] - \\
\hline School [6] - & 2243:15; 2250:8, 20 ; & 16-17, 20, 23; 2300:6; & segment & 2373:19 \\
\hline 2217:23-25; 2261:7 & 2251:1, 11, 21, 23; & 2301:2, 8, 12, 22; & 2421:23; 2422:3 & served [1] - 2319:12 \\
\hline SCHOOL [4] - & 2259:17; 2262:7; & 2302:8; 2303:24; & SEGMENT [1] - & service [2] - 2194:19; \\
\hline 2263:16; 2487:18 & 2264:19; 2266:14; & 2304:4, 20; 2305:5; & 2422:7 & 2422:11 \\
\hline school [2] - 2218:15; & 2269:14, 25; 2270:1; & 2309:10-12, 25; & segments [2]- & SERVICE [1] - \\
\hline 2268:3 & 2317:25; 2321:24; & 2313:3, 5; 2343:15; & 2447:8, 10 & 2422:14 \\
\hline schools [5] - & 2325:9; 2326:3, 6, 10; & 2390:5; 2407:9, 13, & seldom [1] - 2437:12 & services [3] - 2329:4; \\
\hline 2217:22; 2218:25; & 2327:4; 2350:17; & 16; 2410:19; 2431:6, & selected [5] - & 2380:2; 2448:18 \\
\hline 2220:13, 19 & 2368:4; 2369:8; & 10, 13; 2433:17; & 2242:4; 2310:9; & Services [3] - \\
\hline science [4] - & 2412:13; 2469:21; & 2434:20; 2439:10; & 2337:5; 2401:5; & 2331:23; 2332:22; \\
\hline 2332:24; 2371:16; & 2470:15; 2474:25; & 2443:10; 2455:3; & 2403:4 & 2334:21 \\
\hline 2442:21; 2447:19 & 2477:11 & 2465:8, 11 & selecting [1] - & Session [1] - 2321:3 \\
\hline scientific [2] - & SECORD [66] - & sedimentation [6] - & 2403:11 & set [4]-2255:18; \\
\hline 2262:22; 2303:9 & 2197:1; 2199:14, 25; & 2310:21, 24; 2311:2, & selection [3] - & 2297:6; 2351:5; \\
\hline scientists [1] - & 2200:6, 14, 19; & 18, 21; 2438:6 & 2383:3; 2399:16; & 2409:11 \\
\hline 2468:18 & 2201:6, 10; 2205:10, & sediments [12] - & 2405:22 & setback [1] - 2286:9 \\
\hline SCLG [25] - 2200:16; & 16; 2206:1, 6, 14, 16; & 2301:14; 2304:15; & self [4]-2338:14 & sets [3] - 2202:16; \\
\hline 2201:7; 2219:13; & 2207:6, 21, 24 ; & 2308:15; 2378:18, 23; & 2350:2 & 2235:25; 2376:17 \\
\hline 2252:23; 2270:1; & 2213:5, 14, 24; & 2407:21; 2409:8, 22; & self-determination & setting [1] - 2472:5 \\
\hline 2323:25; 2324:20; & 2216:17, 21; 2219:16; & 2410:3, 14, 24; & [2] - 2338:15; 2350:2 & settle [2]-2300:10; \\
\hline 2326:17; 2368:3; & 2220:5, 10, 16, 22; & 2414:13 & self-governance [2] & 2407:10 \\
\hline 2370:10; 2392:17; & 2223:20; 2229:13, 19, & see [71]-2202:25 & - 2338:14; 2350:2 & settled [2] - 2409:9; \\
\hline 2395:13; 2412:1; & 21; 2250:1, 11, 13, & 2240:18; 2241:10, 16; & send [5] - 2199:24; & 2463:3 \\
\hline 2418:18; 2423:8, 10 ; & 23; 2251:3, 14, 16; & 2242:12; 2243:4, 9; & 2207:12; 2469:18; & settling [5] - 2273:7; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

NRCB 1701, Volume 9, April 1, 2021
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2308:23; 2407:12; & sieve [2] - 2410:25; & sited [1] - 2318:16 & smell [1] - 2293:1 & 2206:20; 2207:4, 10; \\
\hline 2409:23; 2410:16 & 2411:1 & sites [9] - 2337:20; & smoke [2] - 2279:12, & 2209:23; 2219:21; \\
\hline seven [1] - 2286:19 & SIEVE [1] - 2411:1 & 2339:14, 19; 2347:10; & 14 & 2223:2; 2229:11; \\
\hline several [7] - 2196:17; & Sifton [1] - 2445:16 & 2362:9; 2365:8; & smooth [2] & 2232:4; 2234:7; \\
\hline 2270:25; 2273:17; & sight [1] - 2293:1 & 2416:19; 2429:3 & 2400:25; 2401:21 & 2242:7; 2250:17; \\
\hline 2358:14; 2377:24; & sightings [2] - & sitting [4]-2238:4; & smoother [1] - & 2251:7, 17; 2264:11, \\
\hline 2448:11; 2455:5 & 2444:10 & 2409:10; 2412:14; & 2402:10 & 22; 2273:23; 2274:12; \\
\hline severity [1] - & sign [6] - 2352:22 & 2450:24 & SNN [8]-2337 & 2278:20; 2282:17; \\
\hline 2349:18 & 2423:18, 25; 2448:1 & situated & 16; 2339:18; 2361:2, & 2284:17, 24; 2292:5, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
shade [1] - 2253:20 \\
shading [3] - 2257:3
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2482:13, } 17 \\
& \text { sign-in [4] - 2423:18, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 2379:25; 2380:3, } 10 \\
& \text { situation [14]- }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
5 ; 2363: 6 ; 2421: 7,18 \\
\text { snow [7] - 2198:17; }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 12 ; 2297: 24 ; 2306: 19 ; \\
& \text { 2307:15; 2321:24; }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 2433:4, 7 & 25; 2482:13, 17 & 2213:12; 2235:10 & 2201:20, 25; 2202:4, & 2327:9; 2344:16; \\
\hline shall [11] - 2259:4; & signalling [1] - & 2239:6; 2247:3; & 14; 2401:20 & 2350:22; 2352:14; \\
\hline 2261:3; 2263:21; & 2265:23 & 2255:4; 2257:13; & Snow [1] - 2367:23 & 2353:21; 2367:11; \\
\hline 2264:16; 2265:13, & signals & 2279:3; 2304:16, 24 ; & snowpack [9] - & 2390:2; 2392:21; \\
