1	
2	NATURAL RESOURCES CONSERVATION BOARD
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	Application No. 1701
8	
9	
10	SPRINGBANK OFF-STREAM RESERVOIR PROJECT
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	PROCEEDINGS
16	
17	
18	
19	Volume 10
20	April 6, 2021
21	(Via videoconferencing)
22	
23	
24	
25	
	_
<u> </u>	
	AMICUS

REPORTING GROUP

1	Natural Resources Conservati	ion Board Proceedings taken
2	virtually in Calgary and Edm	nonton, Alberta.
3		
4	Volume 10	
5	April 6, 2021	
6		
7	.	
8 9	Peter Woloshyn Sandi Roberts Walter Ceroici Daniel Heaney	Chair Commission Member Commission Member Commission Member
10	·	Commission Counsel
	William Kennedy Fiona Vance	Commission Counsel
11	Laura Friend	Commission Staff
12	Michael Iwanyshyn Scott Cunningham	Commission Staff Commission Staff
13	Stephanie Fleck Carina Weisbach	Commission Staff Commission Staff
14	Amanda Cundliffe Justin Wiebe	Commission Staff MNP Technologies
15		
16	Ron Kruhlak, Q.C. Gavin Fitch, Q.C.	For Alberta Transportation
17	Michael Barbero	
18	Melissa Senek	For City of Calgary
19	Sara Munkittrick David Mercer	
20	Luigi_Cusano, Q.C.	For Calgary River Communities
21	Gino Bruni	Action Group and Flood Free Calgary
22	L. Douglas Rae	For Stoney Nakoda Nation
23	Sara Louden	
24		
25		



Richard Secord For SR1 Concerned Landowners 1 Ifeoma Okoye Group 2 3 Bob Williams For Calalta Amusements Ltd. and Calalta Waterworks Ltd. 4 Scott Wagner For Scott Wagner 5 Lorelee Vespa CSR(A) CRR RPR Official Court Reporters 6 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 7 (PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 8:00 A.M.) 8 9 THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. Welcome back to the hearing for Springbank 1701. 10 11 I certainly hope that everyone had an enjoyable 12 and, hopefully, relaxing Easter long weekend. We had 13 some great weather in Edmonton. I know folks are 14 spread around the province and perhaps even outside, 15 but from what I understand, the weather was decent and 16 we certainly hope that everyone had a nice weekend. 17 We do have a schedule for today. We had agreed on 18 some times, as you recall last week, but Ms. Friend 19 will be sending out a schedule for today just so that 20 you can get an idea on timing. 21 It looks like with the 45-minute lunch, we'll 22 finish around 5:30. So, you know, I think that works 23 well and does provide everyone with the time that we

08:00

08:01

had agreed on last week.

24

25

Welcome, Ms. Vespa, this morning. And ${\ensuremath{\mathrm{I}}}$



1	understand we'll have Ms. Gerbrandt in the afternoon.	
2	As Ms. Vespa was talking about this morning, it's	
3	with final argument, it's a lot to get down, so they	
4	are going to split shifts for today.	
5	And, again, I would ask that, you know, we're	
6	cognizant of the fact that we've got a court reporter	
7	getting all of this down, so in terms of your speed of	
8	delivery and that, we'd appreciate being cognizant of	
9	the fact that Ms. Vespa is doing her best to keep up	
10	and get all of this down, so	08:01
11	Now, we do have a few preliminary matters for this	
12	morning. And I think primarily from Alberta	
13	Transportation, there are or were some outstanding	
14	undertakings which I believe have been cleared up and	
15	filed, but we need to get those on the record and	
16	numbered with some exhibits.	
17	So let's start off with that. I'm hoping we get	
18	any prelim matters done by 8:15, but let's start off	
19	with the undertakings.	
20	Mr. Kruhlak?	08:02
21	MR. KRUHLAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can address	
22	that.	
23	We submitted responses to Undertakings 34, 44, and	
24	46 through 59 on Saturday, April 3, which was submitted	
25	to the Board and distributed to all parties. If we	



could have that marked, please. 1 2 THE CHAIR: Ms. Friend. 3 MS. FRIEND: Yes, that will be 4 Exhibit Number 407. EXHIBIT 407 - AT RESPONSES TO 5 UNDERTAKINGS 34, 44, AND 46 THROUGH 59 6 7 MR. KRUHLAK: And, Mr. Chairman, I just have two 8 other matters to speak to. 9 We also submitted on April 4th some brief revisions to the transcripts from the second week of 10 08:03 11 the hearing, and if we could have that marked as well, 12 please. THE CHAIR: 13 Yes. And were those sent to other 14 counsel? 15 MR. KRUHLAK: They were. THE CHAIR: 16 Any objections? 17 Hearing none. Okay. 18 MS. FRIEND: And this is Laura. Sorry, that 19 will be Number 408. EXHIBIT 408 - MARCH 29 TO APRIL 1 20 08:03 AT TRANSCRIPT CORRECTIONS 21 MR. KRUHLAK: 22 Thank you, Ms. Friend. 23 Then, lastly, sir, we have just submitted to 24 Ms. Friend -- it just went out a few moments ago, as we 25 were still making some revisions -- the text of our



ir		
1	final argument, which also has attached our references	
2	to the evidence, which, as Mr. Fitch and I present the	
3	oral argument, we will not make reference to exhibit	
4	numbers or page numbers. But, perhaps that might be	
5	marked, and that might be of assistance to Ms. Vespa in	
6	capturing our comments as we go through it.	
7	THE CHAIR: Indeed.	
8	Ms. Vespa, does that work for you? Great.	
9	Thank you very much, Mr. Kruhlak.	
10	MR. KENNEDY: If we assign Exhibit 409 to that.	08:04
11	THE CHAIR: 409. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy.	
12	MS. FRIEND: Thank you.	
13	EXHIBIT 409 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF ALBERTA	
14	TRANSPORTATION	
15	THE CHAIR: And a quick question for all	
16	counsels. We do have, I think, Ms. Cundliffe on this	
17	morning for document management. We didn't really	
18	expect that there would be documents that you	
19	might you may want up or exhibits, but it's no	
20	problem if you do. I just want to check with folks.	08:04
21	Was there any intent on bringing up documents,	
22	whether they're perhaps printed copy of final argument	
23	or other documents for this morning?	
24	And Alberta Transportation Mr. Kruhlak, you	
25	folks will be up first, but were you intending on	



1 having any documents up? 2 MR. KRUHLAK: No, sir, we aren't. THE CHAIR: 3 Okay. Thank you. 4 MR. SECORD: And Richard Secord here. We 5 weren't intending to pull up any documents, but like Mr. Kruhlak, once we hear his argument, we will be 6 7 providing Ms. Friend with an outline of our speaking notes. 8 9 So it may be -- there might be something that I might want out of that document, perhaps, but other 10 11 than that, I don't expect to need the document 12 managers, or won't be keeping them very busy. 13 THE CHAIR: Thank you. Mr. Cusano? 14 Ms. Senek? 15 MR. CUSANO: Good morning, sir. Our approach will be similar to Mr. Secord and Mr. Kruhlak. We will 16 17 not need any documents. We will also provide a copy of 18 argument to the court reporters. And during the course 19 of argument, we will not be referring to exhibit

08:06

08:05

AMICUS REPORTING GROUE

Okay.

Ms. Senek, would it be similar for the City of

Thank you.

Similar for the City of Calgary,

20

21

22

23

24

25

numbers.

Calgary?

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

MS. SENEK:

yes.

1 THE CHAIR: Thank you. We can deal with this 2 afternoon's later on, but thank you very much. 3 I just wanted to give a heads-up to document 4 managers so they can probably attend to some other 5 stuff that they have got on the go as well. 6 So, thanks, Ms. Cundliffe. It sounds like you 7 are, for the most part, going to be off the hook this morning, but thank you for your participation in the 8 9 hearing, and all the work that you've done over the last couple of weeks. 10 11 So any other preliminary matters from other 12 parties? MR. CUSANO: 13 Yes, sir. Thank you very much. 14 Sir, we have three minor transcript corrections 15 that Mr. Bruni will circulate to all counsel this 16 morning. And at some point later today, I will ask 17 that they be marked as an exhibit, but at this point 18 not all counsel have seen them. I sent them very early 19 to Mr. Secord and Mr. Kruhlak this morning, but, of 20 course, that needs a wider distribution. 21 THE CHAIR: Okay. Well, thank you. We can 22 deal with that perhaps either after lunch or quickly 23 after a break in the afternoon. 24 MR. CUSANO: Thank you, sir.



Thank you. Any other matters?

25

THE CHAIR:

08:06

h			ㅋ
1		Hearing none. I think we can get started then.	
2		And Alberta Transportation is first up with 150	
3		minutes. So that would take us to what is that,	
4		10 well, just 10:45, I think, but we're starting a	
5		bit earlier than the 8:15 start, but I can give you a	
6		bit of a heads-up as we get closer, Mr. Kruhlak. We've	
7		got a little ways to go before then.	
8		So, Mr. Kruhlak, Mr. Fitch, Mr. Barbero, the floor	
9		is yours.	
10		Thank you.	08:08
11	MR.	KRUHLAK: I'm sure Mr. Secord wouldn't	
12		object if I remained on mute for the entire morning.	
13		Mr. Chairman, Panel members, Panel staff, we're	
14		pleased to present to you today our final argument on	
15		behalf of Alberta Transportation with respect to the	
16		Springbank Off-Stream Reservoir Project, which I'll	
17		refer to as SR1.	
18		As I briefly indicated, Mr. Fitch and I will share	
19		this presentation, and I will start.	
20		And I thought it might be useful just to make some	08:08
21		introductory comments to provide some context and then	
22		briefly discuss the framework of the Board's review for	
23		this project.	
24		Our presentation will then review the issues	
25		identified by the Board under the various topic	



sessions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

I'd like to situate these oral remarks within the context of the very large record that exists in these proceedings; in particular, the positions of all parties, including Alberta Transportation, that have already been set out in writing in several documents, which form part of the record and have been marked as exhibits.

9 In the case of Alberta Transportation, we filed the comprehensive reply submission to the written 10 11 submissions of the interveners who oppose the project. 12 Alberta Transportation's reply submissions consist of 13 three main documents: the Exhibit 325, the actual 14 reply; the Appendix A through I of that reply, which is 15 Exhibit 327, which responds to various components of 16 the SCLG's evidence and experts; and, lastly, 17 Appendices J through M, which is Exhibit 324, which 18 responds to various aspects of the evidence of the 19 Stoney Nakoda Nations.

20 When the Board is considering this, we would 21 advise that our oral submissions that we're making this 22 morning are really supplemental to the written 23 submissions in the reply, and we will simply be 24 intending this morning to take into account the 25 testimony and evidence that the Board has heard over



08:09

the last two weeks.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Other materials Alberta Transportation ask the Board to consider as part of our submissions are the various opening statements that were made by Mr. Hebert and other members of our witness panels. There were openings for each of the five main topic sessions, which all were exhibited. And the opening statement for Topic 5 also included Exhibit 392, the PowerPoint presentation.

10 These opening statements summarize Alberta 11 Transportation's position on the topics found by this 12 Board to be relevant for its public interest 13 determination, and we'd encourage the Board to review 14 them during its deliberations in addition to our reply 15 submissions and these closing argument remarks.

16 In this presentation, we respectfully submit that 17 the evidence clearly supports the conclusion that there 18 is a serious need for this project to be built as soon as possible, that this project is in the public 19 20 interest for the people of Alberta, and that the 21 potential impacts of this project have been identified, 22 and Alberta Transportation is committed to implement 23 numerous mitigation measures such that, with few 24 exceptions, the project will not cause significant 25 adverse environmental effects.



08:10

As I've noted prior to addressing the various 1 topics discussed during the hearing, we'd like to make 2 3 several high-level contextual-type submissions. 4 First, despite this project being advanced by the 5 department of the government of Alberta, it's clear that SR1 has been subjected to a rigorous review by the 6 7 respective regulators, Indigenous groups and stakeholders. 8 Mr. Chairman, over the course of the last three 9 years, since the EIA was filed, numerous information 10 08:12 11 requests were asked by your Board, other regulators, 12 all of which Alberta Transportation responded to. 13 Further, we've just completed an almost two-week 14 hearing in which all aspects of this project have been 15 subjected to scrutiny and the interveners have been 16 given the opportunity to advocate their positions 17 directly to the Board. 18 Secondly is the issue of alternative projects. 19 This point was addressed at the pre-hearing, and the 20 Board provided the parties with the following direction 08:12 21 on this issue in its pre-hearing decision: (as read) 22 "It acknowledges that the various 23 parties are advocates for Elbow River 24 Basin flood control alternatives to SR1. 25 In particular, McLean Creek has received



i 		=
1	significant attention by stakeholders	
2	and the applicant. The Board's mandate	
3	is limited to determining whether the	
4	reviewable project, in this case, SR1,	
5	is in the public interest. While a	
6	general understanding of the relative	
7	merits associated with project	
8	alternatives may contribute some	
9	contextual relevance to a determination	
10	of the public interest decision on SR1,	08:13
11	the NRCB focus must be on the social,	
12	economic, and environmental effects	
13	associated with the reviewable project."	
14	The Board went on to say that: (as read)	
15	"It would entertain submissions on how	
16	the proponent's considerations of	
17	alternatives is relevant to a public	
18	interest determination of SR1. However,	
19	the Board does not find merit in the	
20	expenditure of significant time and	08:13
21	resources assessing projects that are	
22	not a reviewable project and under the	
23	NRCBA."	
24	Now, despite that direction, an alternative project,	
25	MC1, was referred to numerous times by certain	



1

2

3

4

5

interveners, in particular the SCLG. We reiterate that there is only one project under review, only one project that is being advanced, and only one project that has been subjected to the regulatory scrutiny which I've just referred to, and that project is SR1.

6 It's for that reason that Alberta Transportation 7 did not engage in debate during the hearing in response to comments or the conjecture about MC1, for which there 8 is no fulsome record of review before this Board; which 9 would include a hearing from parties who might be 10 11 opposed to constructing the in-stream dam on the 12 Elbow River in a popular recreation area in Kananaskis 13 country.

14 That said, in his opening statement on the first 15 day of the hearing, Mr. Hebert, the project's executive 16 director and Alberta Transportation's lead witness, 17 identified the attributes of SR1 which led to its 18 selection, including: it is an off-stream dam and less 19 sensitive than an in-stream dam to the impacts from 20 sediment and debris; it will capture more floodwaters 21 due to the location further downstream; it's closer to 22 operation, response teams, and access roads; it has less 23 environmental impact; it has less impact on the 24 Elbow River; it's less vulnerable to damage during 25 extreme weather, including catastrophic failure during



08:14

construction; it has less impact on social and recreational values and it has less impact on commercial and tourism values; it has a positive economic impact; and it is many years closer to being built and functioning than any alternative project.

6 This project has received expressed support from 7 the City of Calgary, Erlton Community Association, the Calgary Rivers Communities Action Group, Flood Free 8 9 Calgary, which, as you may have heard, includes members such as Calgary Economic Development, Calgary Chamber of 10 08:16 11 Commerce, and the Calgary Stampede, among others. In 12 addition, a number of Indigenous groups in Rocky View 13 County, who raised initial concerns about SR1, did not 14 maintain any objections to this project advancing.

15 Now, in reviewing the framework for review, we note 16 that the NRCB is conducting the review of this project 17 pursuant to its jurisdiction under the NRCBA. The 18 purpose of the Act is to provide an impartial process to 19 review projects that will or may effect the natural 20 resources of Alberta in order to determine whether, in 21 the Board's opinion, the projects are in the public 22 interest having regard to the social and economic 23 effects of the projects and the effect of the projects 24 on the environment.

25

1

2

3

4

5

In previous decisions the Board has confirmed that



2505



ĪĒ

1	it does not have a fixed formula to determining whether	
2	a reviewable project is in the public interest. In its	
3	recent Cougar Creek decision the Board noted that:	
4	(as read)	
5	"There is no fixed objective test. To	
6	make the determination the Board	
7	balances the economic, environmental,	
8	and social interests in the context and	
9	time period for which they arise. In	
10	the Board's view for a project to be in	08:17
11	the public interest, the Board must be	
12	convinced that the identified project	
13	benefits the region and the province and	
14	is consistent with any applicable	
15	Alberta Land Stewardship Act, regional	
16	plan, without generating unacceptable	
17	economic, social, or environmental	
18	impacts."	
19	Clearly SR1 is a reviewable project under the Act	
20	because it is a water management project as defined.	08:17
21	And Alberta Transportation was required to prepare an	
22	environmental impact assessment under the Environmental	
23	Protection Enhancement Act.	
24	On February 5th, 2015, Alberta Environment and	
25	Parks, AEP, issued final terms of reference for the EIA.	



And those terms of reference were comprehensive and included diverse issues such as dam safety, air quality, hydrogeology, hydrology, surface water quality, vegetation, water, wildlife, and biodiversity, terrain soils, historic resources, traditional ecological knowledge, public health and safety, socioeconomic impacts, mitigation measures, and residual effects.

8 As the Board is aware, the EIA was submitted on 9 November 7, 2017, with the revised EIA submitted in 10 March of 2018. As I've already noted, extensive 11 information requests were then submitted by Alberta 12 Transportation to AEP and the Impact Assessment Agency 13 of Canada, IAAC, and to this Board.

14 I'd like to just briefly speak to some of the other 15 approvals required for this project. The project will 16 require provincial approvals under the Water Act and the 17 Public Lands Act. Alberta Transportation has been 18 working with AEP's Water Act approvals team since 2019 19 on SR1. It requires the following approvals under the 20 Approval to conduct project activities that Water Act: 21 affect the aquatic environment; it requires a temporary 22 diversion licence; it requires approval to disturb 23 wetlands under the Alberta Wetlands Policy; and it 24 requires the acceptance by AEP's director of dam safety 25 of the dam design, consequence rating and emergency



08:18

08:19

1

2

3

4

5

6

constructed, operated, and maintained safely. Alberta has regular discussions with the Water Act approvals team to confirm appropriate project design and environmental effects. Information is being provided, including submitting the Water Act application in July 2020; the Wetlands Impact Assessment Report in August of 2020, and a Preliminary Design Report and associated appendices in December of 2020. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Public Lands Act, approvals are needed to support the construction and overall operation of the reservoir by permitting the temporary and permanent work that will take place within the Elbow river and three tributaries located within the

08:20

08:21

15 off-stream reservoir area and along the outlet channel. 16 Finally, as you're aware, IAAC has also conducted 17 an environmental assessment of the project under the 18 Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. As noted by 19 Mr. Hebert in his opening statement, IAAC has released a 20 draft report, which indicates the taking into account 21 the implementation of key mitigation and follow-up 22 program measures. The project is not likely to cause 23 significant adverse effects.

The public review period for the IAAC draft report ended April 1st, 2021, and the report is now being



2508

management plan to ensure the project is designed,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

24

h

1	finalized. And we understand that when that is done it	
2	will be forwarded to the federal minister for decision	
3	under CEAA 2012.	
4	In addition, Alberta Transportation has been	
5	working with Fisheries and Oceans Canada, DFO, since	
6	2019. Alberta Transportation is applying for an	
7	authorization under the federal Fisheries Act for	
8	undertakings or activities that may result in harmful	
9	alteration, disruption, or destruction of fish habitat	
10	or the death of fish.	08:2
11	Alberta Transportation is also applying for	
12	authorization under the federal Species At Risk Act for	
13	potential effects to bull trout.	
14	Alberta Transportation understands that under	
15	section 74 of the Species At Risk Act activities	
16	resulting in prohibited effects on listed aquatic	
17	species at risk such as bull trout can be authorized	
18	under the other federal legislation, including the	
19	Fisheries Act. Our further understanding is that if SR1	
20	receives authorization from DFO, the issued	08:2
21	Fisheries Act authorization will also serve as a species	
22	at risk permit.	
23	Alberta Transportation has had, and continues to	
24	have, ongoing and regular discussions with DFO to	
25	understand the potential fish offsetting requirements	



		1
1	for SR1.	
2	Next, sir, I'd like to turn to project need and	
3	justification.	
4	In the aftermath of the devastating flood of 2013	
5	of the Elbow River, the government of Alberta made flood	
6	mitigation on the Elbow River a matter of the highest	
7	priority. The proposed project is the government's	
8	direct response to the 2013 flood, which resulted in the	
9	loss of human life and significant economic and personal	
10	costs to members of the public, corporations,	08:23
11	municipalities, and the province itself. As Mr. Hebert	
12	said in his opening statement at the commencement of the	
13	hearing: (as read)	
14	"The sole purpose of SR1 is to deliver	
15	the important public benefit of flood	
16	mitigation on the Elbow River. In	
17	tandem with the recent upgrades to the	
18	Glenmore Reservoir, SR1 will operate to	
19	reduce overland flooding below the	
20	reservoir to levels that will not result	08:23
21	in damage to property."	
22	With regard to the need for the project, at the hearing	
23	we heard evidence from Mr. Hebert, the City of Calgary,	
24	CRCAG, and FFC regarding the extensive social,	
25	environmental, and economic costs and impacts caused by	



the 2013 flood; identified the five fatalities, the over \$5 billion in damages, the displacement of 88,000 Calgarians, damage to approximately 14,500 homes, flooding of 4,000 businesses, and Calgary's downtown core being left inaccessible for days due to power outages, damaged access routes, and public safety risks due to pooled water on roadways and pathways.

8 As stated by Mr. Hebert, the 2013 flood was a 9 terrible event that will always be remembered by those 10 that had to live through it.

Mr. Chairman, the need for this project is beyond question. It has now been almost eight years since the 2013 flood. It's predicted that a flood of some magnitude is expected on the Elbow River every eight to ten years. The project is needed, and it is needed now.

The next aspect to address is the social and economic project costs and benefits.

The project will provide considerable social and economic benefits by substantially reducing the flood hazard on the Elbow River in the City of Calgary and other downstream communities. The project will reduce the effects of extreme future flood events on infrastructure, properties, and the people in the City of Calgary and downstream communities.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

As stated in Table 17.6 of the EIA, it is estimated



08:24

h

1	that \$1.5 billion is at risk due to future flooding on	
2	the Elbow River of the same magnitude as the 2013 flood	
3	without flood protection. Put that another way, SR1	
4	will result in flood damage avoidance benefits for a	
5	design flood on the Elbow River of almost 1.5 billion.	
6	The resulting economic effects of a disaster of	
7	this magnitude are far-reaching and have implications	
8	for all Albertans. And by mitigating the risk of future	
9	costly expenses related to flood damages and recovery,	
10	this project will benefit all Albertans.	08
11	David Sol of IBI explained the process by which	
12	damages were divided between the Elbow and Bow River.	
13	As Mr. Sol said, an object-based model calculated	
14	damages for each individual building and they were then	
15	able to delineate whether the damage to a building was	
16	from the Elbow or the Bow River. It's based on that	
17	analysis the flooding risk from the Elbow River system	
18	alone was calculated at 1.5 billion.	
19	As I've stated, without SR1, there will be severe	
20	impacts from unmitigated flooding. And the City of	08
21	Calgary's evidence was clear, the City is unable to	
22	mitigate a 2013-sized flood event on the Bow River on	
23	its own.	
24	This project will also result in a number of	
25	short-term and long-term positive economic impacts to	
		ł



08:26

Rocky View County, Springbank, and Indigenous groups, including employment and business opportunities during project construction, and the economic benefits of flood protection, both directly to Springbank and Rocky View County and indirectly due to the reduced flood risk to the City of Calgary.

The economic benefits for the project are detailed in Exhibits 38 and 56, the employment and economy volumes of the EIA.

Additionally, during a flood event, the project will either avoid or greatly reduce the generalized economic costs that would be borne by all Alberta taxpayers, such as government expenditures on flood cleanup.

Further, while SR1 does not provide a direct
storage component for water, we heard evidence that it
does improve water security on the Elbow River.

18 In oral evidence, Mr. Wood explained that, 19 currently, the Glenmore Reservoir is operated in the 20 spring for a certain degree of flood control through the 08:28 21 drawing down of the reservoir in preparation for the flood season. However, if no floodwater arrives, this 22 23 could result in water deficits later in the year. 24 Therefore, by reducing the flood risk on the 25 Elbow River, the Glenmore Reservoir is able to operate



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

more effectively as a water supply facility. This is 1 2 another benefit of SR1. 3 And, as I've said, in any event, the application 4 before the Board is for flood -- for a flood mitigation 5 project to avoid the critical need -- and to address the critical need for flood mitigation on the Elbow River. 6 7 It's not an application for a drought management 8 project. 9 As was noted in the evidence of Mr. Frigo for the City of Calgary, the Elbow River watershed would not 10 08:29 11 warrant an investment in a drought management project. 12 In response to the repeated submissions of the SCLG 13 and others that alternatives, such as MC1, would provide 14 greater benefits than SR1, Alberta Transportation 15 reiterates that the wisdom of selecting SR1 over other alternatives is not the issue before the Board. 16 17 Regardless, Alberta Transportation submits that the 18 evidence supports SR1, is best suited to provide timely, 19 reliable, and effective flood mitigation on the 20 Elbow River. 08:29 21 I'll address the project costs in a moment, but 22 with respect to social costs, the costs of the project

> AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

23

24

25

and the local community after construction, I just want

temporary, and would occur periodically, some only every

to say, the impacts associated with this project are

100 years. 1 2 As indicated in Alberta Transportation's filed 3 materials and confirmed by Dave Brescia in oral 4 evidence, he said: (as read) 5 "Over the last 100 years of record, the project would only have operated ten 6 7 times, and almost every single one of those flood events would have been at 8 9 the small size of flood, in the sort of a 1 in 10-year size of flood." 10 08:30 11 In most years, SR1 will not be in use, and the land in 12 the reservoir, which will be Crown land, will be 13 available for use by First Nations and the public. 14 This is not a project where there will be impacts 15 such as a facility generating emissions and effluent experienced by the local community 24 hours a day, seven 16 17 davs a week. Instead after construction is completed, 18 there will be limited and mitigative impacts during the 19 infrequent flood operations. 20 Alberta Transportation reiterates that if SR1 is 08:31 21 not approved, there will continue to be serious impacts 22 from unmitigated flooding on local and downstream 23 residents and businesses with the accompanying health 24 and safety risks, public and private expense, and

2515



personal and social effects. The status quo is not

acceptable.

1

2 Now with respect to project costs, we heard in 3 Mr. Hebert's opening statement that the current budget 4 for SR1 in the government of Alberta's capital plan is 5 \$432 million. Alberta Transportation submits that SR1 is a sound investment of public resources, a necessary 6 7 and critical infrastructure. This is demonstrated by the substantial positive benefits that SR1 will provide 8 9 through the mitigation of impacts of future flooding on the Elbow River, on public safety, infrastructure on the 10 08:31 11 lives and livelihood of downstream residents and 12 property owners.

13 It's also demonstrated by the fact that SR1 will
14 result, in the case of another 2013-type flood, in
15 avoided damages of \$1.5 billion.

As noted by Mr. Hebert, the cost estimates for SR1 are being closely monitored to ensure this flood mitigation project can be delivered in a timely and effective manner. Final costs will be based on final design and a competitive construction tender, completion of land acquisition, and any conditions set by the regulators.

Alberta Transportation submits that there is little
value in comparing the current estimated costs of SR1 to
the early estimates of other projects which were never



advanced to the same degree of engineering, design and 1 2 stakeholder consultation and engagement. The increases 3 in cost for SR1 aren't that unusual based on having been 4 several design changes made as the project progressed 5 with additional fieldwork, engineering, and design work This is a normal evolution of an infrastructure 6 itself. 7 project as detailed design provides additional certainty and understanding of the project construction 8 conditions. 9

For example, in the three and a half years between 10 08:33 11 March 31st, 2017, the Interim Design Report, and the 12 September 25th, 2020, Preliminary Design Report, there 13 were notable changes to the project which caused changes 14 to the project's costs estimates, including the 15 inclusion of the debris deflection barrier, the relocation of the low-level outlet and the addition of 16 17 riprap to the diversion channel.

18 With regard to land acquisition costs, Alberta 19 Transportation prepared the land acquisition program. 20 And, as noted, landowners for whom Alberta 21 Transportation must acquire land are entitled to be 22 fully and fairly compensated, as per the *Expropriation* 23 They're entitled to hire appraisers, legal Act. 24 counsel, all at Alberta Transportation's expense, and 25 are entitled to compensation based on the fair market



value of their lands that includes disturbance, damages, 1 and damages for injurious affection. 2 3 The evidence is that since negotiations with SR1 4 landowners began, Alberta Transportation has obtained a 5 substantial number of appraisals, as have landowners. And through this process, Alberta Transportation has 6 7 gained a better understanding of the anticipated land acquisition costs, which have increased from the initial 8 estimates. 9 These changes to the project costs reflect that 10 08:34 11 Alberta Transportation has been responsive to the 12 concerns raised, and has been and remains prepared to 13 address them in the project plans. 14 Mr. Chairman, the benefits associated with SR1 are 15 It will have a substantial effect on indisputable. 16 reducing not only the real economic costs but the 17 emotional toll that has affected downstream residents 18 and businesses. As such, Alberta Transportation submits 19 that the benefits of SR1 clearly and substantially 20 outweigh the costs. 08:35 21 Next, I'd like to address the alternatives considered. 22 23 Section 7.1 of the terms of reference in the EIA 24 require Alberta Transportation to describe the project 25 alternatives considered for flood mitigation. With



h		1
1	respect to that, Alberta Transportation went to	
2	considerable lengths to consider alternatives, including	
3	carrying out a scoping level assessment and benefit cost	
4	analysis of an in-stream project on the Elbow River at	
5	the confluence of McLean Creek.	
6	The outcome of Alberta Transportation's alternative	
7	assessments was that SR1 was selected.	
8	It is submitted that the decision to select SR1	
9	over other alternatives was justified much for the	
10	reasons as summarized by Mr. Hebert, which I referred	08:36
11	to.	
12	Further, as I stated in my introductory remarks,	
13	Alberta Transportation submits that the selection has	
14	been made, and the government's decision to select SR1	
15	over other alternatives is not a matter before the	
16	Board. And, as the Board has noted earlier, its mandate	
17	is limited to determining whether the reviewable	
18	project, in this case, SR1 is in the public interest.	
19	Again, notwithstanding the Board's clear direction,	
20	many interveners have spent much of their time and their	08:36
21	testimony arguing the benefits of MC1 as compared to	
22	SR1. They argue MC1 could provide a suite of other	
23	benefits such as recreation, drought management, and a	
24	water source for firefighting.	
25	Indeed, noting in particular, Ms. Hunter's	
11		.1



submissions were almost entirely aimed at arguing that MC1 should have been selected over SR1, and that it was flawed decision-making which resulted in SR1 being

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

However, as previously noted, the Board is being asked to review SR1 to determine if it is in the public interest, not whether MC1 ought to have been chosen. It would be impossible to compare the two projects at this point, given the extensive assessments and work done on SR1 since it was selected.

selected as she reviewed a detailed timeline.

11 Alberta Transportation submits that the argument 12 that MC1 could provide a suite of other benefits, such 13 as I described, is simply wrong. Similar to SR1, MC1 14 was not developed with the goal of achieving these 15 multiple objectives of recreation, drought management, 16 or water source for firefighting; the conceptual plan 17 for MC1 actually just focused on flood management. The purpose of both SR1 and MC1 is for flood mitigation, not 18 19 for generating a revenue or increasing recreational 20 opportunities. As an in-stream dam, MC1 was designed to 08:38 21 have a small pond for sediment management, not a large 22 reservoir for recreation or water management purposes.

23 Consequently, Mr. Chairman, this is not an argument 24 that MC1 would have been better than SR1; it's an 25 argument that some other project, which was never



08:37

designed, would be better.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

16

17

18

19

20

21

Further, Alberta Transportation submits it's important to remember that SR1 makes up only one component of a larger flood mitigation plan for the Bow River Basin. Other components include the upgrade of Glenmore Reservoir berms within the City of Calgary, berms at Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows, and a potential new flood control structure on the Bow River.

9 Ultimately, all of these projects will work 10 together to provide significantly enhanced flood 11 protection to communities in the Bow River Basin. 12 Moreover, many of these other projects fall within 13 municipal or First Nations' jurisdiction, not 14 provincial, and Alberta Transportation is not their 15 proponent.

Most of those other components are already complete and are not part of this project and not before the NRCB for approval. Again, it's only SR1. And with regard to the new flood control project that was discussed on the Bow, it will be reviewed and assessed in other processes as required.

As required, in the terms of reference for the EIA, Alberta Transportation has described in great details the alternatives considered for flood mitigation on the Elbow River. It cannot be seriously argued that Alberta



08:39

Transportation did not go to great lengths to assess 1 2 alternatives and give them serious consideration. 3 Alberta Transportation accepts that the Board's 4 public interest mandates requires it to consider whether 5 alternatives to the project were adequately assessed 6 and, Mr. Chairman, we submit that they were. 7 Next, I'd like to speak to the Crown engagement with the public. Alberta Transportation submits that 8 9 its engagement with the public on SR1 was appropriate and meets the expectations concerning public 10 11 consultation. Through its engagement program Alberta 12 Transportation explained the social, economic, and 13 environmental effects of the project to potentially 14 affected persons, such as landowners from whom Alberta 15 Transportation must acquire land and members of the 16 larger Springbank community. It made extensive and 17 sincere efforts to resolve the concerns that have been 18 expressed by stakeholders. 19 Beginning in 2014, Alberta Transportation engaged

Beginning in 2014, Alberta Transportation engaged directly with affected landowners, adjacent landowners, and special interest groups, elected officials, and the public to provide project information, including the design and the regulatory process, answer questions and obtain feedback.

25

This information was presented through a variety of



08:40

sources from open houses, meetings, emails, drop-offs, 1 2 phone calls, and newsletters. The engagement with 3 members of the SCLG is detailed in Alberta 4 Transportation's reply submissions that I referred to, 5 turning at paragraph 40 and in the consultation chronology. I won't repeat all of that evidence now, 6 7 but I just want to bring to the Board's attention a couple of points. 8

9 As members of the SCLG complained, the landowners 10 were not consulted early enough. We have heard evidence 08:41 11 that as early as July 18, 2014, representatives of AT, 12 Alberta Transportation, and Alberta Environment met with 13 a number of local landowners, including several who are 14 now members of the SCLG, or interveners.

At this meeting the landowners were advised SR1 had been selected for detailed engineering and design and confirmed also that both MC1 and the Calgary tunnel options were moving forward for continued study. With regard to MC1, that included advancement of the conceptual design and scoping level, assessment, and benefit cost analysis.

08:42

On March 3rd, 2015, representatives of Alberta Transportation and Environment again met with local landowners, including several members of the SCLG. The purpose of that meeting was to provide an update on the

22

23

24

25



project and the continued review of others. Alberta 1 2 Transportation advised that the next step involved 3 carrying out the EIA, and later that month it held two 4 open houses, and also provided a community group, "Don't 5 Dam Springbank," a group in opposition, with a table 6 near the entrance of each of those open houses. 7 In May of 2016, two more open houses were held, and on October 26, 2016, Alberta Transportation 8 9 representatives met with Mrs. Robinson for a walking tour of her property, and she provided the history of 10 11 her ranch and pointed out archeological sites. 12 In 2017 and '18 there were six more open houses, 13 and as well as a technical briefing for landowners on 14 the federal environmental impact assessment that was 15 held in November of 2017 at the McDougall Centre. 16 Towards the end of 2018, senior Alberta, 17 Transportation representatives met with several persons who are now members of the SCLG, including Dr. Klepacki, 18 19 Karen Massey, Karin Hunter, and Mary Robinson. A total 20 of four project updates were issued to stakeholders 21 since the summer of 2019, each at which invited anyone 22 with questions or comments about the project to contact Alberta Transportation. And as of the date of the 23 24 Board's pre-hearing conference, a total of 12 open 25 houses and two community information sessions were held



08:43

at locations in or near the local community.	
We heard in Mr. Hebert's opening statement that he	
had personally spoken to numerous landowners in the	
project area and, whenever requested, has met with them	
to better understand their concerns.	
And as stated by Mr. Hebert: (as read)	
"Alberta Transportation will continue to	
engage with stakeholders after the	
approval of the project if it is granted	
by this Board."	08:44
As I discussed in more detail a moment ago, during 2019	
and 2020 Mr. Hebert was in regular contact with	
Ms. Hunter in her capacity as the president of the	
Springbank Community Association by email and phone to	
provide project updates and respond.	
Mr. Chairman, it's submitted that the mere fact	
that some stakeholders have unresolved concerns does not	
mean that Alberta Transportation's engagement and	
consultation on the project was not adequate. It	
engaged with local stakeholders, including members of	08:45
the SCLG, in good faith. Unfortunately, it's just	
sometimes not possible to resolve all conflicts.	
Alberta Transportation carefully reviewed the	
landowners' statements as part of the SCLG's evidence;	
and many of those statements have complaints about	
	 We heard in Mr. Hebert's opening statement that he had personally spoken to numerous landowners in the project area and, whenever requested, has met with them to better understand their concerns. And as stated by Mr. Hebert: (as read) "Alberta Transportation will continue to engage with stakeholders after the approval of the project if it is granted by this Board." As I discussed in more detail a moment ago, during 2019 and 2020 Mr. Hebert was in regular contact with Ms. Hunter in her capacity as the president of the Springbank Community Association by email and phone to provide project updates and respond. Mr. Chairman, it's submitted that the mere fact that some stakeholders have unresolved concerns does not mean that Alberta Transportation's engagement and consultation on the project was not adequate. It engaged with local stakeholders, including members of the SCLG, in good faith. Unfortunately, it's just sometimes not possible to resolve all conflicts. Alberta Transportation carefully reviewed the landowners' statements as part of the SCLG's evidence;



Alberta Transportation's engagement with stakeholders who are now members of the SCLG. As a result, Alberta Transportation prepared a chronology of engagement with members of the SCLG, and it was included in the reply submissions.

I think it's noteworthy, in our submission, that
none of the members of the SCLG who testified at the
hearing took any serious exception to the accuracy of
that chronology. Alberta Transportation submits the
Board may rely on it as providing an accurate picture of 08:46
engagement that occurred with SCLG members.

12 One SCLG member who did comment on the chronology 13 was Ms. Hunter, who testified that entries which 14 detailed numerous email communications with Mr. Hebert, 15 I think Ms. Hunter commented that she did not consider 16 emails to be consultation. In fact, in several of those 17 emails Mr. Hebert offered to meet with Ms. Hunter as 18 president of the Springbank Community Association. In 19 cross-examination she was asked whether in her view testimony that emails do not constitute consultation. 20 21 she considers the proponent offering to meet -- I'm 22 sorry, I should just correct that.

In view of her testimony that emails do not
constitute consultation, she considers the proponent
offering to meet to be consultation. In response to


h		1
1	that question, she acknowledged Mr. Hebert's various	
2	offers to meet with her, and stated that she appreciated	
3	his willingness to reach out and that Mr. Hebert's	
4	intent was good.	
5	Ms. Hunter acknowledged that she did not take up	
6	Mr. Hebert's offers to meet. And when she was	
7	questioned about this, she explained: (as read)	
8	"I just think there's been there's	
9	been a case of misguided expectations,	
10	potentially on both sides, and honestly,	08:47
11	our philosophy and now I'm going to just	
12	speak as my Springbank Community	
13	Association role. Our priority has	
14	always been hit those regulatory	
15	deadlines. It has not been engage with	
16	Alberta Transportation because	
17	fundamentally we don't agree this is the	
18	right project. And so for us to spend	
19	time one on one with Matthew Hebert and	
20	even the project team to understand,	08:47
21	what's the point."	
22	Clearly, Ms. Hunter's position on SR1 and that of the	
23	SCLG was fixed and no amount of consultation or	
24	engagement by Alberta Transportation could have changed	
25	anything. Ms. Hunter's testimony that hitting the	



regulatory deadlines was her priority, and as she explains in her presentations, both written and oral, are in the nature of advocacy and argument, but not evidence.

1

2

3

4

5 Mr. Chairman, it's sometimes said that consultation 6 is a two-way street. A proponent such as Alberta 7 Transportation is required to provide interested parties with both information about its proposed project and 8 9 opportunities to ask questions and express concerns. Ιf it received questions and answers about a project, it's 10 11 obliged to respond to them in good faith. Alberta 12 Transportation fulfilled those obligations, but a 13 proponent cannot force someone to like a project and it 14 cannot force someone to engage with them.

15 That said, Mr. Chairman, as you know, Alberta 16 Transportation is committed to appointing a community 17 liaison, a representative from Alberta Transportation 18 during construction and from AEP during operations, who 19 will serve as that point of ongoing contact with 20 The community liaison will primarily stakeholders. 21 communicate through the local representation for 22 Indigenous groups, community associations, local 23 businesses, government administration, and local 24 government officials. Any complaints received during 25 project construction will be directed by the community



08:49

1 liaison to the construction contractor. 2 Next I'd like to address Crown consultation land 3 use. 4 In this part of our argument I'll begin by 5 discussing Alberta's consultation with Indigenous 6 people's generally and then speak to some of the 7 specific issues with respect to the Stoney Nakoda I'll also comment on potential project impacts 8 Nations. 9 on historical resources and summarize some of the 10 commitments made by Alberta Transportation. 11 Alberta Transportation has taken its obligation to 12 consult with and, where necessary, accommodate First 13 Nations very seriously and has engaged with Indigenous 14 communities. Alberta Transportation's Indigenous 15 engagement program for the SR1 project reflects its 16 efforts to conduct a meaningful and responsive 17 engagement program based on respected transparency. The program designed by Alberta Transportation followed 18 19 federal and provincial guidelines, took direction from 20 Alberta government's Aboriginal Consultation Office, 21 ACO, and IAAC, and strove to respect each Indigenous

And, as you've heard, Mr. Hebert was directed to consult with five Treaty 7 First Nations by the ACO and another -- and engage with another eight Indigenous

groups' specific protocols.

22



08:50

groups identified by IAAC.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Alberta Transportation recognizes the NRCB must also satisfy itself as to the adequacy of consultation and accommodation based on all of the evidence before it. In this regard, Alberta Transportation submits that it has undertaken a fulsome consultation effort, which was fully documented in the record of consultation, submitted as Exhibits 153 and 320, as part of Alberta Transportation's application before this Board.

08:51

10Its consultation started early with the Treaty 711First Nations in August of 2014, as directed by the ACO.12Alberta Transportation requires a positive consultation13adequacy decision from the ACO prior to issuance of14Water Act or Public Lands Act approvals for the project,15and to support the EIA completeness decision by Alberta16Environment and Parks.

ACO monitors Alberta Transportation's Treaty 7
 consultation activities and receives bimonthly
 consultation updates for review and comment.

20 Once Alberta Transportation informs the ACO that it 21 is closing consultation on the project and submits an 22 adequacy consultation request, the ACO will conduct a 23 consultation adequacy assessment to confirm that the 24 fulfillment of the delegated procedural aspects of 25 consultation have been carried out in accordance with



1 Alberta's policies and guidelines. The ACO's 2 consultation adequacy decision will include any 3 recommendations it has and is made available to the AEP 4 directors responsible for those applications to inform 5 their decision-making. Alberta Transportation is 6 required to close consultation as a prerequisite to 7 issuing those *Water Act* and *Public Lands Act* approvals.

Based on the March 3rd, 2021, letter from the ACO to the NRCB, it's our understanding that the ACO does not provide a recommendation or advice to the NRCB. The ACO has no formal role in the NRCB processes, including regarding any consultation that the NRCB may engage with a First Nation.

14 However, the ACO and Alberta ministries may rely on 15 the NRCB process, including, but not limited to, the 16 decision report to satisfy any duty to consult that may 17 be owed by the Crown regarding potential adverse impacts to the exercise of rights to which section 35 of the 18 19 *Constitution Act* pertains and of traditional uses, as 20 defined in Alberta's First Nation consultation policy 21 and guidelines.

08:53

Alberta Transportation submits that through the engagement process and follow-up, it has been able to successfully respond to many of the concerns raised by Indigenous groups and believes this is reflected in the



fact that only one First Nation has chosen to intervene 1 2 in the hearings before this Board. 3 Alberta Transportation has described the process it 4 undertook of receiving traditional land use studies from 5 each Indigenous group, it prepared written responses to the comments and concerns, it identified potential 6 7 mitigation to avoid or reduce those effects, and offered to meet Indigenous groups and obtain their feedback. 8 9 In response to that feedback that was received, Alberta Transportation then made a number of significant 10 08:54 11 modifications to the project, such as the fish passage 12 measures, the fish rescue program, improved wildlife 13 passage, and the addition of the debris deflector. And as you've heard, one of the most significant 14 15 changes to the project in response to First Nation concerns was the development of the Updated Draft 16 17 Guiding Principles and Direction for Future Land Use. 18 This document provides guidance for the future land 19 uses of the project for AEP as a future operator, and it 20 will be responsible for developing the final land use 08:55 21 plan once and if the project is approved and proceeded 22 with. 23 The project is predominantly situated on private 24 land that has been used for ranching and agriculture

> AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

since the late 1800s.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

19

Alberta Transportation submits the project may enhance opportunities for First Nations to exercise Treaty rights and traditional land uses compared to the existing conditions where access is contingent on the consent of the landowner.

The project creates a novel situation where it acquires private land, converts it to Crown land to allow for future First Nation use and use by other stakeholders. This includes the practice of Treaty rights and traditional uses among a number of secondary uses to the actual flood mitigation activities.

12 The Draft Guiding Principles calls for the 13 additional engagement to ensure all interested parties 14 have an opportunity to express any concerns or interests 15 they have in its finalization, which would occur after 16 all project approvals are obtained.

It is the intention that the final land use plan will be developed with meaningful consideration of input received by First Nations and other users.

The government of Alberta is interested in using an iterative and collaborative approach in the development of the land use plan. It anticipates that land use issues pertaining to First Nations can be reasonably addressed through the First Nations Land Use Advisory Committee that has been proposed.



1 In addition, you've also heard that Alberta 2 Transportation has committed to meaningful Indigenous 3 participation in the construction of SR1, if it is 4 approved, through training, employment and contracting 5 opportunities. 6 Alberta Transportation developed a Draft Indigenous 7 Participation Plan and shared it with Indigenous groups since November of 2019. And since that time, it's 8 9 advanced the draft and met with Indigenous groups hosting business readiness workshops, and has obtained 10 08:57 information on businesses and contractors from those 11 12 First Nations that could participate in construction 13 opportunities. 14 It may be useful in the Board's consideration of 15 the adequacy of consultation to consider some of the comments of Dr. Buchanan who has extensive experience in 16 17 this issue and commented that: (as read) 18 "The record demonstrated that Alberta 19 Transportation conducted robust and 20 meaningful consultation as he reviewed 08:57 21 the thousands of entries of meetings, 22 workshops, site visits, correspondence, 23 funding for traditional use studies and 24 ongoing updates." 25 Relevant project information was shared in a timely



ᆌ

1	manner and in an accessible format. Alberta	
2	Transportation met with Indigenous groups in an earnest	
3	effort to obtain their perspectives on the project, its	
4	effects, and their specific concerns and recommendations	
5	for mitigation.	
6	Dr. Buchanan also noted that: (as read)	
7	"Alberta Transportation took an	
8	exceptional step, ensuring the draft	
9	traditional land and resource use	
10	effects assessment with Indigenous	08:58
11	groups prior to filing the EIA in	
12	March of 2018, and offering to hold	
13	workshops with Indigenous groups to	
14	obtain their input on proposed	
15	mitigation measures and discuss how	
16	project specific concerns have been	
17	addressed in the EIA."	
18	Alberta Transportation submits that all of these efforts	
19	reflect meaningful attempts to ensure that there has	
20	been adequate consultation and engagement.	08:58
21	And further, as you've heard from Mr. Hebert, those	
22	commitments do not end with this hearing, as there will	
23	be continued engagement proposed going forward.	
24	Now, I'd like to speak to some of the concerns	
25	raised by the Stoney Nakoda Nations in these	



proceedings.

1

2 Alberta Transportation has closely reviewed the 3 written submissions and evidence provided by the SNN. 4 It notes that the SNN did not take any issue with the 5 consultation record as it pertained to them. And extracts from that -- from the record of consultation 6 7 were included in Appendix J to Alberta Transportation's reply submissions, Appendix J at Exhibit 324. 8 In fact, 9 much of the cross-examination of Alberta Transportation appeared to focus on the potential flood mitigations on 10 11 the Bow River rather than any issues with respect to the 12 consultation logs.

08:59

Alberta Transportation notes that the EIA
reasonably identified Treaty rights and traditional uses
in the project development area, including those of the
SNN.

17 Alberta Transportation provided numerous 18 opportunities for the SNN to share input, perspectives 19 on potential effects of their Treaty rights and 20 traditional uses, including providing funding to conduct 09:00 21 a traditional uses study; providing the draft TLRU 22 assessment; and subsequently holding two workshops with the SNN to obtain their perspectives on assessment 23 24 methodology and proposed mitigation; project-specific 25 concerns and how the project may affect the exercise of



Section 35 rights.	
And Alberta Transportation provided correspondence	
specifically requesting feedback on the exercise of	
Treaty rights and traditional uses.	
Alberta Transportation notes that the submissions	
of the SNN to this Board demonstrates that it	
understands that the NRCB and IAAC review processes are	
intended to fulfill the provincial and federal Crown's	
duty to consult.	
The March 3rd, 2021 letter from the ACO to the NRCB	09:00
states that: (as read)	
"Alberta may rely on the consultation	
that occurred in the NRCB processes to	
assist in meeting any duty to consult	
owed by Alberta.	
Further, the SNN have had considerable	
opportunities for participation in	
consultation. As noted, they've	
received participant funding to	
participate in the NRCB hearings and	09:01
have provided several witnesses to	
provide oral Indigenous knowledge	
testimony.	
Alberta Transportation submits that the	
information about traditional use by the	
	And Alberta Transportation provided correspondence specifically requesting feedback on the exercise of Treaty rights and traditional uses. Alberta Transportation notes that the submissions of the SNN to this Board demonstrates that it understands that the NRCB and IAAC review processes are intended to fulfill the provincial and federal Crown's duty to consult. The March 3rd, 2021 letter from the ACO to the NRCB states that: (as read) "Alberta may rely on the consultation that occurred in the NRCB processes to assist in meeting any duty to consult owed by Alberta. Further, the SNN have had considerable opportunities for participation in consultation. As noted, they've received participant funding to participate in the NRCB hearings and have provided several witnesses to provide oral Indigenous knowledge testimony. Alberta Transportation submits that the



SNN provided in their interim traditional land use assessment report serves to confirm that the assumptions made in the EIA about the nature and extent of the SNN's traditional use of the -- in the PDA."

1

2

3

4

5

6

Now, Alberta Transportation was concerned to hear the
comments by the elders of their experiences during the
site visits which were conducted in October and
November of 2016. They indicated they were not given
unrestricted access to the lands nor could they attend
on their own, as they indicated is often the case in
these types of assessments.

Alberta Transportation notes it was recognized that the circumstances surrounding those visits was unique. They involved private land rather than the more typical situation of elders conducting visits on Crown land, as access agreements are required from private landowners that can include restrictions on times and locations.

It's truly unfortunate that the SNN did not bring their concerns to the attention of Alberta Transportation sooner rather than on the eve of this hearing, as Alberta Transportation would have sought to address them earlier. However, Alberta Transportation stated it's committed to follow up with representatives



09:01

of the SNN to facilitate further site visits that can 1 2 take place in the most open and respectful manner as 3 possible. 4 Alberta Transportation noted and welcomed the 5 expression of interest from the SNN that they would seek 6 to complete their final traditional use assessment and 7 that elders, such as Henry Holloway, would be interested in attending the site visits. 8 9 Bill Snow, the consultation manager for the SNN, noted that the interim cultural assessment, or 10 11 traditional use assessment, that was prepared by the SNN 12 included some 13 recommendations that focused mainly on 13 mitigations for archaeology, wildlife, and cultural 14 monitoring. 15 Alberta Transportation has responded to each one of 16 those items in its reply document. It welcomes the receipt of SNN's final traditional use assessment and is prepared to provide additional support to the SNN to complete that report, including facilitating additional

17 18 19 20 site visits, sharing project information and proposed 21 mitigation measures and the provision of additional 22 funding if required.

Alberta Transportation notes that there are still funds remaining from the budget approved by Alberta Transportation for the original visits and the TLU

23

24

25



09:03

1

2

3

4

5

report since 2016. However, should additional funding be required, Alberta Transportation welcomes the submission of a budget for review, and it would then propose meetings with the SNN to plan and complete all aspects of the work by the end of the summer of 2021.

6 Alberta Transportation further committed that, upon 7 receipt of the final TLUA, it would review that report and provide its written response, and that response 8 9 would consider the concerns and potential project effects identified by the SNN, noting whether those 10 11 potential effects have been assessed in the EIA and 12 identifying proposed mitigations to serve to reduce or 13 avoid those effects.

Alberta Transportation further committed to meeting
the SNN to receive feedback on the written response and
incorporate that feedback.

17 Alberta Transportation has also committed to 18 arranging site visits with the SNN and representatives 19 of Alberta Culture, Multiculturalism, and Status of 20 Women to review the specific cultural and traditional 21 sites identified by the SNN to gain input into the 22 nature and importance of how those sites -- the 23 importance of those sites and how they might be impacted 24 by the project and identify them from the SNN 25 perspective to ensure appropriate measures to record,



09:04

mitigate and commemorate those sites take place. 1 2 Alberta Transportation noted the SNN were invited 3 to observe archeological mitigation work undertaken last 4 year and will invite the SNN to observe future 5 archeological mitigation work that will be undertaken 6 this summer. It notes the comments and observations of 7 Dr. Berry, the SNN's witness on archaeology, and confirms with Dr. Berry that the Historic Resource 8 9 Impact Assessment has not been completed. Alberta 10 Transportation explained that this is typical for a 11 project at this stage of the regulatory process and in 12 fact reflects the procedures under the Historical 13 *Resources Act*. Additional fieldwork as required by 14 Alberta Culture and Alberta Transportation intends to 15 complete this work in 2021. And as required by the 16 Alberta *Historical Resources Act*, Alberta Transportation 17 will obtain all necessary approvals from Alberta Culture 18 prior to construction.

09:05

19In response to Dr. Berry's comments that the EIA20was not inclusive of SNN's perspectives and protocols on21land management, Alberta Transportation notes that it is22required to conduct work pursuant to the guidance and23requirements by Alberta Culture. The mitigation24measures and definition of significance provided by25Alberta Transportation is in compliance with the



regulatory requirements of the *Historical Resources Act*. In response to Dr. Berry's statement that unlawful destruction of cultural heritage is viewed as a crime against humanity in the international courts, Alberta Transportation notes that its work conducted on the site was in accordance with its permit conditions and that it reported its findings to Alberta Culture in accordance with *Historical Resources Act*.

9 With respect to the submissions by Ms. Vanderjagt 10 with respect to the SNN's submission to the NRCB, 11 Exhibit 288, it's obliged to note that this report 12 appears to be prepared without consideration of the 13 information on the record of consultation and the 14 specific concerns and response table.

Further, Ms. Vanderjagt appeared to rely on other
reports, such as the NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. reports,
which were prepared by others and addressed project
concerns in the Grande Prairie and Edson areas.

19 Ms. Vanderjagt acknowledged that the maps tendered 20 with the submission to the NRCB in this exhibit 21 pertaining to hunting and vegetation did not appear to 22 be supported by site-specific information and were 23 extracted from other projects.

Accordingly, Alberta Transportation submits that the report is of limited value to the NRCB for its



09:07

09:07

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

24

review. With respect to historical resources, Alberta Transportation completed a Historical Resources Impact Assessment for the project and no burials have been identified in the PDA. Should burials be found in the future, Alberta Transportation will follow the provincial regulations in responding to them and is prepared to contact and inform the SNN of the potential to affect grave sites and archeological sites. As noted, the SNN were invited to observe the archeological work that took place in the fall of 2020. And, as it has indicated, Alberta Transportation welcomes a proposal from the SNN to participate in any Historical Resources Impact Assessment to be conducted.

Alberta Transportation set out a number of its commitments to the SNN in its opening statement which it believes largely addressed those recommendations identified by Mr. Snow. These are set out in Alberta Transportation's reply document and its opening statement.

09:09

09:08

Alberta Transportation also responded to other requests, and in particular a letter to the Louis Bull Tribe. And in it Alberta Transportation recognized Louis Bull Tribe's request for post construction site visits and confirmed its commitment to provide



2543

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

21

22

23

24

opportunities to conduct site visits for the project area during construction and another opportunity post-construction to observe the proposed mitigation measures and provide feedback.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

23

24

25

These invitations will be extended to all First Nations that would have an interest in doing so.

Alberta Transportation also committed to provide opportunities for Indigenous elders to conduct site field visits prior to construction to identify priority areas for the harvest of traditional plants, as well to allow for harvesting of medicinal and culturally significant traditional needs plants prior to clearing.

Alberta Transportation has also committed to continuing to provide the Louis Bull Tribe and other engaged Indigenous groups with opportunities to provide impact -- input on mitigation plans for the project, including the draft vegetation and wetlands mitigation and monitoring plan.

Alberta Transportation will welcome further input
and feedback from First Nations, including
recommendations on specific seed mix for the draft
vegetation plans.

Alberta Transportation's committed to have the First Nations land use advisory committee meet on a regular basis to ensure the continued inclusion of the



09:10

participating First Nations and the land use planning for the project area. It is anticipated that the format, structure, and mandate for this advisory committee will be defined in a formal terms of reference and be developed with participating First Nations.

6 As we referred to in the Topic 5 discussion, 7 Alberta Transportation also notes that there has been extensive discussions with the SNN on the issue of 8 9 wildlife passage. Alberta Transportation has been alert to this concern and shared with the SNN over a number of 10 09:11 11 occasions that wildlife movement is improved over the 12 PDA, with the removal of the extensive barbed wire 13 fencing and the fence around the perimeter of the 14 project will be wildlife friendly. Further, the 15 enhancement of the underpass under Highway 22 should 16 facilitate uninterrupted wildlife movement.

17 Alberta Transportation has encouraged First Nations to be involved in reviewing the draft monitoring and 18 19 mitigation plans and the results of those plans, 20 including providing the draft monitoring plans, offering 09:11 21 funding to review the plans, and hosting group meetings 22 to discuss them. It welcomes continued input. And 23 these draft plans at this time include, as I said, 24 wildlife mitigation and monitoring, groundwater 25 monitoring, surface water monitoring plan, vegetation



1

2

3

4

and wetlands mitigation monitoring and revegetation 1 2 plan, the fish rescue and fish health monitoring and 3 mitigation programs, as well as the air quality and 4 management program. 5 I want to briefly speak also to some of the 6 concerns expressed by non-Indigenous interveners with 7 respect to the future land uses for the project development area. 8 9 The SCLG and Mr. Wagner also commented on future land use and, in particular, the updated draft guiding 10 11 principles and directions for future land use. 12 Questions were raised about hunting and firearms use, 13 access parking, the continued use of the project area 14 for grazing. The main concern appeared to be expressed 15 that remained uncertainty and the lack of clarity about 16 future land uses. 17 Mr. Chairman, Alberta Transportation emphasizes 18 that the draft guiding principles are just that: they're 19 draft, they're not final. And as the document states: 20 (as read) 21 "If the project is approved and the land 22 is acquired by the Crown, Alberta 23 Environment and Parks will continue to 24 engage First Nations and stakeholders in 25 the development of the final land use



09:12

This was reiterated by Mr. Hebert during the hearing. 2 3 The questions and concerns raised by interveners 4 about future land use can and will be addressed through the engagement that will be carried out by Alberta 5 Transportation and by AEP. To be clear, however, there 6 7 will be no unfetterred or illegal hunting on the project area, as suggested by any intervener. 8 9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, those are my comments in argument. Next I'll hand this off to my friend, 10 11 Mr. Fitch.

09:14

09:14

12 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kruhlak.
13 MR. FITCH: Thank you, Mr. Kruhlak, and good
14 morning, Mr. Chair and Panel members.

I'm going to be delivering the balance of the
argument for Alberta Transportation. So that the
topics I'll be addressing are Topic Session 3, design
safety and risk; Topic Session 4, water; and Topic
Session 5, air and terrestrial.

20 So to begin with, design safety and risk. I'll 21 make a few introductory comments and then address the 22 various subtopics, being essentially description of the 23 project, the operating plan. And I'm going to 24 specifically address the issue of flooding downstream 25 of SR1, but upstream of the Glenmore Reservoir as that,



2547

plan based on those principles."

quite an issue during the ddress dam safety and risk and then, finally, briefly
-
and then, finally, briefly
, as I am sure you know by
eservoir that is designed to
w River. As an off-stream
ge of local topography.
ed Creek valley that runs
ow River near Highway 22.
bow River will not be
flow will not be altered
. This, in our submission,
he significant adverse
iated with an in-stream dam.
am, SR1 can be operated such
all the flow that occurs on
rovides a very important
in the operation of the
Chair, SR1 will not operate
perate when flows in the
c metres per second and if
rds, SR1 would likely
oio

09:15

operate only once every eight to ten years. When SR1 1 2 does need to operate, the operator, AEP, will divert 3 excess floodwater from the Elbow River into the 4 off-stream reservoir. This will be done incrementally 5 by raising the gates of the service spillway and 6 opening the gates of the diversion inlet. The water 7 will flow down the diversion channel into the reservoir, where it will be impounded until it can be 8 9 released back into the river when conditions allow.

As noted by Mr. Menninger, the design of SR1 is, in our submission, an elegant solution to the problem of providing flood mitigation on the Elbow River.

10

11

12

As is well documented, Mr. Chair, in the EIA and the many SIR responses, SR1 will consist of three basic components: firstly, the diversion structure; secondly, the diversion channel; and, thirdly, the dam and reservoir. And within these three basic components are a number of subcomponents.

19 So just beginning with the diversion structure, it 20 will consist of the service spillway, the diversion 21 inlet, the debris deflection barrier, the floodplain 22 berm, and the auxiliary spillway. The service spillway 23 is a double-gated structure located in the Elbow River 24 channel. When in operation, the gates of the service 25 spillway will be incrementally raised to control the



09:17

water surface elevations in the river and ultimately 1 2 the amount of flow that goes into the diversion 3 channel. 4 The service spillway will work in conjunction with 5 the diversion inlet, also a double-gated structure, that will be constructed on riverbank left. 6 When in 7 operation, the gates of the diversion inlet will be raised, allowing water directed by the service spillway 8 to enter the diversion channel. 9 The debris deflection barrier will be located in 10 09:18 11 the river channel in front of the diversion inlet to. 12 as its name suggests, help block debris from entering 13 the diversion channel and promote debris passage 14 downstream. 15 The floodplain berm will be located adjacent to the right bank of the river in the floodway. 16 The 17 floodplain berm will act to constrain the Elbow River 18 and direct flow to the service spillway and diversion 19 inlet. 20 And finally with respect to the diversion 21 structure, the auxiliary spillway is a safety feature 22 built into the end of the floodplain berm adjacent to 23 the service spillway. Should water elevations in front 24 of the service spillway and diversion inlet get too 25 high, some of the water will flow over the auxiliary



spillway to prevent water circumventing the diversion 1 2 structure. 3 So those are the basic elements of the diversion 4 structure. 5 With respect to the diversion channel, it will 6 convey floodwaters from the diversion inlet to the 7 reservoir. The diversion channel is designed to carry a 8 9 maximum flow rate of 600 cubic metres per second, and 10 this flow rate includes a safety margin of 25 percent 11 over 480 metres cubed per second, which is the flow 12 rate actually required to meet the design goal of 13 reducing flows below the Glenmore Reservoir to under 160 cubic metres per second during a design flood. 14 15 At a point approximately 1300 metres from where 16 the diversion channel enters the reservoir, the 17 emergency spillway will be located on the east side of 18 the diversion channel. As its name suggests, the emergency spillway would not be used during normal 19 20 operations. It would only operate when the reservoir 21 is full and the diversion inlet gates fail to close. It would allow water to flow out of the reservoir and 22 23 back toward the Elbow River to provide a margin of 24 safety at the dam. 25 So, finally, then, the dam and the reservoir, as

2551



09:20

		1
1	you know, Mr. Chair, the SR1 storage dam is an earthen	
2	structure approximately 30 metres tall at its highest	
3	point and approximately 3.3 kilometres in length. For	
4	most of its length, the dam will be considerably	
5	smaller than 30 metres in height.	
6	The dam will impound floodwater in the reservoir	
7	which is designed with active storage volume of	
8	approximately 77.8 million cubic metres.	
9	The storage volume includes a 10 percent margin of	
10	safety over the 70 million cubic metres of storage that	09:21
11	is required to achieve the project's design goal.	
12	The floodwater that is stored in the reservoir	
13	will be released through the low-level outlet works at	
14	the bottom of the dam. And from there, it will run	
15	along the course of the Unnamed Creek and back to the	
16	Elbow River.	
17	The maximum flow rate to the low-level outlet is	
18	27 cubic metres per second. In a design flood, the	
19	low-level outlet will be able to drain the reservoir in	
20	approximately 40 days.	09:22
21	With respect to the operating plan for SR1, this	
22	is also clearly documented in the EIA and it bears	
23	repeating that SR1 will not operate in most years.	
24	This is what is referred to in the EIA as dry	
25	operation. Dry operation of SR1 will consist mainly of	
	N	



routine maintenance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Flood operations will begin when flow rates in the river reach 160 cubic metres per second. The basic operating plan is that flow through the service spillway will be maintained at 160 metres cubed per second while flow rates in the river are between 160 and 760 metres cubed per second with the excess flow up to 600 metres cubed per second directed through the diversion inlet.

When in-flows in the river exceed 760 cubic metres 09:23 per second, SR1 will be operated such that the excess flow will be allowed to continue downstream through the service spillway by lowering the gates so as to maintain a constant diversion rate into the reservoir of 600 metres cubed per second until the reservoir is full.

Alberta Transportation reiterates and emphasizes,
Mr. Chair, that the operating plan for SR1 is simple
and straightforward. And by controlling the amount of
floodwater that enters the reservoir, the risk
associated with dam operations is reduced considerably.

I now want to address this issue of flooding
downstream of SR1 but upstream of the
Glenmore Reservoir.

25

Mr. Chair, it is well documented in the EIA that



2553

the design basis for SR1 is the reduction of flow rates below the Glenmore Reservoir to 160 cubic metres per second. This will afford protection to properties below the reservoir based on the City of Calgary's information that damage from overland flooding occurs at flow rates of approximately 170 cubic metres per second.

8 During the hearing, the SCLG referred at length to 9 the flood protection provided by SR1 for properties 10 downstream of the diversion, but upstream of the 11 Glenmore Reservoir. The assertion made is that SR1 12 provides "Unequal flood protection because there will 13 be residual flooding upstream of Glenmore Reservoir."

Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation strongly rejects this assertion.

The design flood for SR1 is 1240 cubic metres per second. In a design flood, SR1 would operate to divert up to 600 metres cubed per second, as we know, meaning that 640 cubic metres per second of flow would remain in the Elbow River. There is general agreement that flow rate of 640 cubic metres per second on the river is roughly equivalent to a 1 in 50-year flood.

As stated by Mr. Hebert, Mr. Wood and Mr. Menninger several times, Alberta Transportation's position is that SR1 will provide a substantial



09:24

09:25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

reduction of flood risk to all downstream properties, 1 2 whether above or below the Glenmore Reservoir. 3 Now, Mr. Dowsett, one of the witnesses for the 4 SCLG, prepared a report which advances the argument 5 that SR1 does not provide equal protection to 6 properties upstream of the Glenmore Reservoir. 7 In Alberta Transportation's submission, very little, if any, weight should be given to Mr. Dowsett's 8 9 evidence. First, he was a member of the SCLG, then he was not; first he submitted a PowerPoint presentation, 10 09:26 11 then it was withdrawn. And while Mr. Dowsett had a 12 long and successful career in the field of hazard and 13 risk assessment, it all related to pipelines and wells and oil and gas facilities. And, as he acknowledged, 14 15 Mr. Dowsett has no background in dam safety or in assessing the hazards of overland flooding. 16 17 Nevertheless, Alberta Transportation accepts that 18 Mr. Dowsett's evidence was well intentioned, and we 19 will briefly address that evidence now. 20 In my cross-examination of Mr. Dowsett, I referred 09:26 21 to the Land Use Bylaw of Rocky View County, which I provided to the Board and Mr. Second as an aid to 22 23 cross-examination. Now, that aid to cross was not

24 25



entered into evidence but the Land Use Bylaw is

obviously a legal authority, and I'm going to refer to

it now. 1 2 So -- and we've provided in the written version of 3 our remarks, Mr. Chair, the actual reference to 4 the -- where you can find the Land Use Bylaw online. 5 So Part 5 of the Land Use Bylaw for Rocky View 6 County sets out general regulations that are applicable 7 to all development within the county. Within Part 5 is a subsection titled "Parcels and 8 Setbacks" and within that subsection, Sections 195 to 9 203 deal with development within a flood -- sorry, 10 09:27 11 within flood hazard areas and flood fringe areas. 12 Part 8 of the Land Use Bylaw sets out relevant 13 definitions, and I'm going to refer to three right now. 14 Firstly, flood hazard area is defined as: (as read) 15 "The area of land bordering a 16 watercourse or water body that would be 17 affected by a design flood and includes 18 the flood fringe, floodway, and may 19 include areas of overland flow, as 20 determined by the Province of Alberta." 09:28 21 And, Mr. Chair, it is a matter of record that Alberta has determined that the flood hazard area is the 1 in 22 23 100-year area. 24 So returning to the definitions in the Rocky View



County Land Use Bylaw, the next one I'm going to refer

1	to is the definition of floodway, which is defined to	
2	mean: (as read)	
3	"The portion of the flood hazard area	
4	where the flows are deepest, fastest,	
5	and most destructive, as determined by	
6	the Province of Alberta. The floodway	
7	typically involves the main channel of a	
8	watercourse and a portion of the	
9	adjacent overbank area."	
10	And then, finally, the last definition I'll refer the	09:29
11	Board to is for flood fringe, which is defined to mean:	
12	(as read)	
13	"The portion of the flood hazard area	
14	outside of the floodway, as determined	
15	by the Province of Alberta. Water in	
16	the flood fringe is generally shallower	
17	and flows slower than in the floodway."	
18	So, Mr. Chair, with those three definitions in mind,	
19	Alberta Transportation would now like to direct you to	
20	the following key what we say are the following key	09:29
21	sections in the Land Use Bylaw.	
22	Firstly, Section 195 provides that all development	
23	in a flood hazard area is discretionary, which, of	
24	course, means there are no permitted uses.	
25	Secondly, Section 196 provides that no development	



is allowed in a floodway, except for maintenance and 1 repairs of existing or grandfathered development. 2 3 Section 200 provides additional development 4 restrictions specifically to properties along the 5 Elbow River, including that no development shall take 6 place in the floodway. 7 And then, finally, sections 201 to 203 deal with the flood fringe area, and they provide that development 8 9 in the flood fringe may be approved if, in effect, a property is floodproofed. 10 11 So, for example, the bylaw says that the first 12 floor of all buildings must be located at or above the 1 13 in 100-year flood level plus half a metre of freeboard. 14 Now, Mr. Chair, we submit that these provisions in 15 the Land Use bylaw are important because what they show 16 us is that SR1 will limit residual flooding upstream of 17 the Glenmore Reservoir to those areas where, according to the County's own land use bylaw, development is not 18 supposed to occur, or if there is existing development, 19 20 it's supposed to be floodproofed. 21 To be clear, Mr. Chairman, Alberta Transportation 22 acknowledges and confirms that the design basis for SR1 23 was to ensure that flow rates below Glenmore Reservoir 24 do not exceed 170 cubic metres per second. 25 That said, Alberta Transportation strongly also



09:30

i		ส
1	submits that by reducing downstream flows during any	
2	major flood by up to 600 metres cubed per second, SR1	
3	does provide a substantial reduction of flood risk above	
4	Glenmore Reservoir. Mr. Chairman, if SR1 were on the	
5	landscape in 2013, it could have cut flows through that	
6	reach of the river by nearly half.	
7	Turning now to dam safety and risk management.	
8	As noted by Mr. Hebert, the design of SR1 to	
9	protect public safety is of highest priority to Alberta	
10	Transportation.	09:32
11	The SR1 storage dam has been designated as an	
12	extreme consequence facility, and while this sounds	
13	ominous, in fact what it means is that the dam must be	
14	designed to the highest level of safety because of its	
15	location and proximity to local population centres.	
16	The designer of record for SR1 is	
17	Mr. John Menninger of Stantec. Mr. Menninger was	
18	supported by a team of licensed professional engineers	
19	with expertise in geotechnical, hydrotechnical and	
20	structural engineering when he was preparing the design	09:32
21	of SR1.	
22	The design of SR1 was also subjected to an	
23	experienced independent review Board that has been	
24	retained by Alberta Transportation to provide an	
25	independent set of eyes on the design.	



And, finally, the design of SR1 will ultimately 1 2 have to be approved by AEP's director of dam safety. 3 Mr. Chair, the Board heard extensively from 4 Mr. Menninger during Topic Session 3 and also in Topic 5 Session 1. Alberta Transportation submits that 6 Mr. Menninger was a highly credible witness and the 7 Board can have a high degree of confidence in his evidence, and by extension, in the design of SR1. 8 9 Mr. Menninger was cross-examined for several hours by very able counsel, Mr. Secord, on the issues of 10 09:33 11 design and risk, and Alberta Transportation submits that 12 Mr. Menninger's evidence was clear and entirely 13 unimpeached by that cross-examination. 14 Now, Mr. Secord's cross-examination was largely 15 based on evidence and input from the engineering 16 consultant retained by the SCLG, Austin Engineering. 17 Austin prepared a report which was filed in this 18 proceeding as Exhibit 256. 19 Importantly, Austin does not say in its report, and 20 did not say in its testimony at the hearing, that SR1 09:34 21 has been designed such that it cannot operate safely. 22 Instead, all Austin did was provide some 23 recommendations, 24 recommendations, to improve safety. As part of Alberta Transportation's reply 24 25 submissions, Stantec provided a detailed response to



Austin's report and each of those 24 recommendations. 1 2 Now, before discussing this part of the evidence, Alberta Transportation notes that it does not take issue 3 4 with the qualifications of the two witnesses from 5 Austin, Mr. Austin himself, and Ms. Keyes; however, we 6 do note that their experience is primarily in B.C., not 7 Alberta, and in the case of Mr. Austin, all his experience is in B.C., and he has never gone through the 8 9 dam-permitting process in Alberta. Mr. Austin also fairly acknowledged that the first 10 09:35 11 time he reviewed the Alberta Dam and Canal Safety 12 Directive in detail was when he prepared his report for 13 the SCLG. 14 Now, one thing that Mr. Austin did confirm is that 15 he knows that in Alberta it is the director of dam safety and AEP who is responsible ultimately for dam 16 17 safety, not this Board. Alberta Transportation submits. 18 therefore, that to the extent this Board believes that 19 any of Austin's recommendations may have merit, your job 20 is to bring those recommendations to the attention of 09:35 21 the director of dam safety in your report, and then the 22 director can consider what, if anything, he or she wants 23 to do about them.

Now, when Mr. Austin and Ms. Keyes testified, they fairly acknowledged that many of Stantec's responses to

24

25



their report adequately addressed the concerns and recommendations that they had made. The Panel will recall hearing Mr. Austin list off all of the recommendations which he considered had been appropriately addressed by Stantec in its response.

1

2

3

4

5

25

6 That led me to ask him which concerns and issues 7 actually still remained in dispute, and Mr. Austin said 8 that he thought there were two areas where we are still 9 in a little bit of disagreement here. And those two 10 areas, Mr. Chair, are design of the emergency spillway 11 and the potential for second low-level outlet. So I 12 will now address those two concerns.

So first regarding the design of the emergency spillway. Ms. Keyes addressed the concern -- or, sorry, expressed the concern that the maximum discharge capacity of the emergency spillway, which is 360 metres cubed per second, is less than the maximum in-flow rate into the reservoir of 600 metres cubed per second.

19In the Austin report, Ms. Keyes asserted that this20does not meet the requirements of the Canadian Dam21Association Dam Safety Guidelines, which she22characterized as requiring that the spillway of the dam23must be able to discharge the in-stream design flood, or24IDF, while maintaining minimum freeboard.

In fact, as pointed out by Stantec in its response



2562

09:37
b		
1	to the Austin report, what the Dam Safety Guidelines	
2	actually require is that the spillway of a dam must be	
3	able to discharge the IDF while maintaining the minimum	
4	freeboard, taking into account the routing effect of the	
5	reservoir. And as noted by Stantec in its response,	
6	that's exactly what it did.	
7	Specifically Stantec stated: (as read)	
8	"The design of the SR1 emergency	
9	spillway meets these criteria without	
10	relying on closure of the diversion	09:38
11	inlet gates. There is no requirement to	
12	pass the design flow or peak flow into a	
13	reservoir without consideration of	
14	routing effects of the reservoir."	
15	And Stantec concluded: (as read)	
16	"As presented, the emergency spillway	
17	and reservoir can safely pass the	
18	probable maximum flood without relying	
19	on the diversion inlet gates closing and	
20	while maintaining adequate freeboard.	09:38
21	This meets the CDA design guidelines and	
22	industry standard of practice."	
23	. Now, notwithstanding this response, in her testimony	
24	Ms. Keyes stated that she was still concerned about the	
25	design of the emergency spillway because, in her view,	



the routing analysis should begin with the IDF entering 1 2 the reservoir when it is already full, whereas Stantec's 3 routing analysis did not do that. 4 With all due respect to Ms. Keyes, her position 5 does not make sense, and the evidence of Mr. Menninger 6 on this point should be preferred. 7 The scenario that Ms. Keyes posits is the Firstly, you have a full reservoir, which, 8 following. 9 as we know, is a condition that has a recurrence interval of approximately once every 200 years. 10 09:39 11 Secondly, a probable maximum flood would occur right 12 after the 1 in 200-year flood. Thirdly, there would be 13 an error in operation such that the gates were open to 14 the channel, notwithstanding that the reservoir is 15 already full, which, of course, is against the operating 16 plan. And then, finally, there would be a failure of 17 the gates to close without intervention for over three 18 days, which is the amount of time it would take the 19 probable maximum flood to take place. 20 Mr. Chair, it is one thing to be conservative, it 09:40 is another to be unrealistic. And, with respect, 21 22 Ms. Keyes' position is entirely unrealistic. And in 23 fact Mr. Austin acknowledged this. He stated, yeah, I 24 agree that the loss of diversion control is a low 25 possibility, and I agree that this is an off-stream



reservoir and that you could defend the potential for it 1 2 to be empty. 3 Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation is very confident 4 that its routing analysis for the design of the 5 emergency spillway is appropriately conservative. We also note that both the Austin report and Stantec's 6 7 response to it have been forwarded by Alberta Transportation to the AEP dam safety office. 8 9 Mr. Chairman, the Board can rest assured, in our submission, that the director of dam safety will not 10 09:41 11 allow the project to proceed unless he or she is 12 satisfied that the design of the emergency spillway is 13 appropriate; and we are confident he or she will make 14 that finding. 15 With regard to the low-level outlet, Austin also 16 advocated for a second low-level outlet on the dam to 17 provide additional drainage capacity in the event of the 18 need for what it described as "Rapid dewatering of the 19 reservoir in response to a dam safety incident." 20 Stantec reviewed this recommendation and responded to it 09:41 21 in its technical memorandum that was filed as part of 22 Alberta Transportation's reply submission. 23 As noted by Stantec, the low-level outlet design

24 25



capacity was selected based on industry standards for

evacuation times for a reservoir, and Austin provided no

basis for an increased capacity. 1 2 In his testimony, Mr. Austin stated that he 3 accepted that response, but noted that a second outlet 4 structure would result in a significant reduction of 5 risk, and he still recommended that at least 6 consideration be given to a second outlet during final 7 design. And in his cross-examination of Mr. Menninger, 8 9 Mr. Secord suggested that without a second outlet Alberta Transportation did not have any "contingencies," 10 09:42 11 was the word he used, to deal with the need for a rapid 12 dewatering of the reservoir in the event of a dam safety 13 incident. 14 Mr. Menninger responded by reiterating that the 15 design of the low-level outlet was based on industry 16 standards and guidelines, which take into account the 17 risk of a dam safety incident. 18 He further stated that Stantec selected the highest 19 rating to use the most conservative value, and that 20 included looking at downstream consequences. 09:43 21 Also, Mr. Menninger testified that the most likely 22 dam safety incidents that might occur at SR1 would be 23 mitigated by other interventions, not rapid dewatering 24 of the reservoir.

When Mr. Secord asked what dam safeties might



REPORTING GROUP

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

22

23

24

25

require rapid dewatering, Mr. Menninger responded that he could not offer any hypothetical scenario where such a response would be required.

Mr. Chairman, Alberta Transportation submits that the SCLG, through the evidence of its consultant Austin Engineering, have adduced no compelling evidence that a second low-level outlet is reasonably required to address dam safety.

9 The evidence of Stantec and Mr. Menninger should be preferred on this point. And, again, this is a matter 10 11 that falls within the purview of the director of dam 12 safety.

13 Beyond these two issues I've just addressed, design 14 of the emergency spillway and the low-level outlet, no 15 intervener or expert retained by an intervener advanced 16 any evidence that the design of SR1 is anything other 17 than safe and robust. While Ms. Hunter suggested that 18 SR1 somehow constitutes a radical innovation in dam engineering, this claim is not supported by the SCLG's 19 20 own expert, Austin Engineering, nor is it supported by 21 any other evidence.

09:44

Turning now to public safety and emergency response.

Alberta Transportation submits that the evidence is clear that the operator of the project, AEP, will be



required under Alberta's dam safety rules to have a robust and effective emergency management plan for SR1. The only intervener to question this was the SCLG in the reports of Austin Engineering and Mr. Dowsett.

5 Returning to Austin, they made four recommendations dealing with preparation of a safety management plan, 6 7 that was recommendation 21; preparation of emergency plans and response, recommendation 22; dam break 8 9 inundation mapping, that was recommendation 23; and operation, maintenance, and surveillance documentation, 10 and that was their recommendation 24.

09:45

09:46

Stantec responded to these recommendations in its technical memo, and in his testimony Mr. Austin stated that Austin Engineering accepted those responses.

15 So, in our submission, whatever Austin said in its 16 report about emergency response was adequately dealt 17 with, as acknowledged by Mr. Austin.

18 Further, we note that while Austin has considerable 19 experience in dam safety, and several of their 20 recommendations were fine, detailed review of dam 21 commissioning, operations and maintenance manuals, 22 emergency response, and safety management, again, are 23 all within the scope of dam safety review under of the 24 Water Act and the Alberta Dam and Canal Safety 25 Directive.



2568

1

2

3

4

11

12

13

1 While obviously important considerations, they in 2 fact are not within the scope of review in front of this 3 Board. 4 With regard to Mr. Dowsett, section 3 of his report 5 dealt with emergency management. That section is found on pages 11 and 12 of his report. You may recall, 6 7 Mr. Chair, that at the top of page 11 Mr. Dowsett stated that he had reviewed the 2003 AEP guideline for 8 9 emergency preparedness for flood emergencies, and he expressed the opinion that given the size of the project 10 09:46 11 and its proximity to Springbank, he found it a little 12 That's the way he described it. light. He then 13 suggested that the guideline might not constitute best 14 practice for emergency response.

15 Stantec again responded to this assertion in their technical memorandum, in which they noted that the 2003 16 17 AEP guideline had been superseded by the 2018 Alberta 18 Dam and Canal Safety Directive.

19 And the Panel will recall that in his testimony 20 Mr. Dowsett stated that he had, since reading Stantec's 21 memo, reviewed the 2018 safety directive and determined 22 that it is "Comprehensive and does represent best 23 practice."

24 He then stated that, as a result, pages 11 and 12 25 of his report were redundant and didn't accurately



represent his testimony. In other words, Mr. Dowsett 1 2 withdrew his concern about emergency planning. 3 Accordingly, Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation 4 submits that no intervener has presented evidence which 5 challenges that the emergency planning regime for this project will be anything less than best practice; and at 6 7 least one participant, Mr. Dowsett, now agrees that in fact it is best practice. 8 9 So, in terms of what that process is, as is explained in Exhibit 327, the Alberta Dam and Canal 10 11 Safety Directive, which has the legal force of a 12 regulation made under the Water Act and the water 13 ministerial regulation, stipulates that SR1 will require 14 an emergency management plan. An emergency management 15 plan is comprised of an emergency preparedness plan, an 16 emergency response plan, and a flood action plan. A11 17 of these documents have not yet been prepared for SR1. They are -- the responsibility to prepare such documents 18 19 is that of the operator, AEP, and the timing of 20 preparation does not occur until construction 09:49 21 procurement is complete and the project is closer to the 22 commissioning phase.

23 This is because the plans require information on 24 equipment models, construction records, and other 25 details of the facility that are just not known at this



1 time. AEP will begin preparation of the emergency 2 3 management plan following regulatory approval of SR1 and 4 in parallel with the construction process. 5 Finally, Mr. Chair, the Dam and Canal Safety 6 Directive includes review of these plans by the director 7 as part of the Water Act approval process, and the components of the plan are required to be reviewed 8 9 periodically thereafter. And for high consequence dams, such as SR1, they must be reviewed more often than lower 10 09:49 11 consequence dams, and this will be every five years. 12 In summary, Mr. Chairman, SR1 will have an 13 emergency management plan appropriate to its 14 classification as an extreme consequence facility, and 15 there is no evidence in the record to suggest otherwise. 16 Finally, with respect to sensitivity of project 17 design to climate change. 18 Some witnesses, you will recall, Mr. Chair, for the 19 SCLG argued that the design of SR1 does not take into 20 account climate change. The suggestion being that in 09:50

2571



change to impact the size and frequency of future

future floods -- that in the future floods will be

larger and, therefore, SR1 may be undersized. Alberta

Transportation rejects this submission and submits that

the design of SR1 recognizes the potential for climate

21

22

23

24

floods.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

21

22

23

24

25

In this regard we note the following: First. notwithstanding that the Alberta standard for flood risk is the 1 in 100-year flood, the project was increased in scale from 1 in 100 to the 2013 design flood, which is slightly more than 1 in 200 years. And this was done at the outset of the planning process in recognition of the fact that the 2013 flood is now the flood of record on the Elbow River.

The SCLG suggested that the design of SR1 should 10 11 have included consideration of three large historic 12 floods on the Bow River, but the evidence about flooding 13 on the Bow is anecdotal, and there is no such evidence 14 that the Elbow River flooded to the same extent in those 15 three years.

16 SR1 has been designed to the flood of record and 17 whether there was major flooding on the Elbow River 18 during the pre-record period is speculation and does not 19 constitute information that would be suitable for use as 20 a design basis for a civil engineering project like this.

09:51

As for the statistical frequency of the 2013 event, a recent flood hazard report done by Golder Associates for AEP did, we acknowledge, incorporate these historic events into their flood frequency estimates, but the



incorporation of this information did not result in any substantive change to the estimate of the 1 in 200-year flood magnitude. The 2013 event is still estimated to have a return period of approximately 1 in 200 years.

The 2013 flood was a massive flood event. The design of SR1, nevertheless, meets that design basis and also incorporates a factor of safety in both the diversion rate of 25 percent and reservoir volume of 10 percent, above what is needed to achieve the 2013 flood design basis.

11 These factors of safety help mitigate the risk of 12 larger floods in the future, and indeed a climate change 13 assessment was prepared by Alberta Transportation in 14 response to requests made by the federal regulators. 15 And that assessment used climate change affected IDF curves under what's called "RCP 8.5," which is the 16 17 so-called "business as usual" scenario. In other words, 18 it predicts likely outcomes if society does not make 19 concerted efforts to cut greenhouse gas emissions. That 20 assessment confirmed that projections of climate change 21 impacts up until 2050 resulted in a 12 percent increase 22 in the 200-year flood, which is well within the 23 25 percent factor of safety added to SR1.

Finally, Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation notes that the benefits of SR1 for flood damage reduction are



09:52

09:53

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

24

based on, of course, current flood risk and, therefore, 1 2 if floods do become more frequent, the benefits of SR1 3 will also increase. 4 Turning now to Topic Session 6 and water. 5 Mr. Chairman, you will recall Mr. Brescia 6 testifying about the comprehensive consideration given 7 by Alberta Transportation to all aspects of project-related water concerns. These considerations 8 9 commence with preparation of the EIA and carry forward through extensive SIRs and the rest of the regulatory 10 09:54 11 process. And you will also recall Mr. Brescia 12 concluding that this is work that continues. 13 As this proceeding has amply demonstrated, the 14 environmental assessment process is complex and 15 It addresses both project related and involved. 16 cumulative environmental effects and follows a 17 standardized framework for each valued component. 18 As you will also recall, the evidence of Mr. Hebert 19 was that Alberta Transportation's environmental 20 assessment included engagement with stakeholders and 09:55 21 Indigenous groups. Indeed such engagement was key to 22 the development of many of the mitigation and monitoring 23 plans that have been prepared for the project. 24 I will now address in turn each of the key water 25 issues associated with the project. And, Mr. Chair, as



1 you know, these are: hydrology, surface water quality, 2 fish and fish habitat, and hydrogeology. 3 Alberta Transportation submits that the work 4 carried out by our subject matter experts in each of 5 these key areas has resulted in a full and careful consideration of the project's expected impacts. 6 These 7 impacts are in the final analysis well understood, for the most part temporary, and will be mitigated and 8 9 monitored for. So starting with hydrology, Mr. Chair, you will 10 09:56 11 recall that Dr. David Luzi spoke to the issues of 12 hydrology, including the movement of water at the 13 surface, water quantity, geomorphology, and sediment 14 transport. Dr. Luzi also commented on the issue of 15 climate change. 16 In our submission, Mr. Chair, the evidence in this 17 proceeding is that the project will have no impact to 18 the hydrological regime when the project is not in operation, and that the flow rate and flow volume in the 19 20 Elbow River will not be significantly impacted by the 09:56 21 project during dry operations. During flood operations, there will be reduced flow 22 23 rates and volumes downstream. There will also be 24 changes to suspended sediment transport with sediment 25 being removed from the river, transported to the



reservoir and deposited. Given these changes in flow associated with operations, there will also be some minor changes to the Elbow River channel between the outlet and the Glenmore Reservoir over the long term.

As I have already noted, Mr. Chair, the SCLG spent some time cross-examining on the issue of climate change, and I've addressed some of that in Topic Session 3. I'll just now briefly address some of the other points that were specifically referred to during Topic Session 4.

Firstly, you will recall that Alberta Transportation's witnesses pointed to research, current research, which calls into question the generalizations made by the SCLG's expert, Dr. Fennell, on the implications of climate change on the project.

Alberta Transportation's witnesses also disputed the value of using so-called paleo records in the form of tree rings as a predicted measure of future peak flows.

While noting that tree ring data is interesting, Dr. Luzi testified that such data is not relevant to estimating peak flow events as it does not allow for sufficiently accurate extrapolation and application to perspective floods.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Additionally, the validity of the use of such paleo



09:57

information is uncertain given future climate change 1 2 scenarios. 3 I've already briefly touched on the argument about 4 the historic floods. I'll just add to that, that simply 5 applying flood events on one river, the Bow to the Elbow -- to another river, the Elbow, is a highly 6 7 uncertain exercise. And, moreover, the records that do exist call into question whether this method is valid. 8 9 One need only look at the 1932 flood event on the Elbow River, which did not register as a flood event on 10 09:59 the Bow River. 11 12 What the SCLG and Dr. Klepacki failed to appreciate

is that to take this approach introduces still more
 uncertainty and removes precision from the data and
 detailed engineering work that's required for a project
 like SR1.

The SCLG also suggested that changes in climate
will result in greater occurrences of severe weather
conditions manifested in alternating periods of drought
and record floods.

09:59

Again, Dr. Luzi was unequivocal in his view that such assertions cannot be made with any certainty and, moreover, that the research he has looked at actually suggest the opposite, that peak floods associated with climate change are not expected to increase to levels



1 beyond the design flood at Calgary or along the project portions of the Elbow River. 2 3 As was also noted by Dr. Luzi, the impacts of 4 climate change on future events is just not fully 5 understood. 6 Current research, which Dr. Klepacki and 7 Dr. Fennell did not seem to be aware of, suggests that, in the project area, climate change will not result in 8 9 increased flood events or extreme variability. Simply put, the SCLG's arguments on climate change and its 10 11 implications for the project are speculative. There is 12 no credible evidence supporting the assertion that SR1 13 has been underdesigned. Structures like SR1 cannot be 14 designed on the basis of uncertain and anecdotal data. 15 With respect to surface water quality, Alberta 16 Transportation undertook an assessment of the project's 17 impacts to various water parameters including 18 temperature, oxygen and total suspended sediment, or 19 Alberta Transportation's uncontroverted evidence TSS. 20 is that changes to water quality, if realized, are

22 With regard to TSS specifically, Alberta 23 Transportation notes that the project -- or, sorry, the 24 project operation would only occur when TSS is already 25 high, owing to the presence of an ongoing flood event.

manageable and will be monitored for.

21



10:00

1

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this concern.

well set back from the river.

The project would not change or alter this basic fact.

2 Nevertheless, to help mitigate any concerns about TSS 3 concentrations, Alberta Transportation intends to 4 release water back into the river as early as 5 practically possible. 6 Alberta Transportation's hydrology witness, 7 Mr. Darrell Jobson was asked about the risk associated with the nutrient loads in waters released from the 8 9 reservoir, potentially giving rise to algal blooms. In response, he explained the reasons why an algal 10 11 bloom is not expected to occur. And these include the 12 fact that such events typically only occur in permanent 13 in-stream dams and structures which hold water for far 14 greater periods of time than SR1 ever will. 15 Finally on the issue of water quality, Calalta Waterworks Ltd. raised a concern with respect to 16 17 potential impacts to its water intake system as a result 18 of SR1 releasing water from the reservoir after a major

10:02

10:01

Accordingly, Alberta Transportation submits that there is no need for the Board to address this issue

flood event. Yet, under cross-examination, Mr. Williams

frankly acknowledged that he has no evidence to support

system was not impacted by the 2013 flood because it is

Further, he acknowledged that Calalta's



further based on the planned release scenarios from SR1 after a flood. Nevertheless, Alberta Transportation reiterates that it remains prepared to discuss this concern with Calalta.

5 Calalta also raised a concern, you will recall, 6 with respect to possible financial impacts under its 7 franchise agreement as a result of the portion of the project overlapping with this franchise area. Yet, 8 9 Mr. Williams acknowledged that, despite being in operation for approximately 40 years, Calalta has not 10 11 served any lands in the vicinity of the SR1 project 12 area, which is in the west part of Calalta's franchise 13 Rather, Calalta's customers are at the far east area. 14 end of the franchise area.

Further, Calalta provided no evidence which supports that it is probable there would be future development within the SR1 project area at any time within the term of the franchise agreement.

And, finally, there are numerous provisions in the franchise agreement itself, which may give recourse to Calalta if future impacts arise.

Therefore, given this uncertainty, and the lack of evidence supporting the claim, Alberta Transportation submits it would not be appropriate for the panel to impose, on an approval, any conditions related to



10:03

10:03

1

2

3

Calalta's water franchise. Again, however, Alberta Transportation does remain open to discussing this issue further with Mr. Williams and Calalta.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

16

21

22

23

24

25

Turning now to aquatics and fish, Mr. Chair.

As an off-stream dam and reservoir, SR1 will have less impact on fish and fish habitat than a traditional This is one of the many environmental in-stream dam. benefits of the project.

9 Alberta Transportation undertook a substantial amount of work to understand and assess potential 10 11 project impacts on fish and aquatic ecology. The 12 results of this work are contained in the EIA and many 13 SIR responses.

14 Specifically, Alberta Transportation would refer 15 the Board to Exhibit 47, which is Volume 3(b) of the EIA on aquatic ecology; Exhibit 93, which is the Round 1 17 provincial SIRs on water; Exhibits 138, 140, and 141 18 through 149, which are the responses to the Round 2 19 provincial SIRs; and Exhibit 157, which is Alberta 20 Transportation's response to the Round 3 SIR from AEP.

In the Round 2 provincial SIR responses alone, one can find many reports comprehensively dealing with the These include fish passage scenarios for fish issue. all fish species and life stages of the Elbow River fish community; a fish habitat suitability index analysis;



10:04

ir		
1	modelling of habitat change through the use of a bedload	
2	model; draft fish rescue and fish health monitoring and	
3	mitigation programs; spawning suitability assessments	
4	and REDD surveys from Elbow Falls to Discovery Ridge;	
5	and Elbow River habitat mapping from Redwood Meadows to	
6	Discovery Ridge.	
7	Then there is Exhibit 157, which is the	
8	December 2020 or which includes the December 2020	
9	fish population assessment.	
10	Mr. Chairman, a significant finding of that fish	10:06
11	population assessment was confirmation that the vast	
12	majority of bull trout, a species at risk, in the	
13	Elbow River are located upstream of SR1.	
14	Bull trout were predominantly caught 20 kilometres	
15	upstream of SR1 between the confluence of McLean Creek	
16	and Elbow Falls. This can be clearly seen in	
17	Exhibit 327 at PDF page 69, a figure that was included	
18	with Alberta Transportation's reply submissions.	
19	If you look at that figure, Mr. Chair, what you'll	
20	see is that it shows that in the 2020 population survey,	10:07
21	there were no bull trout captured downstream of SR1,	
22	there were two bull trout captured adjacent to the	
23	reservoir, and over 180 were captured upstream of SR1	
24	and, of note, over 150 of these were captured between	
25	Elbow Falls and McLean Creek where the MC1 project would	



be located.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Now, the SCLG retained Mr. Allan Locke, a respected fisheries biologist who worked with AEP for many years, to conduct a technical review of the scientific and technical data assumptions and methods used by the proponent in their environmental assessment to evaluate impacts to fish and fish habitat.

2583

In his report, Mr. Locke made several complimentary 8 9 comments about the work done by Alberta Transportation. He noted that the level of effort conducted by the 10 11 proponent adequately addresses much of the inherent 12 uncertainty in understanding the impact to fish and fish 13 habitat.

14 He noted that his review determined that the proponent describes in sufficient detail the methods and 15 16 analysis undertaken to assess impacts to fish and fish 17 habitat.

18 He noted that the level of effort conducted for 19 this project adequately addresses much of the inherent 20 uncertainty in the field of aquatic ecology and that the 10:08 21 work appropriately acknowledges the uncertainty typical 22 for these types of studies.

23 He noted that, overall, the EIA report and the SIR responses are thorough and address required fish, fish 24 25 habitat and aquatic ecosystem technical data collection



and analysis. 1 2 With regard to the -- with regard to fish passage 3 at the diversion structure, he noted that the proposed 4 structures are effective at providing passage for fish 5 and, in fact, are far superior to a classic fishway. 6 And, finally, with regard to the draft fish rescue 7 plan, Mr. Locke characterized it as a reasonable plan outline containing good steps moving towards a final 8 9 plan. Notwithstanding all these many favourable comments, 10 10:09 11 Mr. Locke did make a couple of recommendations for 12 further analysis and investigation in terms of 13 alternative designs to further reduce project impacts to 14 fish and fish habitat. 15 On behalf of Alberta Transportation, Stantec 16 reviewed Mr. Locke's report and his recommendations and 17 prepared a technical memo in response. Mr. Locke reviewed Stantec's response and testified: (as read) 18 19 "The response to my report by the 20 proponent is well taken and I appreciate 10:10 the clarification." 21 22 So, Mr. Chair, much has occurred with Austin Engineering 23 on the issue of design, safety and risk. By the time we 24 got to the hearing, there was actually very little left 25 in dispute between Alberta Transportation and SCLG on



		-
1	fish.	
2	At the hearing, Mr. Locke testified that his two	
3	outstanding concerns were, one, that Alberta	
4	Transportation should demonstrate that everything that	
5	can be done is done to keep fish from becoming	
6	entrained. And, second, that the impact on fish of the	
7	release of water for the reservoir back into the	
8	Elbow River should be further studied.	
9	Now, Mr. Chairman, Alberta Transportation shares	
10	Mr. Locke's concern that everything that can reasonably	10:11
11	be done to prevent fish entrainment should be done.	
12	And, as stated in our reply submission, means to prevent	
13	entrainment will be identified through discussions with	
14	DFO.	
15	As well, Alberta Transportation is open to	
16	considering other suggestions, such as Mr. Locke's, that	
17	a sound device be installed to deter fish from entering	
18	the diversion channel.	
19	With regard to the impact on fish of the release of	
20	water from the reservoir back into the river, Alberta	10:11
21	Transportation appreciates Mr. Locke's comments about	
22	the use of environmental flow science to determine	
23	impacts on the river of different flow rates from the	
24	reservoir. However, as Mr. Locke acknowledged in	
25	cross-examination, his criterion of no more than a	



10 percent increase in the instantaneous flow in the Elbow River is a late release scenario. In fact, it is a very late release scenario. Mr. Locke agreed that he would not be surprised if it resulted in water being retained in a reservoir until December, assuming a flood occurs during the spring flood season. He also acknowledged the DFO is strongly in favour of an early release scenario. So Alberta Transportation submits that while Mr. Locke's suggestion related to release scenarios was well intentioned the early release and late release scenarios provided by Alberta Transportation are

appropriate bookends for an assessment. And, further, it seems clear that the early release scenario is strongly favored for DFO -- or, sorry, by DFO.

16 In sum, Mr. Chair, there actually is very little 17 disagreement between the experts on fish. The evidence 18 is clear that Alberta Transportation's assessment of 19 fish and fish habitat and potential project effects on 20 fish and fish habitat was robust. And, further, that 21 assessment demonstrates that the project, with 22 appropriate mitigations and offsetting in place, as will 23 be determined by DFO, will not result in significant 24 adverse effects to fish and fish habitat, including bull 25 trout.



2586

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Lastly on water I will discuss hydrogeology. 1 2 Mr. Chair, it is no understatement to say that the 3 SCLG focused the bulk of their cross-examination in 4 Topic 4 on the issue of hydrogeology. 5 Alberta Transportation submits, however, that the evidence of our lead witness on hydrogeology, Mr. Dan 6 7 Yoshisaka, was not impeached, notwithstanding Mr. Secord's sustained cross-examination. 8 And 9 Mr. Yoshisaka's evidence should be preferred over that of Dr. Fennell, who on multiple occasions stepped into 10 11 the role of an advocate against the project and into 12 several areas in which he did not have expertise. A11 13 this in support of his argument that an alternative to SR1, namely MC1, which he did not even assess, was 14 15 better.

16 The hydrogeological portion of the EIA involved 17 examining the potential changes to groundwater quality 18 and quantity that may be associated with the project. Through the use of an extensive borehole drilling and 19 20 well testing program data was obtained and a numerical 21 model created to predict the implications of both dry 22 and flood operations and other factors on groundwater 23 levels, flow regime, and water quality. The models 24 showed that any effects on groundwater would be rare, 25 reversible -- sorry, reversible upon release of water



10:14

from the reservoir and would not extend beyond the project development area, or PDA, at any magnitude that would be material.

4 Briefly, in addition to the SCLG, the Stoney Nakoda 5 Nation also sought to raise the issue of hydrogeology by 6 way of a short memo from their consultant PGL and 7 through the direct evidence of Ms. Leslie Beckmann. But on cross-examination Ms. Beckmann readily acknowledged 8 9 that she was not technically competent to opine on the issue of hydrogeology and, moreover, Stoney Nakoda 10 11 Nation have not raised any issue with or countered the 12 comprehensive response that Alberta Transportation 13 provided in its reply submission to each and every 14 concern raised by Stoney.

10:15

10:16

15 So, then, returning to Dr. Fennell. 16 Cross-examination revealed that he and, as a result, his 17 counsel for SCLG had been operating under a 18 misunderstanding as to the location of certain 19 hydrogeologic units. Mr. Secord therefore asked 20 questions in cross-examination that turned out not to 21 have proper factual foundation.

In particular, Mr. Secord's line of questioning on what was later shown to be erroneously perceived discrepancies between the observed local geology and its representation within Stantec's model was based on this



2588

1

2

i 	i	1
1	misunderstanding. It was shown that Dr. Fennell's	
2	argument that the model was changing over time with	
3	assignment of lower hydraulic conductivity values was	
4	not accurate and that the model in fact did use	
5	conservative assumptions.	
6	Dr. Fennell's report and testimony can be	
7	contrasted with the extensive work done by Stantec under	
8	the direction of Mr. Yoshisaka to obtain a clear and	
9	comprehensive understanding of the sub-surface.	
10	As noted in evidence, Stantec reviewed 2,000	10:
11	borehole records and drilled an additional 1450	
12	boreholes at the site. This massive data was then used	
13	in its modelling.	
14	One thing the SCLG argued was that there was a	
15	presence of surficial sands in the project development	
16	area. Mr. Chair, Mr. Yoshisaka dispelled this notion by	
17	noting repeatedly that in fact his model did account for	
18	sand.	
19	The SCLG's attempt to discredit the accuracy of	
20	Stantec's model vis-à-vis surficial sand was based on a	10:
21	region-wide and outdated academic paper. The paper was	
22	clearly at odds with the reality of the project site, as	
23	demonstrated by the drilling program.	
24	Further, the very text on which Dr. Fennell relied	
25	to support his theory of the presence of surficial sand	



:17

1	in fact indicates that the sand is located below the	
2	glacial till.	
3	In short, Dr. Fennell relied on a paper from the	
4	1980s and disputed the results of in-depth and detailed	
5	drilling program results undertaken by Stantec.	
6	Dr. Fennell also raised the issue of model bias,	
7	which refers to the presence of differences between	
8	modelled and observed values. Mr. Yoshisaka disputed	
9	this claim, and effectively testified that Stantec's	
10	model does not display any systemic bias. He pointed to	10:19
11	the table in his report that plotted the so-called	
12	residuals, and the absence of residuals far above or	
13	below the zero line serves to establish the absence of	
14	systemic bias. And this was further evidenced by the	
15	table and line showing what was called perfect fit in	
16	Exhibit 110, Figure 4-14, which again confirmed the	
17	observed models sorry, the observed values and the	
18	modelled values closely tracked.	
19	Mr. Yoshisaka's evidence was supported by that of	
20	Mr. Dan Back, who provided comment on issues of the	10:19
21	geotechnical performance of the soil formations at the	
22	site. Mr. Back noted, as did Mr. Yoshisaka, that two	
23	separate models were prepared: one for impacts to	
24	groundwater and one for geotechnical purposes. This is	



an important distinction as it appeared, based on

evidence given under cross-examination, that Dr. Fennell confused these two models. It was also established in cross-examination that Dr. Fennell is not a geotechnical engineer, a point that he readily admitted.

During his cross-examination, Mr. Secord sought to raise concerns regarding the presence of swelling clays, suggesting that there would be impact to these clays in periods of prolonged drought.

9 In response, Mr. Back noted that he and his team 10 undertook a number of sophisticated laboratory tests 11 under various conditions to determine how these impacted 12 clays would perform under load.

Mr. Back testified that upon reaching a solid understanding of the way in which the clays would respond under multiple conditions, his team was able to compute and understand at what point shear slip might occur. This information was then used in the design process.

In short, once the point at which a shear slip
could occur was determined, factors of safety were
applied and a design established which, in the words of
Mr. Back, "Will make sure that we never get close to
that value."

24There was also some discussion, Mr. Chair, about25seepage of water from the reservoir. And Alberta



10:20

10:21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Transportation's position remains that seepage will be in the approximate amount of 426 cubic metres per day. This is based on an assessment of the K value, or conductivity factor, assigned to the underlying layers.

5 Dr. Fennell's counter-narrative that seepage would be in the range of 100,000 metres cubed per day is not 6 7 credible. First, as Mr. Yoshisaka described, a sensitivity was applied to the model which assumed that 8 9 the permeability of some of the units making up the underlying hydraulic conductive conditions was greater 10 than -- sorry, was greater than measured value by a factor of 1,000. 12

13 The results, while indicating some further 14 propagation, show that even with this factor of safety, 15 propagation would be limited to the local assessment 16 area.

17 Second, Dr. Fennell's back-of-the-envelope math was 18 predicated on the geometric mean of the clay and tills 19 which underlie the reservoir. As was demonstrated on 20 cross-examination, it appears Dr. Fennell was confused 21 as to the location of these materials relative to the location of the reservoir and, therefore, his rough 22 23 calculations are highly suspect.

24 Lastly, the SCLG suggested that there was a risk of 25 groundwater contamination associated with floodwater



10:22

10:22

1

2

3

4

migration to the sub-surface. In response, 1 2 Mr. Yoshisaka noted that the groundwater flow model also 3 assessed the potential for migration of contaminants. 4 In assessing the areas that might be impacted, the model 5 used conservative assumptions. For example, it assumed 6 contaminants would move as fast as groundwater, when 7 this is generally not the case. Contaminants typically move slower than groundwater. Consequently, the 8 9 modelling done does tend to overestimate the rate at 10 which contaminants migrate to the sub-surface.

11 Further, even with this overestimation of 12 modelling -- sorry, even with this overestimation, the 13 modelling predicted that any contaminant would not 14 extend beyond the project area in a material way, in 15 part owing to the relatively short period of time during 16 which water and, therefore, flow to sub-surface would be 17 held in the reservoir.

18 The flow would be reversed once the water is 19 drained, generally in a matter of weeks.

21

20 And, further, Alberta Transportation has committed 10:24 to monitoring area water wells.

22 Mr. Secord cross-examined on the location of some 23 of his clients' water wells, specifically Ms. Robinson 24 and Mr. Brian Copithorne, but modelling of the 25 groundwater regime has allowed Alberta Transportation to



h		
1	gain a sound understanding of the flow regime, water	
2	levels, distribution of wells, and the presence of	
3	springs. This means that we have a good understanding	
4	of the pathways and effects and have been able to create	
5	a program to monitor those effects.	
6	As Mr. Yoshisaka concluded: (as read)	
7	"Should the monitoring suggest that	
8	there's changes afoot that we need to	
9	apply further mitigation to, then we'll	
10	be able to react in kind and put those	10:24
11	measures in place."	
12	Alberta Transportation has provided a draft groundwater	
13	monitoring plan to evaluate potential impacts during	
14	construction, dry operations, flood operations, and	
15	post-flood operations, and this is described in	
16	Exhibit 111. The draft groundwater monitoring plan	
17	includes both quantity and quality monitoring and will	
18	follow a three-tiered approach. Tier 1 monitoring wells	
19	will be located adjacent to project infrastructure, like	
20	the dam, the diversion inlet, and the diversion channel;	10:25
21	Tier 2 monitoring wells will be located within or very	
22	near the wetted perimeter of the reservoir; and Tier 3	
23	monitoring wells will be situated between the project	
24	and potential receptors, such as local landowners. And	
25	these will provide early detection of potential effects	
1		



on groundwater that may be propagating outward from the local assessment area.

3 The groundwater monitoring plan, finally, also 4 includes a groundwater response plan, which describes 5 the actions that would be taken should monitoring 6 results suggest the project-related effects on 7 groundwater or quality are actually occurring. Alberta Transportation is confident this monitoring plan and the 8 9 proposed response actions will appropriately manage groundwater quality and quantity related to the project. 10

10:26

In summary, Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation's subject matter experts responsible for hydrogeology, hydrology, surface water quality, and aquatic ecology have each considered in great detail the project's impacts and are confident that those impacts are well understood, temporary, and can be monitored.

Finally, Mr. Chair, the last section that we can be a little shorter on is air quality, human health, and terrestrial.

20 Mr. Chair, as with water, Alberta Transportation's 10:26 21 assessments of air quality, human health, vegetation, 22 and impacts to wildlife and biodiversity were conducted 23 using accepted environmental assessment processes to 24 address both project-related and cumulative 25 environmental effects, and they followed a standardized



2595

1

framework for each valued component.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Alberta Transportation is confident that the work undertaken has resulted in a complete and detailed assessment of these issues. Moreover, Alberta Transportation has made commitments in various areas to ensure that potential concerns or impacts are monitored for and mitigated.

Beginning with air and human health, Mr. Chairman, 8 9 concerns have been expressed, we know, by interveners regarding the potential for fugitive dust emissions from 10 10:27 sediment deposited in the reservoir following flood 11 12 operations. Alberta Transportation understands these 13 concerns, but believes it is important to place them in 14 proper context.

15 The fact is, following the completion of 16 construction, SR1 will only operate infrequently. And 17 further, the duration of fugitive dust emissions after 18 flood operations will be short.

19 And, finally, as testified by Mr. Hebert in his 20 opening statement on this topic, Alberta Transportation 10:28 21 will act quickly and proactively to implement proven 22 mitigation measures for dust control.

23 So, in short, what we're dealing with, Mr. Chair, 24 are low frequency events, short duration events, and 25 events that will be mitigated.



Suggestions that the project will create dust 1 storms and blast zones are frankly hyperbole and are not 2 3 supported by the evidence. 4 You will recall that Alberta Transportation's 5 expert on air quality, Mr. Reid Person, provided an 6 opening statement and PowerPoint presentation which set 7 out the fundamental principles underlying the assessment of air quality. 8 9 In that presentation, Mr. Person also called into 10 question some of the assumptions and the approach taken 10:29 11 by Dr. Brian Zelt on behalf of the SCLG. 12 As discussed in Alberta Transportation's reply 13 submission, we acknowledge that our modelling shows the 14 potential for exceedances at receptors outside the PDA. 15 However, the mere existence of potential predicted 16 exceedances is not the end of the story. 17 As was discussed during Mr. Person's evidence, consideration must be had for model uncertainty, model 18 conservatism and for the predicted area frequency, 19 20 location, and adapted mitigations in order to place 10:29 21 these potential exceedances in their proper context. 22 Alberta Transportation has done that, Mr. Chair. 23 The SCLG and its expert Dr. Zelt, on the other hand, 24 have not. 25 While experts may disagree on the finer points of a



model, they must also take care to be reasonable in
their conclusions and in the presentation of those
conclusions. Dr. Zelt, we submit, was neither.
Instead, he chose, in essence, to add layer upon layer
of the most conservative assumptions such that his
predictions are simply not representative of anticipated
events, and only serve to needlessly alarm.

For example, Dr. Zelt presents an alarmist view of 8 9 the potential for a dust storm-like event predicated on the basis of there being absolutely no mitigations 10 11 applied at SR1. But, Mr. Chairman, there will be no 12 unmitigated events and, to the contrary, all events will 13 be mitigated. The sediment management plan is that 14 mitigation will begin immediately after reservoir 15 Alberta Transportation, on behalf of the drainage. 16 operator, AEP, has committed to this.

17 Other differences in the approach taken by Alberta 18 Transportation and Dr. Zelt are seen in the comparison 19 chart at Slide 10 of Mr. Person's PowerPoint. It sets 20 out in stark terms the implications of Dr. Zelt using 21 non-guideline assumptions in his model, with the result 22 of overpredictions at times in the range of 600 percent 23 that we submit are inappropriate and completely devoid 24 of reality.

25

Dr. Zelt ignored hydrological model estimates of



10:30
sediment area and composition provided by Alberta Transportation in its materials. Instead, despite readily admitting that he has no expertise in the area of sediment, he adopted his own unconventional sediment assumptions on the basis of a paper that he found online.

Dr. Zelt was also cavalier in his evidence on the use and effectiveness of tackifiers, a strong and proven dust mitigation tool.

When asked by Panel member Ceroici, Alberta Transportation lead vegetation ecologist Mr. De Carlo testified that tackifier efficacy was in the range of 3 to 18 months post application subject to environmental factors and that reapplication was an option.

15 Dr. Zelt, by contrast, who has no expertise in the 16 area disagreed with Mr. De Carlo on the strength of a 17 phone call that he said he had with a local supplier. 18 Neither the particulars of the call nor any analysis or 19 actual consideration of the issue was included in 20 Dr. Zelt's report. Moreover, Dr. Zelt acknowledged 21 under cross-examination that he was not familiar with 22 the discussion in the EIA pertaining to tackifier 23 application on the basis of a weight-per-hectare formula 24 depending upon the environmental conditions present. 25 Perhaps had Dr. Zelt actually read that material,



10:32

10:32

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

he would not have had to resort to making a phone call 1 2 to a supplier to learn about tackifiers. In short, Mr. Chair, the evidence of Alberta 3 4 Transportation must be favoured over that of Dr. Zelt. 5 We also note that no party other than Alberta 6 Transportation led evidence regarding implications to 7 human health associated with fugitive dust. And you will recall, Mr. Chair, that Ms. Noble of Stantec spoke 8 9 to this issue. Ms. Noble holds a master's of engineering degree 10 with specific training in toxicology and has lengthy 11 12 experience in conducting human health risk assessments. 13 Her conclusions, which were based, in part, on the modelling done by Mr. Person, were that in certain 14 15 circumstances, the potential for exceedance of air 16 quality standards existed. 17 However, Ms. Noble also explained that an 18 exceedance of an air quality standard or objective, in 19 and of itself, does not necessarily give rise to a human 20 health concern. 10:34 21 Again, any model exceedance would be a rare event 22 occurring infrequently and would be short in duration. 23 And, as we know, the operation of the project is itself 24 an infrequent occurrence, and so, too, are the 25 meteorological events and conditions that could give

2600



rise to air quality exceedances. 1 Further, with the application of proven and 2 3 effective dust control methods, air quality exceedances 4 in the modelling can be proactively and effectively 5 mitigated. 6 Mr. Chairman, you will recall that in her questions 7 to Alberta Transportation's Topic 5 panel, Mr. Vance noted -- or, sorry, Ms. Vance asked whether individuals 8 9 in the vicinity of the project would know they were 10 being exposed to PM 2.5. 11 In response, Mr. Person testified that the air 12 quality assessment done for the project was a fugitive 13 dust as a whole. Consequently, one would expect that 14 any PM 2.5 would be entrained with other larger 15 particles. These larger particles would be noticeable 16 and, therefore, act as an indication of the possible 17 presence of PM 2.5. And, further, proposed monitoring 18 will be located between the project and any nearby 19 residence such that dust levels of concern would be 20 detected prior to reaching the nearest residences. 21 So, Mr. Chair, what we are left with here is a set 22 of considerations, duration, frequency, and adaptive 23 mitigations that, when added to a robust mitigation and 24 monitoring plan, led Ms. Noble and, we submit, should 25 lead this Board, to a position of confidence the



10:35

potential effects to human health from dust emissions 1 2 will not be significant. 3 Moving to terrain and soils, Dr. Whitson of Stantec 4 testified at the hearing with respect to the 5 implications of the project and, specifically, 6 sedimentation on soil. 7 Dr. Whitson's uncontroverted evidence was that while the project will have impacts to existing soil 8 9 conditions, these impacts will not result in the sterilization of the soils' productive capabilities. 10 11 Dr. Whitson also commented in his testimony on the 12 change in textural distribution that was identified in 13 the revised sediment modelling. And you will recall 14 that the revised sediment modelling indicated a greater presence of silt and clay particles and less sand than 15 16 had been originally modelled. 17 Silt and clay particles, from a soil's perspective, 18 have high water storage capacity -- higher water storage capacity than sand, which Dr. Whitson characterized as a 19 20 good news story. 21 With respect to vegetation, Alberta 22 Transportation's lead vegetation ecologist Mr. De Carlo 23 gave evidence regarding the expected revegetation of the 24 site post flood, and the efforts that can be undertaken 25 to ensure, assist or facilitate revegetation. And he



10:36

also addressed the issue of weeds, a concern that was raised by the SCLG.

1

2

3 As is set out in Alberta Transportation's reply 4 submission and, as was discussed by Mr. Hebert in his 5 opening remarks, Alberta Transportation has made a 6 number of commitments regarding weed management and 7 associated activities, including a commitment to development of a comprehensive weed management plan. 8 9 This will include the use of preemptive measures and the plan will include input from experienced ecologists. 10

11 Now, SCLG retained a weed expert, Dr. Osko, and, in 12 our submission, it is clear from Dr. Osko's direct 13 evidence that he was somewhat confused as to the nature 14 of the project's operations. For example, when he was 15 asked by Ms. Vance about his recommendation to implement 16 a filtration system on the low-level outlet to filter 17 out weed seeds and whether he was aware of a system that 18 would both remove weed seeds and allow fish to pass, he 19 acknowledged he could not think of any such system.

20 Now, Mr. Chair, as you know, SR1 is a dry dam, 21 meaning that it does not have operations outside of 22 flood events. So Dr. Osko's suggestion that during dry 23 operation you could have such a filter doesn't make any 24 sense, with all due respect. In fact, it's not feasible 25 at all. There are various technical and design matters



10:37

1	that impact the ability to place a filtration system at	
2	this location, and in the context of a drawdown post	
3	flood, as Ms. Vance clearly understood, it is important	
4	that entrained fish be able to exit the reservoir	
5	unobstructed, and a weed seed filtration system would	
6	make that impossible.	
7	Finally, Mr. Chair, I know I've got, I think, five	
8	minutes left before 9:45. I suspect I'll be about ten	
9	minutes, if that is acceptable, and then we can break?	
10	THE CHAIR: Yes, please proceed, Mr. Fitch.	10:
11	MR. FITCH: Thank you.	
12	So quickly regarding wildlife and biodiversity,	
13	Alberta Transportation's expert, Mr. Eliot Terry,	
14	addressed questions on the issue of habitat loss in the	
15	project area.	
16	As he stated in his evidence, operation of the	
17	project is not expected to have significant impacts in	
18	terms of habitat loss, and this conclusion is unchanged	
19	even with the new sediment calculations and modelling.	
20	Now, the Stoney Nakoda Nations raised the issue of	10:
21	an overpass for elk, and Mr. Kruhlak addressed it	
22	briefly, and Alberta Transportation provided a response	
23	by way of an undertaking, but we wish to emphasize the	
24	following: Alberta Transportation reviewed this issue	
25	with Stoney Nakoda Nations a number of times in	



10:39

meetings at which Mr. Eliot attended and made presentations. And as stated by Mr. Eliot in those presentations, such a structure is just not necessary in light of the fact that the project will allow animals to transit through the project area and cross Highway 22.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 And to address this concern, the project design was modified to better facilitate wildlife movement, 8 9 including designing the span dimensions to have a 10-metre height and 24-metre width -- and this is on 10 11 the bridge over Highway 22 -- to allow easy movement 12 under by animals including elk. And also the design 13 was modified by including vegetation on the bottom of 14 the diversion channel by covering the riprap with soil 15 to make it easier for animals to traverse.

Now, Mr. Wallis, on behalf of the SCLG, gave
evidence on biodiversity issues, and, in our
submission, provided what was, I think, a fairly unique
perspective in the context of the hearing with respect
to his concern for impacts on grasslands and wetlands.

He highlighted the concerns associated with developments in environmentally sensitive areas, which he acknowledged encompasses most of the land west of Calgary and south of Highway 1. He also acknowledged that residential development, commercial development,



10:40

as well as projects, such as SR1, all impact the 1 2 landscape. 3 Further, Mr. Wallis testified about the 4 consequence of undertaking flood mitigation projects. 5 He testified about the ecological benefits of flooding 6 to the ecosystem, in particular to riparian areas which 7 rely on periodic high water in order to flourish. In effect, Mr. Wallis argued against flood 8 9 mitigation because of its environmental impacts. And while Alberta Transportation understand these concerns, 10 10:42 11 we submit the need for flood mitigation is too 12 important and some environmental impacts must be 13 accepted in order to achieve this critical objective. 14 We also reiterate that the selection of an 15 off-stream structure like SR1 will result in fewer of the environmental impacts on the Elbow River which 16 17 Mr. Wallis is concerned about than an in-stream dam 18 would. 19 In conclusion, Mr. Chair, and Board members, 20 Alberta Transportation submits that it has demonstrated 10:43 21 through its environmental impact assessment, it's 22 comprehensive responses to supplemental information 23 requests, and all the evidence prepared for and given 24 at the public hearing, that approval of the Springbank



Off-Stream Reservoir Project is in the public interest

25

having regard to its social, economic, and
 environmental effects.

3

4

5

6

Therefore, we respectfully request that the Board recommend that the Lieutenant Governor in Council issue an approval of the project, subject, of course, to appropriate conditions.

With respect to what those conditions might be,
Alberta Transportation notes that it has made numerous
commitments through the course of the Board's review of
the project, and we acknowledge that it may be
appropriate for the Board to make the fulfillment of
some of those commitments conditions of project
approval.

14 We'd just like now to highlight a few of what we 15 consider to be our key commitments. And those include 16 the development of a land use plan for the project, as 17 well as seven environmental monitoring plans, plus a 18 commitment to the development of an additional seven 19 plans prior to construction. These plans will be 20 developed, considering input from federal and 21 provincial regulators, as well as Indigenous groups and 22 other stakeholders.

Alberta Transportation is committed to regular and transparent communications with directly impacted and adjacent landowners and residents of the Springbank



10:43

This includes numerous commitments that 1 community. 2 have been made to work with adjacent landowners on 3 topics of concerns such as land use, air quality, 4 impacts on water wells, shelterbelts, traffic, 5 historical resources, and project operations, among 6 others. 7 To facilitate communication, Alberta Transportation will appoint a community liaison, which 8 9 would be a representative from Alberta Transportation during construction and a representative of AEP during 10 11 operations, and this person will serve as a point of 12 contact with stakeholders, who can primarily 13 communicate through the community liaison and through local representation for Indigenous groups, community 14 15 associations, local businesses, and local government 16 officials. 17 Finally, Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation has 18 committed to continue working with Stoney Nakoda 19 Nations to ensure that it can continue to participate, 20 not only in the monitoring and identification of areas 21 of cultural significance, but also as a participant in

10:45

10:45



Indigenous participation plan.

the construction of the project as part of the broader

22

23

24



the Board, Board staff, the court reporters, the 1 2 technical support staff for their extraordinary efforts 3 in presenting a remarkably smooth and efficient virtual 4 hearing. 5 More importantly, the hearing was well run, fair, 6 and conducted in an appropriately civil tone. And for 7 that we would like also to thank the other participants, including in particular our friends 8 9 Mr. Secord and Ms. Okoye, Mr. Rae and Ms. Louden, Mr. Cusano and Mr. Bruni, Mr. Mercer and Ms. Senek and 10 10:46 11 Ms. Munkittrick, and last, but not least, Mr. Kennedy 12 and Ms. Vance. 13 Mr. Chair, that concludes the closing remarks of 14 Alberta Transportation. Thank you very much. 15 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Fitch, and also 16 Mr. Kruhlak. I appreciate those comments. I know the 17 staff will as well. So thank you very much for those. 18 Let's return back -- it is time for our break. and 19 let's return back at 11:05. And that will be with 20 Mr. Cusano. 10:47 21 MR. CUSANO: Thank you, sir. 22 THE CHAIR: Thank you, and see you soon. 23 (ADJOURNMENT) 24 THE CHAIR: Mr. Cusano, it will be you 25 delivering the argument?



1 MR. CUSANO: Yes, sir. 2 THE CHAIR: Okay. 3 MR. CUSANO: Yeah. 4 THE CHAIR: Okav. Well, I think we can start 5 Calgary River Communities Action Group then. represented by Mr. Cusano. We've got probably to just 6 7 about quarter to 12, so please proceed. MR. CUSANO: We should be well within that time 8 9 frame, sir. Thank you very much. Good morning, Mr. Chair and Board members. 10 11:05 11 As you know, we are counsel to the Calgary River 12 Communities Action Group, or the Action Group, and 13 Flood Free Calgary, or FFC. 14 Our clients wish to thank the Board for the 15 opportunity to participate in this critical hearing as 16 it relates to flood mitigation for the City of Calgary, 17 and to share the views and experiences of its members. 18 We hope that these views and experiences will be of assistance to the Board in its public interest enquiry. 19 20 As noted earlier this morning, we will provide the 11:05 21 court reporter with a copy of this argument, which will 22 contain the evidentiary references and headings for 23 transcript purposes. 24 Mr. Chair, the Action Group and FFC are



participating in this hearing on behalf of thousands of

1	individuals and businesses in Calgary that support SR1.	
2	Our clients have participated in this proceeding	
3	to be the voice of the affected and those who stand to	
4	be protected by SR1. As Ms. Leeds Binder stated in her	
5	opening statement: (as read)	
6	"We're here to tell you what it is like	
7	to endure what was then Canada's worst	
8	natural disaster so that you can	
9	appreciate the future devastation that	
10	can be avoided by SR1."	11:06
11	The Action Group and FFC support the application of	
12	Alberta Transportation and urge the Board to find that	
13	SR1 is in the public interest and to issue the	
14	appropriate approvals.	
15	Our argument today, sir, will be directed, in the	
16	main, to Topic 1 issues and will address the need for	
17	and viability of SR1; and the social, economic and	
18	environmental benefits of the project.	
19	Sir, as we reviewed the evidence and considered the	
20	Board's public interest mandate, we found the Board's	11:07
21	2018 decision approving the construction and operation	
22	of a debris flood retention structure on Cougar Creek in	
23	Canmore, Alberta, to be instructive. The Board's	
24	principal conclusions from that decision, to which we	
25	will refer this morning, remain unaffected by the Board	



1	's decision addendum issued in 2019 in relation to a	
2	proposed updated design.	
3	We want to briefly outline why the Board's analysis	
4	in Cougar Creek is helpful before we move into a more	
5	in-depth analysis of the relevant issues related to the	
6	Board's public interest inquiry here.	
7	THE CHAIR: Mr. Cusano	
8	MR. CUSANO: Yes, sir.	
9	THE CHAIR: I am so sorry to interrupt. I	
10	notice the court reporter I think is perhaps	11:07
11	experiencing the odd glitch in voice. Is that right,	
12	Ms. Vespa? Because I am. Sometimes it might be	
13	Edmonton. And it's only a word or two.	
14	So, therefore, if you're going to be submitting	
15	your remarks, and then we could have a peek of that,	
16	perhaps have a quick review of the transcripts, we	
17	could proceed.	
18	It's not a lot, but I did notice a couple of times	
19	Ms. Vespa is kind of reaching in as well just to get	
20	the broken up word.	11:08
21	Ms. Vespa, would that work, then? It doesn't seem	
22	to be very extended, so	
23	COURT REPORTER: Yes. I think I will be able to	
24	figure it out if I receive the document.	
25	THE CHAIR: 0kay, thank you.	



h		1
1	And, Mr. Cusano, you know, it's not that it's a	
2	lot so don't worry about it, you're coming through very	
3	clearly. Just the odd time there's a little bit of a	
4	garble and we lose maybe one or two words. So I just	
5	wanted to check that with the court reporter, so	
6	Thanks a lot. Please proceed. And if it's	
7	anything more extended, I'll let you know.	
8	MR. CUSANO: Please do, sir. Thank you very	
9	much.	
10	I don't seem to have any issues on my end here,	11:09
11	but, as mentioned, feel free to interrupt if it's	
12	getting worse, sir.	
13	THE CHAIR: Okay.	
14	MR. CUSANO: So, then, sir, returning to my	
15	initial discussion of the decision in Cougar Creek, in	
16	Cougar Creek, the Board first considered whether the	
17	project was justifiable in terms of need and viability.	
18	The Board was convinced there that the project was	
19	justified because the proposed high debris retention	
20	structure, spillway and diversion tunnel was needed,	11:09
21	and would work as intended, to mitigate future debris	
22	floods of similar or greater magnitude to the 2013	
23	flood. The Board referred to the risk to human life,	
24	financial losses from damage to buildings and contents,	
25	and economic losses from the disruption of major	



transportation routes as important considerations in assessing need.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

24

25

The circumstances under consideration in Cougar Creek are similar to those before the Board here in relation to SR1. In particular, there is without doubt a similar need in this case, specifically the need for flood mitigation on the Elbow River to avoid devastating social, economic, and environmental impact. These impacts are outlined in our clients' evidence, as well as the evidence of Alberta Transportation and the City of Calgary.

11:10

11:11

12 SR1, the evidence shows, will be successful in 13 providing such critical flood mitigation as it is 14 designed for a design flood equivalent to the 2013 15 flood. In our respectful submission, the evidence on 16 this record overwhelmingly supports a conclusion that 17 SR1 is needed, viable, and justified.

After establishing that the Cougar Creek project was justifiable, the Board also considered the project's social, economic, and environmental effects. The Board noted that there is no fixed objective test determining whether a project is in the public interest.

And you heard that this morning from Mr. Kruhlak as well. Rather, the Board must balance the economic,



h

1	environmental, and social interests of the project.	
2	The Board found that the balance favoured approval	
3	of the Cougar Creek project because of its public	
4	benefit, namely the increase in public safety and	
5	protection of private property and public	
6	infrastructure, which the Board noted is of paramount	
7	importance to Albertans.	
8	At paragraph 339 of the decision, the Board stated	
9	it this way: (as read)	
10	"The Board finds that the town's primary	11:11
11	objective for developing the project is	
12	to mitigate the effects of future flood	
13	events. The project design is focused	
14	on reducing the risk of loss of life and	
15	protecting residences, businesses, and	
16	infrastructure when flood events occur.	
17	The Board finds that the mitigation of	
18	potential economic losses is a key	
19	consideration that favours approval of	
20	the project."	11:12
21	Clearly, sir, in our submission, those circumstances and	
22	considerations under review in Cougar Creek are	
23	analogous to the application before the Board here. SR1	
24	will also have a significant public benefit to	
25	Albertans, protecting the City of Calgary and other	



downstream communities from flooding and avoiding significant social, economic, and environmental impacts, impacts which were front and centre for the Board in Cougar Creek.

And it is important to note that compensation for or mitigation of any local area impacts has occurred or will occur, and any such impacts are limited and temporary in nature such that the balance, in our respectful view, clearly favours SR1 being in the public interest.

The Action Group and FFC therefore ask this Board to approve this project, and that any conditions imposed not delay construction or operation, as any delay risks downstream communities being exposed to another flood.

We will now elaborate on the basis on which it should, in our respectful view, be found that SR1 is justifiable, the benefits of the project, and respond to some of the positions taken by the SCLG.

First, let's speak about the justification for SR1 and why in our view it is justifiable.

In the Cougar Creek decision the Board determined that a project is justifiable if it is needed and meets its intended outcomes or, in other words, is viable.