\hline 18-19; 2266:5; & 2336:15; 2337:7 & 2384:12; 2413:8; & 2197:21, 25; 2198:11, & 2393:2, 11; 2394:7; \\
\hline 2267:8, 22; 2294:2 & signed [1] - 2354:19 & 2433:5; 2460:5; & 20; 2203:12; 2204:5, & 2403:15; 2406:19; \\
\hline shallow [1] - 2245:23 & significance [17] - & 2474:1 & 24; 2205:3 & 2411:25; 2414:18; \\
\hline shame [1] - 2382:10 & 2336:3; 2346:14, \(25 ;\) & situations [1] - & snowpacks [4] & 2416:9; 2417:4; \\
\hline shapers [1] - 2434:6 & 2348:2, 18; 2349:2, 4, & 2302:16 & 2197:22; 2198:1, 5, 7 & 2419:14; 2436:20; \\
\hline share [3] - 2251:6; & 6, 11; 2360:23; & six [3] - 2335:21 & SO [1] - 2280:16 & 2438:23; 2444:3; \\
\hline 2277:5; 2448:4 & 2427:1, 18; 2438 & 2336:4; 2445:1 & so.. [4]-2229:2; & 2448:23; 2449:12; \\
\hline shared [2] - 2393:18; & 13; 2458:19; 2461:15, & size [13] - 2255:15 & 2250:7; 2307:9; & 2452:7; 2453:1; \\
\hline 2424:14 & 19 & 2317:14; 2389:24 & 2477:19 & 2456:23; 2467:8; \\
\hline sharing [3] - & significant [16] - & 2398:2; 2400:9, 23; & SOCCER [2] - & 2470:15; 2476:1; \\
\hline 2266:21; 2335:17; & 2222:6; 2268:1; & 2401:2, 9; 2410:19; & 2263:16; 2487:18 & 2477:10; 2482:10 \\
\hline 2476:23 & 2328:8; 2346:22; & 2411:2; 2414:16; & soccer [1] - 2222:4 & sort [22] - 2221:14; \\
\hline SHARING [1] - & 2426:6; 2427:9, 13, & 2417:14; 2452:11 & Soccer [2] - 2218:10; & 2246:20; 2260:20; \\
\hline 2267:5 & 15; 2437:3, 11, 16, & sizes [1] - 2411:2 & 2261:8 & 2262:21; 2263:4; \\
\hline Sharon [1] - 2193:15 & 24; 2438:4; 2464:9; & skill [1] - \(2483: 7\) & social [2] - 2338:4; & 2274:21; 2283:15; \\
\hline shift [2]-2304:3, 19 & 2467:3; 2471:14 & skipping [1] - & 2342:25 & 2307:22; 2309:17; \\
\hline shoreline [1] - & signs [3] - 2210:25 & 2406:17 & society [2] - 2465:4; & 2310:23; 2311:15; \\
\hline 2245:24 & 2233:5; 2236:15 & slide [44] - 2396:3 & 2467:20 & 2313:4; 2326:14, 16; \\
\hline short [8] - 2253 & Siksika [1] - 2436:22 & 14; 2398:18; 2400:15; & socioeconomic [1] - & 2351:5; 2397:18; \\
\hline 2293:6; 2295:8; & silly [1] - 2297:9 & 2402:23; 2405:19; & 2334:16 & 2405:4; 2409:14; \\
\hline 2317:1; 2327:6; & silt [2] - 2254:5; & 2406:24; 2409:2; & soft [3] - 2232:10; & 2412:1; 2459:16; \\
\hline 2406:21; 2409:10; & 2278:12 & 2412:5, 25; 2414:6, 8, & 2270:6, 9 & 2460:25 \\
\hline 2474:15 & silt/clay [1] - 2304: & 10; 2415:8, 14; & soil [30]-2208:2, & sorts [1] - 2415:10 \\
\hline short-term [2] - & silts [3] - 2243:9; & 2416:7; 2427:2, 6, 14, & 8-10; 2232:15; & sound [1] - 2365:14 \\
\hline 2317:1; 2474:15 & 2407:11, 21 & 19; 2428:2, 6, 9, 18; & 2233:10; 2246:7; & sounded [1] - \\
\hline shortcut [1] - & silty [1] - 2299:25 & 2429:14; 2430:8, 23 ; & 2265:17; 2266:18; & 2477:22 \\
\hline 2293:14 & similar [9] - 2224:2 & 2431:18; 2432:14; & 2278:9; 2296:20; & sounds [2] - 2196:8; \\
\hline shorter [3] - & 2227:10; 2277:24; & 2433:12, 19; 2434:25; & 2304:1, 7; 2305:9; & 2197:1 \\
\hline 2299:10; 2302:22; & 2326:9; 2340:1; & 2435:15; 2436:6, 24 ; & 2310:10; 2311:15; & source [13] - \\
\hline 2325:17 & 2374:18; 2410:7; & 2437:15, 19; 2438:10; & 2313:5; 2383:13; & 2256:15; 2272:16; \\
\hline shortfall [1] - & 2434:19; 2453:6 & 2471:12; 2473:1, 19 & 2385:5, 7, 12, 16; & 2273:1, 18; 2316:9; \\
\hline 2447:13 & \[
\text { similarly [1] - } 2428: 5
\] & & \[
2390: 14,17 ; 2391: 8
\] & \[
2374: 24 ; 2375: 6,8
\] \\
\hline shorthand [2] - & simple [1] - 2215:2 & 2282:3; 2368:12; & \[
12 ; 2408: 16 ; 2437: 17
\] & \[
2383: 18,22,25
\] \\
\hline 2483:5 & simplified [3] - & 2406:24; 2413:2; & soil-borne [2] - & 2416:20; 2435:21 \\
\hline shortly [4] - 2213:19; & 2303:16; 2397:2; & 2426:24; 2471:11 & 2390:14, 17 & sourced [1] - 2383:9 \\
\hline 2232:22; 2236:6; & \[
2435: 9
\] & slides [5] - 2396:6; & soils [10] - 2232:10; & sources [1] - 2383:4 \\
\hline 2355:11 & simplistic [2] - & 2400:8; 2413:2; & 2302:10; 2303:25; & sourcing [2] - \\
\hline shots [1] - 2476:23 & 2401:7; 2402:15 & 2414:7 & 2304:14; 2378:11; & 2256:7, 12 \\
\hline show [5] - 2220:18; & simply [6]-2196:2 & slight [2] - 2304:19 & 2379:21; 2408:4, 15, & south [7] - 2217:6, \\
\hline 2272:14; 2434:22; & 2272:4; 2280:9; & 2369:14 & 18 & 11; 2348:8; 2361:3; \\
\hline 2444:9; 2452:15 & 2376:2; 2422:2; & slope [1] - 2402:4 & soils' [1] - 2313:14 & 2428:7; 2448:22; \\
\hline showed [2] - & 2429:1 & slopes [5] - 2287:15; & solution [1] - 2468:6 & 2459:16 \\
\hline 2282:22; 2454:9 & simulating [1] - & 2385:5, 10, 13, 25 & solutions [1] - & South [2] - 2278:4; \\
\hline showing [14]-- & 2276:13 & slotted [1] - 2323:9 & 2259:11 & 2436:15 \\
\hline 2198:17, 19; 2220:12; & simultaneously [2] - & slow [5] - 2195:11; & solved [1] - 2201:13 & southeast [1] - \\
\hline 2243:12; 2373:14; & 2245:22; 2481:4 & 2286:15; 2307:6; & solves [1] - 2306:25 & 2242:13 \\
\hline 2403:22; 2407:1; & single [2] - 2249:7; & 2344:20; 2455:7 & sometimes [4] - & southern [4] - \\
\hline 2414:10; 2415:5, 10; & 2335:15 & slower [1] - 2412:23 & 2365:12; 2406:15; & 2426:10; 2442:23; \\
\hline 2432:16, 21, 24; & SIR [2] - 2454:10, 12 & small [19] - 2244:1; & 2444:15; 2460:14 & 2471:9 \\
\hline 2471:20 & sit [3] - 2243:5; & 2253:21; 2273:5; & somewhat [5] - & southwestern [1] - \\
\hline shown [7] - 2204:3; & 2409:24; 2412:13 & 2277:18; 2291:13; & 2252:19; 2303:16; & 2362:16 \\
\hline 2282:5; 2348:9; & site [26] - 2214:8; & 2299:23; 2317:17; & 2413:9; 2414:5; & sow [4] - 2473:7, 10, \\
\hline 2361:4; 2410:18; & 2231:2; 2234:16; & 2328:3; 2361:16; & 2423:7 & 12, 21 \\
\hline 2411:2; 2416:2 & 2312:10; 2315:1; & 2362:15; 2372:14; & somewhere [5] - & sown [1] - 2297:16 \\
\hline shows [14] - 2242:4; & 2317:6; 2339:7; & 2380:23; 2401:9; & 2291:8; 2296:14; & sows [1] - 2473:15 \\
\hline 2362:14; 2402:3; & 2348:24; 2354:10; & 2407:24; 2410:20; & 2299:12; 2383:16; & space [4] - 2230:20; \\
\hline 2403:24; 2410:18; & 2362:15; 2363:19; & 2416:19; 2430:21; & 2398:6 & 2242:25; 2296:4; \\
\hline 2411:4, 18; 2427:15; & 2365:5; 2378:9, 16; & 2440:6 & soon [3] - 2231:2; & 2319:7 \\
\hline 2433:13, 21; 2444:13; & 2383:15; 2384:1, 25; & smaller [14] - 2203:6; & 2246:2; 2308:10 & spaced [1] - 2202:2 \\
\hline 2473:6 & 2390:22; 2405:2; & 2230:18; 2241:4; & sooner [2] - 2248:3; & spaces [1] - 2288:9 \\
\hline shut [1] - 2276:25 & 2413:21; 2417:12, 15; & 2271:23; 2273:7; & 2419:18 & spacial [1] - 2243:13 \\
\hline side [7] - 2217:17; & 2426:12; 2446:7; & 2286:7; 2293:22; & Sorry [3] - 2330:7; & span [1] - 2247:22 \\
\hline 2328:14; 2400:10; & 2452:14 & 2307:13; 2317:16; & 2418:25; 2443:23 & sparsely [2] - \\
\hline 2409:6; 2435:10; & site-specific [1] - & 2415:10; 2433:5; & sorry [63] - 2194:15; & 2378:17; 2415:2 \\
\hline 2472:1 & 2315:1 & 2435:20; 2436:1 & 2199:21; 2200:1; & spatial [5] - 2241:23; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2300:1; 2440:25; & spend [1] - 2472:21 & stand [1] - 2213:19 & 2306:12; 2318:15; & 2464:23 \\
\hline 2441:3, 16 & spending [2] - & standard [12] - & 2351:6 & strategies [2] - \\
\hline spatially [1] - & 2465:1; 2469:3 & 2271:1, 3, 6, 11; & stationed [1] - & 2277:23; 2378:21 \\
\hline 2299:22 & spent [2]-2197:14; & 2272:9; 2274:2, 5 & 2472:1 & strategy [3] - 2379:3; \\
\hline speaker [8] - 2251:9, & 2466:21 & 2373:8; 2376:17; & stations [6] - 2262:2, & 2462:25; 2468:12 \\
\hline 12; 2307:4; 2327:21; & spirit [1] - 2437:22 & 2382:4, 11; 2403:16 & 21; 2274:25; 2275:3; & straw [1] - 2278:11 \\
\hline 2352:20; 2393:1, 5 & spiritual [2]-2359:7, & Standard [1] - & 2306:3; 2318:18 & stream [7] - 2385:20; \\
\hline speakers [1] - & 23 & 2271:13 & statistical [1] - & 2430:9; 2431:7, \(22 ;\) \\
\hline 2351:19 & splitting [1] - 2369:6 & standards [5] - & 2456:7 & 2432:10; 2434:11; \\
\hline speaking [11] - & spoken [2] - & 2221:23; 2316:19, 23; & stats [1] - 2241:18 & 2460:1 \\
\hline 2199:20; 2220:1; & 2196:20; 2424:6 & 2317:21; 2395:20 & status [2] - 2360:20; & streams [3] - \\
\hline 2232:9; 2239:14; & Spokesperson [2] - & Standards [1] - & 2426:11 & 2430:22; 2431:6; \\
\hline 2273:21; 2278:19; & 2470:23; 2485:13 & 2294:10 & stay [2] - 2273:8; & 2438:12 \\
\hline 2303:3; 2318:9; & spot [1] - 2253:22 & standby [1] - & 2468:14 & stressed [1] - 2443:1 \\
\hline 2331:11; 2344:17; & spotlight [1] - 2321:8 & 2329:15 & stays [1] - 2300:5 & stresses [1] - \\
\hline 2360:8 & spotted [1] - 2286:20 & standing [1] - 2302:8 & steeper [1] - 2313:24 & 2463:11 \\
\hline special [2] - 2222:18; & sprayed [1] - & STANDS [2] - & step [2]-2328:6; & stretch [1] - 2324:9 \\
\hline 2367:22 & 2313:25 & 2319:20; 2392:7 & 2405:25 & strike [1] - 2294:12 \\
\hline specializing [2] - & spread [5] - 2228 & Stantec [11] - & Stephanie [1] - & strikeout [1] - \\
\hline 2332:22; 2371:15 & 18; 2378:25; 2381:17; & 2220:5, 12; 2424:21; & 2193:13 & 2294:20 \\
\hline specialty [1] - 2333:2 & 2382:5 & 2429:15; 2430:20, 24 ; & steps [5] - 2210:2 & strong [1] - \(2408: 7\) \\
\hline species [16] - & spreadsheet [1] - & 2433:9; 2435:4, 16; & 2211:5; 2213:10, 13; & structure [3] - \\
\hline 2249:3; 2285:14; & 2207:5 & 2437:15; 2444:9 & 2364:14 & 2257:8; 2283:12; \\