SR1 addresses the critical need for flood mitigation on the Elbow River. The 2013 flood is clear



11:13

11:13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

24

evidence of this need. 1 2 Another flood on the Elbow River is inevitable. 3 Calgary is built on a floodplain at the confluence of 4 the Bow and Elbow Rivers and has historically 5 experienced flooding on several occasions, the 2013 6 flood being only its fourth largest. Climate change has 7 the potential to make matters worse, increasing the flood risk. 8 9 This is evidence that Calgary will flood again. The only question is when, how badly, and whether the 10 11 city will be prepared. 12 Like many other major cities located near a water 13 source, city planners in the early 1900s did not take flood risk into account and Calgary was allowed to grow 14 15 The result is that many of around both of its rivers. 16 the river communities that flooded in 2013 were some of 17 the earliest to be established. The Action Group and 18 FFC represent many residents and businesses in these communities, and our clients' evidence provides personal 19 20 accounts of the devastating impacts of flooding to 21 lives, livelihoods, property and businesses in the city. In addition to affecting residential and commercial 22 23 property, the 2013 flood had a significant impact on 24 public safety and public infrastructure. We will speak 25 to these impacts in more detail shortly. But what is



11:14

important, and this conclusion is in our respectful view 1 self evident, is that these impacts which would be 2 3 avoided for a future flood if SR1 were in operation 4 establish clearly that SR1 is critically needed. 5 It is important to note that the SCLG who opposes 6 SR1 agrees that flood mitigation is needed on the 7 Elbow River. For example, Ms. Hunter and Ms. Feist both stated in their opening remarks for Topic 1 that no one 8 wants to see the City of Calgary flood. And Ms. Massey 9 stated that: (as read) 10 11 "...we are all in total agreement, 12 We all want flood control, we folks. 13 want flood mitigation..." 14 And in fairness, Mr. Chairman, there are, of course, 15 matters on which the SCLG joins issue with Alberta 16 Transportation, and those matters are, of course, for 17 the SCLG and Alberta Transportation to address. 18 SR1 is not only needed but it is viable. SR1 is 19 designed to afford the City of Calgary protection from 20 future flooding events and, in particular, a design 21 flood, which is a flood equivalent to the 2013 flood, 22 approximately equal to a 1 in 200-year flood. 23 SR1 therefore has the capacity to satisfy the need 24 for upstream flood mitigation for the City of Calgary 25 and avoid the devastating impacts of another 2013-sized



11:16

1	flood. Specifically, SR1 will remove 600 metres cubed	
2	per second of peak flow from the Elbow River, which,	
3	with the contribution of storage available at the	
4	Glenmore Reservoir, will protect communities downstream	
5	of the reservoir on the Elbow River from a 1 in 200-year	
6	flood, plus a safety factor of 25 percent.	
7	SR1 also provides flood mitigation benefits to	
8	other downstream communities. Particularly, SR1 will	
9	significantly reduce the flood risk for communities	
10	between SR1 and the Glenmore Reservoir by reducing the	11:17
11	peak flow of a 2013-sized event in half, from	
12	1,240 metres cubed per second to 640 metres cubed per	
13	second, and a 1 in 100-year flood event to a flow rate	
14	as low as 165 metres cubed per second.	
15	And, secondly, lower inflows from the Elbow River	
16	into the Bow River during flood events, which will	
17	provide flood mitigation benefits for communities on the	
18	Bow River downstream of the confluence of the two	
19	rivers.	
20	In our respectful submission, sir, there can be no	11:18
21	other conclusion than this project is needed and viable	
22	and, therefore, justifiable based on the evidence before	
23	the Board in this proceeding.	

Sir, the principal purpose of our clients' evidence is to speak to the social, economic, and environmental



impacts of the 2013 flood on the City of Calgary and
other downstream communities. Alberta Transportation's
and the City's evidence speak to such impacts. The
evidence shows that these are the impacts that would be
avoided if SR1 were operational. And the avoidance of
these impacts is clearly a public benefit and,
therefore, in the public interest.

8 In the Cougar Creek decision, the public benefits 9 of mitigating flood events on Cougar Creek and the 10 social and economic benefits of public safety and damage 11:19 11 avoidance to the local area weighed heavily in favour of 12 the project's approval.

In our submission, the same can be said of SR1. In
fact, SR1 would have a greater public benefit as the
damage avoidance to the City of Calgary and downstream
communities is significantly larger in magnitude.

17 Avoiding the impacts of a design flood has 18 significant, economic, social, and environmental 19 benefits. This is without doubt and is evidenced from 20 the staggering quantifiable impacts of the 2013 flood 21 that are outlined in Section C of our clients' evidence 22 found in Exhibit 237. It is important to note that this 23 evidence is uncontroverted and stands on this record 24 without challenge.

25

We would like to share a few examples of these





impacts. For example, 14,500 homes were damaged in 1 2 Calgary, and 136 homes required reconstruction on the 3 Siksika Nation downstream of where SR1 would be located. 4 4,000 businesses and 3,000 buildings were flooded. 5 16 LRT stations were closed. 50 bus routes were cancelled or detoured, and it took about 13 days to get 6 7 service to be fully restored. 39,837 ENMAX customers were impacted and 34,000 locations were without power. 8 9 Evacuations occurred in 26 communities, affecting 110,000 people, and a state of emergency was declared 10 11:20 11 for 14 days. 12 These are just some of the quantifiable impacts of 13 the 2013 flood. By reducing flows on the Elbow River, SR1 will 14 15 prevent or mitigate these negative impacts in a future flood and will protect much of the historical, cultural, 16 17 and recreational heart of the City of Calgary. It will 18 also protect those areas of the downtown core that were 19 impacted by Elbow River flooding in 2013, and benefit

11:21

The 2013 flood also had a significant impact on the environment. For example, we know that three years' worth of garbage entered the City's landfills in the weeks after the 2013 flood; the province established the

communities downstream of the confluence of the Elbow

20

21

22

23

24

25

and Bow Rivers.



ĪĒ

1	\$10 million FISHES program to mitigate the negative	
2	impacts of the flood on fish and fish habitat; and the	
3	City spent \$100 million repairing erosion damage from	
4	the flood.	
5	SR1 would have the added public benefit of avoiding	
6	such environmental impacts.	
7	In our submission, sir, in light of the weight of	
8	this evidence, it is difficult to argue, let alone	
9	establish, that SR1 would not create a significant	
10	public benefit.	11:
11	I will now speak to the social and economic	
12	benefits of SR1 generally, and then turn to the	
13	Action Group and Flood Free Calgary's evidence on the	
14	specific social and economic benefits of SR1 to the	
15	people and businesses it represents.	
16	SR1 would have considerable social benefits. First	
17	and foremost, SR1 will improve public safety, a concern	
18	of paramount importance to Albertans, and, we suggest,	
19	to the Board.	
20	SR1 is expected to reduce the number of injuries	11:
21	and fatalities that would be directly attributable to a	
22	flood in Calgary. This is critical given that five	
23	people lost their lives in the 2013 Alberta floods. The	
24	Calgary Fire Department performed over 400 water rescues	
25	in the first 24 hours of the flood, which likely	



prevented further death or injuries. 1 2 SR1 would also have a positive effect on the City's 3 ability to respond to emergencies. 4 In the lead-up to the 2013 flood, the City had only 5 15 hours to enact its emergency response plan and 6 conduct evacuations. 7 SR1 will increase the City's response time, and enhance the City's emergency response capacity which 8 9 will help ensure the safety of those downstream. Alberta Transportation has identified that the 10 11 period during and after flooding causes a multitude of 12 public health and safety issues, including waterborne 13 communicable diseases, exposure to chemical 14 contaminants, as well as anxiety, depression and 15 posttraumatic stress disorder. Such impacts would be 16 avoided or significantly reduced if SR1 is operational 17 during the next flood. 18 In addition to the significant social benefits of 19 SR1, SR1 has a clear economic benefit. This is evident 20 when considering the financial damage numbers from the 21 2013 flood, the estimates for which range between 4.875 and \$6 billion. In addition, it is estimated that 22 23 5.1 million working hours were lost in southern Alberta 24 during the 2013 flood.

25

The 2017 IBI study estimates that another flood of



11:23

the same magnitude would cause \$4.7 billion in damages.
\$4.7 billion.
The operation of SR1 would significantly avoid
future flood damages, which is undoubtedly in the public
interest. Alberta Transportation estimates a design
flood on the Elbow River would cause 935 -approximately, \$935 million in direct costs for

8 commercial and residential properties and 318 million 9 for infrastructure, pulling something in the range of 10 \$1.254 billion. In addition, the City of Calgary and 11 IBI group both estimate that SR1 would reduce the 12 average annual flood damage by approximately 13 \$27 million.

11:25

11:26

14 In the Cougar Creek decision, this Board recognized 15 that the 700,000 average annualized damage avoidance to 16 buildings was an important factor for determining the 17 project was in the public interest. The Board also 18 noted there that avoiding damages to public 19 infrastructure, including transportation corridors, 20 further benefits the public at large and all Albertans 21 and Canadians. On this basis, the Board concluded that 22 the economic benefits of the project were significant 23 and a material consideration weighing in favour of the 24 project being in the public interest.

Those considerations, we say, are equally



25

applicable here. The average annualized damage cost for 1 2 SR1 at \$27 million is significantly higher than the 3 \$700,000 for Cougar Creek. 4 And the loss of transportation corridors was also 5 experienced during the 2013 flood in Calgary. We have already spoken to the impact of the 2013 flood on LRT 6 7 and bus routes. In addition, 1,000 kilometres of roads were washed away as were rail lines, pedestrian bridges 8 9 and culverts in Calgary. A rail bridge on the Bow River downstream of the Elbow River confluence also failed 10 11 causing a train carrying highly explosive liquids to derail. 12 13 The \$27 million annual avoidance of damages, 14 including potential damages to transportation corridors, 15 indicate that the economic benefits of SR1 are

11:27

significant and demonstrate that SR1 is indeed in the 16 17 public interest.

18 These numbers also indicate that SR1 is a sound 19 investment. Multiple studies conclude the benefits of 20 SR1 far outweigh its costs, with the City of Calgary 21 finding that the benefit to cost ratio is 5 to 1.

22 With SR1 currently budgeted to cost \$432 million, 23 Alberta Transportation predicts that SR1 would more than pay for itself after a single design flood. 24 In fact. a 25 single design flood would pay for SR1 three times over



	1	based on Alberta Transportation's \$1.254 billion	
	2	property and infrastructure damages estimate for the	
	3	next design flood.	
	4	In our respectful view, sir, SR1 is clearly an	
	5	economic benefit.	
	6	Sir, most important to our clients' membership and	
	7	supporters are the significant and social economic	
	8	benefits to the lives, livelihoods and properties of	
	9	those that were impacted by the 2013 flood, and those	
	10	that stand to be protected by SR1.	11:
	11	Our clients' evidence gives a voice to the people	
	12	behind the statistics of the flood. As Ms. Leeds Binder	
	13	stated in her opening statement, quote: (as read)	
	14	"Our members are the homeowners,	
	15	residents and businesses whose	
	16	financial, mental and physical health	
	17	suffered, and in many cases, continues	
	18	to suffer as a result of the 2013 flood.	
	19	These are the people whose lives,	
	20	livelihoods and properties stand in the	11:
	21	cross-hairs of the next inevitable flood	
	22	event."	
	23	End quote. It is devastating still to hear those words,	
	24	let alone speak them. The experience of the Action	
	25	Group's and FFC's members and other community members	
н	1		4



1	are outlined in the letters and emails received in	
2	support of SR1. These accounts describe what it is like	
3	to suffer through what was then Canada's worst natural	
4	disaster, all of which were shared so the Board can	
5	appreciate the future devastation that could be avoided	
6	by SR1.	
7	Our clients received 193 letters or emails from	
8	individual residents of flood-affected communities in	
9	Calgary. One theme is the devastation and loss in the	
10	immediate aftermath of the flood, including the loss of	11:
11	homes and valued possessions, including family	
12	heirlooms, precious mementos and other irreplaceable	
13	items collected over generations.	
14	The pungent odours and sounds associated with the	
15	flood and its aftermath continue to be constant	
16	companions for many, their memories jolted into regular	
17	reminders of the devastation loss and heartache	
18	suffered.	
19	The video played during our clients' opening	
20	statement demonstrated the harrowing experience of one	11:
21	family that lost their home as a result of the flood.	
22	Unfortunately, this was not a unique experience.	
23	Several homeowners along the Elbow River in Calgary	
24	similarly lost their homes as they were damaged beyond	
25	repair and demolished, including 10 percent of the homes	



11:30

in the community of Roxboro alone. Similar harrowing experiences from the flood are illustrated in many of the photos included in the submissions received.

4 The letters and emails speak to the immeasurable 5 and continuing impact of flooding on physical and mental 6 health and the stress, anxiety and the sense of 7 insecurity that remains following the flood. Many accounts speak to the fear of another flood and the 8 9 anxiety felt during flood season. The added security that SR1 would provide to landowners, residents and 10 11 businesses affected by the 2013 flood, or to those who 12 now reside or work in the flood-impacted area cannot be 13 This is an important social benefit of understated. 14 flood mitigation and the Board recognized in 15 Cougar Creek decision. How could it be argued otherwise 16 in the face of the evidence on this record? Indeed, in 17 our respectful view, it cannot.

18 Perhaps most devastating is that almost every 19 letter or email that has been included in our clients' 20 evidence, speaks to the mental health impact of the 21 flood and the lingering effects for so many. For this 22 reason, many found it too hard to write a letter and 23 this is why an online survey was created where 393 24 responses in support of SR1 were received.

25

1

2

3

Finally, the accounts our clients received from



11:31



individual residents speak to the significant costs they 1 2 have incurred on personal flood mitigation. For 3 example, installing sump pumps, generators, break 4 resilient glass, relocating mechanical, electrical 5 equipment, and raising water tanks, furnaces and other 6 utilities. This was done with the expectation that the 7 city and the province would do their part to protect their citizens. 8

9 For the most part, individual efforts can only 10 reduce property loss. The reality is that only upstream 11:33 11 mitigation can actually keep the flood water out of 12 Calgary, and only the province can build such mitigation 13 infrastructure.

In our clients' evidence you will also find letters
from 10 inner city community associations which,
together, represent well over 43,000 residents. These
letters describe the physical and mental impacts of the
flood on their communities and the ongoing stress felt
each spring by residents looking anxiously at weather
forecasts and river levels.

11:33

While the impact on residential communities was profound, SR1 is about more than protecting these communities. SR1 is critical infrastructure to protect the economy of Alberta, and most certainly Calgary. As Mr. Battistella noted in his opening statement,

21

22

23

24



the City centre area of Calgary that was impacted by the 2013 flood is not only the economic engine for Calgary, but also for the province.

4 Not to be forgotten are the impacts the 2013 flood 5 had on the businesses in Calgary. 4,000 businesses were 6 flooded, and 7,000 were impacted in total, a third of 7 which never re-opened after the flood. In addition to losses due to direct flooding for some businesses, many 8 9 more were impacted by loss of business due to 10 evacuations, power outages, street closures and the 11 temporary suspension of the LRT. One example is First 12 on Colour, the locally owned and operated copier store 13 that Mr. Battistella referenced in his opening statement that was forced to close for 17 days. 14

Fifteen businesses and business-related organizations, such as the Calgary Chamber of Commerce, Calgary Economic Development, Calgary Downtown Association, and local business improvement areas, and revitalization zones representing over 6,000 businesses, wrote letters in support of SR1 expressing their concerns about a repeat of the 2013 flood.

As Mr. Battistella outlined in his opening statement, SR1 is a benefit to businesses for several reasons, including the protection of current and future assets, protection of business revenues, which, in turn,



11:34

11:35

1

2

3

22

23

24

protects owners and employees, reduction of business operating costs such as insurance rates, and the reduction of the risk profile for locating and operating business in and attracting business to the downtown of Calgary.

The social and economic benefits of SR1 that are outlined in the evidence of the Action Group and Flood Free Calgary and the evidence of Alberta Transportation and the City of Calgary demand careful consideration, for such benefits are clear and significant and, in our view, overwhelmingly favour approval of SR1.

11:36

11:36

12 Let me turn now to some of the positions taken by the SCLG. The SCLG is of the view that SR1 creates 13 14 unequal outcomes for downstream communities on the 15 Elbow River. Such a position is premised on the 16 assumption that there is a project that could create 17 equal outcomes for all downstream communities. We agree 18 with Alberta Transportation that no such project could 19 exist.

20 We do not dispute that flood protection for all 21 communities on the Elbow and Bow Rivers is in the public 22 interest and a laudable goal, our clients know all too 23 well the devastating impacts of another flood and would 24 not wish their --

25 THE CHAIR:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11



Mr. --

3 about one minute. There's a fairly lengthy break 4 there. I think it was just before you indicated that 5 you agreed that flood mitigation in all communities along the two rivers -- try about there. 6 7 Or Ms. Vespa -- Ms. Vespa, if you could maybe -what was the last piece that you had? 8 THE COURT REPORTER: 9 (as read) "We do not dispute that flood protection 10 11 for all communities on the Elbow and 12 Bow Rivers is in the public interest 13 and... MR. CUSANO: 14 Thank you, Ms. Vespa. And thank 15 you, sir. We do not dispute that flood protection for all 16 17 communities on the Elbow and Bow Rivers is in the 18 public interest and a laudable goal. Of all

participants before this Board, our clients know all too well the devastating impacts of another flood and would not wish their experiences on any community.

However, SR1 is the only project before this Board, and this project is not intended to be everything for everyone, nor could it be. It is not intended to be flood, fire, and drought protection for



11:38

Yes, sir?

Perhaps if you could just go back

1

2

19

20

21

MR. CUSANO:

THE CHAIR:

Calgary, Bragg Creek, and Redwood Meadows. Rather, it
 has been designed to protect the City of Calgary from a
 design flood on the Elbow River equivalent to the 2013
 flood.

5

6

7

8

9

10

23

24

25

And here it is worth noting that our reference to the city is a reference to not only the lives and property of downstream residents but to businesses, livelihoods and the economy of the province writ large, as we outlined earlier. SR1 is clearly needed in our view and must be built.

Having said that, it is worth mentioning that SR1 does have ancillary benefits in terms of water security because it reduces the quantity of water that must be drawn down on the Glenmore Reservoir during the flood season, thereby increasing water supply to the City.

16 It also bears noting that SR1 and other flood 17 mitigation projects are not mutually exclusive. 18 Indeed, many other such projects have been undertaken 19 or concluded to date, and, no doubt, other such 20 projects will be pursued as the province, cities, and 21 counties act to protect their property, citizens, and 22 businesses from future floods.

In particular, as Alberta Transportation notes in its evidence, SR1 is just one component of a larger flood mitigation plan for the Bow River Basin. Other



11:38

components include a potential new flood control 1 2 structure on the Bow River, upgrades to the 3 Glenmore Reservoir and berms within the City of 4 Calgary, Bragg Creek and Redwood Meadows. 5 The building of SR1 does not preclude these other 6 components or other flood, fire, or drought mitigation, 7 nor are these other components or projects being considered here relevant to the Board's determination 8 9 of whether SR1 is in the public interest. The SCLG also takes the position that MC1 is the 10 11:40 11 project that would cause equal flood mitigation 12 outcomes for downstream communities. First and foremost sir, and with respect, such argument is not 13 14 relevant because MC1 is not the reviewable project 15 before the Board as recognized by the Board in the 16 pre-hearing conference decision report. This is an 17 issue which we will revisit in a moment. 18 Despite MC1 being out of scope, we do want to 19 comment briefly on some of the evidence advanced by 20 MC1 is upstream of SR1 and, therefore, has a SCLG. smaller rainfall catchment area to manage water 21 22 entering the Elbow River. If significant rainfall were 23 to occur downstream of MC1, as occurred, for example, 24 in the 2005 flood, this would mean the project would 25 afford less protection to communities downstream of


that rainfall area. In and of itself, this could 1 2 create unequal outcomes for different communities. 3 The SCLG's unequal outcomes' position is similar 4 to its position that alternatives like MC1 provide 5 greater benefits than SR1. This conclusion cannot be 6 justified on the evidence before this Board. MC1 was 7 considered by Alberta Transportation and ultimately not chosen as an option because of its significant number 8 9 of adverse effects compared to SR1. Mr. Hebert from Alberta Transportation provided 10 11:41 11 further detail on this point in his opening statement 12 for Topic Number 1. He stated that compared to MC1, 13 SR1, as an off-stream dam, is less sensitive to impacts 14 from sediment and debris; is closer to operational 15 response teams and access roads; has less environmental 16 impact; has less of an impact on the Elbow River; is 17 less vulnerable to damage during extreme weather, 18 including catastrophic failure during construction, and 19 has less impact on social, recreation, tourism and 20 commercial values. 11:42 21 Mr. Hebert also --THE CHAIR: 22 Sorry, Mr. Cusano, just go back 23 just 30 seconds. Just that last little clip there, 24 please. Thanks. 25 MR. CUSANO: Mr. Hebert from Alberta



Transportation provided further detail on this point in 1 2 his opening statement for Topic 1. He stated that 3 compared to MC1, SR1, as an off-stream dam, is less 4 sensitive to impacts from sediment and debris; is 5 closer to operational response teams and access roads; 6 has less environmental impact; has less of an impact on 7 the Elbow River; is less vulnerable to damage during extreme weather, including catastrophic failure during 8 9 construction, and has less impact on social, recreational, tourism and commercial values. 10 11 Mr. Hebert also noted that SR1 has a positive 12 economic impact, and perhaps, most importantly, is 13 years closer to being built than any alternative 14 project. 15 It is, therefore, in our view, clear that Alberta Transportation made the right decision in choosing SR1. 16 17 However, all of this is not relevant to the Board's 18 public interest enquiry because it is not choosing 19 between SR1 and MC1; rather, SR1 is the only reviewable 20 project before this Board. 21 SR1 has been selected by three provincial 22 governments and in preference to other options 23 including MC1. The federal government has backed the 24 project with a significant funding commitment, and SR1 25 has also successfully navigated two environmental



11:43

assessment processes, one at the provincial level and one at the federal level.

1

2

3 In the pre-hearing conference decision report, 4 this Board recognized that SR1 is the only reviewable 5 project before it, specifically stating that the focus 6 of this proceeding is on the social, economic and 7 environmental effects associated with SR1. This Board further stated that there is no merit in the 8 9 expenditure of significant time and resources assessing projects that are not reviewable projects under the 10 11 Natural Resources Conservation Board Act.

12 The Board showed exceptional tolerance at hearing 13 evidence from the SCLG on this point during the 14 hearing. However, at the risk of sounding like a 15 broken record, the fact remains MC1 is not the 16 reviewable project, nor does the Board have 17 jurisdiction to consider a project that has not been 18 applied for. In fact, it appears that SCLG's real 19 concern is with the government of Alberta's decision to 20 choose SR1 as the preferred option over other 21 alternatives, including MC1. However, that decision is 22 not subject to review in this proceeding.

Let us not forget, sir, that it has taken nearly eight years to get to this point. There is no evidence that the government of Alberta would pursue MC1, or any



11:44

other option, if SR1 were not approved, or that funding from the provincial and federal government for such a project would even be available, nor is there any evidence that it would take any less time to get another project to this stage.

1

2

3

4

5

21

6 We cannot predict with certainty the groups or 7 individuals that might oppose MC1, nor can we predict, assuming an application were ever made, that the 8 9 project would successfully navigate the environmental assessment process, the NRCB process, and ultimately 10 11 receive approval. All of this would be conjecture, and 12 conjecture about MC1 is not an issue before this Board 13 in this application.

14 Therefore, SR1 is the only project before this 15 Board and, most importantly, most critical, the only prospect of implementing effective and needed 16 17 mitigation for the City of Calgary and other downstream 18 communities.

For all these reasons, in our respectful view, no 19 20 weight can or should be given to SCLG's decision about alternatives with greater benefits and the relative 22 implications of such alternatives.

23 Let us now turn to briefly local area impacts of 24 SR1. This project, like many projects this Board and 25 other facility regulators consider, will not be free of



11:46

impacts to the local area.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

In determining whether SR1 is in the public interest, this Board must balance the social, economic, and environmental impacts of the project. In this case, we submit that such a balance heavily favours approval of SR1.

The City of Calgary's evidence indicates that over 15,000 dwellings, over 3,000 buildings and over 34,000 suites stand to be protected by SR1. In comparison, there are only five residences that exist within the footprint needed for the project.

12 The impacts to the local area from the operation 13 of SR1 will be limited and temporary in nature. In 14 most years SR1 will not be operational, and when it is 15 operational, it will only contain water for a short 16 period of time. Furthermore, the Impact Assessment 17 Agency of Canada, in its draft environmental assessment 18 report, has concluded that SR1 is not likely to cause 19 significant adverse environmental effects when taking 20 into account the implementation of key mitigation and 21 follow-up program measures by Alberta Transportation 22 and any local impacts of SR1 are heavily outweighed by 23 the significant benefits to the City of Calgary and 24 other downstream communities from the reduced risk of 25 flooding and the avoidance of the devastating, social,



11:47

economic, and environmental impacts of a flood. 1 2 SR1, as we have noted, is designed for a 1 in 3 200-year flood plus a safety factor of 25 percent. 4 This stands in stark contrast to the City of Calgary 5 and other downstream communities that are not designed to endure flooding to any degree. 6 Furthermore, SR1 7 local area impacts can be mitigated where as the impacts of a future 2013-size flood on Calgary cannot 8 9 be fully mitigated without upstream mitigation. In terms of the mitigation of impacts of SR1, 10 11 Alberta Transportation has consulted with impacted 12 parties and has worked and is working to address and, 13 where possible, mitigate those impacts. Alberta 14 Transportation has proposed numerous mitigation 15 measures, and has promised to continue to listen to the 16 concerns of residents and accommodate where possible to 17 achieve further mitigation of any impacts. 18 In some circumstances where impacts could not be 19 addressed through mitigation, such as for landowners 20 whose lands are needed for the project, Alberta 21 Transportation has offered compensation. And to date, 22 Alberta Transportation has acquired approximately 23 25 percent of the lands in the project area through 24 voluntary purchases and is in the process of 25 negotiating agreements with three additional landowners



11:49

1 which would increase this number to 43 percent. 2 In the City of Calgary, the city has taken 3 significant steps in terms of local mitigation measures 4 to reduce the potential exposure of flooding, but local 5 mitigation is simply not sufficient to protect the city 6 from a 2013-size flood. Only the province of Alberta 7 can protect the city and southern Alberta from such a flood. 8 The social, economic and environmental benefits of 9 SR1 heavily outweigh any such impacts to the local area 10 11:50 11 of the project. As the Board stated in the 12 Cougar Creek decision, public safety, protecting 13 private property and public infrastructure are of 14 paramount importance to Albertans. And like the Cougar 15 Creek project, these goals will be achieved by SR1 and should weigh heavily in favour of the project's 16 17 approval. In conclusion, sir, it is important to emphasize 18 the public benefit of this project, a project that is 19 20 fully supported by all three levels of government. SR1 11:51 21 will increase public safety, protect private property 22 and infrastructure, and protect the wellbeing of people 23 and businesses in the City of Calgary and other

benefit is in the best interest of all Albertans.

downstream communities. A project of such public

24

25



It is inevitable that the catastrophic impacts of 1 2 the 2013 flood will be repeated if SR1 is not approved. 3 We, therefore, ask the Board to find SR1 is in the 4 public interest and approve this project to avoid such impacts in the future. A decision otherwise would be, 5 in our respectful view, in effect, a decision to leave 6 7 the city vulnerable to flooding indefinitely which cements the intolerable status quo. 8 9 At this point in time, the reality is that it's SR1, a viable project with significant cost/benefit 10 11:52 11 ratios or nothing. That is the reality. 12 Time is of the essence to ensure that SR1 is fully 13 operational before the next major flood. On this 14 point, the mayor of Calgary, Naheed Nenshi, stated the 15 following in a letter supporting SR1: (as read) "...if SR1 is not approved or the 16 17 Province is forced to reconsider other 18 alternatives that have already been 19 dismissed as less effective, the flood 20 mitigation infrastructure Calgary 11:52 21 requires could be delayed by decades." 22 We simply cannot afford to have the City of Calgary and 23 other downstream communities remain unprotected. 24 As Mr. Morris stated in his opening statement : 25 (as read)



1 "The city will flood again, the only 2 question is, will it be ready?" 3 And with the approval and construction and operation of 4 SR1, Mr. Chair, the city and the province will indeed be 5 ready. 6 Sir, those are our submissions. We wish to echo 7 Mr. Fitch's comments regarding the efforts of the Board and Board counsel and staff, the court reporters whose 8 9 task, no doubt, is daunting at times, also the efficiencies with which this hearing was conducted, and 10 11:53 11 the participation of all of the parties. 12 Thank you, sir, and Panel very much for your time 13 and attention. 14 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Cusano. And thank 15 you for the kind remarks in terms of Board staff and 16 all the help that we've received in terms of conducting 17 hearings. So thank you very much. 18 City of Calgary is up next. Ms. Senek, are you 19 speaking on behalf of the City of Calgary? 20 MS. SENEK: Yes, I will be. Thank you. 11:54 21 THE CHAIR: All right. So we're at 5 to. So 22 if you still require your 40 minutes, then that's --23 that's what was requested and approved so that would 24 take you to about 20 to or so. But, if you don't need 25 that time, that's fine, you don't have to take it but



just to let you know that you'd be up around 20 to 1, 1 2 so... 3 MS. SENEK: Okay, thank you so much. Ι suspect I won't need the full 40 minutes that we 4 5 requested. THE CHAIR: 6 Thank you. Please proceed. 7 MS. SENEK: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and members I will start by thanking counsel for 8 of the Panel. 9 Alberta Transportation and for Calgary River Communities Action Group and Flood Free Calgary for 10 11 their submissions. The City of Calgary supports their 12 remarks. 13 I'd also like to thank the Board staff and panel 14 members, court reporters and Zoom host for their 15 patience and assistance, and all parties for taking the 16 time to participate in this very important hearing. 17 Like the other parties you've heard this morning, 18 I will submit a written copy of my submissions to the Board which contains references to the evidence, which 19 20 I will not include in my oral submissions today. 21 There has been a lot of information communicated, 22 tested and digested over the past two weeks. You've 23 heard about the need for SR1, you've heard about the devastating impacts of the 2013 flood, the design flood 24 25 for the project, and you've heard a number of concerns





11:54

from some of the interveners.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

24

25

The Board's task, under Section 2 of the *Natural Resources Conservation Board Act* is to determine whether SR1 is in the public interest, having regard to the social and economic effects of the project and its effects on the environment.

Mr. Chair, the City submits that the evidence has overwhelmingly shown that SR1 is in the public interest and, indeed, that the public cannot afford to wait any longer for that interest to be met.

The City submits that the project meets its stated purpose of reducing the effects of future extreme flood events on the City of Calgary and downstream communities. SR1 is not about protecting pockets of residences along the Elbow River. It will protect critical infrastructure and economic assets needed for the entire region, and will potentially save lives.

For our closing, the City will highlight the dramatic benefits SR1 offers, the conservative approach to design, safety and risk incorporated into the project, and why the City believes that SR1 is a preferable choice to alternatives put forward. I'll begin with the project need and benefits.

The City of Calgary is located at the confluence of the Bow and Elbow River. Both of these rivers drain



11:55

steep, high-elevation mountain terrain that is subject 1 2 to heavy rainfall and rapid run-off, and both lack 3 sufficient natural storage, leaving Calgary at a unique 4 potential for severe flooding. 5 I don't need to repeat the devastating impact of 6 the 2013 floods on Calgarians. The Board has heard this evidence. 7 Some of you may have lived it and nearly everyone who has spoken during this hearing has 8 9 recognized it. Years of technical, economic, 10 engineering and citizen engagement have shown that 11 upstream storage on both rivers is greatly needed, 12 particularly on the Elbow River. 13 The City of Calgary faces constraints in 14 addressing flooding risks from the Elbow River within 15 City limits, but it has done what it can. Since 2013. 16 it has doubled the storage capacity of 17 Glenmore Reservoir from 10 to 20 million cubic metres. 18 The city has completed stream bank and riparian erosion protection improvements, gravel bar modifications, 19 20 rehabilitated fish habitat, replaced bridges with 21 higher flow capacity structures, and completed storm 22 water, water and waste water system improvements. 23 Mitigation efforts have reduced the flood risk to 24 Calgary by 54 percent.

25

Unfortunately, the mitigation that was possible



11:57

1 for the City to undertake on its own is not enough. Unless additional mitigation is undertaken, flood 2 3 damages on the Elbow River will be approximately 2 to 4 \$3 billion over the next hundred years. 5 In 2014, in recognition of the City's limitations 6 respecting flood mitigation within its boundaries, it 7 was agreed that the province would lead the study and configuration of resilience elements outside of city 8 limits. 9 Nearly eight years later, and after extensive 10 11 study and careful thoughtful design, the SR1 project is 12 before this Board. Over 1.3 million Calgarians are now 13 relying on the completion of SR1 to protect public 14 safety, private property, critical regional 15 infrastructure, including waste water treatment, road 16 and rail networks, utilities and vital services, and 17 Calgary's downtown core. 18 With SR1 in place, the likelihood of another flood 19 like that in 2013 causing widespread damage and 20 disruption is significantly reduced. SR1 will work 21 synergistically with other flood resilience measures in 22 Calgary, including the Glenmore Dam itself, to

11:59

11:58



flood downstream of the Glenmore Reservoir.

23

24

25

virtually eliminate overland flooding in a 2013-sized

SR1 will also have appreciable effects on events

larger than the design flood. Though overland flooding 1 2 cannot be eliminated in floods larger than a 1 in 200 3 event, the combined mitigation of SR1 and 4 Glenmore Reservoir offer significant attenuation of 5 For example, after passing through SR1 larger flows. and the Glenmore Reservoir, a 1 in 500-year event turns 6 7 into a 1 in 29-year event. This makes SR1 an adaptive measure that offers substantial benefits should changes 8 9 in climate and hydrologic regime bring more frequent, more severe floods. 10

11 Even those Calgarians upstream of the 12 Glenmore Reservoir will benefit from SR1. Discovery 13 Ridge, the only Calgary community upstream of Glenmore, was regulated at the time of development to the design 14 15 to 1 in 100 standards, meaning that it was designed to 16 a flow rate of 883 cubic metres per second. SR1, by 17 diverting up to 600 cubic metres per second, will 18 increase the threshold for damages in this area to 19 around the 1 in 350-year range.

The benefits of SR1 are staggering. SR1 will avert major social, environmental, and economic impacts along the Elbow and Bow Rivers in Calgary, including about \$1.2 billion in damages for a 1 in 100 flood and \$1.9 billion in damages for 1 in 200 event. The average annual damages to public and private



11:59

infrastructure averted by SR1 are approximately \$27 million a year. The City submits that with SR1 on the landscape, almost 3 billion in damages will be avoided for over 100 years, resulting in a 5-to-1 benefit to capital cost ratio.

6 While the benefit cost analyses performed by 7 Alberta Transportation has been more conservative, all benefit cost analyses have shown net benefit. 8 It is 9 likely, as well, that the net benefits are greater than those shown, given that most analyses do not account 10 11 for some crucial factors that are difficult to 12 monetize, such as the increased flood response 13 flexibility afforded by SR1, health and safety elements, potential increased and, therefore, avoided 14 15 damages due to climate change, and benefits that would 16 be felt outside of the City of Calgary.

17 While upstream mitigation on the Bow River would 18 certainly have its own positive impacts on the flood 19 outlooks of the City of Calgary and other downstream 20 communities, upstream mitigation on the Bow is not 21 necessary for SR1 to provide benefits. The \$27 million 22 of average annual damages avoided by SR1 are solely 23 attributable to SR1 and are not dependent on any 24 additional projects on the Bow River.

25

1

2

3

4

5

Furthermore, flooding on the Bow River would have



12:01

a minimal impact on a mitigated Elbow River as the 1 2 topography of the riverbeds would not allow water to 3 travel very far upstream at the confluence of the two 4 rivers. 5 River flooding has caused at least seven fatalities in southern Alberta since 2005, three of 6 7 which were in Calgary. It must be highlighted that any further loss of human life to flooding in Calgary is 8 9 intolerable to the city. Beyond the life safety impacts of further flood 10 11 mitigation along the Elbow, tens of thousands of 12 Calgarians stand to benefit from the peace of mind this 13 infrastructure will provide, particularly those still 14 impacted mentally and economically by the 2013 flood. 15 I'll move now to a discussion on safety and risk. 16 There have been many suggestions to this Board that SR1 17 is underdesigned. With respect, the City submits that 18 the evidence shows the opposite. The design approach 19 taken by Alberta Transportation and its consultants has 20 been conservative. This conservative design, combined 21 with stringent regulatory requirements, results in 22 infrastructure that has been engineered to be safe. 23 The clearest example of SR1's conservative design is 24 the design flood itself.

25

Despite the Alberta standard being mitigation to a



12:02

1 1 in 100-year event, SR1 was designed to a standard of 2 roughly 1 in 200. 3 In addition, there has been a 25 percent increase 4 from the flood of record to the maximum diversion rate 5 to allow for flexibility and maximum effectiveness 6 throughout a flood event. 7 SR1 is designed to safely withstand and pass the probable maximum floods. While not SR1's intended 8 9 operation, it is also notable that SR1 has an available incremental capacity that will bring SR1 storage 10 12:03 11 capacity from 77 million cubic metres up to 12 approximately 100 million cubic metres if required. 13 In addition, multiple redundancies have been built 14 into SR1's design to increase its safety, including 15 respecting debris management, mechanical and 16 operational systems and, as noted, an emergency 17 spillway that is designed to safely pass the probable 18 maximum flood. 19 SR1 will be classified as an extreme consequence 20 dam. The City owns and operates 13 classified dam 12:04 21 structures including the Glenmore Reservoir which is, 22 itself, classified as extreme consequence. 23 The City is, therefore, familiar with the 24 stringent design, surveillance, operation and 25 maintenance standard such a consequence classification



i 		न
1	entails. Unlike other extreme consequence dams, SR1	
2	will only be operating for periods of up to 40 days	
3	following a major flood and will not hold large amounts	
4	of water continuously, making the already remote chance	
5	of a fair weather failure even less likely.	
6	With its off-stream design, components configure	
7	to meet or exceed its extreme consequence	
8	classification, large storage volume capable of holding	
9	back-to-back 1 in 100 floods and significant	
10	operational flexibility, the City submits that SR1 has	12:05
11	a vanishingly remote chance of failure, and that these	
12	remote risks are far outweighed by the benefits I've	
13	already described.	
14	In, addition and importantly, providing this	
15	higher level of permanent flood protection on the	
16	Elbow River will provide the city with more time to	
17	respond to flood events. It will also allow the city	
18	to eliminate over 40 percent of the emergency actions	
19	in its emergency response plan in a 1 in 200-year event	
20	and direct more emergency response resources during	12:05
21	such a flood to mitigate impacts on the Bow River where	
22	less flood mitigation infrastructure has been completed	
23	to date, increasing overall public safety and reducing	
24	damages on both rivers. With this additional emergency	
25	response capability, combined with the reduced flooding	
		1



evidence, Mr. Chair, that not only is SR1 safe but it increases public safety. I now want to touch on the alternatives. There have been numerous claims throughout this hearing that MC1 ought to have been chosen by Alberta Transportation over SR1. The City reminds the Board that the Board's mandate is limited to determining whether SR1 is in the public interest. However, given that this Panel indicated in its Pre-Hearing Conference Decision Report that a general understanding of the relative merits

associated with project alternatives may be
contextually relevant to the Board's decision on public
interest, the City presents the following submissions
supporting SR1 as the superior choice to MC1.

17 SR1 takes advantage of a natural topographic and 18 geological feature that happens to be underlain by low 19 permeability material. The off-stream design of SR1 20 means that only intermittently, during, and for 21 relatively short periods following major floods does it 22 appreciably interact with the Elbow River's fluvial 23 In addition, as already discussed, SR1's system. 24 off-stream nature makes it less susceptible to fair 25 weather failure, giving it an advantage over MC1 in



12:06

12:06

impacts discussed earlier, it is clear from the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

terms of operational risk. 1 2 SR1's catchment is 28 percent larger than that of 3 MC1. The proposed position of MC1 higher in the 4 catchment means that it would not capture rainfall 5 events occurring lower down in the basin that could 6 raise flows between MC1 and the Glenmore Reservoir, 7 such as the event observed in 2005. Drought management has been frequently cited by 8 9 the interveners opposed to this project as a reason 10 that MC1 ought to have been selected over SR1 by 11 Alberta Transportation. 12 The City's witnesses cross-examined extensively on 13 the City's water security concerns. With respect, 14 water security is not the purpose of SR1. Its purpose 15 is flood mitigation. It is an added public benefit of 16 SR1 that it does provide a modest incremental benefit 17 for water supply. 18 The existence of SR1 will allow the city the 19 flexibility of not needing to draw down 20 Glenmore Reservoir in anticipation of the flood season, 21 allowing the City to maintain higher levels in Glenmore 22 for its potable water needs. 23 The City agrees that water is a precious and

24 25



limited resource. The City supplies potable water to

almost 25 percent of Alberta's population and takes

12:07

water quality and supply very seriously. 1 2 SR1 will not negatively impact its citizens and regional customers' access to water. The City does not 3 4 anticipate any appreciable changes to the timing and 5 availability of water in the Elbow River with SR1 in 6 place. 7 Further, as an off-stream structure, any potential water quality changes in the Elbow River as a result of 8 9 the operation of SR1 are expected to be intermittent, of short duration, reversible and manageable by the 10 11 water treatment infrastructure at Glenmore Reservoir 12 and the flexibility of the City's water treatment 13 Indeed, in the event of an unmitigated strategy. 14 flood, pipelines, utilities and construction materials 15 found in the urban environment are a real concern and 16 these would pose a real threat to water quality, a 17 threat that would be mitigated by SR1. 18 The City has 50 to 70-year horizon plans in place 19 to address the financial infrastructure and licensing 20 needs of the City and its regional partners, while 21 considering the regions' and basins' sustainability for

all water licence holders.

22

While the modest increase in water security
provided by SR1 is, as I mentioned, an added benefit,
the City does not view the Elbow River as the



12:09

1 preferable or practical source as longer-term population, hydrology, treatment and climate dynamics 2 unfold. 3 4 The City's water licence capability on the 5 Elbow River is essentially optimized with the Glenmore Reservoir, particularly since the installation 6 7 of the new gates. As stated by Frank Frigo, the Elbow is only so 8 9 large of a roof. If you put a bucket at the end of that roof, you're only going to get so much water off 10 11 of it, especially in times that are more, if you will, 12 droughty. On the Elbow, there would simply not be 13 enough water. Even a larger bucket would provide no 14 appreciable benefit in terms of water supply. 15 The Bow River is a preferable candidate for 16 upstream storage given its larger catchment, higher 17 elevation, glacier permanent snowfield, less seasonal

12:10

variability and higher precipitation. That said, as
the City has submitted repeatedly throughout these
proceedings, while upstream storage on the Bow River is
important, so is flood mitigation on the Elbow River.
SR1 is necessary.

In conclusion, there has been a lot of discussion throughout these proceedings about what sort of water management strategies the City wants and needs. To be



clear, the City is before this Board to very clearly and emphatically state that what the City needs today is SR1. In the City's submission, SR1 is the most important piece of proposed infrastructure in the history of the City of Calgary and the broader Calgary This is not a for-profit natural resources region. project; this is critical public investment necessary for the protection of human life and regional infrastructure. The Board has seen the evidence of SR1's economic benefits. You've heard how it has been designed to stringent and conservative standard, and you've heard from the source that the project's construction and operation will not sacrifice water quality or security. If this project is completed, the residents of Calgary will finally have protection from one of the greatest threats currently facing the city. SR1 is very much in the public interest and the City urges this Board to recommend its approval. And those are the City of Calgary's submissions. Thank you.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Senek. Much
appreciated. And you're right, you didn't need all of
your time, so we are now a little bit ahead of



12:11

12:12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	schedule, but it is	almost 12:15.
	So let's break	for yes, let's break for lunch.
	If we can get back a	at 1:00.
	And, Ms. Louder	n, will you be representing Stoney
	Nakoda.	
MS	. LOUDEN:	Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will be.
THE	E CHAIR:	Okay. And 1:00, you'll be ready
	to go?	
MS	. LOUDEN:	Yes, sir, I will be.
THE	E CHAIR:	Okay. Well, thank you, everyone.
	Let's reconvene at '	1:00.
(Pł	ROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED A	T 12:12 P.M.)
	DCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO	0 1:00 P.M.
		О Т:ОО Р.М.
		О Т:ОО Р.М.
		О Т:ОО Р.М.
		0 1:00 P.M.
		- T: OU P.M.

1 Volume 10 2 April 6, 2021 P.M. Session 3 4 (PROCEEDINGS RESUMED AT 1:01 P.M.) 5 THE CHAIR: 6 Just before we start, Ms. Louden, 7 welcome, Ms. Gerbrandt, the court reporter for this afternoon. You're a new face for us, but welcome this 8 afternoon. 9 And we now have the final argument for The City of 10 13:01 11 Calgary and CRCAG, so we could enter those as exhibits. 12 So, Ms. Friend, Calgary River Communities Action 13 Group, could be Exhibit Number? MS. FRIEND: 14 That would be Number 410 for the 15 final argument. THE CHAIR: 16 410. Thank you. EXHIBIT 410 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF CRCAG 17 AND FFC 18 19 MS. FRIEND: And they also had transcript

20 corrections.
21 THE CHAIR: Yes, that's correct. And,
22 hopefully, people have had a chance to have a peek.

13:02

Are there any objections to having those entered
as an Exhibit 411?
MR. SECORD: I have no objections.



1 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Secord. 2 MR. SECORD: Richard Secord here. 3 THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Secord. 4 Ms. Louden? MS. LOUDEN: 5 We have no objections. THE CHAIR: 6 Okay. Hearing no others, we can 7 enter those, Ms. Friend, 411. EXHIBIT 411 - TRANSCRIPT CORRECTIONS 8 FROM CRCAG AND FFC 9 THE CHAIR: And we can enter Exhibit 412, 10 13:02 11 then, City of Calgary's final argument from Ms. Senek. 12 MS. FRIEND: Okay. Will do. EXHIBIT 412 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF THE 13 CITY OF CALGARY 14 15 THE CHAIR: Okay. Perfect. Thank you very 16 much, everyone, and welcome back. 17 Ms. Louden, the stage is yours. Please proceed. 18 MS. LOUDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 19 Thank you, Panel members. 20 Just to briefly note, as with the other parties, 13:03 21 which we just heard, upon concluding our arguments this afternoon, we will be filing with the Board a written 22 23 copy of our arguments, which will include references to 24 the material that I refer to this afternoon. 25 The Stoney Nakoda Nations are comprised of the



Bearspaw First Nation, the Chiniki First Nation, and 1 2 the Wesley First Nation. 3 The Stoney Nakoda, as represented by the Bearspaw, 4 Chiniki, and Wesley First Nations were signatories to 5 Treaty Number 7 at Blackfoot Crossing in 1877. 6 The Stoney Nakoda have six Indian reserves. The 7 propose project is located within the Stoney Nakoda's traditional territory to which they have an ongoing 8 9 claim for Aboriginal title and rights in the Court of Queen's Bench of Alberta. 10 11 Woste Igic Nabi Limited is a wholly-owned company 12 of the Stoney Nakoda and owns lands in close proximity 13 to the SR1 project. 14 The purpose or benefit of the proposed project is 15 to provide flood protection for the city of Calgary. 16 However, the evidence shows there will be relatively 17 few benefits to the city of Calgary from the project 18 unless similar flood protection is not also provided on 19 the Bow River. 20 The scope of the EIA for the project should, 13:04 21 therefore, have been expanded to include the 22 proponent's projected flood protection measures on the 23 Bow River in addition to those on the Elbow River. 24 However, this did not happen, and this Board's mandate 25 is restricted to the SR1 project.



1

2

3

4

5

Nevertheless, the Stoney Nakoda submit that the Board, in order to determine the public interest, must still review the costs and benefits of all the flood control projects proposed to protect the city of Calgary from another flood similar to the 2013 flood. But the public interest must also include flood

6 7 protection for communities upstream of the city of Calgary and must recognize their riparian rights. 8 The 9 public interest cannot assume the priority of downstream urban populations over upstream rural 10 11 populations. Most of all, the public interest must 12 include the oldest rights holders of this land, the 13 Indigenous Peoples.

Both Alberta Transportation and The City of Calgary have de facto agreed that SR1 is part of an overall plan for the Bow River Basin, as is evidenced by the voluminous evidence they have put forward that relates to flood damage and flood control on the Bow River.

20The City of Calgary's models that include both SR113:0521and upstream storage reservoirs on the Bow River rank13:0522highest of all of its flood mitigation options.13:0523The City of Calgary expressly states that it is an1424advocate for upstream water storage on both the Bow and1525Elbow Rivers.13:05



h		ก่
1	The City of Calgary speaks of total watershed	
2	management. Calgary's preferred flood control options	
3	are the SR1 project combined with a new reservoir on	
4	the Bow River.	
5	As stated by City of Calgary witness	
6	Mr. Frank Frigo: (as read)	
7	"The City of Calgary's long-term plans	
8	anticipate the population growth and	
9	changes in demand would likely be met	
10	through incremental infrastructure	13:06
11	investment and licensed considerations	
12	along the Bow River."	
13	The evidence before the Board shows that the SR1 project	
14	is only one piece of a combined set of projects on the	
15	Bow and Elbow watersheds that would provide the	
16	necessary mitigation.	
17	As stated again by City of Calgary witness	
18	Mr. Frank Frigo: (as read)	
19	"In the case of the Bow River Basin,	
20	both SR1 and any potential project on	13:07
21	the Bow River combined, would provide	
22	the mitigation necessary for Calgary and	
23	other communities that may benefit from	
24	these projects."	
25	For all these reasons, any review of the SR1 project	



alone without a commensurate review of these other 1 2 projects does not serve the public interest. 3 Alberta Transportation has adopted these models 4 prepared by The City of Calgary. However, the models 5 are based on only an analysis of the financial costs and 6 benefits of flood control and mitigation measures. 7 While such analyses are valuable, ultimately, the Board must determine the public interest by taking into 8 9 account a much broader range of criteria. 10 Value judgments must be transparent and cannot be 13:07 11 hidden with an arbitrary attempt to monetize the value 12 components that purport to constitute the make-up of the 13 cost benefit analyses. 14 Alberta Transportation should have come before this 15 Board with a comprehensive solution for both the Elbow 16 and Bow Rivers, providing various alternatives for each 17 of the rivers, and letting the NRCB choose the best 18 solution for each river from an overall perspective. Such a comprehensive solution should also have 19 20 considered the cultural impacts on landscapes. This did 13:08 21 not happen. 22 To do so would have involved comparing the costs 23 and benefits of the various projects for each of the 24 rivers, taking into account not only the 2013 flood, but 25 also the future: Climate change, drought, fire



protection, recreation, and perhaps most important of 1 all, the greater Calgary area's predicted future water 2 3 needs for generations to come. 4 Included in any such review of the Elbow and Bow 5 projects, the rights of upstream riparian residents and 6 users must be taken into account and not simply 7 sacrificed for the greater good. This Board must ask whether Alberta Transportation 8 9 has taken into account the ecological and conservation values of rural landscapes, or did financial and other 10 13:09 11 benefits to urban communities simply supersede the costs and benefits to the rural communities? 12 13 Remember, there is no legislative policy that 14 mandates the flooding of upstream landowners for the 15 benefit of downstream riparian residents. 16 The waters flowing through the traditional 17 territory of the Stoney Nakoda have been powering 18 the city of Calgary for over 100 years. Any consideration of water control projects on the Bow or 19 20 Elbow Rivers must consider the long-standing historical 13:09 21 and cultural connections that the Stoney Nakoda have to 22 these waters.

Over the past two weeks, the Board has heard
evidence of Alberta's haphazard consultation process
with the Stoney Nakoda, admit the limitations created by



<u> </u>	1	1
1	COVID-19 on Stoney Nakoda communities.	
2	The Aboriginal Consultation Office confirmed that	
3	it may rely on the NRCB process to fulfil the Crown's	
4	duty to consult.	
5	Further, the Court of Appeal of Alberta confirmed	
6	in Fort McKay First Nation versus Prosper Petroleum	
7	Limited that tribunals must consider the honour of the	
8	Crown when making a determination about whether a	
9	project is in the public interest.	
10	As stated by the Court of Appeal: (as read)	13:10
11	"A project authorization that breaches	
12	the constitutionally protected rights of	
13	Indigenous Peoples cannot serve the	
14	public interest."	
15	Consultation with Indigenous groups generally is not	
16	consultation with the Stoney Nakoda. Negotiations and	
17	agreements with the Tsuut'ina and other distant	
18	First Nations bear no relevance to the rights of the	
19	Stoney Nakoda. For Alberta Transportation to imply that	
20	consultation with unrelated Indigenous groups	13:10
21	constitutes consultation with the Stoney Nakoda is	
22	extremely disrespectful.	
23	While the Cree Nations from central Alberta and the	
24	Blackfoot Nations from southern Alberta have their own	
25	rights and interests, they do not speak for the Stoney	



Nakoda.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

The duty to consult and accommodate involves both the procedural and a substantive component. Procedurally, an infringement of constitutional rights might occur. Indigenous peoples must have the opportunity to have their views heard and considered.

Substantively, where adverse effects to constitutional rights might occur, Indigenous Peoples must have the impacts to their rights mitigated or accommodated. Both the procedural and the substantive components must be fulfilled.

12 The assessment of potential impacts from the SR1 13 project on the rights and interests of the Stoney Nakoda 14 has not been adequate and has not been complete. As a 15 result, the extent of potential effects, including what 16 mitigation or accommodation measures may be required to 17 reduce, mitigate, or avoid those impacts, has not yet 18 been determined. Without this information, the Board 19 cannot make a determination about whether the project is 20 in the public interest.

13:12

In its environmental assessment, Alberta Transportation only assessed potential project effects on traditional land and resource use. However, traditional land and resource use is only one component of Aboriginal and Treaty rights, as these rights also



13:11

include Stoney Nakoda cultural, social and governance 1 2 components. 3 For example, the right to hunt includes much more 4 than just the activity of hunting. Hunting is grounded 5 in the respect for the land and animals and is a central 6 part of Stoney Nakoda culture. 7 For the Stoney Nakoda, it is essential to be out on the land to access traditional sites, for not just the 8 9 exercise of the right to hunt, but, also, for example, the passing down of knowledge to younger generations. 10 11 Since there has not yet been assessment or 12 consideration of project impacts to these components of 13 Aboriginal and Treaty rights, there has not yet been a complete assessment of potential effects to the rights 14 15 and interests of the Stoney Nakoda. 16 The oral evidence of Stoney Nakoda elders and 17 knowledge keepers in this hearing, detailed among 18 numerous other concerns, the trauma they have 19 experienced as a result of inadequate consultation and 20 engagement and the destruction of their lands, including 13:13 21 cultural, spiritual, and burial sites. 22 Elder John Snow, Jr. spoke of the trauma he still 23 feels as a result of the flooding and desecration of

2668



Stoney Nakoda grave sites resulting from the Big Horn

Such a situation is intolerable and must not be

24

25

Dam.

permitted to happen again.

1

2

3

4

5

25

Alberta Transportation asserts that the proposed project, including the proposed future land use plan, will provide for an enhanced opportunity for the exercise of treaty rights and traditional uses.

6 However, this statement ignores the fact that the 7 project will disturb or destroy existing traditional use in cultural sites of the Stoney Nakoda in the project 8 9 area, and that the future land use plan includes a multitude of restrictions and competing uses to the 10 11 exercise of Aboriginal and Treaty rights. This cannot 12 be said to enhance the opportunities of the 13 Stoney Nakoda.

Alberta Transportation acknowledges that mitigation 14 15 measures should be directly proportional and responsive to identified impacts. Yet, Alberta Transportation also 16 17 concedes that the mitigation measures it has proposed 18 for impacts to traditional land and resource use are 19 simply mitigations of biophysical components. 20 Mitigations aimed at addressing biophysical components, 21 and by proxy some of the resources used by the 22 Stoney Nakoda are not the same as accommodation of 23 impacts to Aboriginal and Treaty rights. This has been 24 confirmed by the Supreme Court of Canada.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Stoney Nakoda



13:13

therefore submits that it is premature to approve the SR1 project and that the application should be denied. However, in the event the Board approves the project, the Stoney Nakoda submit that the construction of SR1 not be permitted to commence until, and only if, one, the 2016 agreement between the Province of Alberta

and TransAlta Utilities Limited governing water management in the Ghost Reservoir not be renewed unless the Stoney Nakoda Nations be made a party to that agreement.

Two, a full assessment of all the proposed flood and water control structures on the Bow River upstream of the city of Calgary has been completed, including an accounting of all payments to third parties. As part of this assessment, the Board must mandate a fulsome response to both climate change and solutions to the threat of flooding facing the city of Calgary.

And, three, the government of Alberta has obtained a full, free, and informed consent of each of the Stoney Nakoda Nations to any and all flood mitigation or water storage structures on the Bow River upstream of the city of Calgary, regardless as to whether there is projected to be any actual flooding of Stoney Nakoda Indian Reserves 142, 143, and 144.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

We would emphasize that there is no reasonable


reason why these conditions cannot be complied with prior to the commencement of construction of SR1. Further, these positions are responsive to the principles under the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which Alberta Transportation has confirmed its commitment to.

7 In the event the Board approves the SR1 project, the Stoney Nakoda also asks that the following be made 8 9 binding and forceable conditions of any such approval: We note that evidence during the hearing indicated that 10 11 Alberta Transportation can only make commitments for 12 That is, it cannot make commitments on behalf itself. 13 of the eventual operator of SR1, Alberta Environment and 14 Parks. The Stoney Nakoda requests that any commitments 15 by Alberta Transportation, therefore, be made conditions of approval that are also binding on Alberta Environment 16 17 and Parks.

18

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

These include the following:

19Condition 1, completion of the Stoney Nakoda20traditional land use assessment.

13:17

13:16

Prior to construction, Alberta Transportation shall enable the Stoney Nakoda to complete the traditional land use assessment. Alberta Transportation shall review the completed traditional land use assessment and meet with the Stoney Nakoda to discuss outstanding



1	issues and appropriate mitigation or accommodation	
2	measures for identified impacts.	
3	Alberta Transportation shall provide upfront	
4	funding to the Stoney Nakoda for the completion of the	
5	traditional land use assessment based on a budget to be	
6	provided by the Stoney Nakoda.	
7	Condition 2: Cultural awareness training.	
8	Prior to construction and any further fieldwork,	
9	all employees and contractors for the project must	
10	undergo Stoney cultural awareness training in the	13:17
11	communities of Eden Valley, Morley, and Big Horn.	
12	Alberta Transportation shall offer reasonable capacity	
13	to the Stoney Nakoda for the development of the training	
14	program.	
15	Condition 3: Information sharing agreement.	
16	Prior to further fieldwork and the completion of	
17	the Stoney Nakoda traditional land use assessment	
18	referred to in condition 1, Alberta Transportation must	
19	engage the Stoney Nakoda on the development of an	
20	information sharing agreement for the SR1 project based	13:18
21	on the First Nations' principles of ownership, control,	
22	access, and possession.	
23	The agreement shall include and apply to Alberta	
24	Transportation, Alberta Environment and Parks, and	

25



Alberta Culture, Multiculturalism, and Status of Women.

<u> </u>		1
1	Alberta Transportation shall offer reasonable capacity	
2	to the Stoney Nakoda for the development of the	
3	agreement.	
4	Condition 4: Independent Indigenous monitor.	
5	Alberta Transportation shall contract an	
6	independent Indigenous monitor to monitor all fieldwork	
7	activities undertaken as part of the completion of the	
8	Stoney Nakoda traditional land use assessment referred	
9	to in condition 1. The Indigenous monitor shall be	
10	mutually agreed upon between Alberta Transportation and	13:19
11	the Stoney Nakoda.	
12	Condition 5: Stoney Nakoda traditional knowledge	
13	monitoring committee.	
14	Prior to construction and prior to the resumption	
15	of fieldwork and completion of the Stoney Nakoda	
16	traditional land use assessment referred to in	
17	condition 1, Alberta Transportation shall offer	
18	reasonable capacity for the development of the	
19	Stoney Nakoda traditional knowledge monitoring	
20	committee. This committee shall be in place for the	13:19
21	life of the project, and its operation shall be funded	
22	by Alberta Transportation and/or Alberta Environment and	
23	Parks.	
24	This committee shall be engaged on	

pre-construction, construction, operation, and



post-flood activities including, but not limited to: 1 2 Fieldwork investigations and mitigation activities 3 relating to cultural, spiritual, historical, and 4 archeological features and sites in the project area, 5 including those captured by the *Historical Resources* Act; cultural monitoring of the project area at 6 7 predefined intervals including during and after ground disturbance and flood events; monitoring and 8 9 verification of environmental assessment and mitigation effectiveness including for water, fish and fish 10 11 habitat, wildlife and wildlife habitat, vegetation, and 12 wetlands; and cumulative effects monitoring including 13 for water, fish and fish habitat, wildlife and wildlife 14 habitat, vegetation, and wetlands.

15Condition 6: Stoney Nakoda archeological and16heritage management plan.

17 Prior to further fieldwork, Alberta Transportation 18 shall offer reasonable capacity for the development of 19 an archeological and heritage management plan for any 20 structures, sites or things of historical, 21 archeological, paleontological or architectural 22 significance, or physical or cultural heritage resources 23 within the project's development area including, but not 24 limited to, sites and things subject to the 25 Historical Resources Act.



13:20

This plan shall include, but not be limited to, 1 2 engagement of the Stoney Nakoda traditional knowledge 3 committee, referred to in condition 5, on all future 4 fieldwork and investigations relating to sites and 5 features including those subject to the Historical 6 *Resources Act*; provision of reasonable capacity to the 7 Stoney Nakoda to monitor investigations and mitigation activities of sites and features captured under the 8 Historical Resources Act, and conduct ceremonies at 9 these sites as requested; and a procedure for sites and 10 13:21 11 features not captured under the Historical Resources 12 Act, which provides for documentation and protection of 13 the sites and features in accordance with Stoney Nakoda 14 cultural protocols.

15 Condition 7: Previously recorded archeological and16 historical sites.

17 Alberta Transportation shall provide the 18 Stoney Nakoda with all information and reports regarding previously recorded archeological and historical sites 19 20 in the project area, including the findings of the 21 historical resource impact assessment undertaken for the 22 project. Alberta Transportation shall offer reasonable 23 capacity to the Stoney Nakoda to conduct site visits and 24 undertake ceremonies at these archeological and 25 historical sites.



Condition 8: Stoney Nakoda sacred ceremonial 1 2 objects, repatriation regulation. 3 Alberta Transportation shall provide reasonable 4 capacity to the Stoney Nakoda to engage the government 5 of Alberta in the development of the Stoney Nakoda 6 sacred ceremonial objects repatriation regulation under 7 the First Nations Sacred and Ceremonial Objects Repatriation Act. 8 9 Condition 9: Wildlife overpass. Alberta Transportation shall install a wildlife 10 13:22 11 overpass over Highway 22 to facilitate the movement of 12 culturally significant animals. 13 Condition 10: Crown land offset measures plan. 14 Alberta Transportation shall calculate the 15 permanent loss of unoccupied Crown land and private land 16 to which Indigenous groups have a right of access, and 17 based on this calculation, shall develop and provide a 18 Crown land offset measures plan to the Board and the 19 Stoney Nakoda. 20 The plan must include, at minimum, a description of 13:23 21 site-specific details and maps showing their locations 22 where unoccupied Crown land or private land to which 23 Indigenous groups have a right of access is no longer 24 available for traditional use as a result of project 25 activities, and a list of the offset or compensation



h		7
1	measures that will be implemented to address the	
2	permanent loss of unoccupied Crown lands and private	
3	lands to which Indigenous groups have the right of	
4	access.	
5	Condition 11: Water monitoring for Woste Igic Nabi	
6	Limited lands.	
7	Alberta Transportation and/or Alberta Environment	
8	and Parks shall monitor the water quality and quantity	
9	of the Woste Igic Nabi Limited lands prior to, during,	
10	and after ground disturbance activities for the project,	13:24
11	and on an annual basis thereafter, for the life of the	
12	project.	
13	Should the water quality or quantity be impacted,	
14	Alberta Transportation and/or Alberta Environment and	
15	Parks shall provide potable water to the Woste Igic Nabi	
16	Limited lands for agricultural and other purposes.	
17	Condition 12: Chair of the Indigenous advisory	
18	committee.	
19	A Stoney Nakoda member shall be appointed chair of	
20	the proposed Indigenous advisory committee.	13:24
21	Condition 13: Stoney Nakoda communication plan.	
22	Alberta Transportation shall offer reasonable	
23	capacity for the development of a communication plan	
24	specific to the Stoney Nakoda communities regarding, at	
25	minimum, all impacts to land use resulting from the	



i		ส
1	project, post-flood activities and restrictions, and	
2	accidents and malfunctions occurring in relation to the	
3	project, including those within the project development	
4	area, which may affect areas outside the project	
5	development area.	
6	Condition 14: Funding for participation in	
7	conditions or programs.	
8	Where participation of Indigenous groups is an	
9	option as it relates to a project condition or follow-up	
10	program, Alberta Transportation and/or Alberta	13:2
11	Environment and Parks shall offer the Stoney Nakoda a	
12	reasonable amount of capacity funding to support their	
13	involvement.	
14	Condition 15: Funding for consultation on	
15	conditions.	
16	Alberta Transportation and/or Alberta Environment	
17	and Parks must offer the Stoney Nakoda a reasonable	
18	amount of capacity funding to support consultation	
19	activities where such activities are a requirement of a	
20	project condition.	13:2
21	Condition 16: Regional assessments.	
22	No further flood control infrastructure will be	
23	considered for approval by the NRCB until a regional	
24	assessment on flood control needs and impacts has been	
25	completed, either pursuant to the Impact Assessment Act	



1 of Canada or an equivalent standard. This assessment 2 shall consider the region to be assessed to include the 3 entire Bow River system, including the Elbow River as a 4 sub basin. This assessment shall include, but not be 5 limited to, describing a baseline against which to 6 assess the incremental impact of a discrete project; 7 identifying thresholds to inform future project decisions and limit unaccessible cumulative effects: 8 9 clarifying expected standard mitigation measures for future projects; addressing potential impacts on the 10 11 rights and interests of the Stoney Nakoda; and providing 12 guidance for land use planning that may be undertaken by 13 various jurisdictions. 14 Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Panel members. Those 15 conclude the final arguments on behalf of the Bearspaw 16 First Nation, Chiniki First Nation, Wesley First Nation, 17 and Woste Igic Nabi Limited. 18 Thank you to the Board and to the Board staff and 19 to the other parties as well, and we appreciate the 20 opportunity to participate in these hearings. 21 Thank you. THE CHAIR: 22 Thank you, Ms. Louden. 23 Mr. Secord. 24 MR. KRUHLAK: Mr. Chairman, it's Ron Kruhlak. 25 If I could just ask Ms. Louden, would you be able to



13:26

provide us with a copy of your closing argument in the 1 2 next short while, just so we have an opportunity to 3 review it this evening? 4 MS. LOUDEN: Certainly, Mr. Kruhlak. We'll be 5 sending that off right away. 6 MR. KRUHLAK: Thank you very much. 7 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. THE CHAIR: 8 Thank you. 9 Sorry. Mr. Secord on behalf of SCLG. MR. SECORD: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair. 10 I have 13:28 11 circulated our argument to counsel and hearing 12 participants. So, Mr. Kruhlak, I hope you received it 13 and you'll have time to look at it. 14 So my --15 THE CHAIR: Sorry, Mr. Secord, in terms of the timing, we're just slightly ahead, so I think it would 16 17 take you to about 4:00, and I presume that will still 18 work. I was hoping I would still get 19 MR. SECORD: 20 that 4:15 end time, sir, but I will -- you know, I will 13:28 21 do my best. 22 As you can appreciate, there's a lot of material, 23 and actually to respond to what Mr. Kruhlak and his 24 team put together this morning in their, you know, 25 90 plus-page document, I didn't really factor that in



3 you can cut me off if need be. 4 THE CHAIR: Well, how about I'll try to give 5 you a bit of a heads-up before that. I would -- I'll let you get your stuff in. We all agreed on the time. 6 7 MR. SECORD: Sure. THE CHAIR: We're a little bit ahead of time. So it's not like we're going to sort of cut people off for a few minutes, but just a bit of a heads-up. MR. SFCORD: Sure. THE CHAIR: Thank you. MR. SECORD: And I'll endeavour to finish by 4. THE CHAIR: Great, thank you. MR. SECORD: So this is the final argument of

8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 the SCLG. This argument will address the issues 17 identified by the Board in the five topic blocks. 18 To the extent that this argument does not 19 specifically address matters raised by AT, CRCAG, or 20 The City of Calgary in their final arguments today, 21 SCLG's positions remain as expressed in its previous 22 submissions and through the hearing process. 23 So my first series of remarks are going to be on 24 the public interest and how that is framed in this



2681

Anyway, I'll do my best, and maybe at 4 we can --

in terms of my request.

1

2

25

case.