\hline 2304:3; 2338:9; & spreadsheets [1] - & Stantec's [3] - & stewards [1] - & 2460:2 \\
\hline 2341:22; 2344:13; & 2206:18 & 2197:19; 2430:1; & 2381:6 & structures [5] - \\
\hline 2346:11; 2373:1; & spring [2] - 2472:15; & 2433:1 & Stewart [1] - 2442:17 & 2338:18; 2350:5; \\
\hline 2380:20; 2382:3, 8; & 2474:1 & stark [1] - 2308:22 & stick [2] - 2395:11; & 2464:13, 20 \\
\hline 2429:2, 5, 11; & SPRINGBANK [5] - & start [25] - 2195:19; & 2482:6 & struggling [1] - \\
\hline 2471:19 & 2263:14, 16; 2264:7; & 2196:3; 2205:17; & stick-handled [1] - & 2292:5 \\
\hline species' [5] - & 2487:16 & 2211:5, 7; 2252:3; & 2482:6 & stuck [1] - 2254:5 \\
\hline 2301:24; 2302:3, 25 ; & Springbank [25] - & 2264:11; 2274:14; & sticking [1] - & studied [2]-2394:19 \\
\hline 2380:9; 2381:12 & 2217:24; 2218:3, 9; & 2289:7; 2298:11; & 2406:19 & studies [6] - \\
\hline specific [22] - & 2222:6, 22; 2261:6; & 2308:1; 2311:6; & sticky [1] - 2470:11 & 2333:15; 2371:22, 25; \\
\hline 2206:13; 2229:4; & 2263:22; 2282:6; & 2315:4; 2352:10; & still [19] - 2224:3; & 2426:7, 9; 2448:11 \\
\hline 2234:25; 2235:21; & 2283:15; 2285:17 & 2367:14; 2392:12; & 2245:2, 11; 2248:5; & study [11] - 2222:8, \\
\hline 2240:10; 2242:4; & 2287:6, 9, 13; & 2397:25; 2398:16; & 2270:9; 2302:21; & 10; 2287:13; 2298:24; \\
\hline 2252:6; 2253:19; & 2354:11; 2363:21; & 2423:17, 25; 2424:1; & 2360:18; 2365:22; & 2374:5, 9-10; \\
\hline 2254:20; 2255:1; & 2404:22; 2405:3; & 2451:7; 2482:13, 17 & 2369:9; 2383:5; & 2409:18; 2410:3; \\
\hline 2289:24; 2315:1; & 2426:25; 2430:18; & started [7] - 2246:21; & 2399:10; 2406:3; & 2411:16; 2426:6 \\
\hline 2339:16, 19; 2342:14; & 2444:17; 2445:25; & 2327:17; 2330:2; & 2419:14; 2433:3; & studying [1] - \\
\hline 2347:11; 2360:8; & 2446:6 & 2353:10; 2419:7; & 2440:12; 2443:20; & 2394:21 \\
\hline 2378:20; 2380:17; & springs [1] - 2265:16 & 2463:2; 2480:23 & 2445:23; 2468:6 & stuff [3] - 2243:9; \\
\hline 2382:9; 2410:9; & squared [2] - & starting [6] - & stir [1] - 2408:1 & 2291:16; 2327:23 \\
\hline 2441:6 & 2385:17, 21 & 2280:25; 2315:4; & stone [1] - 2211:25 & style [1] - 2478:3 \\
\hline specific-use [1] - & squiggles [1] - & 2328:23; 2362:6; & Stoney [97] - 2194:1; & subject [9] - \\
\hline 2339:19 & 2242:12 & 2423:15; 2430:14 & 2278:4; 2324:1; & 2196:17; 2217:3, 9; \\
\hline specifically [15] - & SR [1] - 2223:19 & starts [2] - 2246:18; & 2331:21, 24; 2332:7, & 2218:18, 22; 2219:2; \\
\hline 2198:17, 22, \(24 ;\) & SR1 [34]-2194:3; & 2286:10 & 13; 2333:20; 2334:3, & 2239:16; 2255:15; \\
\hline 2210:20; 2211:18; & 2199:6; 2238:22; & state [7] - 2221:10 & 7, 11, 22, 24; 2335:1, & 2440:9 \\
\hline 2224:18; 2235:14; & 2240:3, 22; 2241:4; & 2331:19; 2373:20; & 24; 2337:11; 2338:7, & SUBJECT [1] - \\
\hline 2278:3; 2347:1; & 2258:18; 2265:15, 21; & 2377:17; 2429:19; & 11, 14, 17, 21; & 2422:13 \\
\hline 2380:15; 2381:13; & 2277:15; 2286:20; & 2447:17; 2452:5 & 2339:1, 4, 18; 2340:3, & subjective [1] - \\
\hline 2394:21; 2441:8; & 2288:2, 20; 2331:25; & statement [24]- & 5, 10, 15, 24; & 2413:9 \\
\hline 2471:22; 2475:22 & 2332:17; 2339:19; & 2197:17, 24; 2210:16; & 2341:10, 23; 2342:9, & submission [13] - \\
\hline Specifically [1] - & 2353:17; 2377:7; & 2212:13; 2232:20; & 12-13, 17, 20, 23; & 2197:20; 2198:16; \\
\hline 2211:10 & 2382:6; 2426:25; & 2234:3; 2262:13, 23; & 2343:1, 12, 21, \(24 ;\) & 2215:22; 2225:2; \\
\hline specifications [1] - & 2430:17; 2436:2, 9; & 2312:21; 2332:17; & 2344:4, 9; 2345:6, 11, & 2296:4; 2337:11; \\
\hline 2235:9 & 2440:19; 2442:12, 25; & 2333:25; 2334:10, 17; & 15, 18, 25; 2346:4, 7 , & 2340:14; 2353:24; \\
\hline speculate [1] - & 2443:7; 2446:1, 24 ; & 2335:12; 2365:1; & 9-10; 2347:17; & 2363:4; 2389:16; \\
\hline 2230:16 & 2454:22; 2460:2; & 2383:10; 2393:18; & 2348:3, 7, 10, 12, 20; & 2460:17; 2471:13; \\
\hline speculating [1] - & 2462:12; 2472:4; & 2395:5; 2420:20; & 2349:7, 15, 19, 21; & 2473:20 \\
\hline 2213:11 & 2474:5 & 2421:4; 2424:13; & 2350:1, 4, 7; 2353:10, & submissions [3] - \\
\hline speed [5] - 2276:10, & SR1's [1] - 2431:21 & 2438:21; 2443:14 & 12; 2354:2, 6, 21; & 2354:7; 2355:2; \\
\hline 19; 2402:3; 2412:16 & SS [4]-2201:21, 23, & STATEMENT [2] - & 2355:9, 16, 18; & 2363:25 \\
\hline speeds [7] - & 25; 2202:9 & 2421:12 & 2356:22; 2357:3, 8, & submit [3] - 2227:25; \\
\hline 2372:11; 2404:3; & SSRP [2] - 2428:16; & statements [7] - & 10, 25; 2358:9, 15, & 2288:15; 2366:6 \\
\hline 2405:7, 22; 2406:3, 9, & 2437:23 & 2197:21; 2198:23; & \[
22 ; 2359: 19 ; 2360: 10
\] & submitted [9] - \\
\hline 21 & stabilization [1] - & 2199:5; 2240:3; & \[
16 ; 2361: 23 ; 2362: 9 ;
\] & 2199:2; 2317:24; \\
\hline Speller [12] - 2210:7, & 2232:15 & 2433:25; 2434:8; & 2363:25; 2365:6, 16; & 2322:16; 2354:1, 25 ; \\
\hline 11, 14; 2211:4; & staff [5] - 2257:25; & 2439:12 & 2366:4; 2377:3; & 2393:17; 2406:2; \\
\hline 2231:18; 2232:5; & 2258:4; 2289:1; & states [8] - 2235:19; & 2387:6; 2423:10; & 2480:5 \\
\hline 2235:13; 2236:2; & 2328:12; 2466:2 & 2249:14; 2374:3; & 2445:2; 2484:22 & submitting [1] - \\
\hline 2258:7; 2259:25; & Staff [11] - 2193:11 & 2375:4; 2383:12; & storage [1] - 2436:7 & 2197:13 \\
\hline 2268:24; 2296:2 & stage [1] - 2365:14 & 2421:23; 2431:19; & storms [2] - 2264:11; & subregion [2] - \\
\hline SPELLER [12] - & stakeholders [4] - & 2439:12 & 2415:7 & 2437:7, 11 \\
\hline 2205:21; 2210:13; & 2265:5; 2279:23; & stating [3] - 2220:24; & story [2]-2435:19, & Subregions [1] - \\
\hline 2211:9; 2231:18; & 2295:18, 23 & 2376:13; 2435:18 & 22 & 2428:21 \\
\hline 2235:12; 2258:7; & STAKEHOLDERS & station [9] - & storyboard [2] - & subscribe [1] - \\
\hline \[
2260: 5,12 ; 2269: 4,
\] & \[
\text { [1] }-2280: 15
\] & 2198:2-4; 2201:20; & \[
\text { 2283:1, } 10
\] & 2448:6 \\
\hline \[
10 ; 2296: 1 ; 2484: 9
\] & stance [1] - 2448:8 & 2203:7; 2275:6; & straightening [1] - & subsequent [2] - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2208:2, 4; 2243:11; & 2253:17; 2269:22; & 11, 17; 2388:20, 23 & 2451:9, 14, 16, \(20 ;\) & 2407:24 \\
\hline 2252:2, 7; 2253:1, 3 ; & 2312:14; 2319:10, 12; & radeoffs [1] - & 2452:20, 22; 2459:20; & turbulent [2] - \\
\hline 2254:1; 2313:3; & 2329:13; 2331:4, 21 ; & 2300:25 & 2460:18; 2465:24; & 2394:20; 2400:25 \\
\hline 2400:6; 2414:13 & 2356:18; 2423:2; & traditional [26] - & 2476:12; 2478:8; & turn [7] - 2243:17; \\
\hline thinking [7] - & 2424:8; 2451:7; & 2313:4; 2333:15; & 2479:13; 2482:16; & 2290:18; 2355:22; \\
\hline 2223:20; 2260:10, 19; & 2455:15; 2456:6; & 2336:21; 2337:20 & 2484:5, 12 & 2362:5, 20; 2369:5; \\
\hline 2275:17; 2289:9; & 2457:21; 2469:20; & 2338:16; 2339:3, 7 & Transportation's & 2457:11 \\
\hline 2298:10; 2446:6 & 2471:2; 2481:6, 8 & 16; 2340:11, 23; & [12] - 2295:14; 2296:3, & turned [1] - 2306:7 \\
\hline third [6] - 2204:9; & together [5] - & 2344:8, 11; 2346:17; & 11; 2308:9; 2332:16; & turns [2] - 2328:8; \\
\hline 2334:15; 2340:14; & 2248:16; 2273:15; & 2347:6, 8-9, 19; & 2364:3; 2366:3; & 2447:14 \\
\hline 2377:13; 2421:22; & 2299:6; 2450:23; & 2350:3; 2354:1; & 2373:21; 2420:20; & twins [1] - 2473:16 \\
\hline 2479:4 & 2469:12 & 2356:2; 2359:9; & 2434:8; 2460:17; & two [80] - 2209:22; \\
\hline third-party [2] - & toggles [1] - 2403:8 & 2363:17; 2364:20 & 2479:5 & 2210:20; 2211:2, 4-7, \\
\hline 2334:15; 2377:13 & tolerant [1] - 2304:3 & 2365:9; 2366:5 & transported [2] - & 10, 12, 20-21; 2212:1, \\
\hline THIS [1] - 2269:18 & tolerate [3] - & traditions [1] - & 2385:14; 2391:1 & 9, 13; 2213:6; 2214:2, \\
\hline thorough [1] - & 2301:24; 2302:15; & 2349:20 & trapping [2] & 19; 2218:4; 2229:25; \\
\hline 2442:22 & 2303:7 & traffic [6] - 2244:15 & 2252:12; 2338:3 & 2232:25; 2233:4, 7; \\
\hline THOSE [2] - 2267:5; & tons [1] - 2243:20 & 2251:18; 2267:24; & travel [2] - 2232:11; & 2235:1; 2236:17, 19 ; \\
\hline 2269:16 & took [3] - 2204:4; & 2268:2, 7, 16 & 2261:14 & 2237:6, 15, 18, 22; \\
\hline thousand [1] - & 2406:2; 2454:9 & trafficability [3] - & travels [2] - 2272: & 2243:1; 2245:21; \\
\hline 2437:13 & toolbox [1] - 2278:14 & 2210:24; 2232:18; & treated [1] - 2373:1 & 2273:9; 2281:12; \\
\hline thread [2] - 2239:24; & tools [2]-2230:23; & 2252:13 & treatments [1] - & 2294:11; 2295:11; \\
\hline 2447:23 & 2232:9 & Trail [1] - 2278:4 & 2371:24 & 2299:9, 14; 2308:21; \\
\hline threat [2] - 2378:20; & top [10] - 2300:13; & trail [1] - 2477:1 & Treaty [4] - 2288:6 & 2321:15; 2323:24; \\
\hline 2471:14 & 2308:24; 2329:11; & training [1] - 2258 & 2335:2; 2337:25; & 2324:25; 2326:17; \\
\hline three [16] - 2201:14; & 2406:15; 2407:12; & transcribed [1] - & 2358:23 & 2327:1; 2328:8; \\
\hline 2266:11; 2274:25; & 2409:11; 2414:22; & 2483:6 & trees [8]-225 & 2335:24; 2342:15; \\
\hline 2324:22; 2326:9; & 2473:9 & transcript [10] - & 13, 15, 20; 2273:15; & 2345:10; 2352:9; \\
\hline 2334:11; 2335:25; & TOPIC [6] - 2200:17; & 2284:16; 2321:11, 15; & 2376:6; 2400:24; & 2375:19; 2397:20; \\
\hline 2397:20; 2446:25; & 2201:8; 2219:14; & 2368:8, 10, 13; & 2401:24 & 2398:10; 2406:15; \\