13:29

Is the test for whether or not the SR1 application 1 2 is in the public interest, is that it is "better than 3 nothing"? Is the public interest test served when only 4 a portion of the public is protected, in this case the homeowners downstream of the Glenmore Reservoir in 5 Meanwhile, the Alberta residents upstream of 6 Calgary? 7 SR1 in Redwood Meadows, in Bragg Creek are hung out to flood. 8 9 If approved, one community wins flood protection to a 1 in 200-year level, and one loses its 10 13:31 11 environment, its heritage, its inheritance, its 12 culture, its quality of life, and potentially its 13 future. Does this serve the public interest? 14 In the Cougar Creek decision, NR2018-01, the Board 15 stated in paragraph 345 under the heading "Public Interest Test": 16 (as read) 17 "The Board does not have a fixed 18 formula...the outcome of a Board review 19 is shaped by the nature of the project 20 under review...community support for the 13:31 21 project..." 22 And it goes on to say that: 23 "...the Board must be convinced that the 24 identified project benefits the region 25 and the province...without generating



unacceptable economic, social or 1 2 environmental impacts." 3 Cougar Creek had an estimated \$38 million construction 4 cost. Nothing like the project that you have in front 5 of you today. 6 SR1 does not have the support of the Springbank 7 community. SR1 does not benefit the region upstream of SR1 and generates unacceptable economic, social, and 8 9 environmental impacts between SR1 and the Glenmore Reservoir. 10 11 Is the test of public interest time specific? The 12 SR1 project will be here for hundreds of years if it is 13 approved. Is it the public interest for the next five 14 years because Calgary needs flood mitigation now and 15 this is the only project before the Board? Should not 16 consideration of the public interest on a long-lived 17 project like SR1 consider the next 50 years? The next 100 years? The next 200 years? 18 19 What if, as Dr. Fennell stated last week, the 1 in

What if, as Dr. Fennell stated last week, the 1 in 500-year flood becomes the 1 in 200-year flood 50 years from now. What is the responsibility of this Board to consider the long-lived nature of this project?

Is it a test of public interest to consider whether
this project manages our precious water resource, the
Elbow River, for future generations? After all, the



13:32

name of this Board is the Natural Resources Conservation 1 2 Board, with emphasis on "conservation." 3 Is it in the public interest to invest over half a 4 billion dollars in a project that will sit idle while 5 severe drought and climate change takes hold over the 6 next hundred years. 7 Is it in the public interest to approve a project that has not considered the worst-case scenarios? 8 T 9 find it amazing listening to Alberta Transportation saying, "Oh, you can't possibly take a look at the 10 13:35 11 floods on the Bow River in terms of, you know, what 12 might happen in the future. There's no evidence that 13 they occurred on the Elbow." From a worst-case 14 scenario, why wouldn't you do that? I mean, what are 15 vou scared of? 16 Is it in the public interest to approve a project 17 where modelling changes and recalculations continue to 18 be made as late as March 2021? 19 For instance, the soil and sediment modelling 20 revisions and the air quality modelling revisions in 13:35 21 Exhibit 327. 22 Is the public interest served when material costs 23 have been hidden from public view, are uncertain, or 24 simply unavailable for review by this Panel? Is the 25 public interest served when AT explicitly refuses to



disclose certain material costs? 1 2 Is the public interest served when one community, 3 Springbank, is asked to accept fugitive dust emissions, 4 where no exposure is acceptable, on behalf of another 5 community such as Elbow Park or the Calgary Golf and 6 Country Club? 7 My next series of remarks are on Topic Block 1, "Project Purpose and Need." 8 9 The SCLG requests that the Board pay close attention to the numerous submissions made by its 10 13:37 11 members in Exhibit 250, the landowner statements. The 12 SCLG also requests that the Board pay close attention to 13 the viva voce evidence given by Ms. Karin Hunter, Mr. Brian Copithorne, Ms. Mary Robinson, Ms. Tracey 14 15 Feist, Mr. Marshall Copithorne, Mr. Lee Drewry, 16 Ms. Jan Erisman, Mrs. Barbara Teghtmeyer, and 17 Dr. Karen Massey. 18 The SCLG members do not dispute that there is a 19 need for flood management or mitigation to manage high 20 consequence floods. As Marshall Copithorne put it, 13:37 21 nobody could.

But the SCLG disputes the need for a project such as SR1 that has crucial design limitations, that creates unequal outcomes, and that limits its ability to adapt to a range of future flood conditions. And I would



h		7
1	refer in particular to Karin Hunter's evidence in Topic	
2	Block 1.	
3	Under the rubric of project purpose and need, let's	
4	recall the two SCLG aids to cross-exam discussed on	
5	March 22, the first day of the hearing.	
6	Those exhibits, Exhibit 360 and 361, provide a	
7	side-by-side comparison of SR1 to MC1. The comparison	
8	demonstrates that MC1 is vastly superior to SR1 in	
9	capturing peak flows.	
10	The most basic test of whether SR1 should be	13:38
11	approved by this Panel is its ability to manage flood	
12	risk. Exhibit 350, Transcript page 156, Mr. Wood	
13	stated:	
14	"It is the peak, you know, that is the	
15	most important when it comes to flood	
16	damages."	
17	"It is the peak, you know, that is most	
18	important when it comes to flood	
19	damages."	
20	If that is so, why were volumes used to compare SR1 and	13:39
21	MC1? The comparison has always been volumes, not flow	
22	rates. MC1, as an in-stream dam, has superior outcomes	
23	to SR1 for more communities and under more extreme flood	
24	events.	
25	If a flood surge or peak flow arrives that is not	



1	captured by SR1, either because the reservoir is full,	
2	due to forecasting errors or environmental conditions,	
3	back-to-back storms or a short, but high-intensity	
4	storm, SR1 will not be effective at capturing the	
5	floodwaters and preventing damage downstream. What is	
6	the point of infrastructure that may not capture the	
7	peak the flood peak it is intended to capture?	
8	Consider that we are in the middle of a	
9	"hypothetical pandemic." Let's call the virus in this	
10	case a "1 in 200-year flood," with a maximum flow rate	
11	of 1240 cubic metres per second.	
12	There is a vaccine that is 100 percent effective	
13	against the virus. That is MC1.	
14	There is another vaccine that is 0 percent	
15	effective for the population upstream of SR1, and only	
16	25 percent effective for the population downstream of	
17	SR1 to the Glenmore Reservoir, to which the proponent	
18	eagerly acknowledges 1 in 50-year level of protection	
19	rather than the proponent's 1 in 200 target level, and	
20	this SR1 vaccine is only 100 percent effective for the	
21	population downstream of the Glenmore Reservoir to the	
22	confluence of the Elbow and Bow Rivers.	
23	Shouldn't the government of Alberta and the NRCB	

Shouldn't the government of Alberta and the NRCB
look to protect everyone with the vaccine that is
100 percent effective? This vaccine is MC1.



13:40

1	Why would we choose a vaccine that has lower	
2	effectiveness?	
3	Using the vaccine analogy, MC1 is also effective	
4	against the variants of climate change, 1 in 1,000 and	
5	1 in 500-year floods; drought, water security,	
6	fire-fighting protection, and recreation.	
7	SR1 is useless against the variants of a 1 in 1,000	
8	and 1 in 500-year flood.	
9	Even the residents downstream of the Glenmore will	
10	not be protected by SR1 from those events as SR1 can	13:42
11	only take the top off a flood to a maximum of	
12	600 cubic metres per second.	
13	SR1 is also useless against the variants of climate	
14	change: Drought, water security, fire-fighting	
15	protection, and recreation.	
16	And SR1 has a wide range of negative side effects	
17	such as PM 2.5 air pollution for the Springbank	
18	residents.	
19	As Marshall Copithorne stated, "It is never too	
20	late to reverse course and ditch a bad decision." The	13:43
21	SCLG notes the government recently did that with a 1976	
22	coal policy.	
23	Marshall Copithorne stated at Transcript page 537:	
24	(as read)	
25	"With listening to this morning's	



1		1
1	dialogue, I recognize that, with SR1 in	
2	place, we do not protect Calgary. In	
3	fact, 80 percent of the damage could	
4	still occur in Calgary with SR1 and, to	
5	me, that's ridiculous."	
6	And, of course, he's referring to the fact that the Bow	
7	is not looked after in this by SR1 and, of course,	
8	there was considerable damage done to Calgary from the	
9	flood of the Bow River in 2013.	
10	And Mr. Copithorne went on to say: (as read)	13:44
11	"There is some things that really bother	
12	me. In the presentation this morning	
13	with regard to folks in Calgary, and it	
14	seemed to me that private land and	
15	property rights and homes in the city of	
16	Calgary are more important than private	
17	property out in the country. What are	
18	we teaching our kids these days? That	
19	bothers me. Should we let this continue	
20	in our society or should someone stand	13:44
21	up and say this is enough?"	
22	He went on to say: (as read)	
23	"I'd like to advise the Board to the	
24	fact that, whether you're in business or	
25	whether you're in government, it's never	



h		
1	too late to reverse a bad idea or an	
2	investment. It will enhance Alberta's	
3	credibility for future generations to	
4	come. Cut and move on from our	
5	suffering Alberta taxpayers' sunk costs	
6	into SR1. Excite anxious Albertans with	
7	a better, comprehensive, multiuse plan	
8	to address the longer term future of	
9	this great province."	
10		13:
11	"This huge financial investment we have	
12	for SR1 is good for something that might	
13	happen. I know this has been clearly	
14	identified and it just it just sticks	
15	with me. Why wouldn't we put that huge	
16	investment and all our resources into a	
17	project that will serve this province	
18	and this community for the next hundred	
19	years? Next thousand years."	
20	He went on to say: (as read)	13:
21	"What's wrong with us? Why are we	
22	worried about building a mud hole when	
23	we could build a resource that would	
24	enhance the lifestyle and the	
25	productivity of the province for a long,	
1		1



This application should be denied, and the government should be advised by the NRCB that SR1 is not in the public interest and is not the best alternative. Why are we building a mud hole when we could build something like MC1 that could provide lasting benefits, from permanent water storage for generations to come.

As Jan Erisman stated, there is a reason why no one is building dry dams anywhere else in the world.

And as Barbara Teghtmeyer has noted from personal experience, the Elbow River's water flow has been declining, so why aren't we looking to the future?

13:46

13:47

13The NRCB issued a decision for the Revised Highwood14Diversion Plan in 2008. This is NRCB15Decision NR 2008-01.

16And at pdf page 13 of that decision the Board17stated: (as read)

18 "Several conclusions reached by the 19 Joint Review Board in the Decision 20 Report are significant with respect to 21 the deferred items listed in NRCB Board 22 Order 9601-1. Of particular importance is the Joint Review Panel's approach to 23 24 assessing the approached proposed 25 diversion plans. Fundamental to this



2691

long time."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

I		ส
1	approach was its adoption of a	
2	sustainable development frame of	
3	reference to assess the proposed	
4	project, based on the following	
5	principles:	
6	'First, water management projects must	
7	respect existing riparian rights and	
8	water licences, and should not result in	
9	the loss or injury to existing water	
10	rights.'"	13:48
11	So the Board then, we submit, should adopt a sustainable	
12	development frame of reference for the SR1 project as	
13	well.	
14	In terms of the first principle noted above, it	
15	appears that AT clearly stated that the operator of SR1	
16	will need a water licence from the Elbow River to	
17	remediate the reservoir after flood events, water for	
18	reseeding and vegetation growth. This may result in the	
19	loss of water from the Elbow River for downstream	
20	communities in the future.	13:48
21	Why would we do that with water being such a scarce	
22	resource?	
23	The second principle noted by the NRCB, and I	
24	quote: (as read)	
25	"Second, water management projects must	



1	be able to meet basic environmental	
2	criteria to avoid significant adverse	
3	effects."	
4	In this case, the bull trout may be extirpated from	
5	certain reaches of the Elbow River as noted by Paul	
6	Christensen in Exhibit 187, pdf page 3.	
7	And it's interesting in this case, do we really	
8	know what's going to happen to the environment when you	
9	remember that AT didn't do their fish survey until	
10	August. I mean, how much information do you have to	13:49
11	know what the environmental consequences will be from	
12	SR1?	
13	The SR1 project will have significant environmental	
14	effects. Intact native grasslands will be destroyed and	
15	revegetation success is unproven.	
16	Mr. Wallis's report references Lancaster, et al.,	
17	which confirmed that revegetation of native grasslands	
18	is not successful, and the only site that recorded	
19	success was an undisturbed site.	
20	The third principle noted by the NRCB is, and I	13:50
21	quote: (as read)	
22	"Third, water management projects must	
23	be able to meet current and future needs	
24	for domestic, riparian, and municipal	
25	needs, and other consumptive uses."	



	1
SR1 is unable to meet current and future needs for	
	13:50
	13:50
criteria to be worthy of detailed	
consideration by the Panel with respect	
to project effects."	
The NRCB should find that the SR1 fails the sustainable	
development frame of reference test and is not worthy of	
being found to be in the public interest. The focus on	
flood mitigation as the sole purpose of the project	
created a warped decision project, narrow in scope, that	13:51
did not allow consideration of drought, fire	
suppression, and potential recreation.	
Rather than allowing this narrow scope to define	
the Board's review, we ask the Board to consider that	
the original scope was inappropriate for a project of	
	to project effects." The NRCB should find that the SR1 fails the sustainable development frame of reference test and is not worthy of being found to be in the public interest. The focus on flood mitigation as the sole purpose of the project created a warped decision project, narrow in scope, that did not allow consideration of drought, fire suppression, and potential recreation. Rather than allowing this narrow scope to define the Board's review, we ask the Board to consider that



	1	this magnitude.	
	2	In NRCB Decision NR 2008-01 the Board stated:	
	3	(as read)	
	4	"Accordingly, the Joint Review Panel	
	5	concluded that the proposed diversion	
	6	plan fails to remedy the current	
	7	deficits and fails to meet future needs	
	8	for water. The Panel concludes that the	
	9	applicant's proposed diversion plans are	
	10	not sustainable and could not remedy the	13:52
	11	problems that already exist."	
	12	And then it goes on to say: (as read)	
	13	"Further, the Joint Review Panel	
	14	observed there were very few	
	15	alternatives for dealing effectively	
	16	with the demand for consumptive uses of	
	17	water during low flows."	
	18	And it concluded that, in the context of sustainable	
	19	development, there was a need for storage in the	
	20	Highwood Basin.	13:52
	21	And then the Joint Review Panel went on to say, and	
	22	I quote: (as read)	
	23	"The Joint Review Panel also required	
	24	that diversion plans for management of	
	25	water in the Highwood River be revised	
I			



		1
1	to meet the basic criteria of a sound	
2	water management project, including"	
3	And this is the fourth bullet: (as read)	
4	"Known future demands are met"	
5	And the fifth bullet:	
6	"Consideration is given for reserving	
7	water, if possible for future unknown	
8	requirements."	
9	SR1 does none of that.	
10	And in relation to consideration for reserving	13:53
11	water if possible for future unknown requirements, given	
12	climate change, there should be consideration given to	
13	that.	
14	Mr. Frigo from The City of Calgary suggested that	
15	the Elbow River doesn't have the flow for a new storage	
16	dam, but the Glenmore Reservoir is on the Elbow and yet	
17	it was filled up.	
18	Dr. Klepacki estimated you could fill MC1 four	
19	times in the course of a year based on volumes from the	
20	Elbow River.	13:54
21	SCLG asserts that the SR1 design is unprecedented.	
22	On day 5 of the hearing, Mr. Wood testified that the	
23	Pine Coulee Reservoir in southern Alberta is a	
24	comparison to SR1. Mr. Wood referred to Pine Coulee as	
25	an off-stream storage reservoir.	



h	
1	When asked for details of the similarities between
2	Pine Coulee and SR1, Mr. Svenson attempted to provide
3	some clarity on the similarities. He was unable to tell
4	the Panel whether Pine Coulee had a debris deflector; he
5	did not know the outlet capacity; he acknowledged that
6	the reservoir did not empty completely and had some
7	park-like amenities.
8	When you look at the NRCB Pine Coulee decision
9	report, you will see the small creek referred to by AT
10	on Friday, Willow Creek, is used for the Pine Coulee
11	Reservoir. Its maximum diversion flow is
12	8.5 cubic metres per second, and yet that reservoir is
13	50,000 dam cubed.
14	From the NRCB decision report, it states:
15	(as read)
16	"The canal would be constructed with a
17	seven metre bed width and have a flow
18	capacity of 8.5 cubic metres per
19	second."
20	Further, in Exhibit 325, AT states regarding the 13:
21	Elbow River: (as read)
22	"The mean annual flood of the
23	Elbow River in this reach is
24	70.9 cubic metres per second."
25	This is nearly nine times the maximum Pine Coulee



diverse flow rate.

1

2

3

4

5

Pine Coulee Reservoir is filled by this small Willow Creek, yet provides drought mitigation and irrigation capabilities over the long run for the surrounding and downstream communities.

6 There is very little that is similar between that 7 body of water and the SR1 plan. It is a desperate and misleading attempt to make an experimental project that 8 9 is without precedent, SR1 seem common and normal. When questioned, AT failed at drawing any direct comparisons 10 between Pine Coulee and SR1. Let's be crystal clear, 11 12 there is no similarity.

13 AT also refers in its reply evidence to the Miami 14 Ohio conservancy dams, which are 100 old. The Bow River 15 Basin Council Report, dated March 2014, refers to a tour 16 of the Ohio Dams by members of the Flood Recovery Task 17 Force and the Expert Panel on Flood Mitigation in January 2014. From this BRBC report, I quote: 18 19

(as read)

20 "Compared to the Elbow River system, the 21 dry dams of the Miami Conservancy 22 District in Ohio are in a radically 23 different ecosystem and climate and have 24 a much different elevation drop in their 25 rivers, as well as differing riparian



13:57

i		
1	ecology and species. To expect the same	
2	results of a dry dam in each system may	
3	be misleading. The highest rainfall	
4	event in the Miami River occurred in	
5	1925 at 121 millimetres in one day.	
6	Over three days, 170 millimetres was	
7	recorded in Bragg Creek in 2013.	
8	Considering the length and drop of each	
9	river, the average drop of the	
10	Miami River is .6 metres per kilometre,	13:58
11	whereas the average drop of the	
12	Elbow River is 8.83 metres per	
13	kilometre. The runoff coefficient in	
14	the Alberta East Slopes would be much	
15	higher than in the Eastern Corn Belt	
16	Plains Ecoregion with a dramatic	
17	difference in soils and slope. In our	
18	East Slopes, we would face a very	
19	different issue of introducing	
20	shallow-rooted, large, woody debris and	13:58
21	large boulders with significant gradient	
22	and bedload movement. This will make	
23	flows, timing, and debris very	
24	different, as well as the associated	
25	ongoing maintenance costs."	
		ll ll



A further discussion of the Miami Ohio dam is available
in Exhibit 133.
Moving now to project justification - key points:
Storage volumes. The Deltares report included that both
storage facilities have sufficient SR1, MC1 storage
capacity for a 1 in 200-return period and can offer the
same level of protection.

As discussed throughout this hearing, the reliance on storage capacity to conclude that SR1 equals MC1 is erroneous. The diversion limitation of SR1 creates a disproportionate reliance on river flow rate, which was not explored, not discussed by AT until this very hearing. This oversight is nothing less than astounding.

15 Perhaps in-stream dams don't need to consider flow 16 rates if they can control their outflows up to a certain 17 storage volume. Perhaps people involved simply overlook 18 that SR1 allowed more water to bypass it in a design 19 flood than was captured by the diversion inlet. Perhaps 20 no one thought to look at the outflow of the two 21 projects side by side to assess the impacts of a capped 22 Nonetheless, when MC1's superior outcome diversion. 23 becomes apparent, it should have been broadcast far and 24 wide. This is a fundamental and critical oversight that 25 is inexcusable considering communities, properties, and



13:59

lives are on the line. To rely on the storage capacity 1 2 comparison is inexcusable. 3 We heard specifically from AT that flow rates are 4 far more important than volumes. 5 Catchment area. Another reason given for the choice of SR1 over MC1 is SR1's larger catchment area. 6 7 AT and The City of Calgary referred to catchment area repeatedly over the course of the hearing. On Day 8 9 1 of the hearing, Mr. Hebert noted that very thing at Transcript page 158. 10 11 Mr. Frigo, on March 26th, offered to undertake to 12 provide details on the catchment area, which concluded 13 that SR1 was superior to MC1. The response from Mr. Frigo, Exhibit 378, provided details on the 14 15 catchment area. 16 AT has repeatedly referred to this so-called 17 advantage of SR1 over MC1. This appears similar to a reference in Exhibit 12, Table 12, page 38. 18 This is 19 really a critical point, and clarification is required. 20 A larger catchment area, in this case square 14:01 21 kilometres, does not necessarily translate to a much 22 larger water volume or flow rate, especially considering 23 the topography of the Elbow River. 24 The City of Calgary response stated that MC1 was 25 58 percent of the catchment rather than 96 percent



suggested in cross-examination. This is an apples-to-oranges comparison and misleads the Board by falsely comparing SCLG's number of 96 percent of the flow that MC1 would catch relative to the flow that SR1 would catch, to a drainage area based on square kilometres.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

The 96 percent is a flow rate measurement that comes from the Elbow River tributary made by a graduate environmental science class of the University of Calgary in 2012.

11 Dr. Klepacki reviewed published flow measures of 12 the tributaries and mainstream Elbow River by Sosiak and 13 These are the last published measurements of Dixon. 14 these quantities. These measurements show that MC1 15 captures 90.4 percent of the peak flows above the 16 Glenmore Reservoir, and SR1 will have the capability of 17 a percentage of 98 percent of flows above the Glenmore, 18 if all flows were captured. However, because SR1 allows 19 some river flows to bypass the diversion, MC1 will 20 capture more than 91 percent of what SR1 captures.

In summary, on this point, the Elbow River, most of the volume and flow rate is generated in the headwaters, as would be expected in a Foothills region. This is why Bragg Creek floods when Calgary floods. This is intuitive.



14:02

The use of square kilometres to choose SR1 over MC1

2 is not appropriate and the analysis should have been to a much deeper level that considered rates and volumes. 3 4 Catchment area is a gross oversimplification in the SR1 versus MC1 context. A review of Exhibit 12 shows 5 6 the very high correlation between the Bragg Creek 7 station and the Combined Station/Glenmore readings over time for both volumes and rates, consistent with 8 9 Dr. Klepacki's findings. 10 In Exhibit 252, the AEP decision report from 2015, 11 the SR1 project was chosen because it was less 12 expensive, more environmentally friendly, and could be 13 delivered in a shorter timeline. 14 In Exhibit 325, page 8, AT's response to SCLG still 15 uses these same justifications that existed in 2015. 16 The SCLG rejects all these justifications, with the 17 exception of SR1 timelines, which at this point is no 18 doubt faster. 19 SNN is less expensive. Now we know that SR1 costs 20 are well over MC1. SR1 has less environmental impact. 21 This is not backed up by science. No negative

14:04

14:04

environmental outcomes for SR1 were considered at all until the EIA in 2018. A comparison of the two projects based on science has not been done.

SR1 has less impact on the Elbow River. This is a



2703

1

22

23

24

judgment not based on science. Now the proponent states 1 2 that water may be drawn from the Elbow River to water 3 the reservoir. 4 SR1 is off-stream and less sensitive to impacts 5 from sediment or debris. This is not backed up by 6 evidence. If anything, SR1 has more sediment and debris 7 issues being downstream. In fact, a debris reflector wasn't added until 2018, after the EIA was submitted. 8 9 There is no doubt that sediment is a huge problem at SR1. 10 11 SR1 presented less risk than MC1 during 12 We have seen no evidence to support this construction. 13 conclusion. Yet the 2017 Opus report stated that MC1 is 14 relatively easy to operate, meanwhile, the complexity of operating SR1 during a flood is glaring. 15 SR1 has less impact on social recreational values. 16 17 This is a judgment and is reflective of continued bias 18 by the proponent against natural grasslands and their environmental, social, and recreational utility. 19 20 There was no consideration of the community 21 surrounding the SR1 at all and no mention of any air 22 quality concerns until 2018. Air quality risks are 23 highly concerning to my clients.

24SR1 has less impact on commercial tourism values.25Another judgment. There was significant focus on MC1



14:05

recreational attributes in the AEP decision report, 1 2 Exhibit 252. 3 Yet, in the Opus report of 2017, it was concluded 4 that, in fact, very few existing recreational amenities 5 were impacted (19 camp stalls, a camp store, wastewater 6 lift station, and a Ranger station.) 7 The question that the Panel needs to consider when reviewing the justification for this project is whether 8 9 or not the proponent's conclusions are based on judgment and science. Rocky View County's 2018 report on SR1, 10 11 Exhibit 255, stated: (as read) 12 "That in choosing the SR1 project over 13 the McLean Creek option, Alberta 14 Environment and Parks relied on 15 technical experts to make subjective 16 choices on values not linked to the 17 technical merit of either option. The 18 public should have inputs into these value-based decisions, as other choices 19 20 are possible." 14:07 21 Regarding the Bragg Creek berms, a project upstream of 22 Bragg Creek would still benefit Bragg Creek and Redwood 23 It would reduce groundwater flooding and Meadows. 24 increase flood mitigation substantially at higher flow 25 rates, such as a 2013 flood or greater, by reducing the



chance that the berms are breached. There is still 1 2 incremental benefit to these communities from an 3 upstream alternative like MC1. Under the heading of "Unequal Outcomes." Alberta 4 5 Transportation acknowledges that SR1 was designed to 6 protect the city of Calgary from a 1 in 200-year flood. 7 As has been shown through AT's Witness Panel Number 1's responses to cross-examination questions, the SR1 8 9 creates unequal levels of flood protection. As confirmed by Mr. Dowsett in his report, there 10 11 are 16 Springbank properties located directly below and 12 south of the proposed SR1 embankment reservoir that 13 experienced flooding in the 2013 flood that would not be 14 Mr. Dowsett highlighted this protected by this project. 15 during his cross at Exhibit 379, page 1405. 16 He said: (as read) "The ones I'm concerned about are those 17 directly below the foot of the dam, that 18 19 are below the emergency spillway, and 20 I'm worried about those people and what 14:09 21 they knew and what they understood the 22 hazard was and what operational 23 decisions may be taken by the operator 24 that would increase the rates coming 25 down this river and raising numbers even


1	higher."
2	It is important to note that AT did not challenge this
3	evidence.
4	AT also agreed with Mr. Dowsett that the residual
5	flood risk of the project is similar to that of a 1 in
6	50-year flood, in Exhibit 327. This is best explained
7	by using rates. Some of these properties flooded in
8	2005 with a 300 cubic metres per second flood event.
9	In a design flood of 1240 cubic metres per second,
10	SR1 will take between 480 and 600 cubic metres per
11	second. This leaves between 640 and 780 cubic metres
12	per second going down the river. If these homes were
13	protected to a 1 in 100-year flood, that would be
14	protection to approximately 990 cubic metres per second,
15	the rate used for the design of the Bragg Creek berms.
16	Rather, these homes and businesses will flood at levels
17	well below a 1 in 100-year flood. This is inferior and
18	in contravention of the design standards in Alberta of a
19	minimum of 1 in 100-flood mitigation level.
20	The Canadian Dam Association Guidelines state a
21	minimum level of 1 in 100-year level of flood protection
22	for new projects. Similarly, the Government of Canada,
23	the Alberta government, and The City of Calgary bylaws
24	state a 1 in 100-year minimum level of flood protection.
25	Why are some communities receiving a vaccine that is not



14:10

100 percent effective?

1

Although AT accepted -- attempted to diminish the 2 3 impacts to these 16 residents by suggesting, during 4 cross-examination of Mr. Dowsett, that those residents 5 within the 1 and 100-year flood hazard are in an area that Rocky View County's land use bylaw had prohibited 6 7 development. It is important to note, as Mr. Fitch said, not only is it not an exhibit, but there's no 8 9 documentary evidence of Rocky View's land use bylaw on the record, there's no evidence from Rocky View County 10 11 regarding this bylaw, their interpretation of it, and 12 its effects on existing residents. This bylaw dated 13 January 2021 is not applicable retroactively, and we 14 submit that the Board should disregard any information 15 regarding Rocky View's land use bylaw in making a 16 decision on this project. It simply doesn't apply to 17 the existing residents that are going to be affected.

2708

18 In response to the concerns raised by the SCLG
19 about flood risk downstream of SR1, Mr. Wood in
20 Exhibit 350 stated: (as read)

21 "There are some residents, part of
22 Rocky View County, there's some golf
23 courses. It is only those who have
24 built very close to the river who may
25 get flooded. Those who are down low may



14:12

1	still have problems in a 2013 event,	
2	that what they get for living near the	
3	river."	
4	Is this statement not diametrically opposed to the	
5	entire purpose of SR1, which is to protect residents and	
6	inner city locations that are next to the river?	
7	Can we transpose this statement to, that's what	
8	Elbow Park, Roxboro, and Rideau get for living near the	
9	river, all of which are located along the river in	
10	the city of Calgary.	14:13
11	As expressed by CRCAG in their submissions, the	
12	Board must prioritize public health and safety.	
13	Prioritization of public health and safety should	
14	include consideration of impacts to residents upstream	
15	of the project and directly below the project.	
16	In the event of a failure of the dam or structure,	
17	or in the event of flows greater than the design flood,	
18	SR1's location is a serious concern. As discussed in	
19	Exhibit 373, the time for the residents below the	
20	reservoir to evacuate could be less than one hour. And	14:13
21	Mr. Menninger indicated there could be up to a hundred	
22	fatalities as a result of a catastrophic failure of the	
23	SR1 reservoir.	
24	Moving now to the heading "Social and Economic	
25	Project Costs and Benefits."	



T		1
1	The NRCB/CEAA Joint Review Panel issued a decision	
2	report in May 1998 on the Little Bow Project/Highwood	
3	Diversion Plan Application to construct a water	
4	management project to convey and store water diverted	
5	from the Highwood River.	
6	And at Section 8.9 of that decision, the Board, the	
7	JRP wrote: (as read)	
8	"Despite concerns about the extent to	
9	which some project benefits and costs	
10	were adequately quantified in the	14:14
11	economic evaluation, the Panel concludes	
12	that, on balance, project benefits would	
13	exceed costs."	
14	They go on to say that they go on to say: (as read)	
15	"A conclusion that the project is in the	
16	public interest does not commit the	
17	government of Alberta to actually to	
18	actually investing public funds in the	
19	project. Should the Panel determine	
20	that a project is in the public	14:15
21	interest, it remains the responsibility	
22	of the government of Alberta to actually	
23	decide whether an investment of public	
24	funds is warranted."	
25	And it's interesting, in relation to in relation to	
1		



the project that the JRP were looking at, they said the project operations would directly and indirectly lead to a significant increase in reasonable employment and economic activity, would provide new recreational opportunities, it would further enhance the quality of life in the region and become a reasonable tourist attraction. But even with all of those benefits, there was still this caveat that I just expressed.

9 In this case, the Board should have a great deal of 10 concern about the extent to which project benefits and 11 costs were adequately quantified in the economic 12 evaluation. The SCLG submits that the Board should 13 conclude that, on balance, project costs, including 14 ongoing operating costs, which exceed project benefits.

Some things are a certainty. SR1 will not improve
water supply conditions, like the Little Bow project.
SR1 will not result in irrigation expansion. SR1 will
not provide new recreational opportunities. The mud
hole will not become a regional tourist attraction and,
in fact, it's likely the opposite.

14:17

14:16

As I mentioned, the Board -- the JRP said that, just because a project is in the public interest doesn't commit the government of Alberta to actually invest public funds in the project.

25

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

The SCLG hopes the Board will warn the government



REPORTING GROUP

of Alberta that this project does not meet the test of sustainable development and that the money could be better spent on a project like MC1 that included flood protection greater than 1 in 200 for more communities, as well as contemplated future water needs in the age of rising temperatures, climate change and drought.

7 Alternatively, given the benefits of SR1 are designed to accrue to communities downstream of the 8 9 Glenmore Reservoir, then perhaps some of this money for SR1 is best redirected to a large-scale flood mitigation 10 14:18 11 project for Calgary's downtown core where most of the 12 damage occurred in 2013. The advantage to this is 13 the city of Calgary would not be beholden to adverse 14 parties from a timeline standpoint.

15

16

17

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

So let's examine the benefits.

On day 1 of the hearing, the proponent agreed that the avoided damages used to arrive at a benefit cost analysis for SR1 did not include any avoided damages upstream of the Glenmore Reservoir and below SR1.

The proponent also agreed that MC1 would have higher benefits as it would have protected more communities to a higher level than SR1. These benefits would be higher for the life of the project. The increased benefits for MC1 over SR1 were not measured above a 1240 cubic metres per second flood or for the



communities between SR1 and Glenmore, or the communities 1 upstream that would be better protected by MC1 even to a 2 3 1 in 1,000 flood level. 4 Capital project costs. 5 Bragg Creek, which have always been linked with SR1, have increased from 209 million in 2014 to 6 7 263 million in the 2015 IBI report to \$580 million The proponent refers to 432 million as the 8 today. 9 project cost. This ignores costs to date and is a present value or discounted number. 10 14:19 11 The \$580 million capital cost includes construction 12 costs of 340 million from Exhibit 159; land costs of 13 140 million, Exhibit 100; Bragg Creek berms of 14 42 million, Exhibit 254; that totals \$522 million. 15 Add to this, payments to the Rocky View County of 16 10 million cash, and 10.5 million in intersections, and 17 the 32 million grant to Tsuut'ina. 18 Add to this the newly disclosed detour road 19 upgrades to Range Road 40 and Township Road 250 of 20 3.8 million, Exhibit 385; and wetland replacement costs 14:20 21 of approximately 800,000, and you arrive at 22 \$580 million. The MC1 report, Exhibit 101, included a 23 capital cost of \$406 million. 24 Uncertain costs. In cross-examination on day 3,

Uncertain costs. In cross-examination on day 3, Mr. Hebert indicated twice that access road relocation



for landowners was a construction cost, but in response 1 2 to an undertaking, the claim was made it was a land 3 acquisition cost. Which one is correct? 4 The access relocation costs were not specifically 5 mentioned in Exhibit 159. These changes are mentioned 6 at Exhibit 138, with no costing associated with the 7 changes. The total project budget 8 Uncertain costs. Land. 9 for the 3600 acres is now \$140 million. That is just under 40,000 per acre, which is nearly doubled the 2017 10 11 cost. The original land cost used in the 2015 decision was 40 million, as stated in Exhibit 100. 12 It is unclear 13 how this land cost will settle out. The strange shape 14 of the PDA, the fingers that creates the 3600 acres is 15 nonsensical from a land acquisition standpoint and there will be budgetary implications. 16

14:21

Missing costs. All other facilitation payments to
First Nations which AT has refused to disclose. This is
a public project, not a private corporation. Disclosure
of these payments is in the public interest to determine 14:22
the true cost benefit.

Missing costs. Kamp Kiwanis accommodation, either
for interrupted operations during construction,
relocation of the camp, or any other compensation.
Again, this is a cost that should be disclosed for the



purpose of determining the true cost benefits. 1 2 Missing costs. Environmental offsets, including --3 and this was news to us -- "building replacement habitat 4 on the Bow River for habitat lost on the Elbow River" as 5 a result of SR1, as discussed in Exhibit 385 at Transcript pages 1774 and 1779. This is the first time 6 7 that SCLG has heard of this additional cost. MC1 in Exhibit 101 included 10 million for aquatic 8 9 habitat management plan, but there is no equivalent for SR1. 10 11 Missing costs. AT did not provide fish passage 12 measures on the Unnamed Creek, where erosion mitigation 13 measures are proposed. Are fish not passing through the 14 conduit, into a constructed channel, and into the 15 Unnamed Creek? The proponent rejected a request to have 16 a sediment screen at the low-level outlet which would 17 impede fish passage. Is this another missing cost? And I provide a transcript reference. 18 I'm not going to read the transcript references, but they're in 19 20 the document. And in some cases the transcript 21 reference is in the document -- in the argument.

22 Missing costs. AT has not provided a cost for 23 wetland replacement. MC1 did have a wetland offset cost 24 of 700,000 in Exhibit 101, while SR1 has no such budget, 25 despite the fact that wetlands are lost.



14:23

1		
1	The SCLG provided an estimate of 830,000 using the	
2	MC1 budget per hectare, but we look to the Panel to	
3	require this detail as a direct project cost of SR1. To	
4	date, AT has not provided any offsetting details aside	
5	from what we heard from AT on day 9. It is possible	
6	that there are more offsetting plans that weren't	
7	mentioned.	
8	Missing costs. CEAA conditions, Exhibit 219, for	
9	embankment and diversion channel riprap, removal of	
10	storage of the diversion channel substrate and reservoir	14:25
11	grading are expensive.	
12	Missing costs. Dam safety recommendations are	
13	costly, especially the recommendation for a second	
14	outlet and increased capacity of the emergency spillway.	
15	In Exhibit 327, AT states: (as read)	
16	"The design of the emergency spillway is	
17	underway. The need for erosion	
18	protection is part of this design and	
19	will be reviewed by AEP dam safety as	
20	part of Alberta Transportation's	14:25
21	Water Act application."	
22	We are unclear how unsubstantial these costs are, but	
23	they should be included by the Board.	
24	Missing costs. Public benefit. Parking lot,	
25	pathways, any accommodations for the local community for	



benefit. 1 2 Missing costs. Any upgrades required to systems or 3 infrastructure for emergency management, especially 4 considering the significance of this project on a small 5 county like Rocky View County. 6 Missing costs. Updated pipeline estimates that 7 have not changed for five years or so, 2016, Mary Robinson was told by TEC, which is 8 Exhibit 159. two of the seven impacted pipelines, that their costs 9 are 24 million. That's Exhibit 357, transcript 10 14:26 11 pages 509 to 510. 12 The current budget in Exhibit 159 is 12.4 million 13 in totality. Again, we are seven years into this project, sitting here for a final approval by the 14 15 regulatory body, and pipeline costs haven't been updated in the past five years. If Mary Robinson is correct, 16 17 these costs could increase the project budget by at 18 least \$20 million. 19 Exhibit 138 lists a change of new erosion 20 management measures along the full length of the 14:27 21 Unnamed Creek: (as read) 22 "Alberta Transportation, as a result of 23 feedback from regulators, Indigenous 24 groups and stakeholders, has revised the 25 design to include measures to reduce



h		1
1	erosion along the full length of the	
2	Unnamed Creek and to further mitigate	
3	sediment mobilization into the	
4	Unnamed Creek and reduce sediment input	
5	into the Elbow River."	
6	These were also referenced on day 7. The SCLG is unable	
7	to find reference to these erosion reduction measures	
8	along the full length of the Unnamed Creek in	
9	Exhibit 159. In the change summary memo, Exhibit 160,	
10	these erosion measures are not mentioned. As such, we	14:27
11	are concerned that these costs are excluded from	
12	Exhibit 159. We attempted to ask about these costs on	
13	day 1 of the hearing, but were unable to determine if	
14	they are included and what the specific costs are.	
15	Operating costs. Exhibit 159 shows annual	
16	operating costs of 30,000, with no full-time staff	
17	listed; no costs for fire suppression operations; no	
18	costs for testing and reporting requirements for water	
19	or air; no costs for wildlife management, no costs	
20	sorry no costs for wildlife management, including	14:28
21	surveys and reporting, mapping for migratory birds; no	
22	costs for security; no costs for emergency planning	
23	preparedness, including staff training; no costs for	
24	flood forecasting; no costs for the proposed community	
25	liaison or administration of First Nations land use	



committee. Exhibit 159, Table 49, page 231. 1 2 Flood costs direct. Exhibit 159 provides some 3 estimate of flood operations and post-flood operations 4 activities. The proponent has used an average annual 5 benefit calculation for the design flood. Yet, the 6 post-flood costs appear to relate to smaller floods. 7 Reseeding, for instance, uses 25 percent of a 20-year Is this reflective of a design flood? 8 . [oog 9 This appears to be inconsistent with the benefits which are annualized and based on a design flood. Why 10 11 would benefits be based on a design flood, but costs on 12 a much smaller flood? Should benefits be based on a 13 much smaller flood, then, or should the costs be based 14 on the design flood? 15 Flood costs - direct. Dam personnel costs in a 16 flood event are estimated to be every 20 years for a 17 total of 65,000 for four dam attendants. Mr. Wood 18 stated it would be used ten times in the last hundred 19 years. Why is this cost every 20 years? Is the dam going to operate itself during a 1 in 10-year flood? 20 Do 21 these people stay at the site for 36 hours or 50 hours 22 straight during filling, or are they working shifts with 23 another crew or two? Are they on site while water is in 24 the reservoir? This is lacking all sorts of detail. 25 Flood costs - direct. Flood operations are missing



```
14:29
```

costs for emergency operations, including personnel for 1 2 road closures and security at the site of impounded 3 All costs of water testing and reporting, air water. 4 quality monitoring and reporting. There appear to be no 5 costs for the adaptive management program Mr. Hebert referred to for dust suppression, which would include 6 7 tackifier, even the 16 months post-flood. There is no budget for tackifier listed anywhere. Mr. Zelt 8 estimated that tackifiers could run into hundreds of 9 thousands of dollars for a design flood. 10

Flood costs - direct. There's additionally no cost for watering the newly seeded sediment, and in an arid, windy location like Springbank, during the dry summer months, watering is a likely requirement, although the proponent acknowledged on day 10 that water may be diverted from the Elbow River for this purpose. This cost -- this is a cost that could be substantial.

Flood costs - direct. All wildlife rescue costs in the two to three days before a flood. This would be a massive undertaking at significant costs which are not estimated.

Flood costs - direct. Fish rescue costs are missing. If a 30-person crew of fish rescuers, including supervising biologists, is required for the 30 days of draining, this could run in the hundreds of



14:31

1 thousands of dollars. See day 7 of the transcript. 2 Why haven't these operating costs been estimated? 3 How can the Board make a decision without a full 4 accounting of the future expected costs? We view that 5 this lack of detail is due to the unique nature of the 6 project, which does not provide an operating model 7 anywhere in Canada. Yet, these costs are relevant to the decision before this Board. All flood relating 8 9 operating costs should be estimated for a design flood just like the benefits. 10 11 Post-flood costs - indirect. This includes repairs 12 to the Bragg Creek berms, Redwood Meadows berms. 13 Although the proponent states these will be borne by the 14 owner of the infrastructure, it must be clear that, had 15 MC1 been chosen, these costs would be avoided. Instead. these costs are being downloaded to Rocky View County 16 17 and Tsuut'ina Nation. 18 Post-flood costs - indirect. Park infrastructure. 19 Park infrastructure at Highway 66 was damaged in the

Park infrastructure at Highway 66 was damaged in the 20 2013 flood, pathways, parking lots, visitor amenities 21 such as washrooms. These costs would reasonably be 22 expected again in a design flood.

Benefit cost analysis. Until 2019, SR1 had a
favourable benefit cost ratio relative to MC1. All
figures from Exhibit 100, the May 2019 benefit cost, I



14:32

guess B/C update, SR1 has a benefit cost of 1.28, 1 2 including Bragg Creek berms of 32 million, while MC1 had 3 a benefit cost ratio of 1 to 41. MC1 is the project 4 with the better economics at this point. 5 SR1's benefit cost ratio of 1.28 is also missing 6 the 9 million of new costs of the Bragg Creek berms, now 7 at 42.2 million, and also the updated capital costs, including another 17 million of capital to align with 8 9 the new capital costs of 340 million, versus the 323 million included in Exhibit 100. It is also missing 10 14:34 11 the road costs of 3.8 million required for the detour 12 route and all facilitation payments. 13 Each new cost added to SR1 drives this benefit cost ratio lower and lower, further below the benefit cost 14 15 This is relevant to this Panel. ratio of MC1. 16 Simplistically, the MC1 project has higher benefits 17 due to more communities receiving a higher level of 18 protection; all communities receive the 100 percent 19 effective vaccine. It also has lower costs at this 20 point with the capital cost of 406 million, sitting 14:35 21 approximately 170 million cheaper than SR1's 22 580 million. Yes, the 580 million includes facilitation 23 payments to RVC, and to Tsuut'ina. These are costs of 24 the project. Even excluding these known payments for 25 withdrawal of opposition, generously, SR1 is sitting at



527 million, including construction costs from 1 2 Exhibit 159, Bragg Creek berms and the new roads. 3 In summary, SCLG asks that all the costs of the SR1 4 project be estimated and documented. Hidden capital 5 costs, including infrastructure repairs to upstream 6 berms, should be identified and noted. Secret 7 agreements must be brought to light. Operating costs for flood events should be estimated prior to the Panel 8 9 ruling on this project. Social costs. AT from the very beginning chose a 10 14:36 11 strategy that pitted stakeholder against stakeholder. 12 It has been highly divisive. In the beginning it was 13 rural landowners against Elbow River residents. 14 Rocky View against Calgary, urban against rural. There 15 was never an attempt to bring stakeholders together to 16 try and find a win/win solution. And I hope, Mr. Chair, 17 you'll address this in relation to how the consultation 18 was conducted. 19 Looking to the future, the conflict will be between 20 the landowners surrounding SR1, First Nations, and the 14:36 21 public. The SCLG did not see a satisfactory resolution 22 to this conflict looming. 23 In their opening statement on Day 1, the proponent 24 was dismissive of the impacts to Springbank and to



There was no mention of the

25

landowners.

multi-generational ranching history, the families who 1 2 will be wiped out by this project. For Lee Drewry and 3 his siblings, land taken by the government when it will 4 be -- will essentially wipe out the family ranching business in the area, leaving the family with the choice 5 of relocating or giving up their ranching operations. 6 7 That is a tough choice, but even tougher for the children who will no longer have a choice to live on or 8 9 ranch the land of their great, great grandparents. If they had to do it all over again, landowners might have 10 11 had their children provide evidence. Their children are

If this project gets approved, then generational land will be taken. The proponent makes this sound like an everyday occurrence. It is not. The taking of such a huge contiguous block of land is extremely uncommon.

losing most if this project proceeds.

12

13

14

15

16

14:37

14:38

17 The potential for degraded air quality following 18 flood operations is an unacceptable social cost. This 19 project creates an air quality problem that will be 20 challenging to manage and that will no doubt impact the 21 quality of life of residents surrounding the reservoir 22 and downwind. The proponent contends that these periods 23 will be brief, but does not dispute that they will 24 How is it possible that this Panel would occur. 25 knowingly approve a project with this unacceptable



outcome when it could be avoided?

1

2

3

4

5

The SCLG asserts that the Springbank community bears all of the social and also economic costs of the project while the benefit is passed to residents downstream of the Glenmore Reservoir in Calgary.

The safety and viability of our community is at 6 7 risk with this project over the long run. SCLG will live with the impacts to water quality and quantity, 8 degraded air quality, loss of heritage and culture, 9 including the loss of pioneering families who also 10 11 experience loss of inheritance, and loss of their 12 natural environment. This imbalance of the distribution 13 of benefits and costs is striking. Monitoring these 14 effects is not mitigating.

15 CRCAG's closing argument mentioned disruption and 16 impacted bus routes, so, instead, these burdens are 17 passed to Springbank residents and their children on 18 school buses, who will be detoured.

19 With all due respect, CRCAG will take any project 20 that has the shortest timeline when referring to impacts 21 of lost memories collected over generations. What about 22 lost generational land due to SR1? By enthusiastically 23 supporting SR1, CRCAG is enthusiastically supporting 24 negative social and health outcomes in another 25 community.



14:39

CRCAG also mentions substantial economic costs for 1 2 flood-proofing homes. These costs are borne by upstream 3 communities too. 4 The proponents have referred to various future 5 plans that will be developed for all areas of the 6 project operations, land use, dam operations, first 7 fill, air quality monitoring, and adaptive management, weed control, and more. These theoretical plans are 8 9 important and are required now, not after the project is approved. 10 14:40 11 As a condition of approval, the SCLG requests the 12 Panel consider the burdens imposed by the project on the 13 local community and include a budget for community benefit. 14 15 Alternatives considered. Despite what AT and CRCAG 16 have said in their final argument today about 17 alternatives, the Board specifically included in 18 Topic Block 1, 1.3, "Alternatives Considered" as a 19 specific subtopic in Topic Block 1. 20 As The City of Calgary correctly noted in its final 14:41 21 argument, alternatives considered are contextually relevant to the Board's decision in this case. 22 23 And I thought I would direct your attention to the 24 May 1998 Little Bow Project decision of the NRCB. The 25 JRP stated at pdf page 37 of that decision under heading



3.2: (as read) 1 "As discussed in Section 2, water 2 3 management alternatives within the 4 Little Bow River basin have been 5 extensively examined. Twelve potential 6 water storage sites in the Little 7 Bow River were identified." Contrast that to what we have in front of you. 8 MC1 and 9 SR1 were both screening level through 2015 and maybe AT could argue for conceptual design by 2017. AT has led 10 14:42 11 the taxpayers of Alberta and the future generations of 12 Alberta down by only taking one project through a 13 feasibility stage. In fact, when new information about 14 cost, sediment, air quality were identified, no one even 15 stopped to ask if SR1 was still the best path forward. 16 The Little Bow project offers a glaring contrast to 17 There was no extensive examination of alternatives SR1. 18 in this case, and that is a shortcoming of this 19 application. 20 At pdf page 40 of the JRP report, the JRP stated --14:43

21 basically they were critical. They said: (as read) 22 "Consequently, the diversion plan 23 associated with the Expanded Squaw 24 Coulee project component failed to meet 25 basic conveyance needs and licence



requirements. This less comprehensive 1 2 approach to identifying alternatives 3 needed has serious implications." 4 One of the major implications is climate change in this 5 What if the -- what if the 1 in 500-year flood case. 6 becomes the 1 in 200-year flood in terms of frequency as 7 noted by Mr. Fennell. What if there is serious drought in the future? The lack of a comprehensive approach in 8 9 identifying alternatives should result in a denial of Indeed, after the horse had left the 10 this application. 11 barn, the Opus report, basically, dated Exhibit -- dated 12 August 2017, but only brought to light in June of 2019 13 when it was filed as a result of an NRCB round 1 IR. 14 indicated that MC1 was a superior alternative to SR1.

14:44

14:44

15 So there was no extensive investigation done here. 16 AT jumped to a rapid conclusion in 2014 without any 17 It is worthwhile comparing the Bow River serious study. 18 dam projects as Karin Hunter discussed in Topic 2. SR1 19 is just now at the feasibility stage, and it is not too 20 late to take another look. On the Bow River, all three 21 dam options are going through a three-year feasibility Further, public consultation 22 What a contrast. study. 23 with affected parties on the Bow River occurred during 24 the conceptual design and will be ongoing through the 25 feasibility stage.



h		1
1	In the Rocky View County report dated December	
2	2018, Exhibit 255, it stated: (as read)	
3	"This report does not recommend one	
4	option over another; however, in the	
5	review of the literature and discussions	
6	with technical experts, the County	
7	believes that both the McLean Creek dam	
8	and the Priddis diversion were	
9	prematurely dismissed and not given a	
10	thorough technical analysis so that	14:4
11	objective decisions could be made."	
12	In Exhibit 358, AT stated that RVC was presented with	
13	the Opus report and provided a link to an update	
14	provided to RVC. However, the three pages presented on	
15	the Opus report in 2017 to RVC did not show the	
16	difference between SR1 and MC1 on flood effectiveness.	
17	Therefore, SCLG rejects the proponent's claim that	
18	RVC was aware of the superior flood mitigation outcomes	
19	of MC1. The three pages were MC1 costs and timelines	
20	and two MC1 illustrations.	14:40
21	And Rocky View County residents are directly harmed	
22	by SR1 and would have improved outcomes and would	
23	have improved outcomes with MC1. This outcome has never	
24	been discussed by the proponent until raised by the SCLG	
25	at this hearing despite the outcry from the local	



1 community over the past seven years. 2 RVC residents are harmed by new provincial 3 guidelines, Exhibit 356, that will cap payouts to 4 landowners at \$500,000, one time. 5 And I've listed here in paragraphs 151 through to 154 a number of other harms that Rocky View County and 6 7 my clients, in particular, are harmed by. And I think what I'll do, Mr. Chair, is, again, 8 9 given that I'm sort of halfway -- I think I'm more than halfway through, so I'm just going to check on my -- how 10 14:47 11 I'm doing. So-so from a timing perspective. 12 I want to then move ahead to Crown Okav. 13 engagement with the public, and this is starting at 14 paragraph 163 of our final argument. 15 It is the position of the SCLG that AT's 16 consultation with the public, especially the directly 17 impacted landowners, is inadequate and lacking in depth 18 considering the impact these landowners -- considering 19 the impact on these landowners and the Springbank 20 community. 14:48 21 And I'm again, just to save time, I'm not going to read those paragraphs line by line, but I would refer to 22 23 paragraph 168. 24

As pointed out by members of the SCLG, notably Lee Drewry, AT's approach to consultation has not been

25



h		1
1	fair. The residents that are directly impacted by this	
2	project have not been given the same level of	
3	consideration and attention as AT has given to other	
4	groups, such as CRCAG. Mr. Drewry put the issue this	
5	way: (as read)	
6	"So that, to me, is a theme throughout	
7	this whole seven or eight-year debacle	
8	that the rural communities don't seem to	
9	matter as much as the urban communities,	
10	and not even all communities are treated	14:4
11	equally. It seems the ones downstream	
12	from the Glenmore Reservoir are treated	
13	better than the rest. With regards to	
14	the City of Calgary's presentation, I	
15	thought it was interesting that they	
16	indicated they attempted to monetize the	
17	cultural and historical values created	
18	within that flood zone area, and yet I'm	
19	not aware of any attempt by the	
20	proponent to monetize the loss of family	14:5
21	history and the agricultural history	
22	that would be decimated with the	
23	proposed project. So I found that a bit	
24	disconcerting that there's not an equal	
25	playing field in terms of valuing that	



2 Even in the creation of future land use plans for the 3 reservoir area, priority is being given to 4 First Nations' exercise of their traditional rights 5 without any recognition of the multigenerational 6 ranching history of the families that will be removed by 7 the project. For instance, Mary Robinson, Brian Copithorne, and 8 9 Lee Drewry's families have been ranching in the area since the 1800s, and yet there's no recognition of that 10 history that will be wiped away.

12 And I think what I'll do is, given that I've got four more topic blocks to discuss, I will just leave the 13 14 remaining paragraphs in my document for your perusal 15 without reading them into the record.

So now --

THE CHAIR: 17 Excuse me, Mr. Secord, and I 18 presume, then, that other counsels, they will all 19 receive or maybe already have your final argument --20 MR. SECORD: They have, yes. 21 THE CHAIR: -- this is perhaps a little 22 different than what would normally happen, but I mean, 23 if it's going to be accepted in as an exhibit under no 24 objection, then, unless other parties would want to 25 object now and have you either not enter



14:51

14:50

historical resource."

1

11

anything you're not sort of addressing orally or --1 2 which I don't really see, but I would just like to ask 3 the question now --MR. SECORD: 4 Sure. 5 THE CHAIR: -- in terms of time, I sort of 6 appreciate the approach --7 MR. SECORD: Sure. THE CHAIR: Other counsel, any objections? 8 9 MR. KRUHLAK: Mr. Chairman, it's Ron Kruhlak. I certainly understand Mr. Secord's position, that 10 14:52 11 if he has materials and feeling some time constraint to 12 not have to review everything orally, and I don't think 13 we'd have a concern if it's some minor limits, but I 14 guess I just would flag it, that if we're having what 15 might become effectively a written submission, then 16 that makes it a little more challenging, that's all. 17 But I take it, there's a few paragraphs we're 18 moving from one section to the next? 19 MR. SECORD: Right. And I'm sort of halfway 20 through my argument, so I think I'm in -- I think I 14:52 21 should be able to finish by 4. I may not read every 22 line.

And, of course, there's a lot of references in there, which I think we agreed we wouldn't be having to read transcript references.



So, hopefully, that will be, you know, acceptable 1 2 to Mr. Kruhlak. 3 MR. KRUHLAK: Agreed. 4 THE CHAIR: Agreed. Okay, thank you, 5 Mr. Kruhlak. Thank you, Mr. Secord. Proceed. 6 MR. SECORD: So moving to Topic Block Number 2, 7 in terms of the future land use plan for the project development area, the draft land use plan creates 8 9 wholesale land use changes from what was contemplated. In the early days of the project, the proponent assured 10 11 landowners they would continue to be able to ranch the 12 Lee Drewry asserts landowners were regularly -land. 13 well, as First Nation opposition became more obvious, 14 the proponent changed gears and cut out landowner usage 15 and began to focus on making promises to First Nations 16 regarding land use. 17 This is obvious in the First Nations' consultation

14:53

14:54

18 records. Landowners were kicked to the curb and the 19 focus became traditional usage for First Nations to try 20 and bring them onside. In the hearing, the proponent 21 seemed to try to appease the public and the 22 First Nations by claims of opportunities to use the 23 lands, but essentially AT is kicking the can down the 24 road to AEP to figure out all the competing land uses 25 that AT has promised. Interestingly, landowners are



way down the list in terms of future land usage. 1 If SR1 is approved, AEP says it will be 2 3 responsible for consulting the stakeholders to develop 4 the final land use plan consistent with the Draft Use 5 Principles for the project. What does this even mean? 6 Does "consistent with the draft land use principles 7 "mean that any and all community benefit items are automatically excluded because they conflict with 8 First Nations' use? 9 10 Additional conflicts relate to hunting. 11 Mr. Wagner is concerned about hunting for a variety of 12 reasons, including safety and concern for the elk herd. 13 First Nations support hunting. Hunting is at odds with 14 public use of this land and its location along two main 15 roads, yet even more conflicts are expected post-flood with the use of tackifiers and herbicides conflict with 16 17 traditional use. 18 Further, the state of the reservoir, the largest land use area post-flood is a completely unknown 19 20 outcome. 21 General management of the reservoir may also be at 22 odds with First Nation traditional use. Mowing for 23 fire suppression conflicts with traditional uses such

25 behaviour. AT thinks that AEP can solve all these

as planned collecting and may impact wildlife

24



14:55

issues.

1

25

2 In terms of historical resources, Mary Robinson 3 notes that there are many historical and native 4 traditional factors in this area that need to be considered. As noted by Jan Erisman, this project will 5 destroy 14 historical structures, and 22 archeological 6 7 sites will be compromised. Such destruction of historical structures and archeological sites is 8 9 unjustified considering there are other alternatives, such as MC1, that would not involve any destruction of 10 historical resources. 11

12 The SCLG has requested a condition concerning 13 gathering the historical resources in the SR1 area. 14 See the discussion between Ms. Roberts and Ms. Erisman 15 relating to the gathering of historical resources at 16 Transcript page 19 -- 991.

17 In Exhibit 365 I requested that AT advise whether 18 it would accept a number of conditions arising out of 19 the land use topic block as a condition of any approval 20 that might be issued by the Board. A series of 21 undertakings were given to the SCLG by AT. The SCLG 22 requested these conditions asked for by the SCLG be 23 specifically attached to any approval that might be 24 issued by the NRCB.

14:57

14:56



Moving to Topic Block 3, SR1 design, safety, and

		71
1	risk. The SCLG rely on the prefiled evidence of	
2	Dr. Dave Klepacki and Ian Dowsett in this topic block.	
3	See also Karin Hunter's evidence in Exhibit 254.	
4	The pivotal Deltares report of 2015 stated the	
5	following, which still applies to SR1 today: (as read)	
6	"Temporary storage of water in detention	
7	areas is not a very robust measure, in	
8	the sense that it is effective up to a	
9	certain design condition, but when it is	
10	overcharged, its effect is reduced to	14:
11	nil."	
12	We do not believe that operating risks identified by	
13	Deltares, which include the following, have been fully	
14	addressed, even as this project sits before the NRCB.	
15	SR1 is "very sensitive to sound operation and fast	
16	response time" and "the effective storage heavily	
17	depends on the expected range in possible flood	
18	hydrographs, accurate forecasts, and quick operation of	
19	the gates."	
20	We have not seen the range of possible flood	14:
21	hydrographs prepared by the proponent. It is expected	
22	that SR1 is more sensitive for differences in flood	
23	hydrograph or inaccurate forecasts than MC1.	
24	We have not seen sensitivities of SR1 across	
25	various forecasts and nothing over the 2013 flood except	



for the PMF. Is this because SR1 becomes more and more 1 2 unfavourable at higher flow rates? 3 The AEP Draft Hydrology Assessment Report from the 4 fall of 2020, Exhibit 265, summarizes rates with associated return periods and confidence intervals. 5 6 What happens if a downstream flood approaches the upper 7 limit of this forecast? The proponent will say SR1 will bypass the balance of the flood, while the diversion 8 9 skims off 480 to 600 cubic metres per second. That is fine for SR1, but what about the other communities 10 14:59 downstream? 11 12 From Decision report 2008-01 pdf 13, the Board 13 stated -- this is under Section 2.1.4: (as read) 14 "Operating plans for the facilities in 15 the high flow period were approved. 16 Operating plans for the facilities in 17 the high flow period were approved, 18 while consideration of the operation 19 plans for these works during the low 20 flow season of late July and August was 15:00 21 deferred pending receipt and review of additional information." 22 23 It is worth noting that the NRCB specifically approved 24 the operating plans for the facilities in the high flow 25 Why is that not the case, or will you be period.



opining only on the operating plan to only siphon off 1 2 480 cubic metres to 600 cubic metres per second of a 3 1260 cubic metres per second flood of record and pass 4 the balance of the flood downstream? 5 In SR1 we have no operations manual. This to me is 6 a huge deal. So much of this project is dependent on 7 these future operating conditions. Why haven't they brought operating plans for you to review as you did in 8 9 the 2008 decision? Exhibit 2018 provides a high-level flow chart for 10 11 operations of SR1 during a flood. Critically, this flow 12 chart relies on several fundamental assumptions that, if 13 voided, introduce a significant operating risk. 14 Examples, all hydrometric stations are in operation and 15 priority should be to divert to SR1 over Glenmore. Α critique of this flow chart is available in Exhibit 199. 16 17 I reference Mr. Kruhlak's letter marked 18 Exhibit 172, which says that the operating plans are not 19 available. How can the NRCB approve operating plans for 20 the project when there is no operational manual to 15:02 21 review? The SCLG relies on AEL's evidence in 22 Dam safety. 23 this proceeding (Roger Austin and Ruth Keyes.) In 24 particular, the AEL would like to see -- in particular, 25 the SCLG would like to see AEL's recommendations as

REPORTING GROUP

discussed during the hearing added as conditions to any 1 2 approval issued by -- to AT for SR1. 3 And as I -- what I have set out in my argument, 4 then, are these three recommendations: The number one 5 recommendation was the diversion inlet maximum discharge 6 capacity be reviewed and modelled with the access bridge 7 in place. We would like to see that added as a condition. 8 AEL's recommendation Number 2 was that the 9 emergency spillway maximum discharge capacity is less 10 15:03 11 than the diversion channel design flow. And a 12 reassessment of the emergency spillway should be 13 considered to increase the discharge capacity. We would 14 like to see that recommendation Number 2 added as a 15 condition. AEL's recommendation Number 15 is as follows: 16 17 (as read) "The low-level outlet works design 18 19 capacity was selected based on industry 20 standards for evaluation times for the 15:03 21 reservoir. No basis for increased 22 capacity has been provided." 23 Austin Engineering accepts this response, but we note 24 that there is no secondary means for draining the 25 reservoir should a failure of the low-level outlet



occur, and a significant reduction in the risk and 1 2 operation of the structure can be realized from the 3 addition of a second low-level outlet. The Canadian Dam Association Guidelines and the 4 5 Alberta Dam and Canal Safety Directive do not address requirements for sizing of outlet works or evacuation 6 The SCLG would like AEL's 7 times for reservoirs. recommendation Number 15 added as a condition to any 8 9 approval issued to AT. And then AEL's recommendation Number 17 deals with 10 15:04 riprap on the upstream face of the dam. 11 Austin (as read) 12 Engineering stated: 13 "We caution that riprap along the crest 14 of the dam would function during the 15 event where water would be required to be stored within a reservoir at full 16 17 service level or full supply level for a 18 period of time during passage of a major 19 Riprap would still provide a flood. 20 benefit in this instance." 15:05 The SCLG would like AEL's recommendation Number 17 added 21 22 as a condition to any approval issued to AT. 23 The proponent suggests that first fill requirements 24 will be determined through the dam safety review, yet 25 when the SCLG asked for a controlled first fill, as is



standard in dams, the proponent said no. Is it possible
that the Dam Safety review recommends a first fill that
is at odds with the first fill during a flood event?
For instance, if the Dam Safety office requires limits
to reservoir fill level or diversion rate, all financial
benefits could be eroded. In that case, SR1 loses its
time advantage over other options.

8 The SCLG would like the NRCB approval to be 9 conditional on findings from the Dam Safety review, 10 which may impose operating conditions or significant 11 additional capital costs. How long does it usually take 12 for a first fill process? Is it common for dams to go 13 from empty to full in 50 hours, or 36 hours? Most dams 14 are filled over months or even years.

I know they said this is part of future
commissioning plan, but by my math, SR1 reservoir fills
at a rate of one half to three-quarters of a metre per
hour. How long for the water to impact the readings
from instrumentation? How long before you know if it's
okay if there's an issue? Hours? Days? Weeks?

Also, in my cross-examination of the 2018 Dam Canal Safety Directive, I note that the SCLG is concerned that AT has not considered safety of excess flows passing the structure during expected operations. There are a number of paragraphs of concern to the SCLG in



15:06
Exhibit 339.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

And with respect to AT's final argument, the SCLG makes the following points on dam safety: The reference to low probability by Mr. Austin is taken out of context. Even though there is a low probability of the gate failing in the open position, it does not preclude the design taking this into consideration.

(b) the point with regard to the two low-level 8 outlets is not to do with the drawdown rate. 9 This is risk management. We are talking about the only outlet 10 11 for the reservoir that cannot be tested until it is at 12 full service level. What if the low-level outlet fails 13 to function? It will be tested under full design head. 14 It would be prudent to include a secondary means of 15 dewatering the reservoir, as is typical with other structures which have one conduit for the purpose; i.e., 16 17 water supply, power generation, and a low-level outlet.

With regard to the emergency spillway using the US Army Corps Inflow Design Floods for Dams and Reservoirs suggests the initial reservoir level be taken at the full supply level or the pool level after a flood, half the size of the IDF.

Based on the operation assumptions, we cannot be certain the reservoir will be near empty during routing, and, as an extreme consequence dam, it must be able to



15:08

pass the PMF with reservoir routing starting at an appropriate level.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

If the diversion inlet gates fail open or are left open when the SR1 reservoir is already at its FSL, then it only takes 13 hours to overtop the storage dam. By increasing the discharge capacity of the emergency spillway to match the design capacity of the diversion inlet, you can prevent the possibility that the storage dam can be overtopped. For an extreme consequence dam, this possibility, no matter how low, must be avoided.

And operation of the SR1 reservoir has repeatedly been discussed as simple. This is not likely to be the case during flood conditions as information on river levels, instrumentation readings, weir settings, flood forecasts, Glenmore storage volumes will all need to be considered and acted upon appropriately.

And then, finally, both Mr. Austin and Ms. Keyes have much experience with dams within Canada and the application of the CDA guidelines. Their task was to review the safety of the SR1 structure, and they have done that. Their experience with permitting -- their experience with the permitting process in Alberta is not relevant to the safety of the dam.

In terms of risk management, the SCLG rely on
Exhibit 199, which is the Springbank Community



15:09

Association's 36-page letter to IAAC and the NRCB 1 2 relating to risk and the limitations to the SR1. 3 SR1 is not able to rapidly draw down its water 4 levels, which has implications for risk, and also for 5 climate change. 6 Public safety, including emergency response and 7 conditions requested. There is the potential for more than a hundred lives to be lost as a result of the 8 9 failure of SR1. And I refer to -- I also refer to my questioning on the Dam Directive, Exhibit 399, at 10 15:10 11 Transcript page 1132. Public safety and emergency 12 response is of great concern to the SCLG. In 13 Exhibit 373, I requested that AT accept a number of 14 public safety conditions to be attached to any approval 15 issued by the Board. 16 Mr. Fitch noted this might be a problem because AT 17 was kicking the emergency management plan to AEP. As 18 noted by the Chair and Mr. Kennedy, it would appear to

be commonplace for conditions to carry forward to future custodians of the ownership of the project. And I refer to the transcript pages. I will obviously read them.