\hline 2456:8; 2471:25; & 2485:17, 21; 2486:1 & 2437:9; 2440:10; & Tribal [1] - 2354:21 & 2407:23; 2418:6; \\
\hline 2472:24; 2473:5, 10; & topic [23]-2237:24; & 2441:25; 2483:4 & tributary [1] - & 2419:8; 2435:22; \\
\hline 2475:17 & 2238:9; 2242:5; & Transcript [1] - & 2430:22 & 2442:3, 17; 2446:25; \\
\hline threshold [4] - & 2280:21; 2289:5; & 2483:1 & tried [2] - 2395:25; & 2456:2; 2461:22; \\
\hline 2252:2, 7; 2416:11; & 2308:12; 2311:19; & TRANSCRIPT [9] & 2444:8 & 2462:1; 2469:12, 22; \\
\hline 2435:13 & 2319:13; 2324:21, & 2259:23; 2263:18; & trigger [3]-2240:22; & 2471:25; 2472:21, 24; \\
\hline thresholds [1] - & 2325:9, 13; 2330:9; & 2264:8; 2267:6; & 2318:3; 2422:10 & 2473:8, 13, 15, 25; \\
\hline 2437:14 & 2336:6; 2338:19, 23; & 2268:22; 2322:6; & TRIGGER [1] - & 2475:17; 2481:7, 25 \\
\hline throughout [6] - & \[
2340: 14 ; 2342: 6
\] & \[
2486: 4 ; 2487: 5,20
\] & \[
2422: 13
\] & two-month [1] - \\
\hline 2213:10; 2248:23; & 2344:14; 2345:1; & transcripts [2] - & triggered [1] - & 2456:2 \\
\hline 2277:17; 2314:24; & 2346:13; 2389:23; & 2382:16; 2422:20 & 2241:4 & two-week [6] - \\
\hline 2334:10; 2408:20 & 2479:19 & Transfer [1] - 2335:3 & triplets [1] - 2473:16 & 2233:7; 2235:1; \\
\hline throw [1] - 2324:6 & Topic [9]-2228: & transfer [1] - 2359:11 & truck [1] - 2391:8 & 2236:17; 2237:15, 18; \\
\hline thumb [1] - 2404:18 & 2325:12; 2330:4, 16; & transitional [1] - & trucks [2] - 2255:4; & 2328:8 \\
\hline tick [1] - 2329:20 & 2331:22; 2420:20; & 2336:10 & 2275:17 & twofold [1] - 2342:8 \\
\hline tie [1] - 2243:14 & 2449:9; 2470:17; & transmission [1] - & true [2]-2382:25; & tying [1] - 2241:6 \\
\hline tied [1] - 2338:8 & 2479:14 & 2354:5 & 2403:3 & type [8] - 2253:3; \\
\hline tight [1] - 2319:22 & topics [1] - 2367:20 & transmi & trust [2] - 2220:3; & 2276:15; 2306:13; \\
\hline tillage [1] - 2313:4 & topography [2] - & 2363:1 & 2386:20 & 2310:10; 2380:5; \\
\hline timeframes [1] - & 2460:3, 6 & TransMountain [1] - & try [11] - 2243:14; & 2454:2; 2459:17 \\
\hline 2379:22 & topsoil [1] - 2385:3 & 2353:14 & 2284:4; 2286:25; & types [6]-2248:8; \\
\hline timeline [3] - & toss [1] - 2376:2 & transport [4]- & 2326:12; 2344:24; & 2255:17; 2277:16; \\
\hline 2246:15; 2247:5, 11 & tossed [1] - 2376:7 & 2267:12; 2273:1, 10; & 2395:10; 2403:9; & 2304:7; 2436:3; \\
\hline timelines [4] - & total [7] - 2203:12; & 2276:5 & 2416:21; 2426:19; & 2456:1 \\
\hline 2261:23; 2267:13; & 2209:10; 2271:21; & Transportation [82] - & 2468:18 & typical [5] -2219:19; \\
\hline 2303:10; 2356:23 & 2275:1; 2299:23; & 2193:18; 2197:4; & trying [12]-2194:25; & 2317:5; 2334:14, 20; \\
\hline tip [3] - 2339:15; & 2408:11; 2410:22 & 2198:15; 2205:23; & 2195:9; 2197:15; & 2402:3 \\
\hline 2362:16 & totally [3] - 2205:19; & 2212:2; 2213:21; & 2206:7, 24; 2234:2; & typically [8]- \\
\hline tit [1] - 2454:1 & 2323:16; 2472:7 & 2235:8, 20; 2239:4; & 2284:2; 2327:18; & 2255:18; 2273:19 \\
\hline TLRU [5] - 2347:4; & totals [5] - 2198:1; & 2251:18; 2259:15, 18; & 2452:24; 2453:2; & 2287:12; 2315:3, 17; \\
\hline 2356:3; 2357:1, 5, 7 & 2202:24; 2203:4; & 2262:9, 19-20; & 2463:21, 24 & \[
2328: 6 ; 2373: 4
\] \\
\hline TLU [1] - 2363:6 & 2423:13 & 2263:2, 6; 2265:2; & TSEMA [1] - 2447:14 & 2401:22 \\
\hline TO [69] - 2200:16-18; & touch [6] - 2293: & 2266:15; 2268:5, 10, & TSP [15] - 2209:11; & \\
\hline 2201:7-9; 2219:13; & 2342:6; 2344:14; & 13; 2276:23; 2277:8; & 2212:19; 2222:11; & U \\
\hline 2259:20; 2260:23; & 2345:1; 2346:13; & 2279:21; 2281:7; & 2223:11; 2271:22; & \\
\hline 2263:8, 11, 15; & 2477:16 & 2285:9; 2314:22; & 2275:2; 2295:16; & ubiquitous [1] - \\
\hline 2264:4; 2265:9; & tough [1] - 2458:3 & 2319:2, 8, 10; & 2296:9; 2316:11, 17; & \[
2292: 13
\] \\
\hline 2266:23; 2267:4; & towards [3] - & 2323:25; 2324:10; & 2398:25; 2411:9; & unable [1] - 2367:14 \\
\hline 2269:15, 17; 2280:13; & 2243:10; 2304:3, 20 & 2326:14; 2331:6; & 2414:10; 2415:6 & unacceptable [3] - \\
\hline 2320:7; 2421:7-11, & township [2] - & 2338:24; 2349:3; & Tuesday [12] - & 2225:9; 2317:9; \\
\hline 18, 21; 2422:4, 6, 12; & 2286:6 & 2355:8, 14, 21; & 2327:6; 2377:1; & 2472:9 \\
\hline 2478:12, 24; 2479:9; & toxic [1] - 2248:22 & 2360:10; 2363:1; & 2379:4; 2420:3; & unanticipated [1] - \\
\hline 2482:24; 2485:17, & toxicology [1] - & 2365:2, 4; 2366:17; & 2423:3, 17, 21; & 2342:16 \\
\hline 21-22; 2486:1, 13, 15, & 2266:6 & 2369:23; 2385:2; & 2480:13; 2482:10, 12 & uncertainties [1] - \\
\hline 19; 2487:3, 8-9, 12, & TOXICOLOGY [1] - & 2387:18; 2389:15, 21; & turbines [2]-2459:4; & 2416:17 \\
\hline \[
14,17
\] & 2266:24 & 2390:4, 9, 13; & 2460:12 & uncertainty [2] - \\
\hline today [29] - 2212:3; & track [2] - 2199:11 & 2419:20; 2420:7, 13, & turbulence [11] - & 2408:11; 2445:17 \\
\hline 2221:7; 2227:5; & 2278:8 & 17; 2421:2; 2423:5, & 2399:18; 2400:20; & uncontrolled [1] - \\
\hline 2228:1; 2238:1, 4; & tracked [1] - 2231:25 & 7-9, 22; 2424:2; & 2401:3; 2402:9, 13, & 2214:12 \\
\hline 2239:9, 16; 2242:5; & tradeoff [5] - 2301:7, & 2428:13; 2450:12; & 17; 2405:14, 20; & under [41] - 2222:20; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 2225:10, 15; 2226:4; & 2195:15 & 20; 2354:14; 2355:19; & 0:1; & 2218:19 \\
\hline 2228:2, 7; 2231:8; & unfetterred [1] - & 2360:25; 2362:1; & 2427:5; 2441:13, & verification [3] - \\
\hline 2241:15; 2254:3; & 2471:15 & 2364:9; 2369:6; & 18-19; 2442:8 & 2404:7 \\
\hline 2263:3; 2267:18; & unfortunate [1] - & 2373:14; 2376:2; & values [7] - 2204:10, & verifies [1] - 2397:4 \\
\hline 2275:22; 2289:10; & 2227:15 & 2391:9; 2392:23; & 16; 2284:2; 2359:6; & verify [2] - 2396:21, \\
\hline 2295:7; 2300:6, 21; & unfortunately [5] - & 2393:5; 2395:5, 19; & 2435:6; 2454:7; & \\
\hline 2317:23; 2325:15; & 2257:4; 2283:14; & 2397:16; 2398:10; & 2468:23 & version [9]- \\
\hline 2327:7; 2336:12; & 2327:14; 2360:8; & 2400:17; 2401:14; & Vance [13] - 2193:10; & 2215:12, 14; 2220:22; \\
\hline 2346:23; 2351:6; & 2408:10 & 2402:10, 18; 2405:10; & 2289:2; 2291:20, 23; & 2221:6; 2227:2-4; \\
\hline 2356:1, 21; 2357:4; & unintended [2] - & 2406:12, 22; 2407:24; & 2296:1; 2297:25; & 2299:19; 2403:15 \\
\hline 2363:1, 6; 2370:19; & 2343:12, 24 & 2408:1, 8; 2409:11, & 2315:9; 2366:20; & versions [2] - \\
\hline 2376:3, 9; 2392:11; & unique [5] - 2277:21; & 14, 21; 2412:3, 15, & 2388:1; 2389:5; & 2199:10; 2299:21 \\
\hline 2393:19; 2415:6; & 2333:9; 2460:2, 6; & 17; 2414:24; 2419:20; & 2466:3; 2476:15; & versus [7] - 2203:15; \\
\hline 2424:15; 2431:8; & 2472:18 & 2420:18; 2424:8; & 2481:23 & 2309:1; 2402:7; \\
\hline 2443:20; 2452:9; & uniquely [1] - & 2426:15; 2434:22; & VANCE [13] - 2289:3; & 2412:12; 2416:10, 22; \\
\hline 2466:23; 2469:19; & 2434:17 & 2436:16; 2445:8; & 2291:21; 2366:22; & 2445:20 \\
\hline 2480:5 & universally [1] - & 2446:7; 2451:3; & 2388:3; 2389:3; & Vespa [8] - 2194:7; \\
\hline underlying [2] - & 2249:7 & 2452:3; 2454:3; & 2466:4; 2467:15; & 2309:4; 2344:17, 19; \\
\hline 2304:21; 2305:9 & University [3] - & 2455:22; 2457:18; & 2476:16; 2484:16; & 2387:3; 2481:18; \\
\hline underneath [3] - & 2332:25; 2371:12; & 2459:11; 2461:6; & 2485:3, 11 & 2483:12 \\
\hline 2217:11; 2250:7; & 2394:19 & 2470:24; 2471:12; & Vance's [2] - & via [2] - 2255:6 \\
\hline 2304:15 & university [1] - & 2476:4; 2481:21 & 2305:25; 2391:25 & viability [1] - 2314:13 \\
\hline underpass [6] - & 2463:17 & update [3] - 2307:6; & Vanderjagt [18] - & vicinity [1] - 2292:8 \\
\hline 2289:9, 11, 13, 17; & unknowingly [1] - & 2327:15; 2453:7 & 2331:22; 2332:1, 4, & video [2] - 2367:14; \\
\hline 2290:4, 12 & 2316:1 & updated [3]-2195:4; & 21; 2334:5; 2344:16; & 2419:14 \\
\hline undersigned [1] - & unless [4] - 2253:10; & 2311:9, 12 & 2352:17, 19; 2353:7; & View [3] - 2261:4; \\
\hline 2483:3 & 2295:12; 2309:25; & updating [1] - & 2355:24; 2360:2; & 2267:23; 2268:7 \\
\hline undertake [6] - & 2368:5 & 2399:11 & 2362:4, 7; 2363:6, 22; & view [30] - 2251:9, \\
\hline 2210:24; 2215:17; & unlikely [1] - 2430:4 & upfront [1] - 2373:20 & 2364:13; 2366:10; & 12; 2307:4; 2323:17; \\
\hline 2255:24; 2266:20; & unmute [1] - 2297:23 & upland [6] - 2302:14, & 2367:8 & 2325:14; 2327:20; \\
\hline 2280:10; 2356:24 & Unnamed [1] - & 20; 2303:1; 2437:4; & VANDERJAGT [3] - & 2328:10, 20; 2335:23; \\
\hline undertaken [4] - & 2430:14 & 2438:5; 2442:6 & 2332:2, 7; 2484:22 & 2336:7; 2352:16, 20; \\
\hline 2233:5; 2236:14; & unoccupied [3] - & upper [2] - 2432:5; & vanderjagt [1] - & 2392:25; 2393:1, 5, 9, \\
\hline 2365:5, 11 & 2347:16; 2348:9; & 2447:6 & 2332:9 & 11; 2401:16; 2408:14; \\
\hline undertakes [1] - & 2361:4 & uprooted [1] - & variety [1] - 2263:24 & 2432:8, 11, 15; \\
\hline 2281:1 & unplanned [1] - & 2376:6 & various [13] - & 2448:12; 2453:25; \\
\hline undertaking [24] - & 2239:6 & upstream [5] - & 2218:25; 2220:13; & 2468:22 \\
\hline 2196:1; 2205:18; & unquote & 2410:1, 10; 2445:20; & 2222:4; 2303:6; & VIEW [2] - 2263:11; \\