15:11

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is important to the SCLG that these conditions that I requested relating to public safety of the Springbank community not fall through the cracks and that they be added as conditions to any approval issued



1	by the Board.	
2	Sensitivity of the project operation. Project	
3	design, operation, and safety elements to changes are	
4	viability [verbatim] in climate parameters.	
5	The SCLG rely on Dr. Fennell's prefiled evidence as	
6	well as his PowerPoint and viva voce evidence on	
7	March 30 and 31.	
8	AT suggests the protection of people and property	
9	from a future event like the one we experienced in 2013	
10	is the primary goal.	15:12
11	Having said that, the SCLG is quite surprised at	
12	how the climate change aspect of this project has been	
13	dealt with, or, more importantly, how it has not been	
14	dealt with, in a manner consistent with this goal.	
15	Much of the work done to support SR1 has been based	
16	on an evaluation of documented events over a very	
17	protracted period of time. This is a dangerous	
18	limitation and one that has driven the process since the	
19	beginning and, in our opinion, has led to a false sense	
20	of security.	15:13
21	2013 was a significant event, but not the most	
22	significant event that has occurred in this region in	
23	our known history, or likely in the past. You are	
24	probably familiar with the terms "known knowns" and	
25	"unknown knowns" when speaking about situations or	



concepts we are trying to understand. But it is often the unknown knowns and, more importantly, the unknown unknowns that tend to get us into trouble. And it's no one's fault really, but these oversights often lead to unintended consequences, sometimes catastrophic.

If approved, SR1 will be a rather unique and large 6 7 extreme consequence dam set right in the middle of a quiet country residential setting. Now, you are not dam 8 9 engineers, but if there was an option to put something like this in a safer and more beneficial location, 10 wouldn't you do that? So it's beyond the SCLG how 11 12 SR1 -- this SR1 option got so much traction from the 13 outset. It doesn't seem logical.

When it comes to climate change, this is where we see -- the SCLG see us getting into trouble if we don't use our imagination.

17 It is clear SR1 will only be able to deal with a 18 flood similar to 2013, and the rest of the disaster will 19 be sent downstream to other communities, with the 20 possible exception of those below the Glenmore 21 Reservoir. This focus seems to have been on preserving 22 those communities and businesses at the expense of those 23 I am sure AT has to be aware of that, and upstream. there is another solution that would mitigate that risk, 24 25 and that risk of an even greater flood.



15:14

15:14

1

2

3

4

5

14

15

What is a bit disheartening is that when presented 1 2 with evidence prepared by AT themselves from the 3 benefits of MC1 option, they continue to argue the 4 merits of SR1, an arguably inferior option. 5 Maybe it's because they have come so far down this road that they feel compelled to work with it, but it is 6 7 clear that the benefits of SR1 are limited and, in fact, the full cost, and I mean the full cost, has not been 8 9 fully explored, only a limited version of it. As taxpayers in Rocky View County, that makes my 10 15:15 11 clients nervous. Nevertheless, AT remains convinced 12 that it can engineer a way -- its way around these 13 limitations, but at what costs? Costs that seem to keep 14 escalating with each tweak of the design, and there have 15 been many. Is that because of failure of imagination? 16 Shouldn't we strive for something more simple, more 17 robust, more beneficial? 18 The fact that higher magnitude flood events have 19 occurred in the past but perhaps have not been measured 20 or documented is not a reason to move forward with a 15:15 21 partial solution. 22 If there was an option to address larger floods and 23 protect more people and property, we should be looking 24 That is the agreed-upon goal, right, protect at that.

25



people and property? This is no time to have a narrow

1	view.	
2	All of the literature that we have read about what	
3	the future hydro climate of Alberta holds for us, both	
4	from a flood and drought perspective, should alarm us.	
5	We cannot and should not just rely on the period of	
6	record. We have to step outside conventional thinking	
7	to deal with something we don't really understand or	
8	totally understand.	
9	This is due diligence. It should be clear to the	
10	Board that higher magnitude floods of greater frequency	15:16
11	are a distinct possibility in the future when one looks	
12	at the existing data in a different way.	
13	If we are truly trying to assess the worst-case	
14	scenario when it comes to climate change, we need to	
15	step beyond the conventional, and we know that can be	
16	hard for some, but if we don't, then bad decisions are	
17	going to be made that will become other people's	
18	problems.	
19	The SCLG understands the need for standards, and	
20	that much of Canada designs infrastructure with the 1 in	15:17
21	100 event in mind. In Alberta, we align with this	
22	standard, and design infrastructure to withstand such an	
23	event; however, SR1 is designed to address a 1 in 200	
24	event. That would appear conservative, but other	
25	jurisdictions are starting to see a move towards more	



conservative than proactive design constraints. 1 2 Saskatchewan's recent move to incorporate the 1 in 500 3 event in their design considerations is a good example. 4 BC's adoption of the 1 in 200 as their design event is 5 another. As Dr. Fennell noted, it is clear that the 6 engineering community is beginning to understand the 7 risks related to climate change and are adapting to its inevitability. 8

Given the documented limitations of SR1 to address 9 an even greater than 2013, or 1 in 200, the chance that 10 11 an even -- an event greater than that occurred in 12 response to climate change and the extreme consequence 13 classification makes this project a precarious one. The fact that a much better option was put forward earlier 14 15 that protects all, and I mean all, downstream 16 communities from a flood much greater than 1 in 200, and 17 that this option was put aside is, frankly, 18 unbelievable.

19One other aspect we would like to address is20drought. This was not really dealt with in the21application beyond some passing statements.

The SCLG finds it quite interesting that AT and The City of Calgary is putting forward the notion that SR1 will increase water security for the city of Calgary. The SCLG struggles with this logic, given that



15:18

during an extended drought, which would include low snowpacks and low seasonal rainfall, SCLG expects that water levels in the Glenmore Reservoir would not be lowered to the usual degree in order to preserve water for the high-use season. Under such a scenario, SR1 would not be engaged anyway, but would instead sit there generating dust for the local residents to breathe.

8 So how does SR1 enhance water security in this 9 case? It certainly doesn't enhance public health 10 security.

11 During the hearing on Thursday, April 1, Alberta 12 Transportation admitted that some of its climate change 13 data it relied on was incorrect. This had to do with a role that snowpack plays in the intensifying of flood 14 15 risk during early spring rain-on-snow events like 2013. SCLG questions whether AT has modelled the worst-case 16 17 scenario for climate change in coming up with its design 18 criteria for SR1.

19 In terms of reservoir capacity, why isn't the 20 diversion capacity, why isn't the diversion capacity 21 greater so that the entire peak flow can be diverted 22 into the reservoir thus providing residents downstream 23 of SR1 with the same protection as the residents 24 downstream of the Glenmore Dam.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

MC1 has a reservoir capacity of 93,000 dam cubed in



15:19

1	a PMF. SR1 is inferior.	
2	Topic Block 4. I would briefly mention Calgary's	
3	water supply document, Exhibit 347. It specifically	
4	notes: (as read)	
5	"Water is a limited resource and our	
6	water supply is changing due to climate	
7	change and a growing population."	
8	And we've already noted SR1 does not store any water on	
9	the Elbow River.	
10	In terms of hydrology, the SCLG is concerned that	15:21
11	flow from the low-level outlet is going to scour the	
12	Unnamed Creek. The faster the low-level outlet drains,	
13	the greater the risk to the environment and the riparian	
14	areas below the low-level outlet.	
15	And Ms. Robinson also has concerns about the head	
16	pond from SR1 backing up floodwater onto her property.	
17	And I guess another hydrological issue is, you	
18	know, what happens if SR1 is on operation and you have a	
19	huge flood coming down the Bow River? Will that end up,	
20	you know, metres higher than the Elbow River at the	15:22
21	confluence? Will you end up seeing water backing up	
22	into the Bow River and flooding those communities that	
23	SR1 was supposed to protect?	
24	On surface water quality, Mr. Frank Frigo suggested	
25	that SR1 would sequester could sequester water	
11		



contaminated by forest fires. That was last Tuesday. However, AT has done no modelling to use SR1 to hold contaminated water from -- that would be coming from the -- from a watershed that was on -- you know, contaminated by forest fire.

There's also an issue with the flow coming into the SR1, and if the -- and if the head pond will impact the water quality on Mary's ranch. This is a concern that she has, and you've heard about the number of water wells that she has in her -- on her property.

The SCLG is also concerned that the Pirmez canal or 12 creek has not been investigated, including the 13 possibility that floodwaters from a design flood could 14 bypass the SR1 diversion structures via Pirmez Creek. 15 Mr. Wood was asked if he looked at the Pirmez canal on 16 Ms. Robinson's land, and he said that was outside of the 17 PDA and that the water would just go across Highway 22.

18 In terms of aquatics, the SCLG relied on 19 Mr. Locke's evidence, as well as his viva voce evidence. 20 They requested the recommendations set out in 21 Mr. Locke's report be attached as conditions to any 22 approval.

23 Mr. Locke's recommendations to consider alternative 24 release scenarios is based on the fact that it is far 25 better and more efficient to consider all reasonable



15:23

15:24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

1	flow release scenarios now so that the findings can be	
2	incorporated into the final design.	
3	Mr. Locke believes it is better to invest more time	
4	up front instead of more time later trying to react to	
5	unintended outcomes.	
6	With respect to fish entrainment and other possible	
7	detriments, deterrence to fish entering the diversion	
8	channel, all potential solutions should be investigated.	
9	Examples of unique approaches include creating an	
10	electrical field or using physical structures.	15:24
11	Mr. Locke also noted there's considerable	
12	uncertainty when predicting fish entrainment and	
13	headwork structures. It is unlikely a precise	
14	estimate it is unlikely a precise estimate can be	
15	calculated. However, it makes sense to try and frame	
16	the estimate as best as possible in terms of a low and	
17	high value for the number of fish and size of fish that	
18	potentially will be entrained.	
19	Based on the information provided today for this	
20	project, and what is known for irrigation headworks, all	15:25
21	that is possible should be done first to first keep fish	
22	out of the diversion channel; secondly, return fish	
23	during lower flow diversions where it is feasible; and,	
24	thirdly, to have a good fish rescue plan.	
25	Finally, Mr. Locke emphasizes spending more time up	



1 front will be better than spending more time later 2 reacting to unintended consequences. 3 A large amount of data has been collected and a lot 4 of modelling has been carried out making sure the 5 sideboards have been properly identified and all 6 reasonable options have been investigated should be done 7 before final dam design. Regarding fish, there are really no redeeming 8 9 outcomes from the project and there will be much work 10 required to minimize the impacts, the best that they can 15:26 11 do is mitigate. The SCLG does not consider AEP's conclusion that 12 13 bull trout may be extirpated to be a positive outcome of 14 SR1. 15 The SCLG would also note the absurdity of fish 16 30 people, supervising biologists, wandering rescue. 17 around the reservoir as it drains. Again, this could be 18 an expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars in a 19 big flood. 20 On hydrogeology, section 4.4, the SCLG rely on 15:26 21 Dr. Fennell's prefiled evidence, as well as his PowerPoint and viva voce evidence on March 30th and 22 23 31st. An extensive cross-examination of AT was conducted 24 25 on hydrogeology. Mr. Yoshida -- I've got his name.



It's -- I have his name misspelled, my apologies -- AT's hydrologist was an evasive witness, and an examination of the transcript will reveal that he refused to answer straightforward questions on multiple occasions. Sometimes the question had to be asked three times, prolonging the length of the SCLG cross-examination.

The SCLG submits that the evidence of Dr. Fennell should be preferred over the evidence of AT's hydrogeologist.

To recap some key points from the cross-examination 10 15:27 11 of AT's hydrogeologist, and others on the AT panel who 12 attempted to help him, Exhibit 110 shows that the base 13 of the reservoir is underlain by at least 5 metres of 14 lacustrine clay. The evidence also shows the top three layers of the model will be -- with a low permeability 15 16 soil beneath the base of the SR1 footprint. The 17 lacustrine clay should be in these three layers because 18 it is in the uppermost formation. The K value in the 19 top three layers is indicated on those figures.

20 Missing from the top three layers of the model is 21 the documented sand and gravel in the Unnamed Creek 22 valley, which was indicated by AT to be anywhere from 23 1 to 7 metres thick overlain by a layer of glacial 24 material. The sand and gravel in the Unnamed Creek 25 valley should have been at least in layer 1 or 2 of the

15:28



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

model, given its proximity to the surface. 1 2 Sand and gravel is given the K value of up 2.8 3 times 10 to the minus 3 metres per second in the 4 previously cited Table 4.3. This configuration of soils and associated K values in the model is not reflective 5 of the actual geological conditions documented beneath 6 7 the SR1 reservoir from the exploratory drilling The presence of this much lower K value layer 8 programs. 9 will influence the leakage from the base of the SR1 It will reduce it by up to two orders of 10 reservoir. 11 magnitude. 12 Given the fact that only three measurements of 13 K values were obtained with only one for lacustrine 14 clay, the Board should have no confidence that a full 15 range of values has been obtained, including any 16 influence from fractures or other features that would 17 result in higher K values like silt layers. 18 AT indicated in testimony on March 29th that a 19 number of K tests were performed, but were not 20 documented because of slow recovery or lack of water. 21 However, we see in Exhibit 10 that samples were 22 collected for water quality analysis from up to

15:29

15:30

If

AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

16 monitoring wells in the unconsolidated deposits.

you were able to sample these wells that were obviously

full of water, then why were you not able to K test them

23

24

25

1	as well?
2	Also brought up AT also brought up some evidence
3	on March 29th showing very different K values for the
4	model layers, all of which are lower by orders of
5	magnitude than those indicated in Table 4.3. Why the
6	change? And how can the Board have any confidence in a
7	model that just keeps on changing and incorporating
8	lower and lower K values beneath the SR1 footprint,
9	lower K values that lack a sufficient degree of field
10	verification.
11	SR1 will increase the risk to human and ecological
12	health due to the leakage of water out of the base of
13	the reservoir when full or partially filled. This will
14	result in flushing of accumulated contaminants either
15	naturally occurring in the underlying soils or routed to
16	the reservoir during floods. It is going to be flushed
17	into the underlying groundwater and connected systems.
18	This includes the bedrock intervals, the surface water
19	in the channel outlet, and the receptors that will be
20	affected.
21	Alberta Transportation also relied heavily on

Alberta Transportation also relied heavily on models to frame the hydrogeological and hydrological risks of SR1, but failed to address the geochemical risks.

22

23

24

25

I would argue that the hydrological and



15:30

hydrogeological modelling from the physical standpoint 1 and acknowledgement of climate change as a risk is 2 3 flawed to some degree. 4 The SR1 does not consider the risks that the 5 structure poses from extended drought conditions, and 6 SR1 does not increase the water security for the city of 7 Calgary contrary to what AT and The City of Calgary have said. 8 9 Only three hydro -- only three hydraulic conductivity field tests were conducted to give real 10 11 data, not laboratory data, to understand the leakage 12 that would occur from the structure. 13 It is real data that's giving you a better idea of the real picture, as opposed to a point measurement from 14 15 a small core that's confined in a laboratory and tested under controlled conditions. 16 17 One of those three field tests was a test for clay, 18 the main seal beneath the reservoir, and the other two 19 were from the till. This is hardly not enough 20 information to properly constrain the hydraulic 21 conductivity under SR1, and likely led to the very low 22 leakage estimate of 426 cubic metres per day as opposed 23 to the likely greater than 100,000 cubic metres per day 24 that Dr. Fennell calculated, considering the reservoir, 25 partially filled, during a 1 in 100 flood event.



15:32

<u> </u>		i
1	AT's response to much of Dr. Fennell's groundwater	
2	concerns is to monitor in order to assess the	
3	information gaps. Monitoring is not mitigation, and	
4	oftentimes when you detect things, it can be too late	
5	and it can be very difficult, sometimes impossible to	
6	remediate. So this is why we assess the worst-case	
7	scenarios, but that did not happen here.	
8	SCLG's concern is the proximity of the project to	
9	local residents and the utter lack of assessment	
10	regarding potential changes to groundwater quality and	15:33
11	impacts to human and ecological receptors. Absolutely	
12	no work has been done on this aspect beyond some	
13	baseline sampling and reporting.	
14	I understand that AT does not believe that SR1 will	
15	not create any water quality issues, but that is not	
16	good enough. People need some form of evidence. Are we	
17	going to just leave this up to belief?	
18	In my clients' opinion, AT has in no way covered	
19	off this issue. This seems to fall into that category	
20	of unknowns, unknowns for them. It is abundantly clear	15:34
21	there was no qualified geochemist involved in the	
22	development of this application.	
23	If the NRCB Board members are being asked to	
24	approve an extreme consequence structure placed in a	



high-risk area with no real analogues to compare to

them, you should -- you should be given the information 1 2 necessary to make an informed decision. It can't simply 3 be left up to belief. 4 The SCLG has some concerns with the groundwater 5 model that has been used to support AT's impact It is clear the lack of information on the 6 assessment. 7 range of hydraulic conductivity for the underlying clay and tills is impacting the results. Again, only three 8 9 measurements have been provided. Yet AT was able to collect water from up to 10 15:35 11 16 wells. If these wells could yield enough water, then 12 why couldn't they have not been K tested? This is an 13 example of a discrepancy that we have been painfully 14 trying to resolve. The fact that AT thinks three 15 measurements of K value in the clay tills is sufficient 16 to constrain things is alarming. 17 This concern also extends to how the model layers 18 have been configured, which is causing some issues with 19 being able to accurately mimic the measured hydraulic

15:35



model. Again, this is to be expected.

They still refute near surface sand and gravel

How is this considered

that they admitted numerous times is there; yet it is

comprehensive and reflective of the site conditions?

They miss these things, yet they dig in on a flawed

20

21

22

23

24

25

heads.

absent in the model.

There's also the concern with the sub-surface pore 1 2 pressure changes once SR1 is built. This relates to 3 whether or not issues will occur in the interfaces 4 between the formations or within weak intervals. 5 It appears from the answers provided that higher risk intervals of sediment may have been assessed or 6 7 No mineralogy was performed, yet we know for a tested. fact that the tills contain swelling clays which could 8 9 be subject to failure. Dr. Fennell stated that models are only as good as 10 15:36 11 the information used. How it is configured and the 12 skill of the model are to look at the output and make 13 sense of it. In the end, models are not meant to 14 replace human intelligence. They are meant to enhance 15 it; you can't just give it up to a machine. If the NRCB is being asked to make a judgment on a 16 17 project that is heavily predicated on model results, 18 then they need to be sure they can trust them. And if I 19 was a Board member, I would be quite dubious given the 20 explanations or lack thereof provided by the applicant. 15:37 21 There are better options and simpler solutions, but, 22 unfortunately, this is the only one before us. 23 So we will just convince ourselves that we can

24 25



engineer our way around the limitations, unfortunately,

at a greater and greater cost with diminishing benefit.

If there is a more elegant solution, to use 1 2 Mr. Menninger's vernacular, then we should advance it, 3 not just work with something that is better than 4 nothing. 5 As educated professionals entrusted with protecting 6 the public good and ensuring that sound decisions are 7 being made, they have a duty to ensure that we are not inadvertently creating a situation that we will later 8 9 regret just because we believe it is the right choice or we are searching for some convenient answer. 10 11 Politics has no place here, particularly when we 12 are talking about people's safety, wellbeing and 13 financial security. 14 Given that everything that the SCLG have heard over 15 the past two weeks, along with volumes of support materials, the overconfidence displayed by the applicant 16 17 during these proceedings and the magnitude of questions that remain unanswered, the SCLG have a hard time seeing 18 19 how this project can possibly be in the public's best 20 interest when better options exist. 21 And in terms of sensitivity of the project, water 22 elements -- I've already dealt with that under Topic 23 Block 3. 24 And now turning to the final topic block -- and, 25 Mr. Chair, could I have just a brief, you know,



15:38

two-minute break, please, if I could? 1 2 THE CHAIR: Yeah, granted. MR. SECORD: 3 Thank you. Just a guick stretch. 4 THE CHAIR: We could probably all use that. 5 Thank you. (ADJOURNMENT) 6 THE CHAIR: 7 You look a little more refreshed, Mr. Secord. 8 MR. SECORD: Shall I continue? 9 THE CHAIR: Yes. And just note we're just 10 15:42 11 about quarter to 4. MR. SECORD: 12 Right. And I have -- I'm on the 13 last topic block. Topic Block 5. Lucky there weren't 14 6, or I would be in trouble. 15 So dealing with air quality -- first of all, 5.1, air quality and dust. AT has acknowledged in response 16 17 to Dr. Zelt's air quality report that SR1 air born 18 articulates may result in unacceptable short-term risk 19 to human health. The SCLG has raised air concerns for 20 years, and, unfortunately, their fears have turned out 15:43 to be well founded. 21 And I, you know, reference Exhibit 327, pdf 94, 22 23 where AT uses the word: (as read) 24 "Based on this certainty analysis, 25 partial mitigation to reduce fugitive



dust emissions, i.e. assumed dust 1 2 control efficiency of 84 percent, could 3 still result in an unacceptable 4 short-term risk to human health." 5 And they use the words "adaptably manage." Mr. Speller went to great lengths to point out the use of the word 6 7 "could." SCLG agrees with "could." Could children be exposed to unsafe levels of air quality and an 8 9 unacceptable short-term risk to human health? The answer is yes. 10 11 In response to a question regarding school 12 locations, Mr. Speller stated that they were equally 13 alarmed. The SCLG is equally alarmed by the fact that the health impacts to their community do not seem to 14 15 merit serious consideration in this project. There are a number of schools that we have already drawn your 16 17 attention to: Elbow Valley Elementary, Springbank 18 Middle, Springbank High, Edge, Springbank Playschool, 19 Discovery Corner Playschool, Changemakers Charter 20 school, and a future private high school, Webber 21 Academy. There are multiple sports facilities and 22 various developments proposed downwind.

I asked Ms. Noble: (as read)
"What period of time did your education
designate as an acceptable period of



15:44

time that young children should be exposed to unsafe air quality." Her response was: (as read) "Children should not be exposed to unsafe air quality, nor should the elderly, nor should members of the public." In terms of Dr. Zelt's review of air quality, he noted that AT made a calculation error for PM 2.5, which was acknowledged and corrected by Stantec. This correction doubled the PM 2.5 emissions for the 100- and 200-year

15:45

And Dr. Zelt noted issues with AT's assessment 13 dealing with the meteorological data, surface roughness, 14 15 threshold friction velocity, sediment areas, particle 16 size distribution. AT submits that the project air 17 emissions will be adaptably managed. Where is a precedent for a massive sediment reservoir? Are there 18 19 any other dry reservoirs in Canada that we can look to? 20 How do you know you can manage it when the best minds in 15:46 21 California can't manage it there? This adaptive 22 management plan is an attempt to instill confidence when 23 none is earned.

24In terms of the AT argument, with regard to25paragraph 269 of AT's final argument, this statement is



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

flood scenarios.

h		
1	not factual. Dr. Zelt's evidence was based entirely	
2	upon the uncertainties that were not properly	
3	recognized, nor accounted for, in the AT assessment of	
4	air quality. Dr. Zelt's evidence showed both the	
5	urgency required to apply controls. That is the	
6	potential for the severity of air quality issues during	
7	the period before air quality controls are affected and	
8	the likelihood that residual air quality is likely to	
9	remain poor, even with controls in place. The AT	
10	assessment of air quality was based upon	15:47
11	misrepresentation of emissions area and strong bias	
12	underestimating the impacts.	
13	With respect to paragraph 270 of AT's final	
14	argument, this statement is not factual. Dr. Zelt's	
15	assessment was careful to explain that it was all too	
16	easy to demonstrate unreasonable predictions.	
17	Dr. Zelt's reassessment of air quality, using validated	
18	sediments and validated meteorology, demonstrated that	
19	air quality impacts are very likely following post air	
20	drawdown and not serve serving, agency the AT assessment	15:48
21	is. Dr. Zelt carefully outlined that his	
22	representations were more representative of the	
23	conditions rather than favourable for the project.	
24	Dr. Zelt qualified his predictions as being infrequent,	
25	only during the period of larger post-flood drawdown,	



and meteorologically dependent. However, the evidence presented by Dr. Zelt clearly demonstrates the errors and bias in the AT assessment as not being representative of the potential for impacts.

1

2

3

4

5 With respect to paragraph 271 of AT's final 6 argument, there is a difference between results being 7 alarming and an assessment being alarmist. Dr. Zelt's objective analysis may be alarming compared to the 8 9 improper assessment by AT, but Dr. Zelt's objective consideration of each of the major components of the air 10 15:49 11 dispersion modelling presented by AT is factual and 12 representative of potential conditions. Therefore, it 13 is not an alarmist assessment.

14 AT's use of terms such as non-guidance assumptions 15 remain non-factual. AT's assessment made use of 16 guidance values for emissions and meteorology when the 17 conditions of their assessment were not within those 18 quidance limits. Guidance documents are minimalistic in 19 nature, setting out minimal requirements for assessment 20 and suggested values for inputs into modelling based 21 upon generalized scenarios. It is up to the assessor to 22 determine whether the guidance is acceptable for the particular assessment. 23 In this case the AT assessment 24 has been overwhelmingly simplistic and minimalistic to 25 the point where the predictions for air quality are



biased.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

The particular emissions in the guide documents are not representative of the conditions of the site, as demonstrated by Dr. Zelt. The meteorology of the site is not representative of the generalized guidance in the guideline. An expert in air quality, as is Dr. Zelt, recognizes when the other considerations are required due to site-specific conditions.

9 With respect to paragraph 273 of AT's final argument, this statement is not factual. In fact, AT's 10 11 air quality assessment clearly demonstrated that it did 12 not read, nor follow, their own hydrological assessment, 13 by including the larger area of sediment deposits of at least 3 centimetres, as per the AT hydrological 14 15 assessment. The AT air quality assessment was based 16 upon an arbitrary and completely unsubstantiated use of 17 10 centimetres. The AT soils expert even testified that 18 soil and dust erosion could be based upon 3 centimetres. 19 The hydrological assessment, Exhibit 67, and updated 20 hydrological assessment in revised Exhibit 327 showed 15:51 21 the flooded area to be covered in fine particulate 22 matter, whereas the AT assessment ignored this 23 information but instead was modelled using material that 24 would be buried by the fines. AT's assessment was based 25 upon sediment material from the alluvial conditions on



the river's edge, which was proven to be not representative of the post-flood deposits by literature values presented by Mr. Zelt. AT's assessment of the sediments that would be exposed over the larger project area is erroneous.

6 With respect to paragraph 274 of AT's final 7 argument, Dr. Zelt presented evidence of the effectiveness of tackifiers based upon research and the 8 9 specifications of AT suggested tackifier. Dr. Zelt independently inquired about the effectiveness of the 10 11 tackifier longevity and was presented with similar 12 specifications. AT is basing their conclusions on 13 claims of their vegetation ecologist, that is not an 14 expert in air quality emissions modelling.

15 The presence of remnants of tackifier or patchy 16 vegetation growth is evidence of only partial fugitive 17 dust controls. As presented by Dr. Zelt's assessment, 18 even 100 percent effectiveness of controls will not be 19 sufficient to prevent impacts upon a project area under 20 the right meteorological and post-flood conditions.

With respect to paragraph 275 of AT's final
argument, Dr. Zelt is a recognized expert in air quality
dispersion modelling, whereas Mr. De Carlo is not.
Mr. De Carlo's interpretation of the cover misrepresents
the effectiveness of the cover to prevent air quality



15:52

15:52

1

2

3

4

emissions.

1

25

2 With respect to paragraph 276 of AT's final 3 argument, Dr. Zelt made inquiries into tackifiers to 4 determine the cost of application of tackifiers to 5 supplement information not provided in AT's reports. With respect to 277 of AT's final argument, in 6 7 short, Dr. Zelt's assessment was objective and impartial. Dr. Zelt clearly outlined where AT's 8 9 assessment of air quality was not representative of site-specific conditions. AT's assessment used a 10 11 minimalistic approach, using guidance documents without 12 regard to the proper application of the guidance, nor 13 limitations of the guidance. The result of AT's 14 assessment is a strong bias that underpredicts the 15 potential air quality for post-flood drawdown and 16 favourable meteorology. Dr. Zelt's objective assessment 17 was based upon reasonable and site-specific conditions 18 that would be expected, and while applying emission 19 controls, as suggested by AT. Dr. Zelt showed that even 20 with highly effective controls suggested by AT, which 21 would somehow be applied pre-emptively, air quality 22 could still be expected to be degraded in the region 23 surrounding the project area and potentially impacting 24 Calgary City limits and First Nations lands.

With respect to paragraph 279 of AT's final



15:53

argument, this statement is not factual. Because the air quality assessment is a necessary input into human health assessment. Any change to the air quality assessment is a change in the human health assessment. Dr. Zelt clearly demonstrated the faults in the air quality assessment.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7 With respect to paragraph 280 of AT's final argument, Ms. Noble's testimony indicated that air 8 9 quality was a human health concern. She testified that based upon AT's assessment of flood frequency and 10 11 meteorological frequency that the risk would be 12 acceptable. Ms. Noble's assessment is therefore flawed by the fact that the human health impacts are greater 13 14 than she assessed because the emissions are greater than 15 presented by AT.

Downwind air quality concentrations are a direct 16 17 relationship to emissions. Therefore, if emissions are 18 greater than what was assessed, the air quality 19 concentrations downwind will be greater. Ms. Noble's 20 testimony was based upon bias and incorrect air quality 21 predictions. Further, the risk by Ms. Noble -- the risk 22 qualification by Ms. Noble is flawed because the 23 frequency of meteorology is not representative of the 24 site-specific conditions. Since the frequency of 25 exposure is expected to be greater using site-specific



15:55

conditions, the risks will be greater than Ms. Noble
 presented.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

With respect to paragraph 281 of AT's final argument, AT did not provide any evidence to base their claim that the meteorological conditions were rare or infrequent. This comment is anecdotal at best. While the operation of the project is a rare and infrequent event, Dr. Zelt showed that the meteorological conditions are more frequent than modelled by AT.

Dr. Zelt also showed that the meteorological 10 11 conditions relating to dry and windy scenario for high 12 emissions were much greater than AT presented. In fact, 13 AT did not provide any statistics for precipitation, frequency of strong wind, periods between rain events, 14 15 etcetera, whereas Dr. Zelt did present such evidence. 16 This evidence suggests site-specific conditions cannot 17 be assumed to be infrequent events, as per the AT 18 assessment.

With respect to paragraph 282 of AT's final
argument, fugitive dust can be mitigated with
appropriate controls. However, the effectiveness of
those controls must be considered.

23 With respect to paragraph 284 of AT's final 24 argument, this statement is non-factual. The evidence 25 was presented that because TSP would be present in the



15:56

dust cloud, which is visible, than a resident could 1 2 visibly see when they were being impacted. There was no 3 evidence in reference to travel time. Travel time is a 4 function of wind speed. In high winds the dust 5 emissions would reach homes of 1 kilometre away from the 6 project within one to two minutes. It is not possible 7 to monitor, detect, and notify the public within this limited amount of time. 8

9 With respect to paragraph 285 of AT's final argument, this statement is not factual. What the AT 10 11 minimalist and biased assessment has demonstrated is 12 that AT is basing their conclusions on hope that the 13 flood does not occur, hope that they can achieve 14 complete fugitive dust emission controls, hope that they 15 can achieve complete fugitive dust controls before conditions occur that lead to emissions, hope that 16 17 meteorological conditions don't occur, and hope that 18 people are not outdoors to be exposed. I think we can 19 do better than just hope, but actually assessment and 20 modelling of the situation to plan.

Conditions. In Exhibit 406 I requested that AT advise whether they would accept a number of specific conditions arising out of Topic Block 5 as a condition to any approval. The SCLG request that these be added as conditions to any approval that might be issued by

21

22

23

24

25



the Board. And I've given you the transcript reference 1 2 there in paragraph 361. 3 And in terms of Dr. Zelt, the cost of the tackifier 4 and time to spread it out, a condition should be to cost 5 out this and provide a timeline for the application of 6 the tackifier on this massive footprint. 7 I think I've dealt with the human health. I did refer you to a number of transcript references in my 8 9 cross-examination of Dr. Noble, and the references are there. And I've also referred to Exhibit 398 for the 10 16:00 11 air quality isopleths and locations of homes, schools, 12 playgrounds, and camps. 13 In terms of vegetation --14 Mr. Chair, I realize I'm at 4. I've got about --15 I've got about nine pages left. I just wonder whether 16 you would give me that time to just finish off these 17 last two areas. 18 THE CHAIR: And how many minutes per page is 19 that, Mr. Secord? What is your request? 20 MR. SECORD: I had kind of thought about -- I 16:00 21 was kind of going at about a minute and a half per 22 page, is what I was hoping for. I don't know that I've 23 met that time frame, but... 24 THE CHAIR: I'm not sure, but I think that 25 would take us to about ten after. So if you could wrap



1	up by ten after or so. If you could wrap up by 10	
2	after or so. I mean, that's our original timeline. It	
3	does give you a bit more time.	
4	MR. SECORD: Thank you.	
5	THE CHAIR: But, you know, it's not excessive,	
6	but I would appreciate your diligence in getting	
7	through by 4:10.	
8	MR. SECORD: Sure.	
9	THE CHAIR: Thank you.	
10	MR. SECORD: 5.3 was vegetation, including	16:01
11	noxious weeds and invasive species. You'll recall that	
12	my clients had testified to the increase in weed growth	
13	after the 2013 flood. We retained Dr. Osko to look at	
14	the impacts of weeds on the landscape.	
15	As noted by Dr. Osko, weeds compete with crops and	
16	native plants for space, light, and nutrients, as	
17	well and water, as well as introduce pests and	
18	diseases. This is of significant concern to the SCLG	
19	members, considering that many of them are agricultural	
20	producers and ranchers.	16:01
21	AT's assertions that the influence of weeds on	
22	vegetation and wetlands will be located localized to	
23	the PDA is incorrect. Mr. Osko's evidence and	
24	Mr. De Carlo's responses provided to cross questions	
25	confirm that the spread of weed vectors will not be	



limited to the PDA but could spread to the surrounding 1 2 lands. It is therefore important that a comprehensive 3 weed management plan be put in place to prevent and 4 manage weed introduction and dispersal. The SCLG submits that the Panel should include as a condition of 5 approval that AT must develop a comprehensive weed 6 7 management plan prior to construction of the project. The SCLG further submits that the condition of approval 8 9 should require that the comprehensive weed management plan include, at a minimum, preventative measures 10 11 requiring the cleaning of vehicles and equipment prior 12 to entry to the PDA; upon leaving the PDA; details on 13 how cleaning of the vehicles and equipment would be 14 achieved, including locating cleaning stations at entry 15 point and exit points; how to manage potential weed transport by commuting employees; identify the source 16 17 of all incoming materials; the weed risk associated 18 with them; and identify the dispersal barriers to 19 The plan must also assess and prioritize all emplov. 20 of the possible vectors by which weeds could be 21 transported on and off the project area.

The SCLG submits the Board should include a further condition of approval, that AT must ensure all trucks hauling excavated fill material from the diversion channel to the floodplain berm between prior



16:02

		1
1	to leaving and entering the site. Note that	
2	Mr. De Carlo and Mr. Wood agreed in cross that these	
3	are reasonable measures.	
4	The SCLG acknowledges AT's willingness to accept	
5	and implement some of the recommendations of Dr. Osko.	
6	Further, it is likely that the risk of weed seeds	
7	and plant seeds entering the river through the	
8	low-level outlet will continue, especially in times of	
9	non-flood and post-flood.	
10	The SCLG submit that AT must take steps to prevent	16:04
11	the spread of weeds from the reservoir.	
12	Secondly, there's no supportable basis for	
13	suggesting that the filter will prevent stormwater	
14	freely passing through the low level of networks during	
15	dry operations. No information was presented that	
16	shows the impacts that a filter might have on free	
17	passage of stormwater. A filter should not	
18	significantly restrict the free flow of stormwater.	
19	Thirdly, it is not clear how	
20	So the SCLG submits that a refiltration system at	16:05
21	the outlet limited to operating during dry operations	
22	is necessary to ensure that more weed seeds, including	
23	noxious and prohibited weed seeds, are not introduced	
24	into the Elbow River, resulting in likely weed	
25	infestation of downstream Springbank communities.	


The SCLG submits that this should be included as a condition of approval. In the alternative, the SCLG submits the Panel should require AT to inquire further into this issue and conduct a model analysis of their findings.

6 Under vegetation and wetlands. The Board has 7 heard and seen the submissions and oral testimonies of the SCLG members and their expert witnesses. 8 The 9 project is located in one or more landscapes of conservation significance, high value landscape, 10 11 environmentally significant areas, areas of high 12 wildlife sensitivity, key wildlife and biodiversity 13 area, and high sensitivity watershed. This fact is not 14 disputed by AT. Much of this area is high risk.

AT attempts to reduce the significance of this
designation by asserting that the high value landscapes
occupy the entire landscape west of Calgary.

While high value landscapes may be present in other locations in the project, at other locations this does not reduce the significance of the impacts of the project on the environment. In any event, the project's impacts on the environment on which it is situate is the issue and not whether there are other high value landscapes present elsewhere.

25

1

2

3

4

5

The South Saskatchewan Regional Plan mapped some



16:06

of the project area as intact native grasslands, as 1 2 noted by Mr. Wallis in his report. 3 Section 2.1 of the NRCBA requires the Board to act 4 in accordance with any applicable ALSA regional plan. 5 By virtue of Section 2.1 of the NRCBA, the Board must consider the provisions of the SSRP and act in 6 7 accordance with its directions in determining this In fact, I believe that was also done in 8 application. 9 the Cougar Creek decision. This means that the Board must, in accordance with the guidance of the SSRP, 10 11 ensure that intact native grasslands within the project 12 area remain intact and in an undisturbed state. Anv 13 application such as the SR1 project that would result 14 in destruction of the intact native grasslands should 15 be a factor in denying this project. 16 The SCLG notes that Appendix G of the SSRP 17 provides guidance to decision-makers that require 18 considerations of provisions in Strategy 3.7 of the 19 descriptions of the intact native grasslands, as mapped 20 at page 150 of the SSRP. 16:08 21 While acknowledging that this project will 22 intersect areas mapped as intact native grasslands, AT 23 argues it is committed to revegetation. 24 As Mr. Wallis has noted, according to Lancaster 25 et al, revegetation success of rough fescue grassland

2780



has been recorded only on sites that have not been 1 2 disturbed. 3 It is extremely doubtful that AT will revegetate 4 the land to provide the equivalent variety of grassland communities that were present before the project. 5 This outcome was acknowledged by AT in the transcript. 6 7 In terms of wetlands, Mr. Wallis testified that the project will also directly impact 5 kilometres of 8 9 productive stream courses and numerous productive wetlands during construction. 10 11 Also, other than wetlands that will be permanently 12 lost during construction, the project will impact 13 wetlands during flood operations. The alteration of 14 wetlands' functionality during flood operations means 15 that more wetlands could be lost over time. 16 And I would also refer you to Mr. Wallis's 17 evidence on the impact of downstream riparian 18 communities. 19 In relation to cumulative impacts, cumulative 20 impacts on the project on upland habitats and wetlands 21 have not been adequately addressed due to lack of 22 consideration of the degree to which foothills parkland 23 natural subregion habitat has already been heavily 24 modified. Every incremental loss of native habitat is 25 a significant loss for the natural subregion.



16:09

Despite the application of mitigation, impacts 1 2 will still remain. Mr. Wallis recommended that the 3 project not be approved in its current operating mode 4 due to the impacts on downstream riparian habitat. 5 Mr. Wallis also discussed sedimentation impacts on vegetation, and we would refer you to his evidence in 6 7 that regard. We would also refer you to the SCLG evidence on 8 9 wildlife and biodiversity, in particular as set out in the landowners' statements in Exhibit 250 and the 10 16:11 11 remarks made by Dr. Klepacki and Brian Copithorne in 12 his submissions. 13 And with that, I think I should go to my 14 concluding remarks. 15 Rejecting this project should spur immediate 16 innovation and create a substantial budget for the city 17 of Calgary to pursue flood-proofing projects downtown, 18 fully within the purview of The City of Calgary. These 19 could include new floodwall-type projects that would 20 protect against the Bow and Elbow flooding. The 21 increased Glenmore Reservoir capacity is an example of 22 such a project that is already complete. 23 Approval of SR1 would be a triumph of politics 24 over process. The proponent tried to play down the



negative elements of SR1, including air, water, and

25

environment by stating that most floods are small and 1 2 big flood events are so rare. If there is no worry 3 about these big floods, what is the rush? Send this 4 project back to the drawing board. 5 The SCLG is concerned that the various secret compensation agreements have resulted in a biassed 6 7 presentation before the NRCB. Rocky View County should be here as an intervener representing its residents, as 8 should the Tsuu T'ina Nation. 9 10 Why was Alberta Transportation trying to avoid 16:12 11 having any parties participate as an intervener in this 12 process? 13 It is not the fault of this Panel, the regulators, 14 or the Springbank residents who have raised concerns 15 that this project has dragged on for years. The 16 Ignasius report clearly points that out. 17 The responsibility for the delays falls squarely 18 on the proponent's shoulders. 19 Rejecting SR1 will create uncertainty for future 20 flood risk for the city of Calgary, but pursuing a 16:13 21 flawed and inferior project with an indefinite lifespan 22 due to anxiety about near-term flood risk is not in the The SCLG requests that the Board 23 public interest. 24 reject the SR1 application. 25 And, finally, I would like to thank the Board



Panel members, Board counsel and Board staff, 1 2 especially Ms. Friend and the document managers, the hearing participants and their counsel, and, of course, 3 4 Ms. Vespa and Ms. DiPaolo -- and, Donna, I hope you'll 5 forgive me for speaking so quickly -- for running a very efficient and collegial hearing. It was much 6 7 appreciated by the SCLG members and our expert witnesses, Ms. Okoye and me. 8

I would also like to thank Ms. Karin Hunter for 9 her tremendous effort in assisting Ms. Okoye and me 10 11 with the navigation of the voluminous record relating 12 to MC1 and SR1. I relied heavily on her encyclopedic 13 memory and attention to detail and am very grateful to 14 her.

15 And thank you, Mr. Chair, for giving me those 16 extra minutes. Much appreciated.

THE CHAIR: 17 Of course. Thank you, Mr. Secord, 18 and thank you to Ms. Okoye and all of the landowners 19 and members that you represented.

20 MR. SECORD: Thank you.

21 THE CHAIR: I think we should take a bio break 22 now, and we'll come back with Mr. Williams with Calalta 23 followed by Mr. Wagner.

24 And, Mr. Williams, you're there? Yes, I am.

25 MR. WILLIAMS:



16:14

1 THE CHAIR: And you're ready to go after the 2 break? MR. WILLIAMS: 3 Yes, I am. 4 THE CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So let's come 5 back at 4:30 and resume with Mr. Williams. Thank you. 6 (ADJOURNMENT) 7 THE CHAIR: So Ms. Louden had provided her final argument, and that could be Exhibit Number 413, 8 9 with no objections. Hearing none. EXHIBIT 413 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF THE 10 16:30 STONEY NAKODA NATIONS 11 THE CHAIR: 12 And Mr. Secord's exhibit -- or, 13 sorry, final argument would be Exhibit 414. 14 MR. SECORD: Thank you. 15 THE CHAIR: And any objections? I know that you skipped over a few paragraphs here and there and it 16 17 was -- I think, Mr. Kruhlak, you weighed in. Do you 18 want to at least have a peek at what happened? Before 19 you sort of said "no problem," but are there objections 20 or have you had a chance to review? 16:30 21 MR. KRUHLAK: Well, I guess, Mr. Chairman, we 22 have the opportunity to reply tomorrow, so we may do it 23 I can't say that the document shouldn't be then. 24 marked in some fashion. I guess our caution is that 25 there was more than a paragraph or two. There were



		í l				
1	some large components of this argument that was almost					
2	getting close to a written argument that was simply					
3	tendered with the Board.					
4	So our caveat would be that we'll address					
5	perhaps it's best addressed through the weight to					
6	provide certain components of the argument that were					
7	not orally highlighted for the Board.					
8	THE CHAIR: Okay.					
9	MR. KRUHLAK: But with that we won't object to					
10	it being marked and we'll speak to it tomorrow.	16:				
11	MR. SECORD: And I'm fine with that, Mr. Chair.					
12	I mean, I didn't because of time I had to skip over					
13	the soils and terrain components, so I didn't put that					
14	on the record. I tried to use my time up efficiently.					
15	So Mr. Kruhlak is right, and I'm sure he'll be fair in					
16	his response.					
17	THE CHAIR: Well, and the Board will for sure					
18	be reading the entirety of the of your exhibit, of					
19	your final argument, Mr. Secord, and of course will be					
20	interested in any reply you might have tomorrow,	16:				
21	Mr. Kruhlak, so thank you for that.					
22	So that's 414, the exhibit number.					
23	EXHIBIT 414 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF SCLG					
24	THE CHAIR: And I do believe Mr. Williams has					
25	already submitted his final argument to Ms. Friend, and					
		a				



h <u></u>		1
1	that could be entered as Exhibit 415. Now, that may	
2	have just been distributed. If parties would rather	
3	wait until either later last thing of the day or	
4	first thing tomorrow when we re-adjourn, we can do	
5	that, unless you're prepared to allow that to stand as	
6	Exhibit 415 now with no objection.	
7	So any preference on that, parties? Mr. Kruhlak?	
8	MR. KRUHLAK: Well, I haven't Mr. Chairman, I	
9	haven't had a chance yet to look at it. I don't know	
10	if Mr. Williams will confirm it's going to be just	16:32
11	essentially a written version of what he'll say or	
12	whether it's to supplement it in some fashion. If it	
13	is, then perhaps we should defer it until we've had a	
14	look at it.	
15	MR. WILLIAMS: It's just Mr. Chairman, it's	
16	Mr. Williams. It's basically verbatim of what we will	
17	say.	
18	THE CHAIR: Okay. With that caveat, let's	
19	enter it then. Thank you. Yeah.	
20	EXHIBIT 415 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF CALALTA	16:33
21	WATERWORKS AND CALAWAY PARK	
22	THE CHAIR: Okay, Mr. Williams, if you're	
23	ready to go, please proceed.	
24	MR. WILLIAMS: I'm ready to go. Okay.	
25	Good afternoon to Mr. Chairman, the Board, and to	



all hearing participants. The overview that I will present today of our closing comments will be in the fashion of introduction, our three objections, and then a conclusion.

2788

1

2

3

4

11

5 Starting with the introduction. Calalta 6 Amusements Ltd., Calaway Park has been in operation for 7 40 years. We are proud to be one of Alberta's top tourism destinations, employing 650 seasonal and 8 9 40 permanent year-round jobs. We have worked hard to 10 achieve what we have without any provincial, municipal, or federal capital funding. We did receive a small 12 grant for our campground development in 1990.

13 Calalta Waterworks Ltd. has operated and provided 14 safe drinking, potable water to the Springbank 15 community; the Springbank elementary, middle, high 16 school; Edge School; Springbank Park for all seasons; 17 Springbank Heritage Club; Commercial Court, which is approximately 18 businesses; and soon to be 18 19 developments of Bingham Crossing, Pradera Springs, and 20 River Edge, as well as Calaway Park for the last 21 40 vears.

16:34

16:33

22 In 1992, the addition of five intake wells; in 23 2014, a half million gallon aboveground water 24 reservoir, and in 2015, a \$6 million investment into an 25 ultra membrane water treatment plant; and in 2020, the



franchise agreement. We have proven our commitment and 1 2 responsibility to Alberta Environment, the Springbank 3 community, and Rocky View County. 4 Safety is a priority for Calaway Park and 5 Calalta Waterworks. We are held accountable by a 6 number of regulatory standards and believe that Alberta 7 Transportation, Alberta Environment, and Stantec should be held accountable to these same standards. 8 9 As in our presentation in Topic area 1, Exhibit Number 372, we have three objections that the 10 16:35 11 NRCB has given us standing on, which are. And I will 12 proceed to share that information now. 13 Objection 1: air quality, ambient air, 14 atmospheric environment. As shared in our evidence, we 15 are sensitive to the dust and the ambient air quality. 16 The concern in our evidence, Exhibit 372, Slide 3, is 17 that SR1 will take three summer seasons to construct. 18 Calaway will potentially experience consequences and 19 negative impacts of construction dust and/or ambient 20 air to our guest experience, team members, rising 16:36 21 equipment, PLCs, and the sensitivity extends beyond the construction of the dam for the foreseeable future and 22

A great question was asked on April 1,
Exhibit Number 406, by Ms. Vance in regards to ambient

years in the future.

23



air and PM 2.5 and whether we would notice this amount. It is even more evident on the answer that was submitted that the monitoring stations are necessary. During construction post air quality will be a minimum standard for human safety PM 2.5, or 27 percent micrograms fugitive dust. Pausing construction could be a mediation action if required.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

24

25

2790

Westerly winds and chinook winds are what the 8 9 community experiences. This should be taken into 10 consideration. Alberta Transportation Matthew Hebert 11 has had conversations with Calalta on our concerns. As 12 this is higher level conversations, we are requesting 13 that the NRCB Board make the monitoring stations on the 14 Calalta property and that all reporting will be 15 available to Calalta on a weekly basis during our in season and monthly offseason to be a condition of 16 17 approval and that mediating actions to be determined 18 and approved by both parties prior to construction.

In Alberta Transportation's closing argument,
Exhibit Number 409, page 80.286, agrees to the
monitoring station and to the results being shared with
Calalta. Further to this, Alberta Transportation
cites: (as read)

"If data from the station indicate exceedances of applicable air quality





objectives, Alberta Transportation will undertake appropriate mitigation." They go on to say that Calalta's request has been adequately addressed.

5 We appreciate Alberta Transportation's mediation 6 implementations. We do, however, disagree that our 7 requests have been adequately addressed. As an undertaking provided by Alberta Transportation on our 8 9 request of insurance, in the event of Calaway, Calalta Waterworks would be forced to close, Alberta 10 11 Transportation is not contemplating the insurance 12 coverage as we requested. Our insurer will not provide 13 coverage for the events that are not related to property 14 peril. Calalta is requesting that the Board add to the 15 condition of approval compensation for any business interruption caused by the SR1 project. 16

16:38

16:39

17 Aside from this, it was brought to our attention 18 that information that we provided, which is not an undertaking, regarding the Springbank Airport states 19 20 that the Springbank Airport is the second busiest 21 airport in Canada, and one states it is the seventh 22 busiest based on touchdowns and takeoffs, not on passenger traffic. And this is information that was 23 24 requested that we submit.

25

1

2

3

4

Objection Number 2: Surface water sediment back



REPORTING GROUP

into the Elbow River. In One City One Water document, 1 2 Exhibit Number 345, that The City of Calgary submitted 3 stated water security is essential. And we agree. 4 Separate from the Calalta operation there are 5 approximately 2100 school children to consider, plus 6 20 businesses, residences, community, and senior 7 Calalta submitted evidence, centres. Exhibit Number 372, Slide 4, with concerns raised in the 8 9 NRCB supplement information report, Exhibit Number 84, page 91, indicating that a sediment dump could have 10 11 perils on the Calalta water intake, water treatment plant filtration system. 12 13 Sensitivity of the diversion barrier causing downstream's sweepers piling up causing diversion of the 14 15 river of the natural -- of the river's natural course. 16 Who will monitor this? What is the procedure? 17 The current solution being discussed with Alberta 18 Transportation is that in the event of a flood, where 19 SR1 is used, it is understood that an agreed third party 20 will assess damages caused to the Calalta water intake 16:40 21 well system and our water treatment plant filtration 22 The third party will work with Calalta and system. 23 Alberta Transportation to ensure and resolve 24 compensation required for any damages. Nowhere in 25 Alberta Transportation's closing argument,



Exhibit Number 409, do they agree to this third-party 1 2 condition to assess damage, as we have previously 3 discussed. 4 As stated, Alberta Transportation this morning, 5 Exhibit Number 409, page 63.223, yes, our intake wells are set back from the Elbow River and we did not 6 7 experience damage as a result of the 2013 flood. But. despite this, this does not discount the possibility of 8 9 a future flood event causing significant damage, and release of water from the usage of SR1 would be 10 11 significantly different than consistent water flow due 12 to the risks of sediment buildup. 13 We are requesting the NRCB put in place a condition 14 of approval that Alberta Transportation determines the 15 detail of mediation prior to construction that both 16 parties are in agreement. 17 Objection Number 3: franchise agreement. I will 18 address many of Mr. Kruhlak's cross questions. I cannot 19 assume, yet only use my intuition to the intent of his 20 cross questions. 21 Mr. Kruhlak brought up Calalta's 10-inch waterline 22 along Range Road 33. The lines shown did not show the 23 lines into Commercial Court, 18 businesses, and some 24 residential developments that are tied onto the primary 25 line and secondary line. Exhibit Number 362, page 65.



16:41

Future waterlines that are built are development 1 2 driven, as identified in the evidence Mr. Kruhlak submitted, being our franchise agreement, 3 4 Exhibit Number 362. Mr. Kruhlak identified the aspect 5 of water licence availability. Currently the water plant has seven water licences, and Calalta owns five of 6 7 There is an additional licence in the area, that them. we stated, for water and land, as we shared, which is 8 9 well documented. Exhibit 362, page 89. We do not need to own the licence. In essence, 10 11 water licence capacity for potable water is available 12 for future growth. 13 The County recognized the utility and the 14 infrastructure that exists. They have included it in 15 both the north and south ASP plans as being one of the regional solutions. In these documents provided are 16 17 exclusive franchise area, Exhibit Number 362. The same 18 as the evidence we provided on February 25th, 19 Exhibit Number 221, is there. 20 For the Board's information, the franchise 21 agreement document is in excess of a hundred pages. Ι 22 believe it's 104 to be exact, but I could be slightly 23 incorrect. Mr. Kruhlak has brought up the date of the 24 franchise agreement of February 25th, 2020, first 25 reading. As with this process being seven years to



16:43

date, the deliberation of the franchise agreement started in the fall of 2009, when Rocky View County considered the concept of the aqueduct for the county. The franchise agreement is, and was, a public process, no different than this one that we're currently experiencing, which input was ascertained by the AUC and the Rocky View County. Exhibit Number 362, page 6.

The evidence of this map we shared in our 8 9 Objection 3, and several maps of evidence of other participants in this process, Exhibit Numbers 372, 10 11 Slide 5, clearly shows that the proposed dam is adjacent 12 to a major thoroughway: the TransCanada Highway, 13 Highway 8, Highway 22, and Springbank Road. The exact location is a premier opportunity for future 14 15 development, being residential or business commercial.

16:44

And one other point I would say is that that intersection or interchange of 22 and TransCanada is a future of cluster for many potential businesses in the area.

The Board must consider why this area was included 16:45 in our exclusive franchise area. The answer is for its potential opportunity of future development and to provide the utility service for the future.

Mr. Kruhlak brought up evidence that I was referring to the Bow River TransAlta agreement; and,



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2 reference it states: (as read) 3 "Compensation paid to TransAlta is 4 intended to offset the end estimated commercial loss." 5 Exhibit Number 363. This is the same as the lost 6 sterilized land for SR1 for Calalta Waterworks Ltd. 7 We would applaud Mr. Frigo and The City of Calgary 8 9 on the One City One Water document, Exhibit Number 345. It shares what in our mind is the importance of water 10 11 security for both flood, drought, and water supply 12 sustainability. 13 As in our evidence, Exhibit Number 372, Slide 6,

2796

yes, he was correct in this reference.

1

Rocky View County has been compensated \$10 million; Tsuut'ina Nation has been compensated for \$32 million. Not in the evidence, but in Mr. Secord's cross, the Ermineskin First Nations, amount not disclosed; Kainai Blood Tribe amount not disclosed; and the landowners on expropriation of land, the total is unknown for us.

20 We have a formal legal franchise agreement, 21 Exhibit Number 362, in which we agree to ensure and 22 secure safe potable drinking water. This agreement 23 identifies an exclusive boundary area for the potential 24 future development of the utility. Exhibit Number 362, 25 page 65.



16:47

16:46

In this

We entered into this agreement, with further regulatory oversight on us, for the opportunity to tie on future development and growth. As stated in our presentation, 62 percent of the 3600 acres of our right has been sterilized. If a legal binding agreement with AUC and Rocky View County is recognized for them, then this bylaw enforced agreement needs to be recognized for us. Alberta Transportation compensated and recognized other agreements.

In Alberta Transportation's closing arguments, Exhibit Number 408, page 63 and 4 and points 224/225, they state that the given -- the uncertainty and the lack of evidence supporting this claim, Alberta Transportation submits it would not be appropriate for the Panel to impose on approval conditions with respect to Calalta's water franchise.

17 We appreciate the open conversation with Alberta 18 Transportation. However, we feel they have discounted 19 this franchise agreement. Alberta Transportation sees 20 this as a commercial business. This is partially 21 correct. This is a utility that serves the community at 22 large and, like The City of Calgary, water 23 sustainability is a priority. We disagree. 0ur 24 beneficial right has been taken away. 25 We are asking Alberta Transportation to recognize



16:48

16:48

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

and compensate for the lands that are sterilized for the 1 2 life of this agreement and our beneficial right. We are 3 requesting the Board make this an objection, a condition 4 of approval. 5 Conclusion. Our concern about safety is the 6 unintentional incident, which no one can know at this 7 It is the unintentional incident that has time. As this project serves the masses, we are 8 consequences. 9 protecting our livelihood that we have built over the 10 last 40 years. This protection of 660 summer seasonal 16:49 11 jobs, 40 permanent positions, and safe potable drinking 12 water for the local community. 13 Flood mitigation for the city of Calgary is 14 critical. We wholly understand this as we witnessed the 15 2013 flood. Calalta Amusements Ltd., Calaway Park, 16 Calalta Waterworks, and myself want to thank the 17 following: All the participants that have been involved 18 in this hearing: Karin Hunter, our community president 19 for all that she does for the community; the NRCB Board 20 members; you, Mr. Chairman; specifically Laura Friend 21 and Bill Kennedy for guidance and helping us understand 22 the process, and our participation in this process; to 23 the court reporters, staff, and team members that 24 assisted the NRCB in this position; to Elders Holloway, 25 Wesley, and Snow for their spiritual prayers.



h

			1
1		Thank you once again for the standing of our	
2		objections and for the opportunity for us to present	
3		them. I/we have learnt a lot.	
4		We ask the Board to consider the evidence and	
5		presentation in regards to our three objections. We ask	
6		the three conditions of approval for our three	
7		objections to be a condition of approval for this	
8		project.	
9		We look forward to the final report from the NRCB	
10		on this matter, and thank you very much.	16:51
11		And that would conclude, Mr. Chairman, my closing	
12		arguments.	
13	THE	CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Williams, and	
14		thank you for your participation throughout these	
15		proceedings. It's very much appreciated, and you've	
16		done a nice job of it.	
17	MR.	WILLIAMS: Thank you.	
18	THE	CHAIR: Mr. Wagner, are you online?	
19	MR.	WAGNER: I am.	
20	THE	CHAIR: Okay. And if you're in the same	16:51
21		location, we can give it a try in terms of video. I	
22		know that often it locks, but once your audio is on, it	
23		has seemed to work flawlessly throughout the	
24		proceeding, so	
25	MR.	WAGNER: Well, hopefully I exchanged a	



few settings, so maybe it will work a bit better, but 1 2 it is still in the country. 3 Good afternoon, Panel, participants and observers. 4 As a successful business owner, my best decisions 5 have always been bottom up. That is, gather the 6 information on alternatives and being informed prior to 7 making a final decision. I always ask for alternatives I never wanted to be left with a single 8 as well. 9 alternative and an answer of yes or no. As noted in the NRCB hearing over the past two 10 16:52 11 weeks, the Bow River alternatives being examined appear 12 to be this improved process. However, SR1 has all the 13 makings of a top-down process. 14 SR1 was chosen without prior public study, and now 15 an army of 18 employees and consultants are tasked with 16 justifying that decision. I don't envy the AT group. 17 They have a job to do, and obviously have been given marching orders. If only they would have been involved 18 19 in the beginning to evaluate alternatives. 20 The SR1 process has been totally upside down, and 16:53 21 the results are showing. Costs have escalated, budgets 22 are out of date, money is being borrowed from other



areas, and corners are being cut on the ultimate

The budget sits at 432 million, which is over

The scramble is on.

solution.

23

24

25

h		न
1	double the initial estimate, and there have been many	
2	areas that were discussed in the past two weeks that	
3	would grow this cost greatly. By AT's own submission,	
4	many budget items have not been updated.	
5	Some payments to stakeholders have been published	
6	up until recently, and now they have been increasingly	
7	NDA. It is reasonable to total at least a hundred	
8	million and growing. And this number will escalate as	
9	many stakeholder payments have yet to be fully	
10	negotiated.	16:
11	As for cutting corners, I will hit my two biggest	
12	on my thought process.	
13	I was unable to find a single earthen dam without	
14	riprap.	
15	And why 600 cubic metres per second? Why not 800?	
16	Why not 1,000? Why not 1500? Why not 2,000? I heard	
17	2800 cubic metres per second as a potential thousand	
18	year. All would have been available if MC1 would have	
19	been chosen. Most engineers I know prefer to	
20	overdesign rather than meet minimum requirements. I	16:
21	can only assume that engineers were not present from	
22	the initial specification. Road costs, pipeline costs,	
23	ongoing operating costs, updated budget all seem to	
24	have costs shortcomings.	
25	In 2018, the Auditor General of Canada sent the	



federal government back to the drawing board for misrepresenting the complete costs of the new fighter SR1 looks no different to me. jets. Landowners were shocked by the SR1 announcement in the Calgary Herald, and AT took nearly six months after the news release to accept an initial meeting upon our request. Consultants with AT and landowners have been very much one-way: AT telling and landowner opinions not required. I'm personally struggling with an understanding of how AT is going to keep water, sewer, and swelling clay from destroying my house. After seven years we have no engineering solutions. In fact, we have no engineering assistance at all, and are left with a whole lot of questions. Furthermore, the first archeological dig, which was in a very odd location, was not well executed, and

I am left with questions of whether the GoA is capable of caring.

We have been left with the comment that has been burned into my brain that we can have "a newer, smaller house." This does not seem like a party that is interested in landowner input.

Safety. It appears as though the GoA is willing



16:56

16:56

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	to put my family and any visitor to our house or casual	
2	weekend walker within the SR1 footprint in the	
3	crosshairs of a rifle. Further complicating the issue	
4	is the fact that driving in and out on our laneway is	
5	within the rifle hunting zone.	
6	No less concerning will be the high possibility of	
7	having a deer or an elk being killed on our lawn;	
8	hopefully, by an arrow because a rifle would be	
9	technically illegal.	
10	Mr. Kruhlak, in this morning's presentation by AT,	16:57
11	stated that there will be no unfettered hunting.	
12	However, the AT plan is the exact opposite.	
13	My only request in the hearings to make SR1 a no	
14	hunting zone was rejected by AT. Therefore, I contend	
15	that AT's comments are inconsistent.	
16	As a rural landowner as any rural landowner	
17	knows, dealing with hunters is a challenging vocation,	
18	and AT's response to date has been that local knowledge	
19	is not required.	
20	The distance from Calgary and the presence of elk	16:58
21	magnifies the SR1 location risk.	
22	Without NRCB hunting clarification, SR1 will be a	
23	safety risk for both public and residents, and the elk	
24	and grizzly bear populations. Help.	
25	We have two people at our location with	



respiratory considerations, and given that we are 1 2 within metres of the waterline, confined sediment is 3 what we should expect. Air quality does not look good 4 for us. 5 While I agree that this may only happen on a 6 design flood at our location, it is an event that would 7 be real. It is not our choosing. I must say I had quite a chuckle when it was 8 9 suggested at a recent CEAA forum that the frogs would be rounded up. I was not sp amused when a frog pond 10 16:59 11 was chosen for the first archeological dig. 12 As for elk and grizzly bear, the GoA has, in my 13 humble opinion, thrown wildlife under the bus, as they 14 have not addressed the concerns about unfettered 15 hunting, these issues have been raised before and continue to be ignored or dismissed by AT. 16 17 I have dealt with the federal government as a 18 business owner. I admit I have limited dealing with 19 the Alberta government. 20 Having said this, the NRCB submission would be 21 unique in all of my dealings, having only one solution 22 or sole sourcing was not accepted by any government 23 department I dealt with. 24 I have submitted a few recommendations, but here 25 are my top three, after listening over two weeks.

REPORTING GROUP

My first one: Send the project back to the 1 2 drawing board and compel AT to have MC1 as an 3 alternative in the second application. 4 As a condition of approval, compel the AT to 5 renegotiate hunting rights to make SR1 a no hunting 6 zone, or at the very least, a no rifle zone. 7 As a condition of approval, Number 3, compel AT to deal with landowners, as they have stated in their very 8 9 own SR1 submission, with respect and consultation and negotiate in good faith. 10 11 Finally, I would very much like to thank the 12 Panel, support staff, and Alberta Transportation for 13 indulging me. 14 This has been my first process that I have gone 15 through, and I've learned a lot, and I look forward to potentially being involved in another one at some 16 17 point. 18 Take care and stay safe. 19 THE CHAIR: Well, thank you, Mr. Wagner. And 20 the Board does recognize that this is particularly 17:02 21 difficult for those folks that aren't represented by 22 legal counsel and for those folks that are new to the 23 process, to the hearing process, which you just 24 indicated.

25

So we appreciate your participation and we



ĪĒ

1		understand that, you know, it can be a challenge for				
2	those folks that aren't familiar.					
3		So thank you once again and good for you for				
4		stepping up.				
5	MR.	WAGNER: Thank you again, Mr. Chair.				
6	MR.	KENNEDY: Mr. Chair, Mr. Wagner did submit a				
7		copy of his final argument. We should enter that.				
8	THE	CHAIR: Thank you. And that is what				
9		number? And also				
10	MR.	KENNEDY: 416.	17:02			
11	THE	CHAIR: 416. I'm not sure if anybody has				
12		had a chance to review it. It was submitted while he				
13		was talking, of course. Probably not.				
14		Mr. Kruhlak, perhaps under the same caveat?				
15	MR.	KRUHLAK: We have no objection, sir. We've				
16		had a look at it. Thank you.				
17	THE	CHAIR: Okay.				
18	MR.	WAGNER: Mr. Chair, it was basically a read				
19		submission.				
20	THE	CHAIR: Okay, thank you.	17:03			
21		So hearing none.				
22		EXHIBIT 416 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF MR. S.				
23		WAGNER				
24	THE	CHAIR: I would like to thank everyone for				
25		today, and I do appreciate the fact that many of you				



1	used up a long weekend working on these submissions,				
2	the Panel recognizes that, and we do appreciate all the				
3	work that's been put in to final argument over the				
4	weekend largely, we expect.				
5	And we also appreciate the fact that you were				
6	respectful of the time. It was a long day, but we were				
7	able to get all final arguments in today, which allows				
8	us to complete the hearing tomorrow with Alberta				
9	Transportation's reply.				
10	And I'll have additional closing comments tomorrow	17:03			
11	at the close of the hearing, so I won't go into those				
12	now.				
13	We can adjourn for the evening and get back				
14	tomorrow morning, but I will have some closing remarks				
15	tomorrow following Alberta Transportation's reply.				
16	So, once again, thank you to everyone. It's much				
17	appreciated.				
18	Thank you, Ms. Gerbrandt. I know these final				
19	argument days are probably a little tougher on				
20	court reporters than on other days, so thank you very	17:04			
21	much.				
22	Thank you, Mr. Wiebe.				
23	Are there any other matters that anybody wanted				
24	dealt with before we open tomorrow?				
25	Okay, hearing none, tomorrow morning we start at 9				
		1			



1 with an 8:30 sign-in to Zoom.					
2 So thank you once again and we'll see you tomorrow					
3 morning.					
4 MR. KRUHLAK: Thank you, good night.					
5 THE CHAIR: Good night.					
6 (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 5:04 P.M.)					
7					
8 PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED TO 8:30 A.M., APRIL 7, 2021					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
AMICUS					

REPORTING GROUP

IF.

11							
We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing pages 2491 to 2809 are a complete and accurate transcript of the proceedings taken down by us in shorthand and transcribed from our shorthand notes to the best of our skill and ability. Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta, on April 6, 2021. <u>Province of Alberta, on April 6, 2021.</u> <u>Province Vespa</u> Lorelee Vespa, CSR(A) RPR CRR Official Court Reporter <u>Province Gerbrandt</u> <u>Onna Gerbrandt</u> Official Court Reporter Official Court Reporter	1	<u>Certificate of Transcript</u>					
4 pages 2491 to 2809 are a complete and accurate transcript 5 of the proceedings taken down by us in shorthand and 6 transcribed from our shorthand notes to the best of our 7 skill and ability. 8 Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta, on 9 April 6, 2021. 10 Lorelee Vespa"	2						
5 of the proceedings taken down by us in shorthand and 6 transcribed from our shorthand notes to the best of our 7 skill and ability. 8 Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta, on 9 April 6, 2021. 10 Lorelee Vespa" 11 Lorelee Vespa" 12 Lorelee Vespa, CSR(A) RPR CRR 14 Official Court Reporter 15 Donna Gerbrandt" 16 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 18 Official Court Reporter 19	3	We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the foregoing					
<pre>6 transcribed from our shorthand notes to the best of our 7 skill and ability. 8 Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta, on 9 April 6, 2021. 10 11 12 <u>"Lorelee Vespa"</u> 13 Lorelee Vespa, CSR(A) RPR CRR 14 Official Court Reporter 15 16 <u>"Donna Gerbrandt"</u> 17 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 18 Official Court Reporter 19 20 21 22 23 24</pre>	4	pages <u>2491</u> to <u>2809</u> are a complete and accurate transcript					
<pre>7 skill and ability. 8 Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta, on 9 April 6, 2021. 10 11 12 <u>"Lorelee Vespa"</u> 13 Lorelee Vespa, CSR(A) RPR CRR 14 Official Court Reporter 15 16 <u>"Donna Gerbrandt"</u> 17 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 18 Official Court Reporter 19 20 21 22 23 24</pre>	5	of the proceedings taken down by us in shorthand and					
Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta, on April 6, 2021. Image: matrix of the constraint of the	6	transcribed from our shorthand notes to the best of our					
<pre>9 April 6, 2021. 10 11 12 <u>"Lorelee Vespa"</u> 13 Lorelee Vespa, CSR(A) RPR CRR 14 Official Court Reporter 15 16 <u>"Donna Gerbrandt"</u> 17 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 18 Official Court Reporter 19 20 21 22 23 24</pre>	7	skill and ability.					
10 11 12 <u>"Lorelee Vespa"</u> 13 Lorelee Vespa, CSR(A) RPR CRR 14 Official Court Reporter 15 16 <u>"Donna Gerbrandt"</u> 17 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 18 Official Court Reporter 19 20 21 22 23 24	8	Dated at the City of Calgary, Province of Alberta, on					
11	9	April 6, 2021.					
12 "Lorelee Vespa" 13 Lorelee Vespa, CSR(A) RPR CRR 14 Official Court Reporter 15 "Donna Gerbrandt" 16 "Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 17 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 18 Official Court Reporter 19 0 20 21 21 22 23 24	10						
Lorelee Vespa, CSR(A) RPR CRR Official Court Reporter <u>"Donna Gerbrandt"</u> Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) Official Court Reporter Official Court Reporter	11						
14 Official Court Reporter 15 16 <u>"Donna Gerbrandt"</u> 17 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 18 Official Court Reporter 19 20 21 22 23 24	12	<u>"Lorelee Vespa"</u>					
15 16 <u>"Donna Gerbrandt"</u> 17 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 18 Official Court Reporter 19 20 21 22 23 24	13	Lorelee Vespa, CSR(A) RPR CRR					
16"Donna Gerbrandt"17Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A)18Official Court Reporter1920212122232424	14	Official Court Reporter					
17 Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A) 18 Official Court Reporter 19 20 21 22 23 24	15						
18 Official Court Reporter 19 20 21 22 23 24	16	<u>"Donna Gerbrandt"</u>					
19 20 21 22 23 24	17	Donna Gerbrandt, CSR(A)					
20 21 22 23 24	18	Official Court Reporter					
21 22 23 24	19						
22 23 24	20						
23 24	21						
24	22						
	23						
25	24						
	25						
/		/					

AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

1		
1	- INDEX-	
2		
3	VOLUME 10	
4		
5 6	EXHIBITS	
о 7	EXHIBIT 407 - AT RESPONSES TO UNDERTAKINGS 34, 44,	2405
8	AND 46 THROUGH 59	2490
9		
10	EXHIBIT 408 - MARCH 29 TO APRIL 1 AT TRANSCRIPT	2495
11	CORRECTIONS	
12		
13	EXHIBIT 409 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF ALBERTA	2496
14	TRANSPORTATION	
15		
16	EXHIBIT 410 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF CRCAG AND FFC	2659
17		
18	EXHIBIT 411 - TRANSCRIPT CORRECTIONS FROM CRCAG	2660
19	AND FFC	
20		
21	EXHIBIT 412 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF THE CITY OF	2660
22	CALGARY	
23		
24		
25		
	-	
<u> [</u>		



1	EXHIBIT 413 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF THE STONEY NAKODA	2785
2	NATIONS	
3		
4	EXHIBIT 414 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF SCLG	2786
5		
6	EXHIBIT 415 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF CALALTA WATERWORKS	2787
7	AND CALAWAY PARK	
8		
9	EXHIBIT 416 - FINAL ARGUMENT OF MR. S. WAGNER	2806
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	AMICUS	

REPORTING GROUP

NRCB 1701, Volume 10, April 6, 2021

\$	2598:19; 2627:25;	15,000 [1] - 2639:8	2.8 [1] - 2757:2	2623:25; 2704:13;
	2629:15; 2646:17;	150 [3] - 2499:2;	20 [7] - 2582:14;	2705:3; 2714:10;
\$1.254 [2] - 2624:10; 2626:1	2659:1; 2676:13; 2713:16; 2715:8;	2582:24; 2780:20 1500 [1] - 2801:16	2643:24; 2644:1; 2646:17; 2719:16, 19;	2727:10; 2728:12; 2729:15
\$10 [2] - 2622:1; 2796:14	2720:15; 2757:3, 21; 2769:17: 2776:1	151 [1] - 2730:5 153 [1] - 2530:8	2792:6 20-year [1] - 2719:7	2018 [14] - 2507:10; 2524:16; 2535:12;
\$100 [1] - 2622:3	10-inch [1] - 2793:21	154 [1] - 2730:6	200 [14] - 2558:3;	2569:17, 21; 2611:21;
\$140 [1] - 2714:9 \$20 [1] - 2717:18	10-metre [1] - 2605:10	156 [1] - 2686:12 157 [2] - 2581:19;	2564:10; 2572:6; 2573:4; 2648:2, 24;	2703:23; 2704:8, 22; 2705:10; 2729:2;
\$27 [5] - 2624:13;	10-year [2] -	2582:7	2651:2; 2683:18;	2739:10; 2742:21;
2625:2, 13; 2649:2, 21	2515:10; 2719:20 10.5 [1] - 2713:16	158 [1] - 2701:10 159 [10] - 2713:12;	2687:19; 2712:4; 2749:23; 2750:4, 10,	2801:25 2019 [9] - 2507:18;
\$32 [1] - 2796:15 \$38 [1] - 2683:3	100 [24] - 2515:1, 5; 2572:5; 2648:15, 23;	2714:5; 2717:8, 12; 2718:9, 12, 15;	16 200-return [1] -	2509:6; 2524:21; 2525:11; 2534:8;
\$406 [1] - 2713:23	2649:4; 2651:12;	2719:1; 2723:2	2700:6	2612:1; 2721:23, 25;
\$432 [2] - 2516:5; 2625:22	2652:9; 2665:18; 2683:18; 2687:12, 20,	16 [7] - 2621:5; 2678:21; 2706:11;	200-year [13] - 2564:12; 2573:2, 22;	2728:12 2020 [12] - 2508:7-9;
\$500,000 [1] - 2730:4	25; 2698:14; 2708:1;	2708:3; 2720:7;	2618:22; 2619:5;	2517:12; 2525:12;
\$522 [1] - 2713:14 \$580 [3] - 2713:7, 11,	2713:13; 2714:12; 2721:25; 2722:10, 18;	2757:23; 2761:11 160 [7] - 2548:23;	2640:3; 2652:19; 2682:10; 2683:20;	2543:11; 2582:8, 20; 2738:4; 2788:25;
22 \$700,000 [1] - 2625:3	2749:21; 2759:25; 2766:11; 2770:18	2551:14; 2553:3, 5-6; 2554:2; 2718:9	2687:10; 2706:6; 2728:6; 2766:11	2794:24 2021 [10] - 2492:5;
\$935 [1] - 2624:7	100,000 [2] - 2592:6;	163 [1] - 2730:14	2003 [2] - 2569:8, 16	2508:25; 2531:8;
Ţ	2759:23 100-flood [1] -	165 [1] - 2619:14 168 [1] - 2730:23	2005 [4] - 2634:24; 2650:6; 2654:7;	2537:10; 2540:5; 2541:15; 2659:2;
119 m 0504.40	2707:19	17 [4] - 2630:14;	2707:8	2684:18; 2708:13;
'18 [1] - 2524:12 'first [1] - 2692:6	100-year [10] - 2556:23; 2558:13;	2722:8; 2741:10, 21 17.6 [1] - 2511:25	2008 [2] - 2691:14; 2739:9	2808:8 203 [2] - 2556:10;
0	2572:4; 2619:13; 2651:1; 2707:13, 17,	170 [4] - 2554:6; 2558:24; 2699:6;	2008-01 [4] - 2691:15; 2694:7;	2558:7 2050 [1] - 2573:21
_	21, 24; 2708:5	2722:21	2695:2; 2738:12	209 [1] - 2713:6
0 [1] - 2687:14	101 [3] - 2713:22; 2715:8, 24	1701 [1] - 2493:10 172 [1] - 2739:18	2009 [1] - 2795:2 201 [1] - 2558:7	21 [1] - 2568:7 2100 [1] - 2792:5
1	104 [1] - 2794:22	1774 [1] - 2715:6	2012 [2] - 2509:3;	219 [1] - 2716:8
1 [88] - 2495:20;	10:45 [1] - 2499:4 11 [4] - 2569:6, 24;	1779 [1] - 2715:6 18 [5] - 2523:11;	2702:10 2013 [64] - 2510:4, 8;	22 [11] - 2545:15; 2548:10; 2568:8;
2515:10; 2554:22; 2556:22; 2558:12;	2677:5 110 [2] - 2590:16;	2599:13; 2788:18; 2793:23; 2800:15	2511:1, 8, 13; 2512:2; 2559:5; 2572:5, 8, 22;	2605:6, 11; 2676:11; 2686:5; 2736:6;
2560:5; 2564:12;	2756:12	180 [1] - 2582:23	2573:3, 5, 9; 2579:22;	2753:17; 2795:13, 17
2572:4-6; 2573:2, 4; 2581:16; 2594:18;	110,000 [1] - 2621:10 111 [1] - 2594:16	1800s [2] - 2532:25; 2732:10	2613:22; 2614:14; 2616:25; 2617:5, 16,	221 [1] - 2794:19 224/225 [1] - 2797:11
2605:24; 2611:16;	1132 [1] - 2745:11	187 [1] - 2693:6	23; 2618:21; 2620:1,	23 [1] - 2568:9
2618:8, 22; 2619:5, 13; 2625:21; 2635:12;	11:05 [1] - 2609:19 12 [9] - 2524:24;	1877 [1] - 2661:5 19 [2] - 2705:5;	20; 2621:13, 19, 22, 25; 2622:23; 2623:4,	231 [1] - 2719:1 237 [1] - 2620:22
2636:2; 2640:2; 2644:1; 2648:2, 6-7,	2569:6, 24; 2573:21; 2610:7; 2677:17;	2736:16 1900s [1] - 2617:13	21, 24; 2625:5; 2626:9, 18; 2628:11;	24 [6] - 2515:16; 2560:23; 2561:1;
15, 19, 23-24; 2651:1;	2701:18; 2703:5	1925 [1] - 2699:5	2630:2, 4, 21; 2633:3;	2568:11; 2622:25;
2652:9, 19; 2671:19; 2672:18; 2673:9, 17;	12.4 [1] - 2717:12 121 [1] - 2699:5	193 [1] - 2627:7 1932 [1] - 2577:9	2642:2; 2644:24; 2646:6, 15; 2647:19;	2717:10 24-metre [1] -
2682:10; 2683:19;	1240 [4] - 2554:16;	195 [2] - 2556:9;	2650:14; 2662:5;	2605:10
2685:7; 2686:2; 2687:10, 18-19;	2687:11; 2707:9; 2712:25	2557:22 196 [1] - 2557:25	2664:24; 2689:9; 2699:7; 2705:25;	25 [10] - 2551:10; 2573:8, 23; 2619:6;
2688:4, 7-8; 2700:6; 2701:9; 2706:6;	1260 [1] - 2739:3 12:12 [1] - 2658:12	1976 [1] - 2688:21 1980s [1] - 2590:4	2706:13; 2709:1; 2712:12; 2721:20;	2640:3, 23; 2651:3; 2654:25; 2687:16;
2707:5, 13, 17, 19,	12:15 [1] - 2658:1	199 [2] - 2739:16;	2737:25; 2746:9, 21;	2719:7
21, 24; 2708:5; 2712:4, 16; 2713:3;	13 [7] - 2539:12; 2621:6; 2651:20;	2744:25 1990 [1] - 2788:12	2747:18; 2750:10; 2751:15; 2776:13;	250 [3] - 2685:11; 2713:19; 2782:10
2718:13; 2719:20;	2677:21; 2691:16;	1992 [1] - 2788:22 1998 [2] - 2710:2;	2793:7; 2798:15	252 [2] - 2703:10;
2722:3; 2723:23; 2726:18; 2728:5, 13;	2738:12; 2744:5 1300 [1] - 2551:15	2726:24	2013-size [2] - 2640:8; 2641:6	2705:2 254 [2] - 2713:14;
2749:20, 23; 2750:2, 4, 10, 16; 2751:11;	133 [1] - 2700:2 136 [1] - 2621:2	1:00 [4] - 2658:3, 7, 11, 14	2013-sized [4] - 2512:22; 2618:25;	2737:3 255 [2] - 2705:11;
2756:23, 25; 2759:25;	138 [3] - 2581:17;	1:01 [1] - 2659:5	2619:11; 2647:23	2729:2
2774:5; 2789:9, 13, 24	2714:6; 2717:19 14 [3] - 2621:11;	1st [1] - 2508:25	2013-type [1] - 2516:14	256 [1] - 2560:18 25th [3] - 2517:12;
1's [1] - 2706:7	2678:6; 2736:6	2	2014 [9] - 2522:19;	2794:18, 24
1,000 [6] - 2592:12; 2625:7; 2688:4, 7;	14,500 [2] - 2511:3; 2621:1	2 [13] - 2581:18, 21;	2523:11; 2530:11; 2647:5; 2698:15, 18;	26 [2] - 2524:8; 2621:9
2713:3; 2801:16 1,240 [1] - 2619:12	140 [2] - 2581:17; 2713:13	2594:21; 2645:2; 2647:3; 2672:7;	2713:6; 2728:16; 2788:23	263 [1] - 2713:7 265 [1] - 2738:4
1.2 [1] - 2648:23	1405 [1] - 2706:15	2727:2; 2728:18;	2015 [9] - 2506:24;	269 [1] - 2766:25
1.28 [2] - 2722:1, 5 1.3 [2] - 2647:12;	141 [1] - 2581:17 142 [1] - 2670:24	2734:6; 2740:9, 14; 2756:25; 2791:25	2523:22; 2703:10, 15; 2713:7; 2714:11;	26th [1] - 2701:11 27 [2] - 2552:18;
2726:18 1.5 [4] - 2512:1, 5,	143 [1] - 2670:24 144 [1] - 2670:24	2,000 [2] - 2589:10; 2801:16	2727:9; 2737:4; 2788:24	2790:5 270 [1] - 2767:13
18; 2516:15	1450 [1] - 2589:11	2.1 [2] - 2780:3, 5	2016 [6] - 2524:7;	271 [1] - 2768:5
1.9 [1] - 2648:24 10 [18] - 2492:4;	149 [1] - 2581:18 15 [4] - 2623:5;	2.1.4 [1] - 2738:13 2.5 [8] - 2601:10, 14,	2538:10; 2540:1; 2670:6; 2717:7	273 [1] - 2769:9 274 [1] - 2770:6
2499:4; 2552:9;	2678:14; 2740:16;	17; 2688:17; 2766:9,	2017 [11] - 2507:9;	275 [1] - 2770:21
2573:9; 2586:1;	2741:8	11; 2790:1, 5	2517:11; 2524:12, 15;	276 [1] - 2771:2

AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

NRCB 1701, Volume 10, April 6, 2021

277 [1] - 2771:6	357 [1] - 2717:10	42.2 [1] - 2722:7	62 [1] - 2797:4	
279 [1] - 2771:25	358 [1] - 2729:12	426 [2] - 2592:2;	63 [1] - 2797:11	A
28 [1] - 2654:2	36 [2] - 2719:21;	2759:22	63.223 [1] - 2793:5	
280 [1] - 2772:7 2800 [1] - 2801:17	2742:13	43 [1] - 2641:1 43,000 [1] - 2629:16	640 [4] - 2554:19, 21; 2619:12; 2707:11	A.M [2] - 2493:8; 2808:8
281 [1] - 2773:3	36-page [1] - 2745:1 360 [2] - 2562:16;	432 [2] - 2713:8;	65 [2] - 2793:25;	ability [4] - 2604:1;
282 [1] - 2773:19	2686:6	2800:25	2796:25	2623:3; 2685:24;
284 [1] - 2773:23	3600 [3] - 2714:9, 14;	44 [2] - 2494:23;	65,000 [1] - 2719:17	2686:11
285 [1] - 2774:9	2797:4	2495:6	650 [1] - 2788:8	able [26] - 2512:15;
288 [1] - 2542:11	361 [2] - 2686:6;	45-minute [1] -	66 [1] - 2721:19	2513:25; 2531:23;
29 [1] - 2495:20	2775:2	2493:21	660 [1] - 2798:10	2552:19; 2560:10;
29-year [1] - 2648:7	362 [7] - 2793:25;	46 [2] - 2494:24;	67 [1] - 2769:19	2562:23; 2563:3;
29th [2] - 2757:18;	2794:4, 9, 17; 2795:7;	2495:6	69 [1] - 2582:17	2591:15; 2594:4, 10;
2758:3	2796:21, 24	47 [1] - 2581:15		2604:4; 2612:23;
3	363 [1] - 2796:6 365 [1] - 2736:17	480 [4] - 2551:11; 2707:10; 2738:9;	7	2679:25; 2693:1, 23; 2694:12; 2733:21;
3 [22] - 2494:24;	37 [1] - 2726:25	2739:2	7 [10] - 2507:9;	2734:11; 2743:25;
	372 [5] - 2789:10, 16;	49 [1] - 2719:1	2529:24; 2530:10, 17;	2745:3; 2747:17;
2547:17; 2560:4;	2792:8; 2795:10;	4:00 [1] - 2680:17	2661:5; 2675:15;	2757:24; 2761:10, 19;
2569:4; 2576:8;	2796:13	4:10 [1] - 2776:7	2718:6; 2721:1;	2807:7
2581:20; 2594:22;	373 [2] - 2709:19;	4:15 [1] - 2680:20	2756:23; 2808:8	Aboriginal [7] -
2599:12; 2647:4;	2745:13	4:30 [1] - 2785:5	7,000 [1] - 2630:6	2529:20; 2661:9;
2649:3; 2672:15;	378 [1] - 2701:14	4th [1] - 2495:9	7.1 [1] - 2518:23	2666:2; 2667:25;
2693:6; 2713:24;	379 [1] - 2706:15		70 [1] - 2552:10	2668:13; 2669:11, 23
2736:25; 2757:3;	38 [2] - 2513:8;	5	70-year [1] - 2655:18	aboveground [1] -
2763:23; 2769:14, 18;	2701:18		70.9 [1] - 2697:24	2788:23
2789:16; 2793:17;	385 [2] - 2713:20;	5 [17] - 2501:8;	700,000 [2] -	absence [2] -
2795:9; 2805:7	2715:5	2511:2; 2545:6;	2624:15; 2715:24	2590:12
3(b [1] - 2581:15	39,837 [1] - 2621:7	2547:19; 2556:5, 8;	74 [1] - 2509:15	absent [1] - 2761:22
3,000 [2] - 2621:4;	392 [1] - 2501:8	2601:7; 2625:21;	760 [2] - 2553:7, 10	absolutely [2] -
2639:8	393 [1] - 2628:23	2643:21; 2673:12;	77 [1] - 2651:11	2598:10; 2760:11
3.2 [1] - 2727:1	398 [1] - 2775:10	2675:3; 2696:22;	77.8 [1] - 2552:8	absurdity [1] -
3.3 [1] - 2552:3	399 [1] - 2745:10	2756:13; 2764:13;	780 [1] - 2707:11	2755:15
3.7 [1] - 2780:18	3rd [3] - 2523:22;	2774:23; 2781:8;		abundantly [1] -
3.8 [2] - 2713:20; 2722:11	2531:8; 2537:10	2795:11 5-to-1 [1] - 2649:4	8	2760:20 academic [1] -
30 [6] - 2552:2, 5;	4	5.1 [2] - 2623:23;	8 [4] - 2556:12;	2589:21
2635:23; 2720:25;	4 [12] - 2547:18;	2764:15	2676:1; 2703:14;	Academy [1] -
2746:7; 2755:16		5.3 [1] - 2776:10	2795:13	2765:21
30,000 [1] - 2718:16	2576:10; 2587:4;	50 [6] - 2621:5;	8.5 [3] - 2573:16;	accept [6] - 2685:3;
30-person [1] -	2673:4; 2681:2, 13;	2655:18; 2683:17, 20;	2697:12, 18	2736:18; 2745:13;
2720:23	2733:21; 2752:2;	2719:21; 2742:13	8.83 [1] - 2699:12	2774:22; 2778:4;
300 [1] - 2707:8	2764:11; 2775:14;	50,000 [1] - 2697:13	8.9 [1] - 2710:6	2802:6
30th [1] - 2755:22	2792:8; 2797:11	50-year [3] -	80 [1] - 2689:3	acceptable [7] -
31 [1] - 2746:7	4,000 [3] - 2511:4;	2554:22; 2687:18;	80.286 [1] - 2790:20	2516:1; 2604:9;
318 [1] - 2624:8	2621:4; 2630:5	2707:6	800 [1] - 2801:15	2685:4; 2734:1;
31st [2] - 2517:11;	4-14 [1] - 2590:16	500 [1] - 2750:2	800,000 [1] - 2713:21	2765:25; 2768:22;
2755:23	4.3 [2] - 2757:4;	500-year [5] - 2648:6; 2683:20;	830,000 [1] - 2716:1	2772:12
32 [2] - 2713:17;	2758:5		84 [2] - 2765:2;	acceptance [1] -
2722:2	4.4 [1] - 2755:20	2688:5, 8; 2728:5	2792:9	2507:24
320 [1] - 2530:8	4.7 [2] - 2624:1	509 [1] - 2717:11	88,000 [1] - 2511:2	accepted [7] -
323 [1] - 2722:10	4.875 [1] - 2623:21	510 [1] - 2717:11	883 [1] - 2648:16	2566:3; 2568:14;
324 [2] - 2500:17;	40 [15] - 2523:5; 2552:20; 2580:10;	527 [1] - 2723:1	89 [1] - 2794:9	2595:23; 2606:13;
2536:8		537 [1] - 2688:23	8:00 [1] - 2493:8	2708:2; 2732:23;
325 [3] - 2500:13;	2643:22; 2644:4;	54 [1] - 2646:24	8:15 [2] - 2494:18;	2804:22
2697:20; 2703:14	2652:2, 18; 2713:19;	56 [1] - 2513:8	2499:5	accepts [3] - 2522:3;
327 [8] - 2500:15;	2714:12; 2727:20;	58 [1] - 2701:25	8:30 [2] - 2808:1, 8	2555:17; 2740:23
2570:10; 2582:17;	2788:7, 9, 21;	580 [2] - 2722:22	9	access [17] -
2684:21; 2707:6;	2798:10	59 [2] - 2494:24;		2504:22; 2511:6;
2716:15; 2764:22;	40,000 [1] - 2714:10	2495:6		2533:4; 2538:11, 18;
2769:20	400 [1] - 2622:24	5:04 [1] - 2808:6	9 [4] - 2676:9;	2546:13; 2635:15;
33 [1] - 2793:22	406 [3] - 2722:20;	5:30 [1] - 2493:22	2716:5; 2722:6;	2636:5; 2655:3;
339 _[2] - 2615:8;	2774:21; 2789:25	5th [1] - 2506:24	2807:25	2668:8; 2672:22;
2743:1	407 [2] - 2495:4		90 [1] - 2680:25	2676:16, 23; 2677:4;
34 [2] - 2494:23;	408 [3] - 2495:19;	6	90.4 [1] - 2702:15	2713:25; 2714:4;
2495:6	2797:11	6 [10] - 2492:5;	91 [2] - 2702:20;	2740:6
34,000 [2] - 2621:8;	409 [6] - 2496:10, 13;		2792:10	accessible [1] -
2639:8	2790:20; 2793:1, 5	2574:4; 2623:22;	93 [1] - 2581:16	2535:1
340 [2] - 2713:12;	41 [1] - 2722:3	2659:2; 2674:15;		accidents [1] -
2722:9	410 [3] - 2659:14, 16	2699:10; 2764:14;	93,000 [1] - 2751:25 935 [1] - 2624:6	2678:2
345 [3] - 2682:15;	411 [3] - 2659:24;	2788:24; 2795:7;	94 [1] - 2764:22	accommodate [3] -
2792:2; 2796:9	2660:7	2796:13	96 [3] - 2701:25;	2529:12; 2640:16;
347 [1] - 2752:3	412 [2] - 2660:10, 13	6,000 [1] - 2630:19	2702:3, 7	2667:2
35 [2] - 2531:18;	413 [2] - 2785:8, 10	600 [14] - 2551:9;	9601-1 [1] - 2691:22	accommodated [1] -
2537:1	414 [3] - 2785:13;	2553:8, 15; 2554:18;	98 [1] - 2702:17	2667:10
350 [2] - 2686:12;	2786:22	2559:2; 2562:18;	990 [1] - 2707:14	accommodation [5]
2708:20	415 [3] - 2787:1, 6,	2598:22; 2619:1;	991 [1] - 2736:16	- 2530:4; 2667:16;
350-year [1] -	20	2648:17; 2688:12;	9:45 [1] - 2604:8	2669:22; 2672:1;
2648:19	416 [3] - 2806:10, 22	2707:10; 2738:9;		2714:22
356 [1] - 2730:3	42 [1] - 2713:14	2739:2; 2801:15		accommodations

AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

NRCB 1701, Volume 10, April 6, 2021

[1] - 2716:25	2516:21; 2517:18;	2517:5, 7; 2533:13;	admitting [1] -	affection [1] - 2518:2
accompanying[1] -	2518:8; 2714:3, 15	2539:18, 21; 2540:1;	2599:3	afford [5] - 2554:3;
2515:23	acre [1] - 2714:10	2541:13; 2558:3;	adopt [1] - 2692:11	2618:19; 2634:25;
accordance [7] -	acres [3] - 2714:9,	2565:17; 2589:11;	adopted [2] - 2599:4;	2642:22; 2645:9
2530:25; 2542:6;	14; 2797:4	2607:18; 2640:25;	2664:3	afforded [1] -
2675:13; 2780:4, 7,	Act [40] - 2505:18;	2647:2; 2649:24;	adoption [2] -	2649:13
10	2506:15, 19, 23;	2652:24; 2715:7;	2692:1; 2750:4	afoot [1] - 2594:8
according [2] -	2507:16-18, 20;	2735:10; 2738:22;	advance [1] - 2763:2	aftermath [3] -
2558:17; 2780:24	2508:3, 6, 10, 18;	2742:11; 2794:7;	advanced [6] -	2510:4; 2627:10, 15
accordingly [4] -	2509:7, 12, 15, 19,	2807:10	2502:4; 2504:3;	afternoon [9] -
2542:24; 2570:3;	21; 2517:23; 2530:14;	additionally [3] -	2517:1; 2534:9;	2494:1; 2498:23;
2579:24; 2695:4	2531:7, 19; 2541:13,	2513:10; 2576:25;	2567:15; 2634:19	2659:8; 2660:22, 24;
account [13] -	16; 2542:1, 8;	2720:11	advancement [1] -	2680:10; 2787:25;
2500:24; 2508:20;	2568:24; 2570:12;	address [38] -	2523:19	2800:3
2563:4; 2566:16;	2571:7; 2637:11;	2494:21; 2511:16;	advances [1] -	afternoon's [1] -
2571:20; 2589:17;	2645:3; 2674:6, 25;	2514:5, 21; 2518:13,	2555:4	2498:2
2617:14; 2639:20;	2675:6, 9, 12; 2676:8;	21; 2529:2; 2538:24;	advancing [1] -	age [1] - 2712:5
2649:10; 2664:9, 24;	2678:25; 2716:21	2547:21, 24; 2548:2;	2505:14	agency [1] - 2767:20
2665:6, 9	act [6] - 2550:17;	2553:22; 2555:19;	advantage [6] -	Agency [2] -
accountable [2] - 2789:5, 8	2596:21; 2601:16; 2633:21; 2780:3, 6	2562:12; 2567:8; 2574:24; 2576:8; 2579:25; 2583:24;	2548:8; 2653:17, 25; 2701:17; 2712:12; 2742:7	2507:12; 2639:17 ago [2] - 2495:24; 2525:11
accounted [1] - 2767:3 accounting [2] -	acted [1] - 2744:16 action [2] - 2570:16; 2790:7	2595:24; 2605:7; 2611:16; 2618:17;	adverse [10] - 2501:25; 2508:23;	agree [8] - 2527:17; 2564:24; 2631:17;
2670:14; 2721:4 accounts [4] - 2617:20; 2627:2;	Action [14] - 2492:20; 2505:8; 2610:5, 12, 24;	2640:12; 2655:19; 2677:1; 2681:16, 19; 2690:8; 2723:17;	2531:17; 2548:14; 2586:24; 2635:9; 2639:19; 2667:7;	2792:3; 2793:1; 2796:21; 2804:5 agreed [17] -
2628:8, 25 accrue [1] - 2712:8	2611:11; 2616:11; 2617:17; 2622:13;	2741:5; 2748:22; 2749:23; 2750:9, 19; 2758:23; 2786:4;	2693:2; 2712:13 advice [1] - 2531:10	2493:17, 24; 2586:4; 2632:5; 2647:7; 2662:15; 2673:10;
accumulated [1] - 2758:14 accuracy [2] -	2626:24; 2631:7; 2644:10; 2659:12 actions [4] - 2595:5,	2793:18 addressed [21] -	advise [4] - 2500:21; 2689:23; 2736:17; 2774:22	2681:6; 2707:4; 2712:16, 20; 2733:24;
2526:8; 2589:19	9; 2652:18; 2790:17	2502:19; 2533:24;	advised [3] -	2734:3; 2748:24;
accurate [4] -	active [1] - 2552:7	2535:17; 2542:17;	2523:15; 2524:2;	2778:2; 2792:19
2526:10; 2576:23;	activities [16] -	2543:17; 2547:4;	2691:3	agreed-upon [1] -
2589:4; 2737:18	2507:20; 2509:8, 15;	2562:1, 5, 14;	Advisory [1] -	2748:24
accurately [2] -	2530:18; 2533:11;	2567:13; 2576:7;	2533:24	agreement [27] -
2569:25; 2761:19	2603:7; 2673:7;	2603:1; 2604:14, 21;	advisory [4] -	2554:20; 2580:7, 18,
achieve [7] -	2674:1; 2675:8;	2640:19; 2737:14;	2544:24; 2545:3;	20; 2618:11; 2670:6,
2552:11; 2573:9;	2676:25; 2677:10;	2781:21; 2786:5;	2677:17, 20	10; 2672:15, 20, 23;
2606:13; 2640:17;	2678:1, 19; 2719:4	2791:4, 7; 2804:14	advocacy [1] -	2673:3; 2789:1;
2774:13, 15; 2788:10	activity [2] - 2668:4;	addresses [4] -	2528:3	2793:16; 2794:3, 21,
achieved [2] -	2711:4	2574:15; 2583:11, 19;	advocate [3] -	24; 2795:1, 4, 25;
2641:15; 2777:14	actual [6] - 2500:13;	2616:24	2502:16; 2587:11;	2796:20, 22; 2797:1,
achieving [1] -	2533:11; 2556:3;	addressing [6] -	2662:24	5, 7, 19; 2798:2
2520:14	2599:19; 2670:23;	2502:1; 2547:17;	advocated [1] -	agreements [6] -
acknowledge [3] -	2757:6	2646:14; 2669:20;	2565:16	2538:18; 2640:25;
2572:24; 2597:13;	adapt [1] - 2685:24	2679:10; 2733:1	advocates [1] -	2666:17; 2723:7;
2607:10	adaptably [2] -	adduced [1] - 2567:6	2502:23	2783:6; 2797:9
acknowledged [23] -	2765:5; 2766:17	adequacy [6] -	AEL [1] - 2739:24	agrees [5] - 2570:7;
2527:1, 5; 2542:19;	adapted [1] -	2530:3, 13, 22-23;	AEL's [7] - 2739:22,	2618:6; 2654:23;
2555:14; 2561:10, 25;	2597:20	2531:2; 2534:15	25; 2740:9, 16;	2765:7; 2790:20
2564:23; 2568:17;	adapting [1] - 2750:7	adequate [4] -	2741:7, 10, 21	agricultural [3] -
2579:20; 2580:9;	adaptive [5] -	2525:19; 2535:20;	AEP [27] - 2506:25;	2677:16; 2731:21;
2585:24; 2586:7;	2601:22; 2648:7;	2563:20; 2667:14	2507:12; 2528:18;	2776:19
2588:8; 2599:20;	2720:5; 2726:7;	adequately [10] -	2531:3; 2532:19;	agriculture [1] -
2603:19; 2605:23;	2766:21	2522:5; 2562:1;	2547:6; 2549:2;	2532:24
2697:5; 2720:15;	add [5] - 2577:4;	2568:16; 2583:11, 19;	2561:16; 2565:8;	ahead [4] - 2657:25;
2764:16; 2766:10;	2598:4; 2713:15, 18;	2710:10; 2711:11;	2567:25; 2569:8, 17;	2680:16; 2681:8;
2781:6	2791:14	2781:21; 2791:4, 7	2570:19; 2571:2;	2730:12
acknowledgement [1] - 2759:2	added [15] - 2573:23; 2601:23; 2622:5;	adjacent [9] - 2522:20; 2550:15, 22;	2572:24; 2581:20; 2583:3; 2598:16;	aid [2] - 2555:22 aids [1] - 2686:4 aimed [2] - 2520:1;
acknowledges [7] - 2502:22; 2558:22; 2583:21; 2669:14;	2628:9; 2654:15; 2655:24; 2704:8; 2722:13; 2740:1, 7,	2557:9; 2582:22; 2594:19; 2607:25; 2608:2; 2795:11	2608:10; 2703:10; 2705:1; 2716:19; 2734:24; 2735:2, 25;	2669:20 air [71] - 2507:2;
2687:18; 2706:5;	14; 2741:8, 21;	adjourn [2] - 2787:4;	2738:3; 2745:17	2546:3; 2547:19;
2778:4	2745:25; 2774:24	2807:13	AEP's [4] - 2507:18,	2595:18, 21; 2596:8;
acknowledging [1] -	addendum [1] -	ADJOURNED [4] -	24; 2560:2; 2755:12	2597:5, 8; 2600:15,
2780:21	2612:1	2658:12, 14; 2808:6,	affect [4] - 2507:21;	18; 2601:1, 3, 11;
ACO [12] - 2529:21,	addition [20] -	8	2536:25; 2543:9;	2608:3; 2684:20;
24; 2530:11, 13, 17,	2501:14; 2505:12;	ADJOURNMENT [3]	2678:4	2688:17; 2704:21;
20, 22; 2531:8, 11,	2509:4; 2517:16;	- 2609:23; 2764:6;	affected [12] -	2718:19; 2720:3;
14; 2537:10	2532:13; 2534:1;	2785:6	2518:17; 2522:14, 20;	2724:17, 19; 2725:9;
ACO's [1] - 2531:1	2588:4; 2617:22;	administration [2] -	2556:17; 2573:15;	2726:7; 2727:14;
acquire [2] - 2517:21; 2522:15	2623:18, 22; 2624:10; 2625:7; 2630:7;	2528:23; 2718:25 admit [2] - 2665:25; 2804:18	2611:3; 2627:8; 2628:11; 2708:17;	2764:15-17, 19; 2765:8; 2766:2, 5, 8,
acquired [2] - 2546:22; 2640:22 acquires [1] - 2533:7	2651:3, 13; 2652:14; 2653:23; 2661:23; 2741:3; 2788:22	admitted [3] - 2591:4; 2751:12;	2728:23; 2758:20; 2767:7 affecting [2] -	16; 2767:4, 6-8, 10, 17, 19; 2768:10, 25; 2769:6, 11, 15;
acquisition [6] -	additional [22] -	2761:21	2617:22; 2621:9	

Т

AMICUS REPORTING GROUP
0771.0 15 01.	20, 2506,2,4,42,4
2771:9, 15, 21;	20; 2596:2, 4, 12, 2
2772:2, 5, 8, 16, 18,	2597:4, 12, 22;
20; 2775:11; 2782:25;	2598:15, 17; 2599:
2789:13, 15, 20;	10; 2600:3, 5; 260
2790:1, 4, 25; 2804:3	2602:21; 2603:3, 5
Aires antice 0704:40	2002.21, 2003.3, 3
Airport [2] - 2791:19	2604:13, 22, 24; 2606:10, 20; 2607:
airport [1] - 2791:21	2606:10, 20; 2607:
al [2] - 2693:16;	23: 2608:7. 9. 17. 2
2780:25	2609:14; 2611:12,
	2614:10: 2618:15
alarm [2] - 2598:7;	2614:10; 2618:15,
2749:4	2620:2; 2622:23;
alarmed [2] -	2623:10, 23; 2624:
2765:13	2625:23; 2626:1;
alarming [3] -	2629:24; 2631:8, 1
0764.46. 0760.7	2020.24, 2001.0, 1
2761:16; 2768:7	2633:23; 2635:7, 1
alarmist [3] - 2598:8;	25; 2636:15; 2637:
2768:7, 13	2639:21; 2640:11,
ALBERTA [1] -	20, 22; 2641:6;
2496:13	2644:9; 2649:7;
	2044.3, 2043.1,
Alberta [397] -	2650:6, 19, 25; 2653:6; 2654:11;
2492:2, 16; 2494:12;	2653:6; 2654:11;
2496:24; 2499:2, 15;	2661:10; 2662:14;
2500.5 9 12 2501.2	2664.3 14 2665.8
2500:5, 9, 12; 2501:2, 10, 20, 22; 2502:5,	2664:3, 14; 2665:8 2666:5, 19, 23-24;
10, 20, 22, 2302.5,	2000.5, 19, 23-24,
12; 2504:6, 16;	2667:21; 2669:2, 1
2505:20; 2506:15, 21,	16; 2670:6, 18;
24; 2507:11, 17, 23;	2671.5 11 13 15
2508:3; 2509:4, 6, 11,	2671:5, 11, 13, 15- 21, 23; 2672:3, 12,
2300.3, 2309.4, 0, 11,	21, 23, 2072.3, 12,
14, 23; 2510:5;	18, 23-25; 2673:1,
2513:12; 2514:14, 17;	10, 17, 22; 2674:17
2515:2, 20; 2516:5,	2675:17, 22; 2676: 5, 10, 14; 2677:7,
23; 2517:18, 20, 24;	5 10 14 2677 7
26, 2011.10, 20, 24,	22, 2679, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10
2510.4, 0, 11, 10, 24,	22; 2678:10, 16;
2519:1, 6, 13;	2682:6; 2684:9;
2518:4, 6, 11, 18, 24; 2519:1, 6, 13; 2520:11; 2521:2, 14,	2687:23; 2690:5;
23 25 2522 3 8 11	2696 23 2699 14
14 10:2523:3 12	2696:23; 2699:14; 2705:13; 2706:4;
14, 15, 2525.5, 12, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10	2703.13, 2700.4,
14, 19; 2523:3, 12, 22; 2524:1, 8, 16, 23;	2707:18, 23; 2710:
2525:7, 18, 23;	22; 2711:23; 2712:
2526:1, 9; 2527:16,	2716:20; 2717:22;
24; 2528:6, 11, 15, 17; 2529:10, 14, 18,	2727.11.2741.5
17: 2520:10 1/ 18	2727:11; 2741:5; 2744:22; 2749:3, 2
17, 2523.10, 14, 10, 20, 2520.0, 5, 0, 40	2744.22, 2743.3, 2
20, 2530:2, 5, 8, 12,	2751:11; 2758:21;
20; 2530:2, 5, 8, 12, 15, 17, 20; 2531:5,	2783:10; 2789:2, 6
14. 22: 2532:3. 10:	2790:10, 19, 22;
2533:1, 20; 2534:1, 6,	2791:1, 5, 8, 10;
18: 2535:1 7 18:	2702.17 23 25
10, 2000, 1, 7, 10, 0000000000000000000000000	2732.17, 23, 23, 23, 23, 230, 230, 230, 24, 44, 230, 200, 4, 44, 230, 200, 200, 200, 200, 200, 200, 200
18; 2535:1, 7, 18; 2536:2, 7, 9, 13, 17; 2537:2, 5, 12, 15, 24; 2529:7, 44, 21, 22, 24;	2792:17, 23, 25; 2793:4, 14; 2797:8 10, 13, 17, 19, 25;
2537:2, 5, 12, 15, 24;	10, 13, 17, 19, 25;
2538.7, 14, 21, 23-24;	2804:19; 2805:12;
2539:4, 15, 23-24; 2540:2, 6, 14, 17, 19; 2541:2, 9, 14, 16-17,	2807:8, 15
2540.2 6 14 17 19	Alberta's [10] -
2541.2 0 14 16 17	
2341.2, 9, 14, 10-17,	2516:4; 2529:5;
21, 23, 25, 2542:4, 7, 24, 2543:2, 6, 12, 15,	2531:1, 20; 2568:1 2637:19; 2654:25;
24; 2543:2, 6, 12, 15,	2637:19; 2654:25;
18, 21, 23; 2544:7,	2665:24; 2690:2;
13. 19. 23. 2545:7. 9.	2788:7
18, 21, 23; 2544:7, 13, 19, 23; 2545:7, 9, 17; 2546:17, 22; 2547:5, 16; 2553:17;	Albertans [9] -
2547.5 16: 2553.17	2512:8, 10; 2615:7
2547.5, 10, 2555.17,	2512.0, 10, 2015.7
2554:14, 24; 2555:7,	25, 2022:18, 2024:
2554:14, 24; 2555:7, 17; 2556:20; 2557:6,	25; 2622:18; 2624: 2641:14, 25; 2690:
15. 19: 2558:21. 25:	alert [1] - 2545:9
2559:9, 24; 2560:5, 11, 24; 2561:3, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17; 2565:3, 7,	algal [2] - 2579:9
$11 \ 24 \ 2561 \ 3 \ 7 \ 9$	align [2] - 2722:8;
11, 24, 2501.5, 7, 5,	
11, 15, 17; 2565:3, 7,	2749:21
22; 2566:10; 2567:4,	Allan [1] - 2583:2
24; 2568:24; 2569:17;	allow [15] - 2533:8
11, 15, 17, 2505.3, 7, 22; 2566:10; 2567:4, 24; 2568:24; 2569:17; 2570:3, 10; 2571:22; 2572:3; 2573:13, 24; 2574:7, 19: 2575:3;	2544:11; 2549:9; 2551:22; 2565:11;
2572.3. 2573.13 24	2551.22.2565.11
2012.0, 2010.10, 24,	2551.22, 2505.11,
	25/0.22.2003.18.
2576:11, 16; 2578:15,	2605:4, 11; 2650:2 2651:5; 2652:17;
19, 22; 2579:3, 6, 24;	2651:5; 2652:17:
2580:2, 23; 2581:1, 9,	2654:18; 2694:21;
14, 19; 2582:18;	2787:5
7502.0. 2502.10,	
2583:9; 2584:15, 25;	allowed [5] -
2585:3, 9, 15, 20;	2553:12; 2558:1;
2586:9, 12, 18; 2587:5; 2588:12;	2593:25; 2617:14;
2587:5: 2588:12	2700:18
2591:25; 2593:20, 25;	allowing [3] -
2501.20, 2000.20, 20,	
2594:12; 2595:7, 11,	2550:8; 2654:21;

0; 2596:2, 4, 12, 20; 597:4, 12, 22; 2694.23 allows [2] - 2702:18; 598:15, 17; 2599:1, 0; 2600:3, 5; 2601:7; 2807.7 alluvial [1] - 2769:25 602:21; 2603:3, 5; almost [10] -2502:13; 2511:12; 606:10, 20; 2607:8 2512:5; 2515:7; 3; 2608:7, 9, 17, 25; 2520:1; 2628:18; 609:14; 2611:12, 23 2649:3; 2654:25; 614:10; 2618:15, 17; 2658:1; 2786:1 alone [6] - 2512:18; 623:10, 23; 2624:5; 2581:21; 2622:8; 625:23; 2626:1; 629:24; 2631:8, 18; 2626:24; 2628:1; 2664.1 ALSA [1] - 2780:4 alter [1] - 2579:1 633 23 2635 7 10 5: 2636:15: 2637:25 639:21; 2640:11, 13, alteration [2] -2509:9; 2781:13 altered [1] - 2548:12 alternating [1] -2577:19 alternative [14] 664:3, 14; 2665:8; 666:5, 19, 23-24; 2502:18; 2503:24; 2505:5; 2519:6; 667:21; 2669:2, 14, 2584:13; 2587:13; 2636:13; 2691:4; 671:5, 11, 13, 15-16, 2706:3; 2728:14; 1, 23; 2672:3, 12, 8, 23-25; 2673:1, 5, 2753:23; 2779:2; 2800:9; 2805:3 0, 17, 22; 2674:17; alternatively [1] -675:17, 22; 2676:3 2712.7 10, 14; 2677:7, 14, alternatives [35] -2502:24; 2503:8, 17; 2514:13, 16; 2518:21, 25; 2519:2, 9, 15; 2521:24; 2522:2, 5; 2635:4; 2637:21 2638:21; 2642:18; 2645:22; 2653:4, 13; 707:18, 23; 2710:17, 2; 2711:23; 2712:1; 2664:16; 2695:15; 727:11; 2741:5; 744:22; 2749:3, 21; 2726:15, 17, 21; 2727:3, 17; 2728:2, 9; 2736:9; 2800:6, 11, 783:10; 2789:2, 6-7; 19 Alternatives [1] -2726:18 Amanda [1] -793:4, 14; 2797:8, 0. 13. 17. 19. 25: 2492:14 amazing [1] - 2684:9 ambient [4] 2789:13, 15, 19, 25 amenities [3] -516:4; 2529:5; 531:1, 20; 2568:1; 2697:7; 2705:4; 2721:20 amount [13] · 2527:23; 2550:2; 2553:19; 2564:18; 2581:10; 2592:2; 2678:12, 18; 2755:3; 512:8. 10: 2615:7. 5; 2622:18; 2624:20; 2774:8; 2790:1; 641:14, 25; 2690:6 2796.17 amounts [1] - 2652:3 amply [1] - 2574:13 amused [1] -2804:10 Amusements [3] allow [15] - 2533:8; 2493:3; 2788:6; 2798:15 analogous [1] -2615.23 605:4, 11; 2650:2; 651:5; 2652:17; analogues [1] -2760:25 analogy [1] - 2688:3 analyses [5] 2649:6, 8, 10; 2664:7, 13 analysis [23] -2512:17; 2519:4; 2523:21; 2564:1, 3; 2565:4; 2575:7;

2581:25; 2583:16; 2584:1, 12; 2599:18; 2612:3, 5; 2664:5; 2703:2; 2712:18; 2721:23; 2729:10; 2757:22; 2764:24; 2768:8; 2779:4 ancillary [1] -2633:12 AND [4] - 2495:6; 2659:18; 2660:9; 2787:21 and.. [1] - 2632:13 anecdotal [3] -2572:13; 2578:14; 2773.6 animals [5] - 2605:5. 12, 15; 2668:5; 2676.12 announcement [1] -2802:4 annual [8] - 2624:12; 2625:13; 2648:25; 2649:22; 2677:11; 2697:22; 2718:15; 2719.4 annualized [3] -2624:15; 2625:1; 2719.10 answer [7] 2522:23; 2756:3; 2763:10; 2765:10; 2790:2; 2795:21; 2800.9 answers [2] 2528:10; 2762:5 anticipate [2] -2655:4; 2663:8 anticipated [3] -2518:7; 2545:2; 2598.6 anticipates [1] -2533:22 anticipation [1] -2654.20 anxiety [4] - 2623:14; 2628:6, 9, 2783:22 anxious [1] - 2690:6 anxiously [1] -2629:19 anyway [2] - 2681:2; 2751:6 apologies [1] -2756:1 apparent [1] -2700.23 Appeal [2] - 2666:5, 10 appear [6] - 2542:21; 2719:6; 2720:4; 2745:18; 2749:24; 2800.11 appeared [4] 2536:10; 2542:15; 2546:14; 2590:25 appease [1] 2734:21 Appendices [1] -2500:17 appendices [1] -2508:9 Appendix [4] -2500:14; 2536:7; 2780:16 applaud [1] - 2796:8 apples [1] - 2702:2 apples-to-oranges - 2702 applicable [6] -2506:14; 2556:6;

2625:1; 2708:13; 2780:4; 2790:25 applicant [3] -2503:2; 2762:20; 2763.16 applicant's [1] -2695:9 Application [1] -2710 application [30] -2508:6; 2514:3, 7; 2530:9; 2576:23; 2599:13, 23; 2601:2; 2611:11; 2615:23; 2638:8, 13; 2670:2; 2682:1; 2691:2; 2694:6; 2716:21; 2727:19; 2728:10; 2744:19; 2750:21; 2760:22; 2771:4, 12; 2775:5; 2780:8, 13; 2782:1; 2783:24; 2805:3 applications [1] -2531:4 applied [5] -2591:21; 2592:8; 2598:11; 2637:18; 2771:21 **applies** [1] - 2737:5 **apply** [4] - 2594:9; 2672:23; 2708:16; 2767.5 applying [4] -2509:6, 11; 2577:5; 2771:18 appoint [1] - 2608:8 appointed [1] -2677-19 appointing [1] -2528:16 appraisals [1] -2518:5 appraisers [1] -2517.23 appreciable [3] -2647:25; 2655:4; 2656:14 appreciably [1] -2653:22 appreciate [16] -2494:8; 2577:12; 2584:20; 2609:16; 2611:9; 2627:5; 2679:19; 2680:22; 2733:6; 2776:6; 2791:5; 2797:17 2805:25; 2806:25; 2807:2, 5 appreciated [6] -2527:2; 2657:24; 2784:7, 16; 2799:15; 2807.17 appreciates [1] -2585:21 approach [15] 2497:15; 2533:21; 2577:13; 2594:18; 2597:10; 2598:17; 2645:19; 2650:18; 2691:23; 2692:1; 2728:2, 8; 2730:25; 2733:6: 2771:11 approached [1] -2691.24 approaches [2] -2738:6; 2754:9 appropriate [17] -2508:4: 2522:9:

2540:25; 2565:13;

2571:13; 2580:24;	2802:17; 2804:11	2733:20; 2740:3;	2578:16; 2582:9, 11;	assuming
				assuming [2] -
2586:13, 22; 2607:6,	architectural [1] -	2743:2; 2766:24;	2583:6; 2586:13, 18,	2586:6; 2638:8
11; 2611:14; 2672:1;	2674:21	2767:14; 2768:6;	21; 2592:3, 15;	assumption [1] -
2703:2; 2744:2;	area [92] - 2504:12;	2769:10; 2770:7, 22;	2595:2, 23; 2596:4;	2631:16
2773:21; 2791:2;	2508:15; 2525:4;	2771:3, 6; 2772:1, 8;	2597:7; 2601:12;	assumptions [11] -
2797:14				
	2536:15; 2544:2;	2773:4, 20, 24;	2606:21; 2637:1;	2538:3; 2583:5;
appropriately [6] -	2545:2; 2546:8, 13;	2774:10; 2785:8, 13;	2638:10; 2639:17;	2589:5; 2593:5;
2562:5; 2565:5;	2547:8; 2556:14,	2786:1, 6, 19, 25;	2667:12, 21; 2668:11,	2597:10; 2598:5, 21;
2583:21; 2595:9;	22-23; 2557:3, 9, 13,	2790:19; 2792:25;	14; 2670:11, 15;	2599:5; 2739:12;
2609:6; 2744:16			2671:20, 23-24;	2743:23; 2768:14
	23; 2558:8; 2578:8;	2806:7; 2807:3, 19		
approval [49] -	2580:8, 12-14, 17;	arguments [8] -	2672:5, 17; 2673:8,	assured [2] - 2565:9;
2507:20, 22; 2521:18;	2588:2; 2589:16;	2578:10; 2660:21, 23;	16; 2674:9; 2675:21;	2734:10
2525:9; 2571:3, 7;	2592:16; 2593:14, 21;	2679:15; 2681:20;	2678:24; 2679:1, 4;	astounding [1] -
2580:25; 2606:24;	2595:2; 2597:19;	2797:10; 2799:12;	2760:9; 2761:6;	2700:14
2607:5, 13; 2615:2,	2599:1, 3, 16;	2807:7	2766:13; 2767:3, 10,	AT [113] - 2493:8;
19; 2620:12; 2631:11;	2604:15; 2605:5;	arid [1] - 2720:12	15, 20; 2768:3, 7, 9,	2495:5, 21; 2523:11;
2638:11; 2639:6;	2616:6; 2620:11;	arise [2] - 2506:9;	13, 15, 17, 19, 23;	2658:12; 2659:5;
2641:17; 2643:3;	2628:12; 2630:1;	2580:21	2769:11, 15, 19-20,	2681:19; 2684:25;
2657:20; 2671:9, 16;	2634:21; 2635:1;	arising [2] - 2736:18;	22, 24; 2770:3, 17;	2692:15; 2693:9;
2678:23; 2717:14;	2638:23; 2639:1, 12;	2774:23	2771:7, 9-10, 14, 16;	2697:9, 20; 2698:10,
	2000.20, 2000.1, 12,	-		
2726:11; 2736:19, 23;	2640:7, 23; 2641:10;	army [1] - 2800:15	2772:2-4, 6, 10, 12;	13; 2700:12; 2701:3,
2740:2; 2741:9, 22;	2648:18; 2669:9;	Army [1] - 2743:19	2773:18; 2774:11, 19	7, 16; 2707:2, 4;
2742:8; 2745:14, 25;	2674:4, 6, 23;	arranging [1] -	Assessment [9] -	2708:2; 2714:18;
2753:22; 2774:24;	2675:20; 2678:4;	2540:18	2507:12; 2508:7, 18;	2715:11, 22; 2716:4,
2777:6, 8, 23; 2779:2;	2701:5, 8, 12, 15, 20;	arrive [2] - 2712:17;	2541:9; 2543:4, 14;	15; 2723:10; 2726:15;
2782:23; 2790:17;	2702:5; 2703:4;	2713:21	2639:16; 2678:25;	2727:9; 2728:16;
2791:15; 2793:14;	2708:5; 2724:5;	arrives [2] - 2513:22;	2738:3	2729:12; 2731:3;
2797:15; 2798:4;	2731:18; 2732:3, 9;	2686:25	assessments [7] -	2734:23, 25; 2735:25;
2799:6; 2805:4, 7	2734:8; 2735:19;	arrow [1] - 2803:8	2519:7; 2520:9;	2736:17, 21; 2740:2;
approvals [11] -	2736:4, 13; 2760:25;	articulates [1] -	2538:13; 2582:3;	2741:9, 22; 2742:23;
2507:15, 18-19;	2767:11; 2769:13, 21;	2764:18	2595:21; 2600:12;	2745:13, 16; 2746:8;
			2678:21	
2508:4, 11; 2530:14;	2770:5, 19; 2771:23;	ascertained [1] -		2747:23; 2748:2, 11;
2531:7; 2533:16;	2777:21; 2779:13;	2795:6	assessor [1] -	2750:22; 2751:16;
2541:17; 2611:14	2780:1, 12; 2789:9;	aside [3] - 2716:4;	2768:21	2753:2; 2755:24;
approve [8] -	2794:7, 17;	2750:17; 2791:17	assets [2] - 2630:25;	2756:11, 22; 2757:18;
2616:12; 2642:4;	2795:19-21; 2796:23	ASP [1] - 2794:15	2645:16	2758:2; 2759:7;
2670:1; 2684:7, 16;	area's [1] - 2665:2	aspect [5] - 2511:16;	assign [1] - 2496:10	2760:14, 18; 2761:10,
2724:25; 2739:19;	areas [28] - 2542:18;	2746:12; 2750:19;	assigned [1] -	14; 2764:16, 23;
2760:24	2544:10; 2556:11, 19;	2760:12; 2794:4	2592:4	2766:9, 16, 24;
approved [23] -	2558:17; 2562:8, 10;	aspects [5] -	assignment [1] -	2767:3, 9, 20; 2768:3,
2515:21; 2532:21;	2575:5; 2587:12;	2500:18; 2502:14;	2589:3	9, 11, 23; 2769:14,
2534:4; 2539:24;	2593:4; 2596:5;	2530:24; 2540:5;	assist [2] - 2537:14;	17, 22; 2770:9, 12;
2546:21; 2558:9;	2605:22; 2606:6;	2574:7	2602:25	2771:19; 2772:15;
2560:2; 2638:1;	2608:20; 2621:18;	asserted [1] -	assistance [4] -	2773:4, 9, 12-13, 17;
2642:2, 16; 2643:23;	2630:18; 2678:4;	2562:19	2496:5; 2610:19;	2774:10, 12, 21;
2682:9; 2683:13;	2726:5; 2737:7;	asserting [1] -	2644:15; 2802:15	2777:6, 23; 2778:10;
2686:11; 2724:13;	2752:14; 2766:15;	2779:16	assisted [1] -	2779:3, 14-15;
2726:10; 2735:2;	2775:17; 2779:11;	assertion [4] -	2798:24	2780:22; 2781:3, 6;
2738:15, 17, 23;	2780:22; 2800:23;	2554:11, 15; 2569:15;	assisting [1] -	2800:16; 2802:5, 8-9,
2747:6; 2782:3;	2801:2	2578:12	2784:10	12; 2803:10, 12, 14;
2790:18	arguably [1] - 2748:4	assertions [2] -	associated [25] -	2804:16; 2805:2, 4, 7;
approves [2] -	argue [5] - 2519:22;	2577:22; 2776:21	2503:7, 13; 2508:9;	2808:6
2670:3; 2671:7	2622:8; 2727:10;	asserts [4] - 2669:2;	2514:24; 2518:14;	AT's [40] - 2703:14;
		2696:21; 2725:2;		2706.7. 2720.15 25
approving [1] -	2748:3; 2758:25		2548:15; 2553:21;	2706:7; 2730:15, 25;
2611:21	argued [5] - 2521:25;	2734:12	2574:25; 2576:2;	2743:2; 2756:1, 8, 11;
approximate [1] -	2571:19; 2589:14;	assess [13] - 2522:1;	2577:24; 2579:7;	2760:1; 2761:5;
2592:2	2606:8; 2628:15	2581:10; 2583:16;	2587:18; 2592:25;	2766:13, 25; 2767:13;
April [7] - 2492:5;	argues [1] - 2780:23	2587:14; 2679:6;	2600:7; 2603:7;	2768:5, 14-15;
2494:24, 2495:9;	arguing [2] -	2692:3; 2700:21;	2605:21; 2627:14;	2769:9, 24; 2770:3, 6,
2508:25; 2659:2;	2519:21; 2520:1	2749:13; 2760:2, 6;	2637:7; 2653:13;	21; 2771:2, 5-6, 8, 10,
	ARGUMENT [7] -			13, 25; 2772:7, 10;
2751:11; 2789:24		2777:19; 2792:20;	2699:24; 2714:6;	
APRIL [2] - 2495:20;	2496:13; 2659:17;	2793:2	2727:23; 2738:5;	2773:3, 19, 23;
2808:8	2660:13; 2785:10;	assessed [9] -	2757:5; 2777:17	2774:9; 2776:21;
aquatic [8] -	2786:23; 2787:20;	2521:20; 2522:5;	Associates [1] -	2778:4; 2801:3;
2507:21; 2509:16;	2806:22	2540:11; 2593:3;	2572:23	2803:15, 18
2581:11, 16; 2583:20,	argument [68] -	2667:22; 2679:2;	Association [8] -	atmospheric [1] -
25; 2595:13; 2715:8	2494:3; 2496:1, 3, 22;	2762:6; 2772:14, 18	2505:7; 2525:14;	2789:14
aquatics [2] -	2497:6, 18-19;	assessing [6] -	2526:18; 2527:13;	attached [4] -
2581:4; 2753:18	2499:14; 2501:15;	2503:21; 2555:16;	2562:21; 2630:18;	2496:1; 2736:23;
aqueduct [1] -	2520:11, 23, 25;	2593:4; 2614:2;	2707:20; 2741:4	2745:14; 2753:21
2795:3	2528:3; 2529:4;	2637:9; 2691:24	Association's [1] -	attempt [6] -
arbitrary [2] -	2547:10, 16; 2555:4;	assessment [98] -	2745:1	2589:19; 2664:11;
2664:11; 2769:16	2577:3; 2587:13;	2506:22; 2508:17;	associations [3] -	2698:8; 2723:15;
archaeology [2] -	2589:2; 2609:25;	2519:3; 2523:20;	2528:22; 2608:15;	2731:19; 2766:22
2539:13; 2541:7	2610:21; 2611:15;	2524:14; 2530:23;	2629:15	attempted [5] -
archeological [16] -	2634:13; 2659:10, 15;	2535:10; 2536:22;	assume [3] - 2662:9;	2697:2; 2708:2;
2524:11; 2541:3, 5;	2660:11; 2680:1, 11;	2538:2; 2539:6,	2793:19; 2801:21	2718:12; 2731:16;
2543:9, 11; 2674:4,	2681:15, 18; 2715:21;	10-11, 17; 2548:3;	assumed [4] -	2756:12
15, 19, 21; 2675:15,	2725:15; 2726:16, 21;	2555:13; 2573:13, 15,	2592:8; 2593:5;	attempts [2] -
19, 24; 2736:6, 8;	2730:14; 2732:19;	20; 2574:14, 20;	2765:1; 2773:17	2535:19; 2779:15
10, 24, 2100.0, 0,	2130.14, 2132.13,	20, 2014.14, 20,	2100.1, 2110.11	2000.10, 2110.10