\hline 2259:19; 2260:22; & 2445:20 & 2446:13; 2448:24 & 2310:7; 2372:1, 7; & 2487:14 \\
\hline 2263:7; 2264:3; & UNRELATED [1] - & uptake [1] - 2311:2 & 2426:7; 2433:25; & viewed [3] - 2225:23; \\
\hline 2265:6; 2266:1; & 2413:12 & US [4] - 2411:11; & 2438:7; 2453:5; & 2313:11 \\
\hline 2269:9, 11, 13; & unresolved [1] - & 2452:14, 22; 2453:5 & 2461:16 & viewing [1] - 2365:10 \\
\hline 2331:7, 15, 19; & 2395:17 & usage [1] - 2343:25 & vary [6] - 2243:10; & views [2] - 2268:20; \\
\hline 2366:13; 2368:10; & unsuccessful [1] - & useful [3] - 2223:15; & 2310:9; 2341:21, \(25 ;\) & 2358:21 \\
\hline 2389:20; 2419:19; & 2429:10 & 2307:23; 2318:22 & 2417:15 & virtually [2] - 2193:2; \\
\hline 2420:25; 2421:5, 22; & unsuitable [1] - & user [1] - 2341:5 & varying [1] - 2277:18 & 2458:23 \\
\hline 2459:22; 2479:24; & 2233:13 & users [4]-2343:21; & vast [1] - 2295:4 & virus [6] - 2194:16, \\
\hline 2480:1 & unusable [1] - & 2344:5; 2347:25; & vectors [3] - & 23; 2195:5, 18; \\
\hline UNDERTAKING [28] & 2344:11 & 2348:12 & 2380:13; 2386:14 & 2260:20; 2480:25 \\
\hline - 2200:18; 2201:9; & unusual & uses [2]-2228:14; & vegetated [1] - & viruses [2]-2481:8, \\
\hline 2259:20; 2260:23; & 2255:16 & 2364:20 & 2415:2 & \\
\hline 2263:8; 2264:4; & unwanted [1] - & usual [1] - 2449:2 & vegetation [48] - & visited [2] - 2426:12; \\
\hline 2265:9; 2266:23; & 2195:16 & utilize [1] - 2278:6 & 2208:12, 17, 20, 25; & 2444:14 \\
\hline 2268:22; 2269:15; & unwarranted [1] - & & 2214:24; 2242:5; & visitors [1] - 2447:6 \\
\hline 2280:13; 2288:19; & 2465:14 & V & 2248:14; 2254:21; & visits [2] - 2354:10; \\
\hline 2421:7, 13, 18; & up [120]-2195:12; & & 2256:2; 2273:12, 14; & 2365:5 \\
\hline 2422:4, 12; 2478:13; & 2199:16; 2200:12; & valid [1] - 2406:1 & 2277:11; 2296:17; & visual [5] - 2240:11; \\
\hline 2479:10; 2485:19, 23; & 2206:4, 22; 2214:23; & validate [3] - & 2297:15; 2301:3, 5 , & 2275:11; 2314:7; \\
\hline 2486:13, 19; 2487:3, & 2216:18, 20; 2220:11, & 2405:25; 2411:14; & 15, 18-19, 21, 23; & 2315:3; 2335:11 \\
\hline 8, 12 & 17; 2222:3; 2223:15; & 2454:6 & 2302:2, 5; 2304:11; & voice [2] - 2270:11; \\
\hline Undertaking [7] - & 2224:1; 2229:8; & validating [1] - & 2309:22; 2310:20; & 2345:15 \\
\hline 2196:13, 16; 2199:2; & 2231:3; 2232:5; & 2417:9 & 2311:7, 16; 2312:8, & volleyball [1] - \\
\hline 2201:18; 2475:19; & 2238:23; 2239:17, & validation [3] - & 10; 2313:17; 2314:19; & \(2218: 5\) \\
\hline 2478:9; 2479:6 & 21-22, 24; 2240:9, 12; & 2404:7, 10 & 2315:6; 2343:15, 17; & VOLUME [1] - \\
\hline undertakings [8]- & 2241:13; 2243:13, 18; & validity [3] - 2197:24; & 2371:22; 2372:4; & 2484:3 \\
\hline 2319:15; 2331:12; & 2250:11; 2253:7, & 2334:15; 2417:9 & 2377:25; 2379:20; & Volume [2] - 2193:4; \\
\hline 2420:14, 16; 2475:16, & 17-18; 2256:21; & Valley [3] - 2217:24; & 2428:14; 2439:21, 25; & 2321:1 \\
\hline 18; 2478:5, 15 & 2257:22; 2258:12, 24 ; & 2261:8; 2451:3 & 2442:15; 2455:15 & volume [1] - 2262:18 \\
\hline UNDERTAKINGS [3] & 2266:12; 2268:24; & VALLEY [2] - & vegetative [1] - & vulnerability [1] - \\
\hline - 2478:25; 2486:15; & 2276:22; 2279:11; & 2263:17; 2487:18 & 2312:18 & 2467:25 \\
\hline 2487:1 & 2281:12; 2282:3, 9, & valley [2] - 2427:8; & vehicles [5] - & vulnerable [2] - \\
\hline underway [1] - & 25; 2283:2, 19; & 2432:9 & 2232:11; 2267:25; & 2348:4; 2349:23 \\
\hline 2391:3 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2285: 19 ; 2289: 10 \\
& 2290: 1: 2293: 15:
\end{aligned}
\] & & \[
2378: 8,10,15
\] & \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { undiscounted [1] - } \\
& \text { 2445:14 }
\end{aligned}
\] & 2290:1; 2293:15;
2305:24; 2307:4, & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { value [16]-2283:25; } \\
\text { 2341:23; 2380:4, } 7
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { velocities [1] - } \\
& 2416: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & W \\
\hline undisturbed [1] - & 2312:23; 2318:3; & \[
2399: 1,4,20
\] & velocity [1] - 2400:13 & Wagner [31] - \\
\hline 2428:15 & 2321:6; 2328:6, & 2400:12; 2411:9; & veneer [1] - 2304:17 & 2194:6; 2281:6, 18, \\
\hline undulations [1] - & 18-19; 2330:14; & 2431:3; 2444:20, 23, & verbatim [1] - & 24; 2282:11; 2283:8; \\
\hline 2252:11 & 2344:22; 2346:20; & 25; 2453:9; 2459:12; & 2272:11 & 2286:1, 23; 2288:3, \\
\hline unexpected [1] - & 2351:6, 24; 2352:16, & 2468:20 & verbatim) [1] - & 24; 2322:20; 2323:9; \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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