6

NRCB 1701, Volume 10, April 6, 2021

attend [2] - 2498:4;	avoided [14] -	24; 2770:8; 2771:17;	2561:18; 2596:13;	Berry [2] - 2541:7
2538:11	2516:15; 2611:10;	2772:10, 20, 2791:22	2645:21; 2729:7;	Berry's [2] - 2541:19;
attendants [1] -	2618:3; 2620:5;	baseline [2] -	2754:3	2542:2
2719:17	2623:16; 2627:5;	2679:5; 2760:13	below [18] - 2510:19;	best [21] - 2494:9;
attended [1] - 2605:1	2649:4, 14, 22;	basic [10] - 2549:14,	2551:13; 2554:2, 4;	2514:18; 2569:13, 22;
attending [1] -	2712:17; 2721:15;	17; 2551:3; 2553:3;	2555:2; 2558:23;	2570:6, 8; 2641:25;
2539:8	2725:1; 2744:10	2579:1; 2686:10;	2590:1, 13; 2706:11,	2664:17; 2680:21;
attention [12] -	avoiding [4] -	2693:1; 2694:10;	18-19; 2707:17;	2681:2; 2691:4;
2503:1; 2523:7;	2616:1; 2620:17;	2696:1; 2727:25	2709:15, 19; 2712:19;	2707:6; 2712:10;
2538:21; 2561:20; 2643:13; 2685:10, 12;	2622:5; 2624:18 aware [7] - 2507:8;	basin [3] - 2654:5; 2679:4; 2727:4	2722:14; 2747:20; 2752:14	2727:15; 2754:16; 2755:10; 2763:19;
2726:23; 2731:3;	2508:16; 2578:7;	Basin [8] - 2502:24;	Belt [1] - 2699:15	2766:20; 2773:6;
2765:17; 2784:13;	2603:17; 2729:18;	2521:5. 11: 2633:25:	Bench [1] - 2661:10	2786:5; 2800:4
2791:17	2731:19; 2747:23	2662:16; 2663:19;	beneath [4] -	better [22] - 2518:7;
attenuation [1] -	awareness [2] -	2695:20; 2698:15	2756:16; 2757:6;	2520:24; 2521:1;
2648:4	2672:7, 10	basing [2] - 2770:12;	2758:8; 2759:18	2525:5; 2587:15;
attracting [1] -	R	2774:12	beneficial [4] -	2605:8; 2682:2;
2631:4	В	basins' [1] - 2655:21	2747:10; 2748:17;	2690:7; 2712:3;
attraction [2] -	B.C [2] - 2561:6, 8	basis [17] - 2544:25; 2554:1; 2558:22;	2797:24; 2798:2 benefit [54] -	2713:2; 2722:4; 2731:13; 2750:14;
2711:7, 19 attributable [2] -	B/C [1] - 2722:1	2566:1; 2572:20;	2510:15; 2512:10;	2753:25; 2754:3;
2622:21; 2649:23	back-of-the-	2573:6, 10; 2578:14;	2514:2; 2519:3;	2755:1; 2759:13;
attributes [2] -	envelope [1] - 2592:17	2598:10; 2599:5, 23;	2523:21: 2615:4. 24:	2762:21; 2763:3, 20;
2504:17; 2705:1	back-to-back [2] -	2616:15; 2624:21;	2620:6, 14; 2621:19;	2774:19; 2800:1
AUC [2] - 2795:6;	2652:9; 2687:3	2677:11; 2740:21;	2622:5, 10; 2623:19;	between [33] -
2797:6	backed [3] -	2778:12; 2790:15	2625:21; 2626:5;	2512:12; 2517:10;
audio [1] - 2799:22	2636:23; 2703:21;	Battistella [3] -	2628:13; 2630:23;	2553:6; 2576:3;
Auditor [1] - 2801:25	2704:5	2629:25; 2630:13, 22	2641:19, 25; 2648:12;	2582:15, 24; 2584:25;
August [5] - 2508:8; 2530:11; 2693:10;	background [1] - 2555:15	BC's [1] - 2750:4 bear [3] - 2666:18;	2649:5, 8; 2650:12; 2654:15; 2655:24;	2586:17; 2588:24; 2590:7; 2594:23;
2728:12; 2738:20	2000.10 backing [2] -	2803:24; 2804:12	2656:14; 2661:14;	2601:18; 2619:10;
Austin [34] -	2752:16, 21	bears [3] - 2552:22;	2663:23; 2664:13;	2623:21; 2636:19;
2560:16, 19, 22;	bad [3] - 2688:20;	2633:16; 2725:3	2665:15; 2683:7;	2654:6; 2670:6;
2561:5, 7, 10, 14, 24;	2690:1; 2749:16	Bearspaw [3] -	2705:22; 2706:2;	2673:10; 2683:9;
2562:3, 7, 19; 2563:1;	badly [1] - 2617:10	2661:1, 3; 2679:15	2712:17; 2714:21;	2697:1; 2698:6, 11;
2564:23; 2565:6, 15,	balance [10] -	became [3] - 2548:1;	2716:24; 2717:1;	2703:6; 2707:10;
25; 2566:2; 2567:6,	2547:15; 2614:25;	2734:13, 19	2719:5; 2721:23-25;	2713:1; 2723:19;
20; 2568:4, 13-15, 17-18; 2584:22;	2615:2; 2616:8; 2639:3, 5; 2710:12;	Beckmann [2] - 2588:7	2722:1, 3, 5, 13-14; 2725:4; 2726:14;	2729:16; 2736:14; 2762:4; 2768:6;
2739:23; 2740:23;	2711:13; 2738:8;	become [5] - 2574:2;	2735:7; 2741:20;	2773:14; 2777:25
2741:11; 2743:4;	2739:4	2711:6, 19; 2733:15;	2762:25	beyond [12] -
2744:17	balances [1] -	2749:17	Benefits [1] -	2511:11; 2567:13;
Austin's [2] - 2561:1,	2506:7	becomes [4] -	2709:25	2578:1; 2588:1;
19	bank [2] - 2550:16;	2683:20; 2700:23;	benefits [77] -	2593:14; 2627:24;
authority [1] -	2646:18	2728:6; 2738:1	2506:13; 2511:17, 19;	2650:10; 2747:11;
2555:25 authorization [5] -	bar [1] - 2646:19 Barbara [2] -	becoming [1] - 2585:5	2512:4; 2513:3, 7; 2514:14; 2516:8;	2749:15; 2750:21; 2760:12; 2789:21
2509:7, 12, 20-21;	2685:16; 2691:10	bed [1] - 2697:17	2518:14, 19; 2519:21,	bias [8] - 2590:6, 10,
2666:11	barbed [1] - 2545:12	bedload [2] - 2582:1;	23; 2520:12; 2573:25;	14; 2704:17; 2767:11;
authorized [1] -	Barbero [2] -	2699:22	2574:2; 2581:8;	2768:3; 2771:14;
2509:17	2492:17; 2499:8	bedrock [1] -	2606:5; 2611:18;	2772:20
automatically [1] -	barn [1] - 2728:11	2758:18	2616:17; 2619:7, 17;	biased [2] - 2769:1;
2735:8	barrier [4] - 2517:15; 2549:21; 2550:10;	began [2] - 2518:4; 2734:15	2620:8, 10, 19;	2774:11
auxiliary [3] - 2549:22; 2550:21, 25	2549:21; 2550:10; 2792:13	begin [8] - 2529:4;	2622:12, 14, 16; 2623:18; 2624:20, 22;	biassed [1] - 2783:6 Big [2] - 2668:24;
availability [2] -	barriers [1] - 2777:18	2547:20; 2548:5;	2625:15, 19; 2626:8;	2672:11
2655:5; 2794:5	base [5] - 2756:12,	2553:2; 2564:1;	2631:6, 10; 2633:12;	big [3] - 2755:19;
available [12] -	16; 2757:9; 2758:12;	2571:2; 2598:14;	2635:5; 2638:21;	2783:2
2515:13; 2531:3;	2773:4	2645:23	2639:23; 2641:9;	biggest [1] - 2801:11
2619:3; 2638:3;	based [55] - 2512:13,	beginning [8] -	2645:19, 23; 2648:8,	bill [1] - 2539:9
2651:9; 2676:24; 2700:1: 2730:16, 10:	16; 2516:19; 2517:3, 25; 2529:17; 2530:4;	2522:19; 2549:19; 2506:8: 2723:10, 12:	20; 2649:9, 15, 21; 2652:12: 2657:12:	Bill [1] - 2798:21 billion [15] - 2511:2
2700:1; 2739:16, 19; 2790:15; 2794:11;	25, 2529:17, 2530:4; 2531:8: 2547:1:	2596:8; 2723:10, 12; 2746:19; 2750:6;	2652:12; 2657:12; 2661:17; 2662:3;	billion [15] - 2511:2; 2512:1, 5, 18;
2801:18	2548:25; 2554:4;	2800:19	2664:6, 23; 2665:11;	2516:15; 2623:22;
average [8] -	2560:15; 2565:24;	behalf [12] - 2499:15;	2682:24; 2691:6;	2624:1, 10; 2626:1;
2624:12, 15; 2625:1;	2566:15; 2574:1;	2584:15; 2597:11;	2710:9, 12; 2711:7,	2647:4; 2648:23;
2648:25; 2649:22;	2580:1; 2588:25;	2598:15; 2605:16;	10, 14; 2712:7, 15,	2649:3; 2684:4
2699:9, 11; 2719:4	2589:20; 2590:25;	2608:25; 2610:25;	21-22, 24; 2715:1;	bimonthly [1] -
avert [1] - 2648:21	2592:3; 2600:13; 2619:22; 2626:1;	2643:19; 2671:12;	2719:9, 11-12;	2530:18 Bindor tot 2611:4:
averted [1] - 2649:1 avoid [11] - 2513:11;	2619:22; 2626:1; 2664:5; 2672:5, 20;	2679:15; 2680:9; 2685:4	2721:10; 2722:16; 2725:13; 2742:6;	Binder [2] - 2611:4; 2626:12
2514:5; 2532:7;	2676:17; 2692:4;	behaviour [1] -	2748:3, 7	binding [3] - 2671:9,
2540:13; 2614:7;	2696:19; 2702:5;	2735:25	berm [5] - 2549:22;	16; 2797:5
2618:25; 2624:3;	2703:24; 2704:1;	behind [1] - 2626:12	2550:15, 17, 22;	Bingham [1] -
2642:4; 2667:17;	2705:9, 19;	beholden [1] -	2777:25	2788:19
2693:2; 2783:10	2719:10-13; 2740:19;	2712:13	berms [13] - 2521:6;	bio [1] - 2784:21
avoidance [7] - 2512:4; 2620:5, 11,	2743:23; 2746:15; 2753:24; 2754:19;	belief [2] - 2760:17; 2761:3	2634:3; 2705:21; 2706:1; 2707:15;	biodiversity [6] - 2507:4; 2595:22;
15; 2624:15; 2625:13;	2753.24, 2754.19, 2764:24; 2767:1, 10;	believes [7] -	2713:13; 2721:12;	2604:12; 2605:17;
2639:25	2768:20; 2769:15, 18,	2531:25; 2543:17;	2722:2, 6; 2723:2, 6	2779:12; 2782:9
	,,,,	,,	, , , , _	. ,

7

NRCB 1701, Volume 10, April 6, 2021

biologist [1] - 2583:3 biologists [2] -2720:24; 2755:16 biophysical [2] -2669 19 birds [1] - 2718:21 **bit** [12] - 2499:5; 2562:9; 2613:3; 2657:25; 2681:5, 8, 10; 2731:23; 2748:1; 2776:3; 2800:1 Blackfoot [2] -2661:5; 2666:24 blast [1] - 2597:2 Block [10] - 2685:7; 2686:2; 2726:18; 2734:6; 2736:25; 2752:2; 2763:23; 2764:13: 2774:23 block [6] - 2550:12; 2724:16; 2736:19; 2737:2; 2763:24; 2764:13 blocks [2] - 2681:17; 2732:13 Blood [1] - 2796:18 bloom [1] - 2579:11 blooms [1] - 2579:9 Board [180] - 2492:1: 2494:25; 2499:25; 2500:20, 25; 2501:3, 12-13; 2502:11, 17, 20; 2503:14, 19; 2504:9; 2505:25 2506:3, 6, 11; 2507:8, 13; 2514:4, 16; 2519:16; 2520:5 2525:10; 2526:10; 2530:9; 2532:2; 2537:6; 2555:22 2557:11; 2559:23 2560:3, 7; 2561:17; 2565:9; 2569:3; 2579:25; 2581:15; 2601:25; 2606:19; 2607:3. 11: 2609:1: 2610:10, 14, 19; 2611:12, 25; 2613:16, 18, 23; 2614:4, 19, 21, 25; 2615:2, 6, 8, 10, 17, 23; 2616:3, 11, 21; 2619:23; 2622:19; 2624:14, 17, 21; 2627:4; 2628:14; 2632:19, 23; 2634:15; 2635:6; 2636:20; 2637:4, 7, 11-12, 16; 2638:12, 15, 24; 2639:3; 2641:11; 2642:3; 2643:7, 15; 2644:13, 19; 2645:3; 2646:6; 2647:12; 2650:16; 2653:8; 2657:1, 11, 20; 2660:22; 2662:2 2663:13; 2664:7, 15; 2665:8, 23; 2667:18; 2670:3, 15; 2671:7; 2676:18; 2679:18; 2681:17; 2682:14, 17-18, 23; 2683:15, 21; 2684:1; 2685:9, 12, 2689:23, 2691:16, 19, 21; 2692:11; 2694:7, 24; 2695:2; 2702:2; 2708:14; 2709:12; 2710:6; 2711:9, 12, 21, 25; 2716:23; 2721:3, 8; 2726:17; 2736:20;

2738:12; 2745:15; 2746:1; 2749:10; 2757:14; 2758:6; 2760:23; 2762:19; 2775:1; 2777:22; 2779:6; 2780:3, 5, 9; 2783:23, 25; 2784:1; 2786:3, 7, 17; 2787:25; 2790:13; 2791:14; 2795:20; 2798:3, 19; 2799:4; 2805:20 **board** [3] - 2783:4; 2802:1; 2805:2 Board's [24] -2499:22; 2503:2; 2505:21; 2506:10; 2519:19; 2522:3; 2523:7; 2524:24; 2534:14; 2607:9; 2611:20, 23; 2612:3, 6; 2634:8; 2636:17; 2645:2; 2653:8, 14; 2661:24; 2694:24; 2726:22; 2794:20 Bob [1] - 2493:3 body [3] - 2556:16; 2698:7; 2717:15 bookends [1] -2586.13 bordering [1] -2556:15 borehole [2] 2587:19; 2589:11 boreholes [1] -2589:12 born [1] - 2764:17 **borne** [3] - 2513:12; 2721:13; 2726:2 borrowed [1] -2800:22 bother [1] - 2689:11 bothers [1] - 2689:19 bottom [3] - 2552:14; 2605:13; 2800:5 boulders [1] -2699.21 boundaries [1] -2647.6 boundary [1] -2796:23 Bow [68] - 2512:12 6, 22; 2521:4, 8, 11 20; 2536:11; 2572:12; 2577:5, 11; 2617:4; 2619:16, 18; 2621:21; 2625:9; 2631:21; 2632:12, 17; 2633:25; 2634:2; 2645:25; 2648 22 2649 17 20 24-25; 2652:21; 2656:15, 20; 2661:19, 23; 2662:16, 19, 21, 24; 2663:4, 12, 15, 19, 21; 2664:16; 2665:4, 19; 2670:12 21; 2679:3; 2684:11; 2687:22; 2689:6, 9; 2698:14; 2710:2; 2711:16; 2715:4; 2726:24; 2727:4, 7, 16; 2728:17, 20, 23; 2752:19, 22; 2782:20; 2795:25; 2800:11 Bragg [17] - 2521:7; 2633:1; 2634:4; 2682:7; 2699:7; 2702:24; 2703:6; 2705:21; 2707:15; 2713:5, 13; 2721:12;

2722:2, 6; 2723:2 brain [1] - 2802:22 BRBC [1] - 2698:18 breached [1] -2706.1 breaches [1] -2666:11 break [11] - 2498:23; 2568:8; 2604:9; 2609:18; 2629:3; 2632:3; 2658:2; 2764:1; 2784:21; 2785:2 breathe [1] - 2751:7 Brescia [3] - 2515:3; 2574:5.11 **Brian** [5] - 2593:24; 2597:11; 2685:14; 2732:8; 2782:11 bridge [3] - 2605:11; 2625:9; 2740:6 bridges [2] - 2625:8; 2646:20 brief [3] - 2495:9; 2724:23; 2763:25 briefing [1] - 2524:13 briefly [15] - 2499:18, 22; 2507:14; 2546:5; 2548:3; 2555:19: 2576:8; 2577:3; 2588:4; 2604:22; 2612:3; 2634:19; 2638:23; 2660:20; 2752.2 bring [7] - 2523:7; 2538:20; 2561:20; 2648:9; 2651:10; 2723:15; 2734:20 bringing [1] -2496:21 broad [1] - 2548:9 broadcast [1] -2700:23 broader [3] · 2608:22; 2657:6; 2664.9broken [2] - 2612:20; 2637.15 brought [9] - 2723:7; 2728:12; 2739:8; 2758:2; 2791:17; 2793:21; 2794:23; 2795:24 Bruni [3] - 2492:20; 2498:15; 2609:10 Buchanan [2] -2534:16; 2535:6 bucket [2] - 2656:9, 13 **budget** [15] - 2516:3; 2539:24; 2540:3; 2672:5; 2714:8; 2715:24; 2716:2 2717:12, 17; 2720:8; 2726:13; 2782:16; 2800:25; 2801:4, 23 budgetary [1] -2714:16 budgeted [1] -2625.22 budgets [1] -2800:21 **build** [3] - 2629:12; 2690:23; 2691:5 building [7] -2512:14; 2634:5; 2690:22; 2691:5, 9; 2715:3 buildings [5]

2621:4; 2624:16; 2639:8 buildup [1] - 2793:12 **built** [11] - 2501:18; 2505:4; 2550:22; 2617:3; 2633:10; 2636:13; 2651:13; 2708:24; 2762:2; 2794:1; 2798:9 bulk [1] - 2587:3 bull [9] - 2509:13, 17; 2582:12, 14, 21-22; 2586:24; 2693:4; 2755:13 Bull [3] - 2543:22, 24 2544 14 bullet [2] - 2696:3, 5 burdens [2] 2725:16; 2726:12 burial [1] - 2668:21 burials [2] - 2543:4 buried [1] - 2769:24 burned [1] - 2802:22 **bus** [4] - 2621:5; 2625:7; 2725:16; 2804:13 buses [1] - 2725:18 **busiest** [2] - 2791:20, 22 business [17] 2513:2; 2534:10; 2573:17; 2630:9, 15, 18, 25; 2631:1, 4; 2689:24; 2724:5; 2791:15; 2795:15; 2797:20; 2800:4; 2804:18 business-related [1] 2630:15 businesses [29] -2511:4; 2515:23 2518:18; 2528:23; 2534:11; 2608:15; 2611:1; 2615:15; 2617:18, 21; 2621:4; 2622:15; 2626:15; 2628:11; 2630:5, 8, 15, 19, 23; 2633:7 22; 2641:23; 2707:16; 2747:22; 2788:18; 2792:6; 2793:23; 2795:18 busy [1] - 2497:12 but. [1] - 2775:23 Bylaw [7] - 2555:21, 24; 2556:4, 12, 25; 2557:21 **bylaw** [9] - 2558:11, 15, 18; 2708:6, 9, 11-12, 15; 2797:7 bylaws [1] - 2707:23 bypass [4] - 2700:18; 2702:19; 2738:8; 2753:14 С CALALTA[1] -2787:20 Calalta [28] - 2493:3; 2579:15; 2580:4, 10, 15, 21; 2581:3; 2784:22; 2788:5, 13; 2789:5; 2790:11, 14-15, 22; 2791:9, 14; 2792:4, 7, 11, 20, 22; 2794:6; 2796:7; 2798:15 Calalta's [7] -2579:21; 2580:12;

2581:1; 2791:3; 2793:21: 2797:16 CALAWAY [1] -2787.21 Calaway [6] 2788:6, 20; 2789:4, 18; 2791:9; 2798:15 calculate [1] -2676:14 calculated [4] -2512:13, 18; 2754:15; 2759:24 calculation [3] 2676:17; 2719:5; 2766.9 calculations [2] -2592:23; 2604:19 Calgarians [5] -2511:3; 2646:6; 2647:12; 2648:11; 2650:12 Calgary [143] 2492:2, 18, 20-21; 2497:23; 2505:7-11 2510:23; 2511:20, 24; 2513:6; 2514:10; 2521:6; 2523:17; 2578:1; 2605:24; 2610:5, 11, 13, 16; 2611:1; 2614:11: 2615:25; 2617:3, 9, 14; 2618:9, 19, 24; 2620:1, 15; 2621:2, 17; 2622:22. 24: 2624:10; 2625:5, 9, 20; 2627:9, 23 2629:12, 24; 2630:1 16-17; 2631:5, 8-9; 2633:1; 2634:4; 2638:17; 2639:23; 2640:4, 8; 2641:2, 23; 2642:14, 20, 22 2643:18; 2644:9-11; 2645:13, 24; 2646:3, 13, 24; 2647:22 2648:13, 22; 2649:16, 19; 2650:7; 2657:6, 17; 2659:11; 2661:15, 17; 2662:5, 8, 15, 23; 2663:1, 5, 17, 22 2664:4; 2665:2, 18; 2670:13, 17, 22 2681:20; 2682:6; 2683:14; 2685:5; 2689:2, 4, 8, 13, 16; 2696:14; 2701:7, 24; 2702:9, 24; 2706:6; 2707:23; 2709:10; 2712:13; 2723:14; 2725:5; 2726:20; 2750:23, 25; 2759:7; 2771:24; 2779:17; 2782:17; 2783:20; 2792:2; 2796:8; 2797:22; 2798:13; 2802:5; 2803:20 CALGARY [1] -2660:14 Calgary's [14] 2511:4; 2512:21; 2554:4; 2622:13; 2639:7; 2647:17; 2657:21; 2660:11; 2662:20; 2663:2, 7; 2712:11; 2731:14; 2752.2 California [1] -2766:21 camp [3] - 2705:5; 2714:24

AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

2558:12; 2613:24;

campground [1] - 2788:12
camps [1] - 2775:12
Canada [12] -
2507:13; 2509:5;
2639:17; 2669:24;
2507:13; 2509:5; 2639:17; 2669:24; 2679:1; 2707:22; 2721:7; 2744:18;
2749:20; 2766:19; 2791:21; 2801:25
2791:21; 2801:25
Canada's [2] - 2611:7; 2627:3
Canadian [4] -
2508:18; 2562:20;
2707:20; 2741:4
Canadians [1] - 2624:21
Canal [7] - 2561:11;
Canal [7] - 2561:11; 2568:24; 2569:18; 2570:10; 2571:5;
2570:10; 2571:5; 2741:5; 2742:21
canal [3] - 2697:16;
2753:11, 15
cancelled [1] -
2621:6 candidate [1] -
2656:15
Canmore [1] -
2611:23 cannot [26] -
Cannot [26] - 2521:25; 2528:13; 2560:21; 2577:22; 2578:13; 2628:12, 17; 2635:5; 2638:6; 2640:8; 2642:22; 2645:9; 2648:2; 2662:9; 2664:10; 2666:13; 2667:19; 2669:11; 2671:1, 12; 2743:11, 23; 2749:5; 2773:16; 2793:18
2560:21; 2577:22;
2578:13; 2628:12, 17;
2000.0, 2000.0; 2640.8 2642.22
2645:9; 2648:2;
2662:9; 2664:10;
2666:13; 2667:19;
2743·11 23· 2749·5·
2773:16; 2793:18 cap [1] - 2730:3
cap [1] - 2730:3
capabilities [2] - 2602:10; 2698:4
capability [3] -
2652:25; 2656:4;
2702:16 capable [2] - 2652:8;
2802:19
capacity [42] - 2525:13; 2562:16;
2525:13; 2562:16;
2505:17, 24; 2506:1; 2602:18: 2618:23
2565:17, 24; 2566:1; 2602:18; 2618:23; 2623:8; 2646:16, 21;
2651 10 2672 12
2673:1, 18; 2674:18; 2675:6, 23; 2676:4; 2677:23; 2678:12, 18; 2607:5 18; 2700:6 0;
2677:23; 2678:12, 18;
2697:5, 18; 2700:6, 9; 2701:1; 2716:14;
2701:1; 2716:14;
2740:6, 10, 13, 19, 22; 2744:6; 2751:19,
25; 2782:21; 2794:11
capital [12] - 2516:4;
2649:5; 2713:4, 11, 23; 2722:7-9, 20;
2723:4; 2742:11;
2788:11
capped [1] - 2700:21
capture [5] - 2504:20; 2654:4;
2687:6; 2702:20
captured [10] -
2582:21-24; 2674:5; 2675:8, 11; 2687:1;
2700:19; 2702:18
captures [2] -
2702:15, 20
capturing [3] - 2496:6; 2686:9;
- , ,

2687.4 care [2] - 2598:1: 2805:18 career [1] - 2555:12 careful [4] - 2575:5; 2631:9; 2647:11; 2767:15 carefully [2] -2525:23; 2767:21 Carina [1] - 2492:13 caring [1] - 2802:20 Carlo [5] - 2599:11, 16; 2602:22; 2770:23; 2778.2 Carlo's [2] - 2770:24; 2776.24 carried [4] - 2530:25; 2547:5; 2575:4; 2755.4carry [3] - 2551:8; 2574:9; 2745:19 carrying [3] - 2519:3; 2524:3; 2625:11 case [31] - 2500:9; 2503:4; 2516:14; 2519:18; 2527:9; 2538:12; 2561:7; 2593:7; 2614:6; 2639:5; 2663:19; 2681:25; 2682:4 2684:8, 13; 2687:10; 2693:4, 7; 2701:20; 2711:9; 2726:22; 2727:18; 2728:5; 2738:25; 2742:6; 2744:13; 2749:13; 2751:9, 16; 2760:6; 2768:23 cases [2] - 2626:17; 2715:20 cash [1] - 2713:16 casual [1] - 2803:1 catastrophic [6] · 2504:25; 2635:18; 2636:8; 2642:1; 2709:22; 2747:5 catch [2] - 2702:4 catchment [12] -2634:21; 2654:2, 4; 2656:16; 2701:5-7 12, 15, 20, 25; 2703:4 category [1] · 2760:19 caught [1] - 2582:14 caused [5] · 2510:25; 2517:13; 2650:5; 2791:16; 2792:20 causes [1] - 2623:11 causing [6] -2625:11; 2647:19; 2761:18; 2792:13; 2793:9 caution [2] 2741:13; 2785:24 cavalier [1] - 2599:7 caveat [4] - 2711:8; 2786:4; 2787:18; 2806:14 CDA [2] - 2563:21; 2744:19 **CEAA** [3] - 2509:3; 2716:8; 2804:9 cements [1] - 2642:8 centimetres [3] -2769:14.17 central [2] - 2666:23; 2668:5 centre [2] - 2616:3; 2630:1

Centre [1] - 2524:15 centres [2] -2559:15; 2792:7 ceremonial [2] -2676:1.6 Ceremonial [1] -2676:7 ceremonies [2] -2675:9, 24 Ceroici [2] - 2492:8; 2599:10 certain [10] · 2503:25; 2513:20; 2588:18; 2600:14; 2685:1; 2693:5; 2700:16; 2737:9; 2743 24 2786 6 **certainly** [7] -2493:11, 16; 2629:24; 2649:18; 2680:4; 2733:10; 2751:9 certainty [5] 2517:7; 2577:22; 2638:6; 2711:15; 2764:24 chair [11] - 2677:17 19; 2680:10; 2723:16; 2730:8; 2763:25 2775:14; 2786:11; 2806:5, 18 **Chair** [55] - 2492:7; 2547:14; 2548:5, 21; 2549:13; 2552:1; 2553:18, 25; 2554:14; 2556:3, 21; 2557:18; 2558:14; 2560:3 2562:10; 2564:20; 2565:3; 2569:7; 2570:3; 2571:5, 18; 2573:24; 2574:25; 2575:10, 16; 2576:5; 2581:4; 2582:19; 2584:22; 2586:16; 2587:2; 2589:16; 2591:24; 2595:11, 17, 20: 2596:23: 2597:22: 2600:3, 8; 2601:21; 2603:20; 2604:7; 2606:19; 2608:17, 24: 2609:13; 2610:10, 24; 2643:4; 2644:7; 2645:7; 2653:2; 2745:18; 2784:15 CHAIR [83] - 2493:9; 2495:2, 13, 16; 2496:7, 11, 15; 2497:3, 13, 21; 2498:1, 21, 25; 2547:12; 2604:10; 2609:15, 22, 24; 2610:2, 4; 2612:7, 9 25; 2613:13; 2631:25; 2632:2; 2635:22; 2643:14, 21; 2644:6; 2657:23; 2658:7, 10; 2659:6, 16, 21 2660:1, 3, 6, 10, 15; 2679:22; 2680:8, 15; 2681:4, 8, 12, 14; 2732:17, 21; 2733:5, 8; 2734:4; 2764:2, 4, 7, 10; 2775:18, 24; 2776:5, 9; 2784:17 21: 2785:1. 4. 7. 12. 15; 2786:8, 17, 24; 2787:18, 22; 2799:13, 18, 20; 2805:19; 2806:8, 11, 17, 20, 24·2808·5 Chairman [36] -

2494:21; 2495:7; 2499:13; 2502:9; 2508:10; 2511:11; 2518:14; 2520:23; 2522:6; 2525:16; 2528:5, 15; 2546:17; 2547:9; 2558:21; 2559:4; 2565:9; 2567:4; 2571:12 2574:5; 2582:10; 2585:9; 2596:8; 2598:11; 2601:6; 2618:14; 2658:6; 2660:18; 2679:14, 24; 2680:7; 2733:9; 2785:21; 2787:8, 25; 2799.11 chairman [2] 2787:15; 2798:20 challenge [3] -2620:24; 2707:2; 2806:1 challenges [1] -2570:5 challenging [3] -2724:20; 2733:16; 2803:17 Chamber [2] -2505:10; 2630:16 **chance** [8] - 2652:4, 11; 2659:22; 2706:1; 2750:10; 2785:20; 2787:9; 2806:12 change [44] - 2548:4; 2571:17, 20, 25; 2573:2, 12, 15, 20; 2575:15; 2576:7, 15; 2577:1, 25; 2578:4, 8, 10; 2579:1; 2582:1; 2602:12; 2617:6; 2649:15; 2664:25; 2670:16; 2684:5; 2688:4, 14; 2696:12; 2712:6; 2717:19; 2718:9; 2728:4; 2745:5: 2746:12 2747:14; 2749:14; 2750:7, 12; 2751:12, 17; 2752:7; 2758:6; 2759:2: 2772:3 changed [3] 2527:24; 2717:7; 2734.14 Changemakers [1] -2765.19 changes [23] 2517:4, 13; 2518:10; 2532:15; 2575:24; 2576:1, 3; 2577:17; 2578:20; 2587:17; 2594:8: 2648:8: 2655:4, 8; 2663:9; 2684:17; 2714:5, 7; 2734:9; 2746:3; 2760:10; 2762:2 **changing** [3] -2589:2; 2752:6; 2758:7 channel [28] 2508:15; 2517:17; 2549:7, 16, 24; 2550:3, 9, 11, 13; 2551:5, 8, 16, 18; 2557:7; 2564:14; 2576:3; 2585:18; 2594:20; 2605:14; 2694:4; 2715:14; 2716:9; 2740:11; 2754:8, 22; 2758:19; 2777:25

characterized [3] -2562:22; 2584:7; 2602:19 chart [4] - 2598:19; 2739:10, 12, 16 Charter [1] - 2765:19 cheaper [1] -2722:21 check [3] - 2496:20; 2613:5; 2730:10 chemical [1] -2623:13 **children** [8] - 2724:8, 11; 2725:17; 2765:7; 2766:1, 4; 2792:5 Chiniki [3] - 2661:1, 4 2679 16 chinook [1] - 2790:8 **choice** [7] - 2645:22; 2653:16; 2701:6; 2724:5, 7-8; 2763:9 choices [2] 2705:16, 19 choose [4] 2637:20; 2664:17; 2688:1; 2703:1 choosing [4] 2636:16, 18; 2705:12; 2804:7 chose [2] - 2598:4; 2723.10chosen [9] - 2520:7; 2532:1; 2635:8; 2653:6; 2703:11; 2721:15; 2800:14; 2801:19; 2804:11 Christensen [1] -2693:6 chronology [4] · 2523:6; 2526:3, 9, 12 chuckle [1] - 2804:8 circulate [1] -2498:15 circulated [1] -2680.11 circumstances [5] -2538:15; 2600:15; 2614:3; 2615:21; 2640.18circumventing[1] -2551:1 cited [2] - 2654:8; 2757:4 cites [1] - 2790:23 cities [2] - 2617:12; 2633:20 citizen [1] - 2646:10 **citizens** [3] - 2629:8; 2633:21; 2655:2 **City** [99] - 2492:18; 2497:22, 24; 2505:7; 2510:23; 2511:20, 23; 2512:20; 2513:6; 2514:10: 2521:6: 2554:4; 2610:16; 2614:11; 2615:25; 2618:9, 19, 24 2620:1, 15; 2621:17; 2622:3; 2623:4; 2624:10; 2625:20; 2630:1; 2631:9; 2633:2, 15; 2634:3; 2638:17; 2639:7, 23; 2640:4; 2641:2, 23; 2642:22; 2643:18; 2644:11; 2645:7, 11, 13, 18, 21, 24; 2646:13, 15; 2647:1; 2649:2, 16, 19; 2650:17; 2651:20, 23;

2652:10; 2653:8, 15; 2654:21, 23-24; 2655:3, 18, 20, 25 2656:19, 25; 2657:1, 6, 20-21; 2659:10; 2660:11; 2662:14, 20, 23; 2663:1, 5, 7, 17; 2664:4; 2681:20; 2696:14; 2701:7, 24; 2707:23; 2726:20; 2731:14; 2750:23; 2759:7; 2771:24; 2782:18; 2792:1; 2796:8; 2797:22 **CITY** [1] - 2660:14 **city** [37] - 2617:11, 13, 21; 2629:7, 15; 2633:6; 2641:2, 5, 7; 2642:7; 2643:1, 4; 2646:18; 2647:8; 2650:9; 2652:16; 2654:18; 2657:18 2661:15, 17; 2662:4 ; 2665:18; 2670:13, 17, 22; 2689:15; 2706:6; 2709:6, 10; 2712:13; 2750:24; 2759:6; 2782:16; 2783:20; 2798:13 City's [11] - 2620:3; 2621:24; 2623:2, 7-8; 2647:5; 2654:12; 2655:12; 2656:4; 2657.4civil [2] - 2572:20; 2609:6 claim [8] - 2567:19; 2580:23; 2590:9; 2661:9; 2714:2; 2729:17; 2773:5; 2797:13 claims [3] - 2653:5; 2734:22; 2770:13 clarification [3] -2584:21; 2701:19; 2803.22 clarifying [1] -2679:9 clarity [3] - 2546:15; 2694:3; 2697:3 class [1] - 2702:9 classic [1] - 2584:5 classification [4] -2571:14; 2651:25; 2652:8: 2750:13 classified [3] -2651:19, 22 **clay** [10] - 2592:18; 2602:15, 17; 2756:14, 17: 2757:14: 2759:17: 2761:7, 15; 2802:12 clays [5] - 2591:6, 12, 14; 2762:8 cleaning [3] 2777:11, 13 cleanup [1] -2513:14 clear [26] - 2502:5; 2512:21; 2519:19; 2547:6; 2558:21; 2560:12; 2567:25 2586:14, 18; 2589:8; 2603:12; 2616:25; 2623:19; 2631:10; 2636:15; 2653:1; 2657:1: 2698:11 2721:14; 2747:17; 2748:7; 2749:9; 2750:5; 2760:20; 2761:6; 2778:19

cleared [1] - 2494:14 clearest [1] -2650.23 clearing [1] -2544:12 **clearly** [24] -2501:17; 2506:19; 2518:19; 2527:22; 2552:22; 2582:16; 2589:22; 2604:3; 2613:3; 2615:21; 2616:9; 2618:4; 2620:6; 2626:4; 2633:9; 2657:1; 2690:13; 2692:15; 2768:2; 2769:11; 2771:8; 2772:5: 2783:16; 2795:11 clients [10] -2610:14; 2611:2; 2627:7; 2628:25; 2631:22; 2632:19; 2704:23; 2730:7; 2748:11; 2776:12 clients' [11] -2593:23; 2614:9 2617:19; 2619:24; 2620:21; 2626:6, 11; 2627:19; 2628:19; 2629:14: 2760:18 climate [41] - 2548:4; 2571:17, 20, 24; 2573:12, 15, 20; 2575:15; 2576:6, 15; 2577:1, 17, 25; 2578:4, 8, 10; 2617:6; 2648:9; 2649:15; 2656:2; 2664:25; 2670:16; 2684:5 2688:4, 13; 2696:12; 2698:23; 2712:6; 2728:4; 2745:5; 2746:4, 12; 2747:14; 2749:3, 14; 2750:7, 12; 2751:12, 17; 2752:6; 2759:2 clip [1] - 2635:23 close [12] - 2531:6; 2551:21; 2564:17; 2591:22; 2630:14; 2661:12; 2685:9, 12; 2708:24; 2786:2 2791:10; 2807:11 closed [1] - 2621:5 closely [3] - 2516:17; 2536:2; 2590:18 closer [7] - 2499:6; 2504:21; 2505:4; 2570:21; 2635:14; 2636:5, 13 closing [14] 2501:15; 2530:21; 2563:19; 2609:13; 2645:18; 2680:1; 2725:15; 2788:2; 2790:19; 2792:25; 2797:10; 2799:11; 2807:10, 14 closure [1] - 2563:10 closures [2] -2630:10; 2720:2 cloud [1] - 2774:1 **Club** [2] - 2685:6; 2788:17 cluster [1] - 2795:18 coal [1] - 2688:22 coefficient [1] -2699:13 cognizant [2] -2494:6,8

collaborative [1] -2533:21 collect [1] - 2761:10 collected [4] -2627:13; 2725:21; 2755:3; 2757:22 collecting [1] -2735:24 collection [1] -2583:25 collegial [1] - 2784:6 Colour [1] - 2630:12 combined [6] -2648:3; 2650:20; 2652:25; 2663:3, 14, 21 Combined [1] -2703:7 coming [6] - 2613:2; 2706:24; 2751:17; 2752:19; 2753:3, 6 commemorate [1] -2541:1 commence [2] 2574:9; 2670:5 COMMENCED [1] -2493:8 commencement [2] 2510:12; 2671:2 commensurate [1] -2664.1comment [7] -2526:12; 2529:8; 2530:19; 2590:20; 2634:19; 2773:6; 2802.21 commented [5] -2526:15; 2534:17; 2546:9; 2575:14; 2602:11 comments [19] -2496:6; 2499:21; 2504:8; 2524:22; 2532:6; 2534:16; 2538:8; 2541:6, 19; 2547:9, 21; 2583:9; 2584:10; 2585:21; 2609:16; 2643:7; 2788:2; 2803:15; 2807:10 Commerce [2] 2505:11; 2630:16 Commercial [2] -2788:17; 2793:23 commercial [10] -2505:2; 2605:25; 2617:22; 2624:8; 2635:20; 2636:10; 2704:24; 2795:15; 2796:5; 2797:20 Commission [11] -2492:8 commissioning [3] -2568:21; 2570:22 2742:16 commit [2] 2710:16; 2711:23 commitment [6] -2543:25; 2603:7 2607:18; 2636:24; 2671:6; 2789:1 commitments [12] -2529:10; 2535:22; 2543:16; 2596:5; 2603:6: 2607:9. 12. 15; 2608:1; 2671:11, 14 committed [15] 2501:22; 2528:16; 2534:2; 2538:25;

2540:6, 14, 17; 2544:7, 13, 23; 2593:20; 2598:16; 2607:23; 2608:18; 2780.23 Committee [1] -2533:25 committee [10] · 2544:24; 2545:4; 2673:13, 20, 24; 2675:3; 2677:18, 20; 2719:1 **common** [2] - 2698:9; 2742:12 commonplace [1] -2745:19 communicable [1] -2623.13 communicate [2] -2528:21; 2608:13 communicated [1] -2644:21 communication [3] -2608:7; 2677:21, 23 communications [2] 2526:14; 2607:24 communities [68] 2511:21, 24; 2521:11; 2529:14; 2616:1, 14; 2617:16, 19; 2619:4, 8-9, 17; 2620:2, 16; 2621:9, 20; 2627:8; 2629:18, 21, 23 2631:14, 17, 21; 2632:5, 11, 17 2634:12, 25; 2635:2; 2638:18; 2639:24; 2640:5; 2641:24; 2642:23; 2645:14; 2649:20; 2662:7; 2663:23; 2665:11; 2666:1; 2672:11; 2677:24; 2686:23; 2692:20; 2698:5; 2700:25; 2706:2; 2707:25; 2712:4, 8, 22; 2713:1; 2722:17; 2726:3; 2731:8-10; 2738:10; 2747:19, 22; 2750:16; 2752:22; 2778:25; 2781:5, 18 Communities [6] -2492:20; 2505:8 2610:5, 12; 2644:10; 2659:12 Community [5] -2505:7; 2525:14; 2526:18; 2527:12; 2744:25 community [47] -2514:23; 2515:16; 2522:16; 2524:4, 25; 2525:1; 2528:16, 20, 22, 25; 2581:25 2608:1, 8, 13-14; 2626:25; 2628:1; 2629:15; 2632:21; 2648:13; 2682:9; 2683:7; 2685:2, 5; 2690:18; 2704:20; 2716:25; 2718:24; 2725:2, 6, 25; 2726:13; 2730:1, 20; 2735:7; 2745:24; 2750:6; 2765:14; 2788:15: 2789:3: 2790:9; 2792:6; 2797:21; 2798:12, 18 commuting [1] -

companions [1] -2627:16 company [1] -2661:11 compare [3] -2520:8; 2686:20; 2760:25 compared [7] -2519:21; 2533:3; 2635:9, 12; 2636:3; 2698:20; 2768:8 comparing [4] -2516:24; 2664:22; 2702:3; 2728:17 comparison [9] -2598:18; 2639:9; 2686:7, 21; 2696:24; 2701:2; 2702:2; 2703.23 comparisons [1] -2698:10 compel [3] - 2805:2, 4.7 compelled [1] -2748:6 compelling [1] -2567:6 compensate [1] -2798:1 compensated [4] -2517:22; 2796:14; 2797.8 compensation [9] -2517:25; 2616:5; 2640:21; 2676:25; 2714:24; 2783:6; 2791:15; 2792:24; 2796:3 compete [1] -2776:15 competent [1] -2588:9 competing [2] - 2669:10; 2734:24 competitive [1] -2516.20 complained [1] -2523:9 complaints [2] -2525:25; 2528:24 complete [15] 2521:16; 2539:6, 19; 2540:4; 2541:15; 2570:21; 2596:3; 2667:14; 2668:14; 2671:22; 2774:14; 2782:22; 2802:2; 2807:8 completed [11] -2502:13; 2515:17; 2541:9; 2543:3; 2646:18, 21; 2652:22; 2657:16; 2670:13; 2671:24: 2678:25 completely [4] -2598:23; 2697:6; 2735:19; 2769:16 completeness [1] -2530:15 completion [8] 2516:20; 2596:15; 2647:13; 2671:19; 2672:4, 16; 2673:7, 15 complex [1] -2574:14 complexity [1] -2704:14 compliance [1] -2541:25

AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

2777:16

10

NRCB 1701, Volume 10, April 6, 2021

complicating [1] -	2536:25; 2538:21;	2761:23; 2767:23;	conjecture [3] -	2765:15; 2768:10;
2803:3				
	2540:9; 2542:14, 18;	2768:12, 17; 2769:3,	2504:8; 2638:11	2781:22; 2790:10
complied [1] -	2546:6; 2547:3;	8, 25; 2770:20;	conjunction [1] -	considerations [13] -
2671:1	2562:1, 6, 12; 2574:8;	2771:10, 17; 2772:24;	2550:4	2503:16; 2569:1;
complimentary [1] -	2579:2; 2585:3;	2773:1, 5, 9, 11, 16;	connected [1] -	2574:8; 2601:22;
2583:8	2591:6; 2596:6, 9, 13;	2774:16, 21, 23, 25;	2758:17	2614:1; 2615:22;
component [8] -	2605:21; 2606:10;	2797:15; 2799:6	connections [1] -	2624:25; 2663:11;
2513:16; 2521:4;	2608:3; 2630:21;	conduct [12] -	2665:21	2694:10; 2750:3;
2574:17; 2596:1;	2640:16; 2644:25;	2507:20; 2529:16;	consent [2] - 2533:5;	2769:7; 2780:18;
2633:24; 2667:3, 24;	2654:13; 2668:18;	2530:22; 2536:20;	2670:19	2804:1
2727:24	2704:22; 2708:18;	2541:22; 2544:1, 8;	consequence [17] -	Considered [1] -
components [20] -	2710:8; 2752:15;	2583:4; 2623:6;	2507:25; 2559:12;	2726:18
2500:15; 2521:5, 16;	2760:2; 2761:4;	2675:9, 23; 2779:4	2571:9, 11, 14;	considered [25] -
2549:15, 17; 2571:8;	2764:19; 2783:14;	conducted [13] -	2606:4; 2651:19, 22,	2518:22, 25; 2521:24;
2634:1, 6-7; 2652:6;	2790:11; 2792:8;	2508:16; 2534:19;	25; 2652:1, 7;	2562:4; 2595:14;
2664:12; 2667:11;	2804:14	2538:9; 2542:5;	2685:20; 2743:25;	2611:19; 2613:16;
2668:2, 12; 2669:19;	concerted [1] -	2543:14; 2583:10, 18;	2744:9; 2747:7;	2614:19; 2634:8;
2768:10; 2786:1, 6,	2573:19	2595:22; 2609:6;	2750:12; 2760:24	2635:7; 2664:20;
13	conclude [6] -	2643:10; 2723:18;	consequences [6] -	2667:6; 2678:23;
composition [1] -	2608:24; 2625:19;	2755:24; 2759:10	2566:20; 2693:11;	2684:8; 2703:3, 22;
2599:1	2679:15; 2700:9;	conducting [4] -	2747:5; 2755:2;	2726:15, 21; 2736:5;
comprehensive [17]	2711:13; 2799:11	2505:16; 2538:17;	2789:18; 2798:8	2740:13; 2742:23;
- 2500:10; 2507:1;	concluded [9] -	2600:12; 2643:16	consequently [4] -	2744:16; 2761:22;
2569:22; 2574:6;	2563:15; 2594:6;	conductive [1] -	2520:23; 2593:8;	2773:22; 2795:3
2588:12; 2589:9;	2624:21; 2633:19;	2592:10	2601:13; 2727:22	considering [14] -
2603:8; 2606:22;	2639:18; 2695:5, 18;	conductivity [5] -	conservancy[1] -	2500:20; 2585:16;
2664:15, 19; 2690:7;	2701:12; 2705:3	2589:3; 2592:4;	2698:14	2607:20; 2623:20;
2728:1, 8; 2761:23;	concludes [3] -	2759:10, 21; 2761:7	Conservancy[1] -	2655:21; 2699:8;
2777:2, 6, 9	2609:13; 2695:8;	conduit [2] -	2698:21	2700:25; 2701:22;
comprehensively [1]	2710:11	2715:14; 2743:16	Conservation [4] -	2717:4; 2730:18;
- 2581:22	concluding [3] -	Conference [1] -	2492:1; 2637:11;	2736:9; 2759:24;
comprised [2] -	2574:12; 2660:21;	2653:11	2645:3; 2684:1	2776:19
2570:15; 2660:25	2782:14	conference [3] -	conservation [3] -	considers [2] -
compromised [1] -	conclusion [15] -	2524:24; 2634:16;	2665:9; 2684:2;	2526:21, 24
2736:7	2501:17; 2604:18;	2637:3	2779:10	consist [4] -
compute [1] -	2606:19; 2614:16;	confidence [6] -	conservatism[1] -	2500:12; 2549:14, 20;
2591:16	2618:1; 2619:21;	2560:7; 2601:25;	2597:19	2552:25
concedes [1] -	2635:5; 2641:18;	2738:5; 2757:14;	conservative [14] -	consistent [6] -
2669:17	2656:23; 2704:13;	2758:6; 2766:22	2564:20; 2565:5;	2506:14; 2703:8;
concentrations [3] -	2710:15; 2728:16;	confident [5] -	2566:19; 2589:5;	2735:4, 6; 2746:14;
2579:3; 2772:16, 19	2755:12; 2788:4;	2565:3, 13; 2595:8,	2593:5; 2598:5;	2793:11
concept [1] - 2795:3	2798:5	15; 2596:2	2645:19; 2649:7;	constant [2] -
concepts [1] -	conclusions [8] -	configuration [2] -	2650:20, 23; 2657:13;	2553:14; 2627:15
2747:1	2598:2; 2600:13;	2647:8; 2757:4	2749:24; 2750:1	constitute [5] -
conceptual [4] -	2611:24; 2691:18;	configure [1] -	consider [29] -	2526:20, 24; 2569:13;
2520:16; 2523:20;	2705:9; 2770:12;	2652:6	2501:3; 2519:2;	2572:19; 2664:12
2727:10; 2728:24	2774:12	configured [2] -	2522:4; 2526:15;	constitutes [2] -
concern [33] -	condition [45] -	2761:18; 2762:11	2534:15; 2540:9;	2567:18; 2666:21
2545:10; 2546:14;	2564:9; 2671:19;	confined [2] -	2561:22; 2607:15;	Constitution [1] -
2562:14; 2570:2;	2672:7, 15, 18;	2759:15; 2804:2	2637:17; 2638:25;	2531:19
2579:16, 21; 2580:4;	2673:4, 9, 12, 17;	confirm [6] - 2508:4;	2665:20; 2666:7;	constitutional [2] -
2585:10; 2588:14;	2674:15; 2675:3, 15;	2530:23; 2538:3;	2679:2; 2683:17,	2667:4, 8
2600:20; 2601:19; 2603:1: 2605:7, 20:	2676:1, 9, 13; 2677:5, 17, 21; 2678:6, 9, 14,	2561:14; 2776:25; 2787:10	22-23; 2687:8; 2694:24; 2700:15;	constitutionally [1] - 2666:12
2603:1; 2605:7, 20;				
2622:17; 2637:19; 2655:15: 2709:18:	20-21; 2726:11; 2736:12, 10: 2737:0:	confirmation [1] -	2705:7; 2726:12; 2753:23, 25: 2755:12:	constrain [3] -
2655:15; 2709:18; 2711:10; 2733:13;	2736:12, 19; 2737:9; 2740:8, 15; 2741:8,	2582:11 confirmed [12] -	2753:23, 25; 2755:12; 2759:4; 2780:6;	2550:17; 2759:20; 2761:16
2735:12; 2742:25;	22; 2774:23; 2775:4;	2505:25; 2515:3;	2792:5; 2795:20;	constraint [1] -
2745:12; 2753:8;	2777:5, 8, 23; 2779:2;	2523:17; 2543:25;	2792.5, 2795.20, 2799:4	2733:11
2760:8; 2761:17;	2790:16; 2791:15;	2573:20: 2590:16:	considerable [7] -	constraints [2] -
2762:1; 2772:9;	2793:2, 13; 2798:3;	2666:2, 5; 2669:24;	2511:18; 2519:2;	2646:13; 2750:1
2776:18; 2789:16;	2799:7; 2805:4, 7	2671:6; 2693:17;	2537:16; 2568:18;	construct [2] -
2798:5	conditional [1] -	2706:10	2622:16; 2689:8;	2710:3; 2789:17
Concerned [1] -	2742:9	confirms [2] -	2754:11	constructed [4] -
2493:1	conditions [64] -	2541:8; 2558:22	considerably [2] -	2508:2; 2550:6;
concerned [10] -	2516:21; 2517:9;	conflict [4] -	2552:4: 2553:21	2697:16; 2715:14
2538:7; 2563:24;	2533:4; 2542:6;	2723:19, 22; 2735:8,	consideration [32] -	constructing [1] -
2606:17; 2706:17;	2549:9; 2577:19;	16	2522:2; 2533:18;	2504:11
2718:11; 2735:11;	2580:25; 2591:11, 15;	conflicts [4] -	2534:14; 2542:12;	construction [54] -
2742:22; 2752:10;	2592:10; 2599:24;	2525:22; 2735:10, 15,	2563:13; 2566:6;	2505:1; 2508:11;
2753:11; 2783:5	2600:25; 2602:9;	23	2572:11; 2574:6;	2513:3; 2514:23;
concerning [4] -	2607:6, 12; 2616:12;	confluence [10] -	2575:6; 2597:18;	2515:17; 2516:20;
2522:10; 2704:23;	2671:1, 9, 15; 2678:7,	2519:5; 2582:15;	2599:19; 2614:3;	2517:8; 2528:18, 25;
2736:12; 2803:6	15; 2685:25; 2687:2;	2617:3; 2619:18;	2615:19; 2624:23;	2529:1; 2534:3, 12;
concerns [49] -	2711:16; 2716:8;	2621:20; 2625:10;	2631:9; 2665:19;	2541:18; 2543:24;
2505:13; 2518:12;	2736:18, 22; 2739:7;	2645:24; 2650:3;	2668:12; 2683:16;	2544:2, 9; 2570:20,
2522:17; 2525:5, 17;	2740:1; 2742:10;	2687:22; 2752:21	2694:14, 21; 2696:6,	24; 2571:4; 2594:14;
2528:9; 2531:24;	2744:13; 2745:7, 14,	confused [3] -	10, 12; 2704:20;	2596:16; 2607:19;
2532:6, 16; 2533:14;	19, 22, 25; 2753:21;	2591:2; 2592:20;	2709:14; 2731:3;	2608:10, 22; 2611:21;
2535:4, 16, 24;	2757:6; 2759:5, 16;	2603:13	2738:18; 2743:7;	2616:13; 2635:18;

2636:9; 2643:3; 2655:14; 2657:14; 2670:4; 2671:2, 21; 2672:8; 2673:14, 25; 2683:3: 2704:12: 2713:11; 2714:1, 23; 2723:1; 2777:7 2781:10, 12; 2789:19, 22; 2790:4, 6, 18; 2793:15 consult [7] 2529:12, 24; 2531:16; 2537:9, 14; 2666:4; 2667.2 consultant [3] -2560:16; 2567:5; 2588:6 consultants [3] 2650:19; 2800:15; 2802.8 consultation [51] -2517:2; 2522:11; 2523:5; 2525:19; 2526:16, 20, 24-25; 2527:23; 2528:5; 2529:2, 5; 2530:3, 6-7, 10, 12, 18-19, 21-23, 25; 2531:2, 6, 12, 20; 2534:15, 20; 2535:20; 2536:5, 12; 2537:12, 18; 2539:9; 2542:13; 2665:24; 2666:15, 20-21; 2668:19; 2678:14, 18; 2723:17; 2728:22; 2730:16, 25; 2734:17; 2805:9 Consultation [2] -2529:20; 2666:2 consulted [2] -2523:10; 2640:11 consulting [1] -2735.3 consumptive [3] -2693:25; 2694:3; 2695.16 contact [5] 2524:22; 2525:12; 2528:19; 2543:8; 2608:12 contain [3] 2610:22; 2639:15; 2762:8 contained [1] -2581:12 containing [1] -2584:8 contains [1] -2644:19 contaminant [1] -2593.13 contaminants [6] -2593:3, 6-7, 10; 2623:14; 2758:14 contaminated [4] 2694:4; 2753:1, 3, 5 contamination [1] -2592:25 contemplated [2] -2712:5; 2734:9 contemplating [1] -2791:11 contend [1] -2803:14 contends [1] -2724:22 contents [1] -2613:24 context [10] -2499:21; 2500:3;

2506:8; 2596:14; 2597:21; 2604:2; 2605:19; 2695:18; 2703:5; 2743:5 contextual [2] -2502:3; 2503:9 contextual-type [1] -2502:3 contextually [2] -2653:14; 2726:21 contiguous [1] -2724:16 contingencies [1] -2566:10 contingent [1] -2533:4 continue [15] -2515:21; 2525:7; 2546:23; 2553:12; 2608:18; 2627:15; 2640:15; 2684:17; 2689:19; 2734:11; 2748:3; 2764:9; 2778:8; 2804:16 continued [7] -2523:18; 2524:1; 2535:23; 2544:25; 2545:22; 2546:13; 2704.17 continues [3] 2509:23; 2574:12; 2626.17 continuing [2] -2544:14; 2628:5 continuously [1] -2652:4 contract [1] - 2673:5 contracting [1] -2534:4 contractor [1] -2529:1 contractors [2] -2534:11; 2672:9 contrary [2] 2598:12; 2759:7 contrast [5] 2599:15; 2640:4; 2727:8, 16; 2728:22 contrasted [1] -2589:7 contravention [1] -2707:18 contribute [1] -2503:8 contribution [1] -2619:3 control [22] -2502:24; 2513:20; 2521:8, 19; 2549:25; 2564:24: 2596:22: 2601:3; 2618:12; 2634:1; 2662:4, 18; 2663:2; 2664:6; 2665:19; 2670:12; 2672:21; 2678:22, 24; 2700:16; 2726:8; 2765:2 controlled [2] 2741:25; 2759:16 controlling [1] -2553:19 controls [11] -2767:5, 7, 9; 2770:17; 2771:19; 2773:21; 2774.14 convenient [1] -2763:10 conventional [2] -2749:6, 15 conversation [1] -

2797:17 conversations [2] -2790.11 converts [1] - 2533:7 convey [2] - 2551:6; 2710:4 conveyance[1] -2727:25 convince [1] -2762:23 convinced [4] -2506:12; 2613:18; 2682:23; 2748:11 copier [1] - 2630:12 Copithorne [9] -2593:24; 2685:14, 20; 2688:19, 23; 2689:10; 2732:8; 2782:11 **copy** [7] - 2496:22; 2497:17; 2610:21; 2644:18; 2660:23; 2680:1; 2806:7 **core** [5] - 2511:5; 2621:18; 2647:17; 2712:11; 2759:15 Corn [1] - 2699:15 Corner [1] - 2765:19 corners [2] · 2800:23; 2801:11 corporation [1] -2714:19 corporations [1] -2510:10 Corps [1] - 2743:19 correct [6] - 2526:22; 2659:21; 2714:3; 2717:16; 2796:1; 2797:21 corrected [1] -2766:10 correction [1] -2766:10 **CORRECTIONS** [2] -2495:21: 2660:8 corrections 121 2498:14: 2659:20 correctly [1] -2726:20 correlation [1] -2703:6 correspondence [2] 2534:22; 2537:2 corridors [3] 2624:19; 2625:4, 14 cost [52] - 2516:16: 2517:3; 2519:3; 2523:21; 2625:1 21-22; 2649:5, 8; 2664:13; 2683:4; 2712:17; 2713:9, 11, 23; 2714:1, 3, 11, 13, 21, 25; 2715:1, 7, 17, 22-23; 2716:3; 2719:19; 2720:11, 17; 2721:23-25; 2722:1, 3, 5, 13-14, 20 2724:18; 2727:14; 2748:8; 2762:25; 2771:4; 2775:3; 2801:3 cost/benefit [1] -2642:10 costing [1] - 2714:6 costly [2] - 2512:9; 2716.13 **COStS** [120] · 2510:10, 25; 2511:17; 2513:12; 2514:21; 2516:2, 19, 24; 2517:14, 18; 2518:8,

10, 16, 20; 2624:7; 2625:20; 2629:1; 2631:2; 2662:3; 2664:5, 22; 2665:11; 2684:22; 2685:1; 2690:5; 2699:25; 2703:19; 2710:9, 13; 2711:11, 13-14; 2713:4, 9, 12, 20, 24; 2714:4, 8, 17, 22; 2715:2, 11, 22; 2716:8, 12, 22, 24; 2717:2, 6, 9, 15, 17; 2718:11, 14-20, 22-24; 2719:2, 6, 11, **L**-**LT**, **L**, 19, **L**, 0, 11, 13, 15, 25; 2720:1, 3, 5, 11, 18, 20, 22; 2721:2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 15-16, 18, 21; 2722:6, 9, 11, 40, 22; 2722:6, 9, 11, 19, 23; 2723:1, 3, 5, 7, 10; 2725:3, 13; 2726:1; 2729:19; 2742:11; 2748:13; 2800:21; 2801:22-24; 2802:2 Costs [1] - 2709:25 Cougar [21] - 2506:3; 2611:22; 2612:4; 2613:15; 2614:4, 18; 2615:3, 22; 2616:4, 21; 2620:8; 2624:14; 2625:3; 2628:15; 2641:12, 14; 2682:14; 2683:3; 2780:9 Coulee [10] -2696:23; 2697:2, 4, 8, 10, 25; 2698:2, 11; 2727:24 Council [2] - 2607:4; 2698:15 counsel [14] -2495:14; 2498:15, 18; 2517:24; 2560:10; 2588:17; 2610:11; 2643:8; 2644:8; 2680:11: 2733:8: 2784:1, 3; 2805:22 Counsel [2] -2492.10 counsels [2] 2496:16; 2732:18 counter [1] - 2592:5 counter-narrative [1] 2592:5 countered [1] -2588:11 counties [1] -2633:21 country [4] -2504:13; 2689:17; 2747:8; 2800:2 Country [1] - 2685:6 county [3] - 2556:7; 2717:5; 2795:3 **County** [23] 2505:13; 2513:1, 5; 2555:21; 2556:6, 25; 2708:10, 22; 2713:15; 2717:5; 2721:16; 2729:1, 6, 21; 2730:6; 2748:10; 2783:7; 2789:3; 2794:13; 2795:2, 7; 2796:14; 2797:6 County's [3] -2558:18; 2705:10; 2708.6 couple [4] - 2498:10; 2523:8; 2584:11; 2612:18

course [22] -2497:18; 2498:20; 2502:9; 2552:15; 2557:24; 2564:15; 2574:1; 2607:5, 9; 2618:14, 16; 2688:20; 2689:6; 2696:19; 2701:8; 2733:23; 2784:3, 17; 2786:19; 2792:15; 2806:13 courses [2] 2708:23; 2781:9 court [11] - 2494:6; 2497:18; 2609:1; 2610:21; 2612:10; 2613:5; 2643:8; 2644:14; 2659:7; 2798:23; 2807:20 Court [7] - 2493:5; 2661:9; 2666:5, 10; 2669:24; 2788:17; 2793:23 COURT [2] 2612:23; 2632:9 courts [1] - 2542:4 cover [2] - 2770:24 coverage [2] -2791:12 covered [2] -2760:18; 2769:21 covering [1] -2605.14 COVID-19 [1] -2666:1 cracks [1] - 2745:24 CRCAG [11] -2510:24; 2659:11, 17; 2660:9; 2681:19; 2709:11; 2725:19, 23; 2726:1. 15: 2731:4 CRCAG's [1] -2725:15 create [8] - 2594:4; 2597:1; 2622:9; 2631:16; 2635:2; 2760:15; 2782:16; 2783.19 created [5] 2587:21; 2628:23; 2665:25; 2694:20; 2731:17 creates [8] - 2533:6; 2631:13; 2685:23; 2700:10; 2706:9; 2714:14; 2724:19; 2734.8 creating [2] - 2754:9; 2763:8 creation [1] - 2732:2 credibility [1] -2690.3credible [3] - 2560:6; 2578:12; 2592:7 Cree [1] - 2666:23 creek [2] - 2697:9; 2753:12 Creek [58] - 2502:25; 2506:3; 2519:5; 2521:7; 2548:9; 2552:15; 2582:15, 25; 2611:22; 2612:4; 2613:15; 2614:4, 18; 2615:3, 22; 2616:4, 21; 2620:8; 2624:14; 2625:3; 2628:15; 2633:1: 2634:4: 2641:12, 15; 2682:7, 14; 2683:3; 2697:10; 2698:3; 2699:7; 2702:24; 2703:6;

2705:13, 21-22;	Crown's [2] - 2537:8;	cutting [1] - 2801:11	Darrell [1] - 2579:7	5, 16; 2611:21, 24;
2707:15; 2713:5, 13;	2666:3	D	data [16] - 2576:20;	2612:1; 2613:15;
2715:12, 15; 2717:21;	CRR [1] - 2493:5		2577:14; 2578:14;	2615:8; 2616:21;
2718:2, 4, 8; 2721:12;	crucial [2] - 2649:11;	Dam [20] - 2524:5;	2583:5, 25; 2587:20;	2620:8; 2624:14;
2722:2, 6; 2723:2;	2685:23		2589:12; 2749:12;	2628:15; 2634:16;
2729:7; 2752:12;	crystal [2] - 2694:3;	2561:11; 2562:20;	2751:13; 2755:3;	2636:16; 2637:3, 19,
2753:14; 2756:21, 24;	2698:11	2563:1; 2568:24;	2759:11, 13; 2766:14;	21; 2638:20; 2641:12; 2642:5; 2653:14;
2780:9	CSR(A [2] - 2493:5	2569:18; 2570:10;	2790:24	
crest [1] - 2741:13	cubed [16] - 2551:11;	2571:5; 2647:22;	date [10] - 2524:23;	2682:14; 2688:20;
crew [2] - 2719:23;	2553:5, 7-8, 15;	2668:25; 2707:20;	2633:19; 2640:21;	2691:13, 16; 2694:20;
2720:23	2554:18; 2559:2;	2741:4; 2742:2, 4, 9,	2652:23; 2713:9;	2697:8, 14; 2703:10;
crime [1] - 2542:3	2562:17; 2592:6;	21; 2745:10; 2751:24	2716:4; 2794:23;	2705:1; 2708:16;
criteria [6] - 2563:9;	2619:1, 12, 14;	dam [86] - 2504:11,	2795:1; 2800:22;	2710:1, 6; 2714:11;
2664:9; 2693:2;	2697:13; 2751:25	18-19; 2507:2, 24-25;	2803:18	2721:3, 8; 2726:22,
2694:13; 2696:1;	cubic [39] - 2548:23; 2551:9, 14; 2552:8,	2520:20; 2548:2, 15;	dated [5] - 2698:15;	24-25; 2739:9;
2751:18		2549:16; 2551:24;	2708:12; 2728:11;	2761:2; 2780:9, 17;
criterion [1] -	10, 18; 2553:3, 10;	2552:1, 4, 6, 14;	2729:1	2800:7, 16
2585:25	2554:2, 6, 16, 19, 21;	2553:21; 2555:15;	daunting [1] - 2643:9	Decision [6] - 2653:11; 2691:15, 19;
critical [17] - 2514:5;	2558:24; 2592:2;	2559:7, 11, 13;	Dave [2] - 2515:3;	
2516:7; 2606:13;	2646:17; 2648:16;	2560:2; 2561:9,	2737:2	2694:7; 2695:2;
2610:15; 2614:13; 2616:24; 2622:22;	2651:11; 2687:11;	15-16, 21; 2562:22;	David [3] - 2492:19;	2738:12
	2688:12; 2697:12, 18,	2563:2; 2565:8, 10,	2512:11; 2575:11	decision-makers [1]
2629:23; 2638:15;	24; 2707:8-11, 14;	16, 19; 2566:12, 17, 22, 25; 2567:8, 11,	days [16] - 2511:5;	- 2780:17
2645:16; 2647:14;	2712:25; 2738:9;		2515:17; 2552:20;	decision-making [2]
2657:8; 2700:24;	2739:2; 2759:22;	18; 2568:1, 8, 19-20,	2564:18; 2621:6, 11;	- 2520:3; 2531:5
2701:19; 2727:21;	2801:15, 17	23; 2581:5, 7;	2630:14; 2652:2;	decisions [8] -
2798:14	cultural [18] -	2594:20; 2603:20;	2689:18; 2699:6;	2505:25; 2679:8;
critically [2] -	2539:10, 13; 2540:20;	2606:17; 2635:13;	2720:19, 25; 2734:10;	2705:19; 2706:23;
2618:4; 2739:11	2542:3; 2608:21;	2636:3; 2651:20;	2742:20; 2807:19	2729:11; 2749:16;
critique [1] - 2739:16	2621:16; 2664:20;	2686:22; 2696:16;	De [6] - 2599:11, 16;	2763:6; 2800:4
crops [1] - 2776:15 cross [42] - 2526:19;	2665:21; 2668:1, 21; 2669:8; 2672:7, 10;	2697:13; 2699:2; 2700:1; 2706:18;	2602:22; 2770:23; 2776:24	Declaration [1] - 2671:4
2536:9; 2555:20, 23;	2674:3, 6, 22;	2709:16; 2716:12, 19;	de [2] - 2662:15;	declared [1] -
2560:9, 13-14;	2675:14; 2731:17	2719:15, 17, 19;	2778:2	2621:10
2566:8; 2576:6;	culturally [2] -	2726:6; 2728:18, 21;	deadlines [2] -	declining [1] -
2579:19; 2585:25;	2544:11; 2676:12	2729:7; 2739:22;	2527:15; 2528:1	2691:12
2587:3, 8; 2588:8, 16, 20; 2591:1, 3, 5;	Culture [6] - 2540:19; 2541:14, 17,	2741:11, 14, 24; 2743:3, 25; 2744:5, 9,	deal [10] - 2498:1, 22; 2556:10; 2558:7;	deeper [1] - 2703:3 deepest [1] - 2557:4
2592:20; 2593:22;	23; 2542:7; 2672:25	23; 2747:7; 2751:25;	2566:11; 2711:9;	deer [1] - 2803:7
2599:21; 2605:5;	culture [3] - 2668:6;	2755:7; 2789:22;	2739:6; 2747:17;	defend [1] - 2565:1
2626:21; 2654:12;	2682:12; 2725:9	2795:11; 2801:13	2749:7; 2805:8	defer [1] - 2787:13
2686:4; 2702:1;	culverts [1] - 2625:9	dam-permitting [1] -	dealing [8] - 2568:6;	deferred [2] -
2706:8, 15; 2708:4;	cumulative [6] -	2561:9	2581:22; 2596:23;	2691:21; 2738:21
2713:24; 2742:21;	2574:16; 2595:24;	damage [26] -	2695:15; 2764:15;	deficits [2] -
2755:24; 2756:6, 10;	2674:12; 2679:8;	2504:24; 2510:21;	2766:14; 2803:17;	2513:23; 2695:7
2775:9; 2776:24;	2781:19	2511:3; 2512:4, 15;	2804:18	define [1] - 2694:23
2778:2; 2793:18, 20;	Cundliffe [3] -	2554:5; 2573:25;	dealings [1] -	defined [6] -
2796:16	2492:14; 2496:16;	2613:24; 2620:10, 15; 2622:3; 2623:20;	2804:21	2506:20; 2531:20;
cross-exam [1] -	2498:6		deals [1] - 2741:10	2545:4; 2556:14;
2686:4	Cunningham [1] -	2624:12, 15; 2625:1;	dealt [10] - 2568:16;	2557:1, 11
cross-examination	2492:12	2635:17; 2636:7;	2569:5; 2746:13;	definition [3] -
[28] - 2526:19; 2536:9;	curb [1] - 2734:18	2647:19; 2662:18;	2750:20; 2763:22;	2541:24; 2557:1, 10
2555:20, 23; 2560:13;	current [12] - 2516:3, 24; 2574:1; 2576:12;	2687:5; 2689:3, 8;	2775:7; 2804:17, 23;	definitions [3] -
2566:8; 2579:19;		2712:12; 2793:2, 7, 9	2807:24	2556:13, 24; 2557:18
2585:25; 2587:3, 8;	2578:6; 2630:24;	damaged [4] -	death [2] - 2509:10;	deflection [3] -
2588:8, 16, 20;	2693:23; 2694:1;	2511:6; 2621:1;	2623:1	2517:15; 2549:21;
2591:1, 3, 5; 2592:20;	2695:6; 2717:12;	2627:24; 2721:19	debacle [1] - 2731:7	2550:10
2599:21; 2702:1;	2782:3; 2792:17	damages [28] -	debate [1] - 2504:7	deflector [2] -
2706:8; 2708:4;	curves [1] - 2573:16	2511:2; 2512:9, 12,	debris [19] - 2504:20;	2532:13; 2697:4
2713:24; 2742:21;	CUSANO [13] -	14; 2516:15; 2518:1;	2517:15; 2532:13;	degraded [3] -
2755:24; 2756:6, 10;	2497:15; 2498:13, 24;	2624:1, 4, 18;	2549:21; 2550:10,	2724:17; 2725:9;
2775:9	2609:21; 2610:1, 3, 8;	2625:13; 2626:2;	12-13; 2611:22;	2771:22
cross-examined [3]	2612:8; 2613:8, 14;	2647:3; 2648:18,	2613:19, 21; 2635:14;	degree [9] - 2513:20;
- 2560:9; 2593:22;	2632:1, 14; 2635:25	23-25; 2649:3, 15, 22;	2636:4; 2651:15;	2517:1; 2560:7;
2654:12	Cusano [10] -	2652:24; 2686:16, 19;	2697:4; 2699:20, 23;	2600:10; 2640:6;
cross-examining [1]	2492:20; 2497:13;	2712:17; 2792:20, 24	2704:5	2751:4; 2758:9;
- 2576:6	2609:10, 20, 24;	dammed [1] -	decades [1] -	2759:3; 2781:22
cross-hairs [1] -	2610:6; 2612:7;	2548:12	2642:21	delay [2] - 2616:13
2626:21	2613:1; 2635:22;	dams [12] - 2571:9,	December [5] - 2508:9; 2582:8;	delayed [1] - 2642:21
crosshairs [1] -	2643:14	11; 2579:13; 2652:1;		delays [1] - 2783:17
2803:3	custodians [1] -	2691:9; 2698:14, 21;	2586:6; 2729:1	delegated [1] -
Crossing [2] -	2745:20	2700:15; 2742:1,	decent [1] - 2493:15	2530:24
2661:5; 2788:19	customers [2] -	12-13; 2744:18	decide [1] - 2710:23	deliberation [1] -
Crown [14] - 2515:12; 2522:7;	2580:13; 2621:7	Dams [2] - 2698:16;	decimated [1] -	2795:1
	customers' [1] -	2743:19	2731:22	deliberations [1] -
2529:2; 2531:17;	2655:3	Dan [2] - 2587:6;	decision [55] -	2501:14
2533:7; 2538:17;	cut [7] - 2559:5;	2590:20	2502:21; 2503:10;	delineate [1] -
2546:22; 2666:8;	2573:19; 2681:3, 9;	dangerous [1] -	2506:3; 2509:2;	2512:15
2676:13, 15, 18, 22;	2690:4; 2734:14;	2746:17	2519:8, 14; 2520:3;	deliver [1] - 2510:14
2677:2; 2730:12	2800:23	Daniel [1] - 2492:9	2530:13, 15; 2531:2,	delivered [2] -

Т

Т

2516:18; 2703:13 delivering [2] - 2547:15; 2609:25 delivery [1] - 2494:8 Deltares [3] - 2700:4; 2737:4, 13 demand [3] - 2631:9; 2663:9; 2695:16 demonstrate [1] - 2696:4 demolished [1] - 2627:25 demonstrate [3] - 2585:4; 2625:16; 2767:16 demonstrated [13] - 2516:7, 13; 2534:18; 2574:13; 2589:23; 2592:19; 2606:20; 2627:20; 2767:18; 2764:11; 2772:5; 2774:11 demonstrates [4] - 2537:6; 2586:21; 2686:8; 2768:2 denial [1] - 2728:9 denied [2] - 2670:2; 2691:2 denying [1] - 2780:15 Department [2] - 2502:5; 2804:23 dependent [3] - 2649:23; 2739:6; 2768:1 deposite [2] - 2577:23; 2769:13; 2770:2 depression [1] - 2623:14 depth [3] - 2590:4; 2612:5; 2730:17 derail [1] - 22590:4; 2612:5; 2730:17 derail [1] - 22591:4; 2612:5; 2730:17 describe [3] - 2518:24; 2627:2; 2629:17 describe [3] - 2532:13; 2565:18; 2569:12; 2599:4; 2659:12; 2599:7; 2594:15; 2595:4 describing [1] - 2679:5	16; 2571:17, 19, 24; 2572:5, 10, 20; 2573:6, 10; 2578:1; 2584:23; 2591:17, 21; 2603:25; 2605:7, 12; 2612:2; 2614:14; 2615:13; 2618:20; 2620:17; 2624:5; 2625:24; 2626:3; 2633:3; 2644:24; 2645:20; 2647:11; 2648:1, 14; 2650:18, 20, 23-24; 2651:14, 24; 2652:6; 2653:19; 2685:23; 2696:21; 2700:18; 2707:9, 15, 18; 2707:9, 15, 18; 2707:9, 15, 18; 2707:9, 15, 18; 2707:9, 15, 18; 2709:17; 2716:16, 18; 2717:25; 2719:5, 8, 10-11, 14; 2720:10; 2721:9, 22; 2727:10; 2721:9, 22; 2727:10; 2728:24; 2736:25; 2737:9; 2740:11, 18; 2743:7, 13; 2744:7; 2746:3; 2748:14; 2749:22; 2750:1, 3-4; 2751:17; 2753:13; 2754:2; 2755:7; 2804:6 Design [4] - 2508:8; 2517:11; 2723:13; 2754:2; 2755:7; 2804:6 Designate [1] - 2765:25 designate [1] - 279:16 designate [1] - 279:16; 259:11, 2520:20; 2521:1; 2529:18; 2552:7; 2559:14; 2560:21; 2572:16; 2578:14; 2614:14; 2560:21; 2572:16; 2578:14; 2614:14; 2665:19; 2633:2; 2640:2, 5; 2648:15; 2657:12; 2706:5; 2712:8; 2749:23 designer [1] - 2698:7 designs [2] - 2584:13; 2749:20 desperate [1] - 2698:7 design [1] - 2698:7	2635:11: 2636:1; 2716:3; 2719:24; 2721:5; 2784:13; 2793:15 detailed [13] - 2513:7; 2517:7; 2520:4; 2523:3, 16; 2526:14: 2560:25; 2568:20; 2577:15; 2590:4; 2596:3; 2668:17; 2694:13 details [8] - 2521:23; 2570:25; 2676:21; 2697:1; 2701:12, 14; 2774:7 detected [1] - 2601:20 detection [1] - 2594:25 detention [1] - 2594:25 determination [8] - 2501:13; 2503:9, 18; 2506:6; 2634:8; 2666:8; 2667:19; 2664:8; 2667:19; 2664:8; 2677:19; 2664:8; 2710:19; 2774:7 determinet [12] - 2505:20; 2520:6; 2585:22; 2591:11; 2664:8; 2710:19; 2774:4 determined [12] - 2505:20; 2520:6; 2585:22; 2591:20; 2664:8; 2710:19; 2714:20; 2718:13; 2768:22; 2777:4 determined [12] - 2556:20, 22; 2557:5, 14; 2569:21; 2583:14; 2586:23; 2591:20; 2616:21; 2667:18; 2741:24; 2790:17 determines [1] - 2793:14 determines [1] - 2754:7 detour [2] - 2713:18; 2722:11 detoured [2] - 2621:6; 2725:18 detriments [1] - 2754:7 devastating [11] - 2754:7 devastating [11] -	2536:15; 2546:8, 25; 2556:7, 10; 2557:22, 25; 2558:2, 5, 8, 18-19; 2574:22; 2580:17; 2588:2; 2589:15; 2603:8; 2605:25; 2607:16, 18; 2648:14; 2672:13, 19; 2673:2, 18; 2674:18, 23; 2676:5; 2677:23; 2694:17; 2695:19; 2708:7; 2712:2; 2734:8; 2760:22; 2788:12; 2794:1; 2795:15, 22; 2796:24; 2797:3 developments [4] - 2605:22; 2765:22; 2788:19; 2793:24 device [1] - 2585:17 devoid [1] - 2598:23 dewatering [5] - 2565:18; 2566:12, 23; 2567:1; 2743:15 DFO [8] - 2509:5, 20, 24; 2585:14; 2586:7, 15, 23 dialogue [1] - 2689:1 diametrically [1] - 2709:4 differences [3] - 2590:7; 2598:17; 2737:22 different [12] - 2585:23; 2639:19, 24; 2785:3; 2793:11; 2795:5; 2802:3 differig [1] - 2698:25 difficult [4] - 2622:8; 2649:11; 27706:5; 2805:21 digested [1] - 2644:22 difference [1] - 2644:22 difference [1] - 2698:25 difficult [4] - 2622:8; 2649:11; 27706:5; 2805:21 dig [3] - 2761:24; 2802:17; 2804:11 digested [1] - 2644:22 difference [1] - 2605:9 difficult [4] - 2708:2 difficult [4] - 2622:8; 2649:11; 27706:5; 2805:21 dig [3] - 2761:24; 2802:17; 2804:11 digested [1] - 2644:22 diifference [1] - 2644:22 diifference [1] - 2655:24 difficult [1] - 2749:9; 2776:6 dimensions [1] - 2605:9 diminish [1] - 2708:2 diminish [1] - 2708:2 diminish [1] - 2708:2	2546:11: 2780:7 Directive [8] - 2561:12: 2568:25; 2569:18: 2570:11; 2571:6: 2741:5; 2742:22: 2745:10 directive [1] - 2569:21 directly [14] - 2502:17: 2513:4; 2522:20; 2607:24; 2622:21: 2669:15; 2706:11, 18; 2709:15; 2711:2; 2729:21; 2730:16; 2731:1; 2781:8 director [9] - 2504:16; 2507:24; 2560:2; 2565:10; 2567:11; 2571:6 directors [1] - 2531:4 disagree [3] - 2597:25; 2791:6; 2797:23 disagreed [1] - 2599:16 disagreement [2] - 2562:15; 23; 2565:17; 2611:8; 2627:4; 2747:18 discharge [7] - 2562:15; 23; 2563:3; 2740:5; 10, 13; 2744:6 disclosed [4] - 2713:18; 2714:25; 2796:17 discount [1] - 2731:24 discount [1] - 2793:8 discount [2] - 2713:10; 2797:18 Discovery [4] - 258:24 discredit [1] - 258:24 discredit [1] - 258:24 discredit [1] - 258:24 discredit [1] - 268:24 discredit [1] - 268:24 discredit [1] - 269:13 discredit [1] - 2793:8 discredit [
2532:3; 2565:18; 2569:12; 2592:7; 2594:15; 2652:13 describes [2] - 2583:15; 2595:4 describing [1] -	2584:13; 2749:20 desperate [1] - 2698:7 despite [12] - 2502:4; 2503:24; 2580:9;	2722:11 detoured [2] - 2621:6; 2725:18 detriments [1] - 2754:7	2749.9; 2776:6 dimensions [1] - 2605:9 diminish [1] - 2708:2 diminishing [1] -	2589:19 discrepancies [1] - 2588:24 discrepancy [1] - 2761:13
description [2] - 2547:22; 2676:20 descriptions [1] - 2780:19 desecration [1] - 2668:23 design [121] -	2650:25; 2710:8; 2715:25; 2720:15; 2729:25; 2782:1; 2793:8 destinations [1] - 2788:8 destroy [2] - 2669:7;	2510:4; 2614:8; 2617:20; 2618:25; 2626:23; 2628:18; 2631:23; 2632:20; 2639:25; 2644:24; 2646:5 devastation [4] -	DiPaolo [1] - 2784:4 direct [19] - 2510:8; 2513:15; 2550:18; 2557:19; 2588:7; 2603:12; 2624:7; 2630:8; 2652:20; 2698:10; 2716:3;	discret[i] 2013.0 discret[i] 2013.0 2557:23 discuss [7] - 2499:22; 2535:15; 2545:22; 2580:3; 2587:1; 2671:25; 2732:13
2507:25; 2508:4; 2512:5; 2516:20; 2517:1, 4-5, 7; 2522:23; 2523:16, 20; 2547:17, 20; 2549:10; 2551:12, 14; 2552:11, 18; 2554:1, 16-17; 2556:17; 2558:22; 2559:8, 20, 22, 25; 2560:1, 8, 11; 2562:10, 13, 23; 2563:8, 12, 21, 25;	2736:6 destroyed [1] - 2693:14 destroying [1] - 2802:13 destruction [6] - 2509:9; 2542:3; 2668:20; 2736:7, 10; 2780:14 destructive [1] - 2557:5 detail [12] - 2525:11;	devastation [4] - 2611:9; 2627:5, 9, 17 develop [3] - 2676:17; 2735:3; 2777:6 developed [6] - 2520:14; 2533:18; 2534:6; 2545:5; 2607:20; 2726:5 developing [2] - 2532:20; 2615:11 Development [2] - 2505:10; 2630:17	2096:10; 2716:3; 2719:2, 15, 25; 2720:11, 18, 22; 2726:23; 2772:16 directed [6] - 2528:25; 2529:23; 2530:11; 2550:8; 2553:8; 2611:15 direction [5] - 2502:20; 2503:24; 2519:19; 2529:19; 2589:8 Direction [1] -	discussed [22] - 2502:2; 2521:19; 2525:11; 2597:12, 17; 2603:4; 2653:1, 23; 2686:4; 2700:8, 12; 2709:18; 2715:5; 2727:2; 2728:18; 2729:24; 2740:1; 2744:12; 2782:5; 2792:17; 2793:3; 2801:2 discussing [3] -
2565:4, 12, 23; 2566:7, 15; 2567:13,	2561:12; 2583:15; 2595:14; 2617:25;	development [49] - 2532:16; 2533:21;	2532:17 directions [2] -	2529:5; 2561:2; 2581:2

T

13, 18, 20, 24;2550:5; 2801:12597:11, 23; 2598:3,2664:25; 2684:5;2537:9, 14; 2666:4;2551:1, 3, 5-6, 8, 16,double-gated [2] -8, 18, 20, 25; 2599:7,2688:5, 14; 2694:21;2667:2; 2763:718, 21; 2553:9, 14;2549:23; 2550:515, 20, 25; 2600:4;2698:3; 2712:6;dwellings [1] -	discussion [8] - 2545:6; 2591:24; 2599:22; 2613:15; 2650:15; 2656:23; 2700:1; 2736:14 discussions [5] - 2508:3; 2509:24; 2545:8; 2585:13; 2729:5 diseases [2] - 2623:13; 2776:18 disheartening [1] - 2748:1 dismissive [3] - 2642:19; 2729:9; 2804:16 dismissive [1] - 2723:24 disorder [1] - 2623:15 dispersal [2] - 2777:4, 18 dispersion [2] - 2768:11; 2770:23 displayed [1] - 2589:16 dispersion [2] - 2768:11; 2770:23 displayed [1] - 2763:16 dispute [7] - 2562:7; 2584:25; 2631:20; 2632:10, 16; 2685:18; 2744:23 dispute [7] - 2562:7; 2584:25; 2631:20; 2632:10, 16; 2685:18; 2744:23 dispute [1] - 2766:16; 2590:4, 8; 2779:14 disputes [1] - 2665:22 disregard [1] - 2708:14 disrespectful [1] - 2665:22 distant [1] - 2666:17 distinct [1] - 2749:11 distinct [1] - 2603:20 distant [1] - 2666:17 distinbuted [2] - 2494:25; 2787:2 distant [1] - 2666:17 distinbuted [2] - 2494:25; 2787:2 distant [1] - 2666:17 distinct [1] - 2749:11 distinct [1] - 2766:16 District [1] - 2698:22 distributed [2] - 2494:25; 2787:2 disturb [2] - 2507:22; 2669:7 disturbance [3] - 2518:1; 2674:8; 2677:10 disturbance [3] - 2507:22; 2517:17; 2549:6, 15-16, 19-20; 2698:1 diversion [67] - 2507:22; 2517:17; 2549:6, 15-16, 19-20; 2549:1 diversion [67] - 2507:22; 2517:17; 2549:6, 15-16, 19-20; 2549:1 diversion [67] - 2507:22; 2517:17; 2549:6, 15-16, 19-20; 2549:1 diversion [67] - 2549:20; 2577:27; 2549:20;	2564:24; 2573:8; 2584:3; 2585:18; 2594:20; 2605:14; 2691:25; 2694:4; 2697:12; 2702:19; 2716:9; 2727:22; 2729:8; 2738:8; 2740:5, 11; 2742:5; 2744:13, 7; 2751:20; 2753:14; 2754:7, 22; 2777:25; 2792:13 Diversion [2] - 2691:14; 2710:3 diversions [1] - 2754:23 divert [3] - 2549:2; 2554:17; 2739:15 divertd [3] - 2710:4; 2720:16; 2751:21 diverting [1] - 2648:17 divided [1] - 2512:12 divisive [1] - 2723:12 Dixon [1] - 2702:13 document [19] - 2496:17; 2497:10; 2496:17; 2497:10; 2496:17; 2497:10; 2496:17; 2497:10; 2496:25; 2715:20; 2732:14; 2752:3; 2784:2; 2785:23; 2792:1; 2794:21; 2796:9 documentary [1] - 2708:9 documentary [1] - 2709:10 domary [2] - 2493:6; 2709:25; 27:25	2646:16; 2714:10; 2766:11 doubt [7] - 2614:6; 2620:19; 2633:19; 2643:9; 2703:18; 2704:9; 2724:20 doubtful [1] - 2781:3 Douglas [1] - 2492:22 down [21] - 2494:3, 7, 10; 2513:21; 2549:7; 2633:14; 2654:5, 19; 2668:10; 2706:25; 2707:12; 2708:25; 2727:12; 2708:25; 2727:12; 2708:25; 2727:12; 2708:25; 2727:12; 2734:23; 2735:1; 2745:3; 2748:5; 2752:19; 2782:24; 2800:13, 20 downloaded [1] - 2721:16 downstream [65] - 2504:21; 2511:21, 244; 2515:22; 2516:11; 2518:17; 2547:24; 2550:14; 2553:12, 23; 2554:10; 2655:1; 2559:1; 2638:17; 2639:24; 2610:1, 14; 2619:4, 8, 18; 2620:2, 15; 2627:3, 2638:17; 2639:24; 2640:5; 2641:24; 2640:5; 2641:24; 2640:5; 2641:24; 2640:5; 2641:24; 2640:5; 2641:24; 2640:5; 2641:24; 2640:5; 2641:24; 2640:5; 2647:55; 2682:5; 2687:5, 16, 21; 2688:9; 2692:19; 2685:10; 2655:15; 2682:5; 2731:11; 2738:6, 11; 2739:4; 2725:5; 2731:11; 2738:6, 11; 2739:4; 2747:19; 2770:4; 2747:19; 2778:25; 2781:17; 2782:4 downstream's [1] - 2792:14 downstream's [1] - 2792:14 downstream's [1] - 2792:14; 2647:17; 2710:11; 2782:17; Dowsett [16] - 2555:3, 11, 15, 20; 2568:4; 2569:4, 7, 20; 2575:2; 2751:1, 14; 2676:14, 2724:22; 2765:22; 2770:1, 7; 2706:10; 14; 2707:4; 2708:4; 2737:2 Dowsett [16] - 2555:3, 11, 15, 20; 2568:4; 2569:4, 7, 20; 2575:12, 24; 2778:25; 2751:12, 24; 2778:25; 2751:14; 2621:18; 2631:4; 2647:17; 2772:14; 2778:24; 2772:16; 2778:25; 2771:16; 19 Dowsett [16] - 2555:3, 11, 15, 20; 2568:4; 2569:4, 7, 20; 2576:11, 14; 2576:14, 2772:2; 2775:2; 2755:11, 14; 2576:14, 2737:2; Dowsett [16] - 2555:3, 11, 15, 20; 2568:4; 2569:4, 7, 20; 2575:11, 14; 2576:14, 2555:3, 11, 15, 20; 2568:4; 2569:4, 7, 20; 2575:11, 14; 2576:14, 2774:22; 2765:22; 2775:11, 14; 2576:14, 2774:258:15; 25897:10; 2784:15; 25897:10; 2784:15	2603:11, 22; 2683:19; 2685:17; 2696:18; 2702:11; 2703:9; 2737:2; 2746:5; 2750:5; 2755:21; 2750:7; 2759:24; 2760:1; 2762:10; 2764:17; 2766:8, 13; 2767:1, 4, 14, 17, 21, 24; 2768:2, 7, 9; 2769:4, 6; 2770:7, 9, 17, 22; 2771:3, 7-8, 16, 19; 2772:5; 2775:3, 9; 2776:13, 15; 2775:3, 9; 2776:13, 15; 2778:5; 2782:11; Draft [5] - 2532:16; 2533:12; 2534:6; 2735:4; 2738:3 draft [20] - 2508:20, 24; 2534:9; 2535:8; 2536:21; 2544:17, 21; 2545:18, 20, 23; 2546:10, 18-19; 2582:2; 2584:6; 2594:12, 16; 2639:17; 2734:8; 2735:6 dragged [1] - 2783:15 drain [2] - 2552:19; 2645:25 drainage [3] - 2565:17; 2598:15; 2702:5 drained [1] - 2598:10; 2702:5 draining [2] - 2720:25; 2740:24 drains [2] - 2752:12; 2755:17 dramatic [2] - 2720:25; 27740:24 drains [2] - 2752:12; 2755:17 dramatic [2] - 270:25; 27740:24 drains [2] - 2752:12; 2755:17 dramatic [2] - 270:25; 2771:15 drawing [5] - 2767:20, 25; 2771:15 drawing [5] - 2513:21; 2698:10; 2783:4; 2802:1; 2805:2 drawn [3] - 2633:14; 2704:2; 2765:16 Drewry [5] - 2685:15; 2731:4; 2730:25; 2731:4;	2750:20; 2751:1; 2759:5; 2796:11 droughty [1] - 2656:12 dry [15] - 2552:24; 2575:21; 2587:21; 2594:14; 2603:20, 22; 2691:9; 2698:21; 2699:2; 2720:13; 2766:19; 2773:11; 2778:15, 21 dubious [1] - 2762:19 due [23] - 2504:21; 2513:5; 2564:4; 2603:24; 2630:8; 2649:15; 2687:2; 2721:5; 2722:17; 2725:19, 22; 2749:9; 2752:6; 2758:12; 2769:8; 2781:21; 2782:4; 2783:22; 2793:11 dump [1] - 2792:10 duration [5] - 2596:17, 24; 2600:22; 2601:22; 2655:10 during [90] - 2497:18; 2501:14; 2502:2; 2504:7, 24-25; 2513:2, 10; 2515:18; 2525:11; 2528:18, 24; 2538:8; 2544:2; 2547:2; 2548:1; 2551:14, 19; 2554:8; 2559:1; 2560:4; 2566:6; 2572:18; 2575:21; 2576:9; 2586:6; 2591:5; 2593:15; 2594:13; 2597:17; 2603:22; 2608:10; 2619:16; 2623:11, 17, 24; 2625:5; 2627:19; 2637:13; 2646:8; 2652:20; 2653:20; 2671:10; 2645:17; 2704:11, 15; 2706:15; 2708:3; 2714:23; 2719:20, 22; 2720:13; 2728:23; 2738:19; 2739:11; 2740:1; 2741:14, 18; 2742:3, 2741:24; 2743:24; 2744:13; 2759:25; 2763:17; 2704:14; 2742:3, 2741:14, 18; 2742:3, 2741:14, 19; 27596:10, 17, 22; 25997:1; 2598:9; 25999:9; 2600:
	2698:1	2760:12; 2780:8;	21; 2577:12, 21;	drought [22] -	2769:18; 2770:17;
	diversion [67] -	2799:16	2578:3, 6-7; 2587:10;	2514:7, 11; 2519:23;	2773:20; 2774:1, 4,
	2507:22; 2517:17;	Donna [2] - 2493:6;	2588:15; 2589:1, 6,	2520:15; 2577:19;	14-15; 2789:15, 19;
	2549:6, 15-16, 19-20;	2784:4	24; 2590:3, 6; 2591:1,	2591:8; 2632:25;	2790:6
	2550:2, 5, 7, 9, 11,	double [3] - 2549:23;	3; 2592:5, 17, 20;	2634:6; 2654:8;	duty [6] - 2531:16;
	13, 18, 20, 24;	2550:5; 2801:1	2597:11, 23; 2598:3,	2664:25; 2684:5;	2537:9, 14; 2666:4;
	2551:1, 3, 5-6, 8, 16,	double-gated [2] -	8, 18, 20, 25; 2599:7,	2688:5, 14; 2694:21;	2667:2; 2763:7

Т

Т

dynamics [1] - 2656:2	2492:2; 2493:13; 2612:13	2703:23; 2704:8 eight [7] - 2511:12,	2763:22; 2782:25 elevation [3] -	2743:24 enable [1] - 2671:22
Е	educated [1] -	2637:24; 2647:10;	2698:24	encompasses [1] -
2656:2 E eagerly [1] - 2687:18 earliest [1] - 2617:17 early [13] - 2498:18; 2516:25; 2523:10; 2530:10; 2579:4; 2586:8, 11, 14; 2594:25; 2617:13; 2734:10; 2751:15 earned [1] - 2766:23 earnest [1] - 2605:15 East [2] - 2699:14, 18 east [2] - 2552:1; 2801:13 Easter [1] - 2493:12 Eastern [1] - 2699:15 easy [3] - 2605:11; 2704:14; 2767:16 echo [1] - 2643:6 ecological [5] - 2507:5; 2606:5; 2665:9; 2758:11; 2760:11 ecologist [3] - 2599:11; 2602:22; 2770:13 ecologists [1] - 2603:10 ecology [5] - 2581:11, 16; 2583:20; 2595:13; 2699:1 Economic [3] - 2505:10; 2630:17; 2709:24 economic [54] - 2503:12; 2505:3, 22; 2506:7, 17; 2510:9, 25; 2615:18; 2616:2; 2619:25; 2620:10, 18; 2622:11, 14; 2643:6; 2522:12; 2607:1; 2611:17; 2613:25; 2614:8, 20, 25; 2615:18; 2616:2; 2637:6; 2639:3; 2640:1; 2641:9; 2642:2; 2625:15; 2626:6; 12; 2637:6; 2639:3; 2640:1; 2641:9; 2648:21; 2657:11; 2683:1, 8; 2694:10; 2710:11; 2711:4, 11; 2725:3; 2726:1 economically [1] - 2650:14	2612:13 Edson [1] - 2542:18 educated [1] - 2763:5 education [1] - 2765:24 effect [9] - 2505:19, 23; 2518:15; 2558:9; 2563:4; 2606:8; 2623:2; 2642:6; 2737:10 effective [19] - 2514:19; 2516:19; 2568:2; 2584:4; 2601:3; 2638:16; 2642:19; 2687:4, 12, 15-16, 20, 25; 2688:3; 2708:1; 2722:19; 2737:8, 16; 2771:20 effectively[5] - 2514:1; 2590:9; 2601:4; 2695:15; 2733:15 effectiveness[10] - 2599:8; 2651:5; 2674:10; 2688:2; 2729:16; 2770:8, 10, 18, 25; 2773:21 effects [54] - 2501:25; 2503:12; 2505:52; 2522:13; 2532:7; 2535:4, 10; 2536:19; 2540:10, 13; 2548:15; 2563:14; 2574:16; 2586:19, 244; 2574:16; 2586:19, 244; 2574:16; 2586:19, 244; 2574:26; 2667:7, 15, 259:6, 25; 2602:1; 2635:9; 2637:7; 2639:19; 2645:5, 12; 2647:25; 2667:7, 15, 22; 2668:14; 2674:12; 2679:8; 2688:16; 2693:3, 14; 2694:15; 2708:12; 2725:14 efficiencies [1] - 2643:10 efficiency [1] - 2599:12 efficient [3] - 2609:3; 2753:25; 2784:6 efficient [1] - 2515:15 effort [5] - 2530:6; 2535:3; 2583:10, 18; 2784:10 efforts [9] - 2522:17; 259:16; 2535:18;	eight [7] - 2511:12, 14; 2529:25; 2549:1; 2637:24; 2647:10; 2731:7 eight-year [1] - 2731:7 either [9] - 2498:22; 2513:11; 2678:25; 2687:1; 2705:17; 2714:22; 2732:25; 2758:14; 2787:3 elaborate [1] - 2616:15 Elbow [132] - 2502:23; 2504:12, 24; 2508:14; 2510:5, 16; 2511:14, 20; 2512:2, 5, 12, 16-17; 2513:17, 25; 2514:6, 10, 20; 2516:10; 2519:4; 2521:25; 2548:7, 10-11, 18, 23; 2549:3, 12, 23; 2550:17; 2551:23; 2552:16; 2554:20; 2578:3; 2577:6, 10; 2578:2; 2581:24; 2582:4, 13, 16, 25; 2585:8; 2572:9, 14, 17; 2551:23; 2635:16; 2584:24; 2285:4, 13, 16, 25; 2585:8; 2572:9, 14, 17; 2551:23; 2631:15, 21; 2621:14, 19-20; 2624:6; 2625:10; 2627:23; 2631:15, 21; 2632:11, 17; 2633:3; 2644:22; 2655:16; 2636:7; 2645:15, 25; 2646:12, 14; 2647:3; 2648:22; 2650:1, 11; 2652:16; 2655:10; 2627:23; 2631:15, 21; 2634:12; 14; 2647:3; 2648:22; 2650:1, 11; 2652:16; 2655:5, 8, 12, 21; 2661:23; 2664:15; 2665:4, 20; 2679:3; 2683:25; 2684:13; 2685:5; 2684:13; 2685:5; 2684:13; 2685:5; 2684:13; 2685:5; 2684:13; 2685:5; 2684:13; 2685:5; 2684:13; 2685:5; 2684:13; 2685:5; 2684:13; 2685:5; 2684:13; 2693:22; 2701:23; 2702:8, 12; 2701:23; 2702:8, 12; 2701:23; 2702:8, 12; 2701:23; 2702:8, 12; 2701:23; 2702:8, 12; 2709:8; 2715:4; 2718:5; 2720:16; 2723:13; 2752:9, 20; 2765:71; 2778:24; 2782:20; 2792:1; 2793:6 elder [1] - 2668:22 elder[1] - 2668:22	elevation [3] - 2646:1; 2656:17; 2698:24 elevations [2] - 2550:1, 23 eliminate [2] - 2647:23; 2652:18 eliminated [1] - 2648:2 eliminates [1] - 2548:14 Eliot [3] - 2604:13; 2605:1 elk [7] - 2604:21; 2605:12; 2735:12; 2803:7, 20, 23; 2804:12 elsewhere [1] - 2779:24 email [3] - 2525:14; 2526:14; 2628:19 emails [8] - 2523:1; 2526:16, 20, 23; 2627:1, 7; 2628:4 embankment [2] - 2706:12; 2716:9 emergencies [2] - 2569:9; 2623:3 emergency [49] - 2507:25; 2551:17, 19; 2562:5, 12; 2567:14, 22; 2568:2, 7, 16, 22; 2569:5, 9, 14; 2570:2, 5, 14-16; 2577:2, 13; 2627:10, 13, 16; 2563:8, 16, 25; 2565:5, 12; 2567:14, 22; 2568:2, 7, 16, 22; 2569:5, 9, 14; 2570:2, 5, 14-16; 2577:2, 13; 2621:10; 2623:5, 8; 2651:16; 2652:18-20, 24; 2706:19; 2716:14, 16; 2717:3; 2718:22; 2720:1; 2740:10, 12; 2743:18; 2744:6; 2745:6, 11, 17 emission [2] - 2777:18; 2774:14 emissions [20] - 2515:15; 2573:19; 2596:10, 17; 2602:1; 268:3; 2765:1; 276:11, 17; 2777:12; 2772:14, 17; 2777:12; 2772:44, 17; 27773:12; 2770:14; 2777:12; 2772:44, 17; 27773:12; 2777:45, 16 emotional [1] - 264:2; 2604:23; 2641:18; 2670:25 emphasize [3] - 2604:23; 2641:18; 2670:25 emphasize [3] - 2604:23; 2641:18; 2670:25 emphasize [3] - 254:617; 2553:17; 2754:25	enable [1] - 2671:22 enact [1] - 2623:5 encourages [1] - 2605:23 encourage [1] - 2501:13 encouraged [1] - 2545:17 encyclopedic [1] - 2784:12 End [1] - 2626:23 end [13] - 2524:16; 2535:22; 2540:5; 2550:22; 2580:14; 2597:16; 2613:10; 2656:9; 2680:20; 2752:19, 21; 2762:13; 2796:4 endeavour [1] - 2681:13 ended [1] - 2508:25 endure [2] - 2611:7; 2640:6 enforced [1] - 2797:7 engage [9] - 2504:7; 2525:8; 2527:15; 2528:14; 2529:25; 2531:12; 2546:24; 2672:19; 2676:4 engaged [6] - 2522:19; 2525:20; 2529:13; 2544:15; 2673:24; 2751:6 engagement [23] - 2517:2; 2522:7, 9, 11; 2523:2; 2525:18; 2531:23; 2533:13; 2535:20, 23; 2547:5; 2574:20; 2646:10; 2668:20; 2675:2; 2730:13 engineer [3] - 2591:4; 2748:12; 2762:24 engineer [1] - 2630:2 engineer [3] - 2591:4; 2748:12; 2762:24 engineer [1] - 2650:22 Engineering [8] - 2560:16; 2567:6, 20; 2568:4, 14; 2584:22; 2740:23; 2741:12 engineer [4] - 2559:20; 2560:15; 2567:19; 2672:0; 2577:15; 2600:10; 2646:10; 2750:6; 2802:14 engineers [4] - 2559:18; 2747:9; 2801:19; 21 enhance [9] -
2640:1; 2641:9; 2645:5, 16; 2646:9; 2648:21; 2657:11; 2683:1, 8; 2694:10; 2710:11; 2711:4, 11; 2725:3; 2726:1	efficiently [1] - 2786:14 effluent [1] - 2515:15 effort [5] - 2530:6; 2535:3; 2583:10, 18; 2784:10	2718:5; 2720:16; 2723:13; 2752:9, 20; 2765:17; 2778:24; 2782:20; 2792:1; 2793:6 elder [1] - 2668:22	emphasis [1] - 2684:2 emphasize [3] - 2604:23; 2641:18; 2670:25 emphasizes [3] -	2567:19; 2572:20; 2577:15; 2600:10; 2646:10; 2750:6; 2802:14 engineers [4] - 2559:18; 2747:9;
2650:14 economics [1] - 2722:4 economy [3] - 2513:8; 2629:24;	2529:16; 2535:18; 2573:19; 2602:24; 2609:2; 2629:9; 2643:7; 2646:23 EIA [29] - 2502:10;	elderly [1] - 2766:6 elders [5] - 2538:8, 17; 2539:7; 2544:8; 2668:16 Elders [1] - 2798:24 elected [1] - 2522:21	2754:25 emphatically [1] - 2657:2 employ [1] - 2777:19 employees [4] -	enhance [9] - 2533:2; 2623:8; 2669:12; 2690:2, 24; 2711:5; 2751:8; 2762:14
2633:8 Ecoregion [1] - 2699:16 ecosystem [3] - 2583:25; 2606:6; 2698:23 Eden [1] - 2672:11 Edge [3] - 2765:18;	2506:25; 2507:8; 2511:25; 2513:9; 2518:23; 2521:22; 2524:3; 2530:15; 2535:11, 17; 2536:13; 2538:4; 2540:11; 2541:19; 2549:13; 2552:22, 24; 2553:25;	electrical [2] - 2629:4; 2754:10 elegant [2] - 2549:11; 2763:1 elementary [1] - 2788:15 Elementary [1] - 2765:17	2631:1; 2672:9; 2777:16; 2800:15 employing [1] - 2788:8 employment [4] - 2513:2, 8; 2534:4; 2711:3 emptively [1] - 2771:21	enhanced [2] - 2521:10; 2669:4 enhancement [1] - 2545:15 Enhancement [1] - 2506:23 enjoyable [1] - 2493:11
2788:16, 20 edge [1] - 2770:1 Edmonton [3] -	2574:9; 2581:12, 15; 2583:23; 2587:16; 2599:22; 2661:20;	elements [6] - 2551:3; 2647:8; 2649:14; 2746:3;	empty [4] - 2565:2; 2697:6; 2742:13;	ENMAX [1] - 2621:7 enquiry [2] - 2610:19; 2636:18

Т

16

NRCB 1701, Volume 10, April 6, 2021

ensure [18] - 2508:1; 2516:17; 2533:13; 2535:19; 2540:25; 2544:25; 2558:23; 2596:6; 2602:25; 2608:19; 2623:9; 2642:12; 2763:7; 2777:23; 2778:22; 2780:11; 2792:23; 2796:21 ensuring [2] - 2535:8; 2763:6 entails [1] - 2652:1 enter [7] - 2550:9; 2659:11; 2660:7, 10; 2732:25; 2787:19; 2806:7 entered [5] - 2555:24; 2621:24; 2659:23; 2787:1; 2797:1 entering [7] - 2550:12; 2564:1;	12, 16, 21; 2607:2, 17; 2611:18; 2614:8, 20; 2615:1; 2616:2; 2619:25; 2620:18; 2622:6; 2635:15; 2636:6, 25; 2637:7; 2638:9; 2639:4, 17, 19; 2640:1; 2641:9; 2648:21; 2667:21; 2674:9; 2683:2, 9; 2687:2; 2693:1, 11, 13; 2694:9; 2702:9; 2703:20, 22; 2704:19; 2715:2 Environmental [2] - 2506:22; 2508:18 environmental [3] - 2506:22; 2703:12; 2779:11 envy[1] - 2800:16 equal [5] - 2555:5; 2618:22; 2631:17; 2634:11; 2731:24	2614:18 estimate [10] - 2573:2; 2624:11; 2626:2; 2716:1; 2719:3; 2754:14, 16; 2759:22; 2801:1 estimated [14] - 2511:25; 2516:24; 2573:3; 2623:22; 2683:3; 2696:18; 2719:16; 2720:9, 21; 2721:2, 9; 2723:4, 8; 2796:4 estimates [10] - 2516:16, 25; 2517:14; 2598:25; 2623:21, 25; 2694:5; 2717:6 estimating [1] - 2576:22 et [2] - 2693:16; 2780:25 etcetera [1] -	2671:13 everyday[1] - 2724:15 evidence [155] - 2496:2; 2500:16, 18, 25; 2501:17; 2510:23; 2512:21; 2513:16, 18; 2514:9, 18; 2515:4; 2518:3; 2523:6, 10; 2525:24; 2528:4; 2530:4; 2536:3; 2555:9, 18-19, 24; 2560:8, 12, 15; 2561:2; 2564:5; 2567:5, 9, 16, 21, 24; 2570:4; 2571:15; 2572:12; 2574:18; 2575:16; 2578:12, 19; 2579:20; 2580:15, 23; 2586:17; 2589:10; 2590:19; 2591:1; 2597:3, 17; 2599:7;	2713:24; 2727:17; 2742:21; 2755:24; 2756:2, 6, 10; 2775:9 examine [1] - 2712:15 examined [5] - 2560:9; 2593:22; 2654:12; 2727:5; 2800:11 examining [2] - 2576:6; 2587:17 example [18] - 2517:10; 2558:11; 2593:5; 2598:8; 2603:14; 2618:7; 2621:1, 23; 2629:3; 2630:11; 2634:23; 2648:5; 2650:23; 2648:5; 2650:23; 2668:3, 9; 2750:3; 2761:13; 2782:21 examples [3] - 2620:25; 2739:14; 2754:9
2585:17; 2634:22;	equally (4) -	2773:15	2600:3, 6; 2602:7, 23;	excavated [1] -
2754:7; 2778:1, 7	2624:25; 2731:11;	evacuate [1] -	2603:13; 2604:16;	2777:24
enters [2] - 2551:16;	2765:12	2709:20	2605:17; 2606:23;	exceed [6] - 2548:23;
2553:20	equals [1] - 2700:9	evacuation [2] -	2611:19; 2614:9, 12,	2553:10; 2558:24;
entertain [1] -	equipment [5] -	2565:25; 2741:6	15; 2617:1, 9, 19;	2652:7; 2710:13;
2503:15	2570:24; 2629:5;	evacuations [3] -	2619:22, 24; 2620:3,	2711:14
enthusiastically [2] -	2777:11, 13; 2789:21	2621:9; 2623:6;	21, 23; 2622:8, 13;	exceedance [3] -
2725:22	equivalent [7] -	2630:10	2626:11; 2628:16, 20;	2600:15, 18, 21
entire [6] - 2499:12;	2554:22; 2614:14;	evaluate [3] -	2629:14; 2631:7;	exceedances [6] -
2645:17; 2679:3;	2618:21; 2633:3;	2583:6; 2594:13;	2633:24; 2634:19;	2597:14, 16, 21;
2709:5; 2751:21;	2679:1; 2715:9;	2800:19	2635:6; 2637:13, 24;	2601:1, 3; 2790:25
2779:17	2781:4	evaluation [4] -	2638:4; 2639:7;	except [2] - 2558:1;
entirely [4] - 2520:1;	Erisman [4] -	2710:11; 2711:12;	2644:19; 2645:7;	2737:25
2560:12; 2564:22;	2685:16; 2691:8;	2740:20; 2746:16	2646:7; 2650:18;	exception [3] -
2767:1	2736:5, 14	evasive [1] - 2756:2	2653:2; 2657:11;	2526:8; 2703:17;
entirely [1] - 2786:18	Eriton [1] - 2505:7	eve [1] - 2538:22	2661:16; 2662:17;	2747:20
entitled [3] -	Ermineskin [1] -	evening [2] - 2680:3;	2663:13; 2665:24;	exceptional [2] -
2517:21, 23, 25	2796:17	2807:13	2668:16; 2671:10;	2535:8; 2637:12
entrained [4] -	eroded [1] - 2742:6	event [53] - 2511:9;	2684:12; 2685:13;	exceptions [1] -
2585:6; 2601:14;	erosion [9] - 2622:3;	2512:22; 2513:10;	2686:1; 2698:13;	2501:24
2604:4; 2754:18	2646:18; 2715:12;	2514:3; 2565:17;	2704:6, 12; 2707:3;	excess [5] - 2549:3;
entrainment [4] -	2716:17; 2717:19;	2566:12; 2572:22;	2708:9; 2724:11;	2553:7, 11; 2742:23;
2585:11, 13; 2754:6,	2718:1, 7, 10;	2573:3, 5; 2577:9;	2737:1, 3; 2739:22;	2794:21
12	2769:18	2578:25; 2579:19;	2746:5; 2748:2;	excessive [1] -
entrance [1] - 2524:6	erroneous [2] -	2598:9; 2600:21;	2753:19; 2755:21;	2776:5
entries [2] - 2526:13;	2700:10; 2770:5	2619:11, 13; 2626:22;	2756:7, 14; 2758:2;	exchanged [1] -
2534:21	erroneously [1] -	2648:3, 6-7, 24;	2760:16; 2767:1, 4;	2799:25
entrusted [1] -	2588:23	2651:1, 6; 2652:19;	2768:1; 2770:7, 16;	excite [1] - 2690:6
2763:5	error [2] - 2564:13;	2654:7; 2655:13;	2773:4, 15-16, 24;	excluded [2] -
entry [2] - 2777:12,	2766:9	2670:3; 2671:7;	2774:3; 2776:23;	2718:11; 2735:8
14	errors [2] - 2687:2;	2699:4; 2707:8;	2781:17; 2782:6, 8;	excluding [1] -
envelope [1] -	2768:2	2709:1, 16-17;	2789:14, 16; 2792:7;	2722:24
2592:17	escalate [1] - 2801:8	2719:16; 2741:15;	2794:2, 18; 2795:8,	exclusive [4] -
environment [13] -	escalated [1] -	2742:3; 2746:9,	24; 2796:13, 16;	2633:17; 2794:17;
2505:24; 2507:21;	2800:21	21-22; 2749:21,	2797:13; 2799:4	2795:21; 2796:23
2621:23; 2645:6;	escalating [1] -	23-24; 2750:3, 11;	evidenced [3] -	excuse [1] - 2732:17
2655:15; 2682:11;	2748:14	2759:25; 2773:8;	2590:14; 2620:19;	executed [1] -
2693:8; 2725:12;	especially [7] -	2779:21; 2791:9;	2662:16	2802:18
2752:13; 2779:21;	2656:11; 2701:22;	2792:18; 2793:9;	evident [3] - 2618:2;	executive [1] -
2783:1; 2789:14	2716:13; 2717:3;	2804:6	2623:19; 2790:2	2504:15
Environment [16] -	2730:16; 2778:8;	events [37] -	evidentiary [1] -	exercise [9] -
2506:24; 2523:12, 23;	2784:2	2511:22; 2515:8;	2610:22	2531:18; 2533:2;
2530:16; 2546:23; 2671:13, 16; 2672:24; 2673:22; 2677:7, 14; 2678:11, 16; 2705:14; 2789:2, 7 environmental [61] - 2501:25; 2503:12; 2504:23; 2506:7, 17, 22; 2508:5, 17; 2510:25; 2522:13; 2524:14; 2548:15; 2574:14, 16, 19; 2581:7; 2583:6; 2585:22; 2595:23, 25; 2599:13, 24; 2606:9,	essence [3] - 2598:4; 2642:12; 2794:10 essential [2] - 2668:7; 2792:3 essentially [5] - 2547:22; 2656:5; 2724:4; 2734:23; 2787:11 establish [3] - 2590:13; 2618:4; 2622:9 established [4] - 2591:2, 21; 2617:17; 2621:25 establishing [1] -	2572:25; 2576:22; 2577:5; 2578:4, 9; 2579:12; 2596:24; 2598:7, 12; 2600:25; 2603:22; 2615:13, 16; 2618:20; 2619:16; 2620:9; 2645:13; 2647:25; 2652:17; 2654:5; 2674:8; 2686:24; 2688:10; 2692:17; 2723:8; 2746:16; 2748:18; 2746:16; 2748:18; 2751:15; 2773:14, 17; 2783:2; 2791:13 eventual (1) -	evolution [1] - 2517:6 exact [3] - 2794:22; 2795:13; 2803:12 exactly [1] - 2563:6 exam [1] - 2686:4 examination [30] - 2526:19; 2536:9; 2555:20, 23; 2560:13; 2566:8; 2579:19; 2585:25; 2587:3, 8; 2588:8, 16, 20; 2591:1, 3, 5; 2592:20; 2599:21; 2702:1; 2706:8; 2708:4;	2536:25; 2537:3; 2577:7; 2668:9; 2669:5, 11; 2732:4 Exhibit (114] - 2495:4; 2496:10; 2500:13, 15, 17; 2501:8; 2536:8; 2542:11; 2560:18; 2570:10; 2581:15, 19; 2582:7, 17; 2590:16; 2594:16; 2620:22; 2659:13, 24; 2660:10; 2684:21; 2685:11; 2686:6, 12; 2693:6; 2697:20; 2700:2;

2701:14, 18; 2703:5, 10, 14; 2705:2, 11; 2706:15; 2707:6; 2708:20; 2709:19; 2713:12-14, 20, 22; 2714:5, 12; 2715:5, 8, 24; 2716:8, 15; 2717:8, 10, 12, 19; 2718:9, 12, 15; 2719:1; 2721:25 2722:10; 2723:2 2728:11; 2729:2, 12; 2730:3; 2736:17; 2737:3; 2738:4; 2739:10, 16, 18; 2743 1 2744 25 2745:10, 13; 2752:3; 2756:12; 2757:21; 2764:22: 2769:19: 2774:21; 2775:10; 2782:10; 2785:8, 13; 2787:1, 6; 2789:10, 16, 25; 2790:20; 2792:2, 8-9; 2793:1, 5, 25; 2794:4, 9, 17, 19; 2795:7, 10; 2796:6, 9, 13, 21, 24; 2797.1 EXHIBIT [10] -2495:5, 20; 2496:13; 2659:17; 2660:8, 13; 2785:10; 2786:23; 2787:20; 2806:22 exhibit [9] - 2496:3; 2497:19; 2498:17; 2542:20; 2708:8; 2732:23; 2785:12; 2786:18, 22 exhibited [1] -2501:7 Exhibits [3] - 2513:8; 2530:8; 2581:17 exhibits [5] -2494:16; 2496:19; 2500:8; 2659:11; 2686.6 **exist** [5] - 2577:8; 2631:19; 2639:10; 2695:11; 2763:20 existed [2] 2600:16; 2703:15 existence [2] · 2597:15; 2654:18 existing [11] -2533:4; 2558:2, 19; 2602:8; 2669:7; 2692:7, 9; 2705:4; 2708:12, 17; 2749:12 exists [2] - 2500:3; 2794.14 exit [2] - 2604:4; 2777:15 expanded [1] -2661:21 Expanded [1] -2727:23 expansion [1] -2711:17 expect [6] - 2496:18; 2497:11; 2601:13; 2699:1; 2804:3; 2807:4 expectation [1] -2629.6 expectations [2] -2522:10: 2527:9 expected [20] -2511:14; 2575:6; 2577:25; 2579:11; 2602:23; 2604:17;

2622:20; 2655:9; 2679:9; 2702:23; 2721:4, 22; 2735:15; 2737:17, 21; 2742:24; 2761:25; 2771:18, 22; 2772:25 expects [1] - 2751:2 expenditure [3] -2503:20; 2637:9; 2755:18 expenditures [1] -2513:13 expense [3] 2515:24; 2517:24; 2747:22 expenses [1] -2512:9 expensive [3] -2703:12, 19; 2716:11 experience [16] -2534:16; 2561:6, 8; 2568:19; 2600:12; 2626:24; 2627:20, 22; 2691:11; 2725:11; 2744:18, 21-22; 2789:18, 20; 2793:7 experienced [8] -2515:16; 2559:23; 2603:10; 2617:5; 2625:5; 2668:19; 2706.13.2746.9 experiences [6] -2538:8; 2610:17; 2628:2; 2632:21; 2790:9 experiencing [2] -2612:11; 2795.6 experimental [1] -2698:8 expert [13] - 2567:15, 20; 2576:14; 2597:5, 23; 2603:11; 2604:13; 2769:6, 17; 2770:14, 22; 2779:8; 2784:7 Expert [1] - 2698:17 expertise [4] -2559:19; 2587:12; 2599:3.15 experts [7] 2500:16; 2575:4; 2586:17; 2595:12; 2597:25; 2705:15; 2729:6 explain [1] - 2767:15 explained [9] -2512:11; 2513:18; 2522:12; 2527:7; 2541:10; 2570:10; 2579:10; 2600:17; 2707.6 explains [1] - 2528:2 explanations [1] -2762:20 explicitly [1] -2684:25 exploratory [1] -2757:7 explored [2] -2700:12; 2748:9 explosive [1] -2625:11 exposed [7] 2601:10; 2616:14; 2765:8; 2766:2, 4; 2770:4; 2774:18 exposure [4] -2623:13; 2641:4; 2685:4; 2772:25 express [2] - 2528:9; 2533:14

expressed [10] -2505:6; 2522:18; 2546:6, 14; 2562:15; 2569:10; 2596:9; 2681:21; 2709:11; 2711:8 expressing [1] -2630:20 expression [1] -2539:5 expressly [1] -2662:23 Expropriation [1] -2517 22 expropriation [1] -2796.19 extend [2] - 2588:1; 2593:14 extended [5] · 2544:5; 2612:22; 2613:7; 2751:1; 2759:5 extends [2] 2761:17; 2789:21 extension [1] -2560.8 extensive [14] · 2507:10; 2510:24; 2520:9; 2522:16; 2534:16; 2545:8, 12; 2574:10; 2587:19; 2589:7; 2647:10; 2727:17; 2728:15; 2755.24 extensively [3] 2560:3; 2654:12; 2727:5 **extent** [7] - 2538:5; 2561:18; 2572:14; 2667:15; 2681:18; 2710:8; 2711:10 extirpated [2] -2693:4; 2755:13 extra [1] - 2784:16 extracted [1] -2542:23 extracts [1] - 2536:6 extraordinary [1] -2609.2extrapolation [1] -2576:23 **extreme** [18] 2504:25; 2511:22; 2559:12; 2571:14; 2578:9; 2635:17; 2636:8; 2645:12; 2651:19, 22; 2652:1, 7; 2686:23; 2743:25; 2744:9: 2747:7: 2750:12; 2760:24 extremely [3] 2666:22; 2724:16; 2781:3 eyes [1] - 2559:25 F **face** [4] - 2628:16; 2659:8; 2699:18; 2741.11 faces [1] - 2646:13 facilitate [6] -2539:1; 2545:16; 2602:25; 2605:8; 2608:7; 2676:11 facilitating [1] -2539 19 facilitation [3] 2714:17; 2722:12, 22 facilities [6] -

2555:14; 2700:5; 2738:14, 16, 24; 2765.21 facility [7] - 2514:1; 2515:15; 2559:12; 2570:25; 2571:14; 2638:25; 2694:6 facing [2] - 2657:18; 2670:17 fact [54] - 2494:6, 9; 2516:13; 2525:16; 2526:16; 2532:1; 2536:8; 2541:12 2559:13; 2562:25; 2564:23; 2569:2; 2570:8; 2572:8; 2579:1, 12; 2584:5; 2586:2; 2589:4, 17; 2590:1: 2596:15: 2603:24; 2605:4; 2620:14; 2625:24; 2637:15, 18; 2669:6; 2689:3, 6, 24; 2704:7; 2705:4; 2711:20; 2715:25; 2727:13; 2748:7, 18; 2750:14; 2753:24; 2757:12; 2761:14; 2762:8; 2765:13; 2769:10; 2772:13; 2773:12; 2779:13; 2780:8; 2802:15; 2803:4; 2806:25; 2807:5 facto [1] - 2662:15 factor [10] - 2573:7, 23; 2592:4, 12, 14; 2619:6; 2624:16; 2640:3; 2680:25; 2780:15 factors [6] - 2573:11; 2587:22; 2591:20; 2599:14; 2649:11; 2736:4 factual [9] - 2588:21; 2767:1, 14; 2768:11, 15; 2769:10; 2772:1; 2773:24; 2774:10 fail [2] - 2551:21; 2744:3 failed [5] - 2577:12; 2625:10; 2698:10; 2727:24; 2758:23 **failing** [1] - 2743:6 **fails** [4] - 2694:16; 2695:6; 2743:12 failure [13] - 2504:25; 2564:16; 2635:18; 2636:8; 2652:5, 11; 2653:25; 2709:16, 22; 2740:25; 2745:9; 2748:15; 2762:9 fair [6] - 2517:25; 2609:5; 2652:5; 2653:24; 2731:1; 2786:15 fairly [5] - 2517:22; 2561:10, 25; 2605:18; 2632:3 fairness [1] -2618:14 **faith** [3] - 2525:21; 2528:11; 2805:10 **fall** [6] - 2521:12; 2543:11; 2738:4; 2745:24; 2760:19; 2795.2 falls [2] - 2567:11; 2783:17 Falls [3] - 2582:4, 16, 25

false [1] - 2746:19 falsely [1] - 2702:3 familiar [4] 2599:21; 2651:23; 2746:24; 2806:2 families [4] - 2724:1; 2725:10; 2732:6, 9 family [6] - 2627:11, 21; 2724:4; 2731:20; 2803:1 far [12] - 2512:7 2579:13; 2580:13; 2584:5; 2590:12; 2625:20; 2650:3; 2652:12: 2700:23: 2701:4; 2748:5; 2753:24 far-reaching [1] -2512.7 fashion [3] 2785:24; 2787:12; 2788:3 **fast** [2] - 2593:6; 2737:15 faster [2] - 2703:18; 2752:12 fastest [1] - 2557:4 fatalities [4] · 2511:1; 2622:21: 2650:6; 2709:22 fault [2] - 2747:4; 2783.13faults [1] - 2772:5 favored [1] - 2586:15 favour [5] - 2586:8; 2620:11; 2624:23; 2631:11; 2641:16 favourable [4] -2584:10; 2721:24; 2767:23: 2771:16 favoured [2] 2600:4; 2615:2 favours [3] -2615:19; 2616:9; 2639.5 fear [1] - 2628:8 fears [1] - 2764:20 feasibility [4] · 2727:13; 2728:19, 21, 25 feasible [2] 2603:24; 2754:23 **feature** [3] - 2548:19; 2550:21; 2653:18 features [6] - 2674:4; 2675:5, 8, 11, 13; 2757:16 February [3] -2506:24; 2794:18, 24 federal [15] - 2509:2, 7, 12, 18; 2524:14; 2529:19; 2537:8; 2573:14; 2607:20; 2636:23: 2637:2: 2638:2; 2788:11; 2802:1; 2804:17 feedback [9] -2522:24; 2532:8; 2537:3; 2540:15; 2544:4, 20; 2717:23 Feist [2] - 2618:7; 2685:15 **felt** [3] - 2628:9; 2629:18; 2649:16 fence [1] - 2545:13 fencing [1] - 2545:13 Fennell [16] -2576:14; 2578:7; 2587:10; 2588:15; 2589:24; 2590:3, 6;

2591:1, 3; 2592:20; 2683:19; 2728:7; 2750:5; 2756:7; 2759:24; 2762:10 Fennell's [7]- 2589:1, 6; 2592:5, 17; 2746:5; 2755:21; 2760:1 fescue [1] - 2780:25 few [14] - 2494:11; 2495:24; 2501:23; 2547:21; 2607:14; 2620:25; 2661:17; 2681:10; 2695:14; 2705:4; 2733:17; 2785:16; 2800:1; 2804:24 fewer [1] - 2606:15 FFC [8] - 2510:24; 2610:13, 24; 2611:11; 2659:18; 2660:9 FFC's [1] - 2626:25 field [8] - 2544:9; 2555:12; 2583:20; 2731:25; 2754:10; 2758:9; 2759:10, 17 fieldwork [9] - 2517:5; 2541:13; 2672:8, 16; 2673:6, 15; 2674:2, 17; 2675:4 Fifteen [1] - 2630:15 fifth [1] - 2696:5 fighter [1] - 2690:16 figure [1] - 2590:16 figure [1] - 2590:16 figure [2] - 2721:25; 2756:19 filed [7] - 2494:15; 2500:9; 2502:10; 2515:2; 2560:17; 2665:21; 2728:13 filling [2] - 2535:11; 2660:22 fill [9] - 2696:18; 2726:7; 2741:23, 25; 2776:13 filled [5] - 2696:17; 2698:2; 2742:14; 2778:13; 2759:25 filling [1] - 2719:22 filled [5] - 2696:17; 2698:2; 2742:14; 2778:13; 2759:25 filling [1] - 2719:22 fill [9] - 2742:16 filter [5] - 2603:16, 23; 2778:13, 16 filtration [5] - 2603:16; 2604:1, 5; 2792:12, 21 FINAL [7] - 2496:13; 2787:20; 2806:22; final [57] - 2494:3; 2496:1, 22; 2499:14; 2506:22; 2499:14; 2506:22; 2499:14; 2506:22; 2499:14; 2506:22; 2499:14; 2506:22; 2499:14; 2506:22; 2499:14; 2506:22; 2499:14; 2506:22; 2506:19	2767:13; 2768:5; 2769:9; 2770:6, 21; 2771:2, 6, 25; 2772:7; 2773:3, 19, 23; 2774:9; 2785:8, 13; 2786:19, 25; 2799:9; 2807:3, 7, 18 finalization [1] - 2533:15 finally [1] - 2509:1 Finally [1] - 2754:25 finally [24] - 2508:16; 2548:3; 2550:20; 2551:25; 2557:10; 2558:7; 2560:1; 2564:16; 2571:5, 16; 2573:24; 2579:15; 2580:19; 2584:6; 2595:3, 17; 2596:19; 2604:7; 2608:17; 2628:25; 2657:17; 2744:17; 2783:25; 2805:11 financial [10] - 2580:6; 2613:24; 2623:20; 2626:16; 2655:19; 2664:5; 2665:10; 2690:11; 2742:5; 2738:10; 2742:9; 2754:1; 2779:5 fine [5] - 2568:20; 2643:25; 2738:10; 2769:21; 2786:11 finer [1] - 2597:25 fines [1] - 2769:24 fingers [1] - 2714:14 finish [4] - 2493:22; 2681:13; 2773:21; 2775:16 Fiona [1] - 2492:10 fire [9] - 2632:25; 2634:6; 2664:25; 2688:6, 14; 2694:21; 2775:16 Fiona [1] - 2492:10 fires [1] - 2753:13 fires [1] - 2753:23; 2753:5 Fire [1] - 2622:24 fires [1] - 2753:1 fires [2] - 2763:1 fires [2] - 2763:1 fires [2] - 2763:1 fires [2	2661:1, 4: 2666:6, 18; 2672:21; 2676:7; 2732:4; 2734:13, 15, 17, 19, 22; 2735:9, 13, 22; 2771:24; 2796:17 firstly[5] - 2549:15; 2556:14; 2557:22; 2564:8; 2576:11 fish[7] - 2509:9, 25; 2532:11; 2546:2; 2575:2; 2581:4, 6, 11, 23-25; 2582:2, 9-10; 2583:7, 12, 16, 24; 2584:2, 4, 6, 14; 2585:1, 5-6, 11, 17, 19; 2586:17, 19-20, 24; 2603:18; 2604:4; 2622:2; 2646:20; 2674:10, 13; 2693:9; 2715:11, 13, 17; 270:22; 2754:6, 12, 17, 21-22, 24; 2755:8, 15 fisheries[1] - 2583:3 Fisheries[4] - 2509:5, 7, 19, 21 FISHES[1] - 2622:1 fishway[1] - 2584:5 fit[1] - 2590:15 Fitch [9] - 2492:16; 2496:2; 2499:8, 18; 2547:11; 2604:10; 2609:15; 2708:7; 2745:16 FITCH [2] - 2547:13; 2604:11 Fitch's [1] - 2643:7 five[13] - 2501:6; 2511:1; 2529:24; 2577:11; 2604:7; 2622:22; 2639:10; 2681:17; 2683:13; 2717:7, 16; 2788:22; 2794:6 fixed [5] - 2506:1, 5; 2527:23; 2614:21; 2682:17 flag [1] - 2733:14 flawed [6] - 2520:3; 2759:3; 2761:24; 2772:12, 22; 2783:21 fiawlesly[1] - 2799:23 Fleck [1] - 2492:13 flexibility [5] - 2649:13; 2651:5; 2652:10; 2654:19; 2655:12 Flood [8] - 2492:20; 2505:8; 2610:13; 2622:21; 2639:16; 2649:13; 2651:5; 2652:10; 2654:19; 2649:13; 2651:5; 2652:10; 2654:19; 2655:12	22; 2557:3, 11, 13, 16, 23; 2558:8, 13; 2559:2; 2562:23; 2563:18; 2564:11, 19; 2569:9; 2570:16; 2572:3-5, 8, 16, 23, 25; 2573:3, 5, 10, 22, 25; 2574:1; 2575:22; 2577:5, 9-10; 2578:1, 9, 25; 2579:19, 22; 2580:2; 2586:6; 2587:22; 2594:14; 2596:11, 18; 2602:24; 2603:22; 2604:3; 2606:4, 8, 11; 2610:16; 2611:22; 2613:23; 2614:7, 13-15; 2615:12, 16; 2616:14, 24-25; 2617:2, 6, 8-9, 14, 23; 2618:3, 6, 9, 12-13, 21-22, 24; 2619:1, 6-7, 9, 13, 16-17; 2620:1, 9, 17, 20; 2621:13, 16, 22, 25; 2622:2, 4, 22, 25; 2622:4, 22, 25; 2623:4, 17, 21, 24-25; 2624:4, 6, 12; 2625:5; 24-25; 2626:3, 9, 12, 18, 21; 2627:8, 10, 15, 21; 2628:2, 7-9, 11-12, 14, 21; 2629:2, 11, 18; 2630:2, 4, 7, 21; 2633:3, 14, 16, 25; 2633:3, 14, 16, 25; 2634:1, 6, 11, 24; 2645:12; 2646:23; 2645:12; 2646:23; 2645:12; 2646:23; 2645:14, 23, 2649:12, 18, 2650:10, 14, 24; 2645:12; 2646:23; 2645:14; 2649:12, 18, 2650:10, 14, 24; 2645:12; 2646:23; 2647:2, 6, 18, 21, 24; 2645:14, 23, 2649:12, 18; 2650:10, 14, 24; 2650:41, 6, 18; 2652:3, 15, 17, 21-22; 2654:15, 20; 2655:14; 2656:21; 2661:15, 18, 22; 2663:2; 2664:6, 24; 2670:11, 20; 2674:1, 8; 2678:1, 22, 2654:15, 20; 2655:14; 2656:21; 2661:15, 18, 22; 2663:2; 2664:6, 24; 2670:11, 20; 2674:1, 8; 2678:1, 22, 2654:15, 19, 25; 2688:, 11; 2689:9; 2692:17; 2694:19; 2704:15; 2705:24; 2706:6, 9, 13; 2707:5, 8-9, 13, 16-17, 21, 24; 2708:5, 19, 2709:17; 2713:3; 2718:24; 2719:2, 5-6, 8, 10-16, 20, 25; 27207, 10-11, 18, 20, 22; 2721:8, 11, 18, 20, 22; 2721:8, 11, 18, 20, 22; 2721:8, 11, 2723:8; 2718:24; 2719:2, 5-6, 8, 10-16, 20, 22; 2721:8, 11, 2723:8; 2718:24; 2719:2, 5-6, 8, 10-16, 20, 22; 2721:8, 11, 2723:8; 2721:8; 21, 2723:8; 27223:8; 2721; 2723:8; 27223:8; 2721; 2723:8; 27223:8; 27223; 2723:8; 27223; 2723:8;	2759:25; 2766:12; 2767:25; 2770:2, 20; 2771:15; 2772:10; 2774:13; 2776:13; 2778:9; 2781:13; 2782:17; 2783:2, 20, 22; 2792:18; 2793:7, 9; 2796:11; 2798:13, 15; 2804:6 flood-affected [1] - 2627:8 flood-impacted [1] - 2628:12 flood-proofing [2] - 2726:2; 2782:17 flooded [7] - 2572:14; 2617:16; 2621:4; 2630:6; 2707:7; 2708:25; 2769:21 flooding [44] - 2510:19; 2511:4; 2512:1, 17, 20; 2547:24; 2553:22; 2554:5, 13; 2555:16; 2558:16; 2572:12, 17; 2666:5; 2616:1; 2617:5, 20; 2618:20; 2621:4; 2642:7; 2646:4, 14; 2647:23; 2648:1; 2649:25; 2650:5, 8; 2652:25; 2650:5, 8; 2652:25; 2665:14; 2649:25; 2650:5, 14; 2649:25; 2650:5, 8; 2652:25; 2665:14; 2649:25; 2650:5, 8; 2652:25; 2665:14; 2649:25; 2650:5, 8; 2652:25; 2665:14; 2649:25; 2650:5, 8; 2752:22; 2782:20 floodproofed [2] - 2558:10, 20 floods [31] - 2548:7; 2571:21; 2572:1, 12; 2576:24; 2577:4, 20, 24; 2613:22; 26240:6; 2684:2, 10; 2651:8; 2652:9; 2653:21; 2684:511; 2685:20; 2688:5; 2702:24; 2719:16; 2748:22; 2749:10; 2758:16; 2783:1, 3 Floods [1] - 2743:19 floodwall [1] - 2782:19 floodwall [1] - 2782:19 floodwaler [7] - 2513:22; 2549:3; 2552:6, 12; 2553:20; 2592:25; 2752:16 floodwaler [7] - 2513:22; 2549:3; 2552:6, 12; 2553:20; 2592:25; 2752:16
filtration [5] -	2504:14; 2555:9;	2652:10; 2654:19;	2704:15; 2705:24;	floodwall [1] -
2603:16; 2604:1, 5;	2558:11; 2561:10;	2655:12	2706:6, 9, 13; 2707:5,	2782:19
2792:12, 21	2562:13; 2572:2;	Flood [8] - 2492:20;	8-9, 13, 16-17, 21, 24;	floodwall-type [1] -
FINAL [7] - 2496:13;	2592:7; 2613:16;	2505:8; 2610:13;	2708:5, 19; 2709:17;	2782:19
2659:17; 2660:13;	2616:19; 2622:16, 25;	2622:13; 2631:7;	2712:3, 10, 25;	floodwater [7] -
2785:10; 2786:23;	2634:12; 2681:23;	2644:10; 2698:16	2713:3; 2718:24;	2513:22; 2549:3;
2787:20; 2806:22	2686:5; 2692:14;	flood [401] - 2502:24;	2719:2, 5-6, 8, 10-16,	2552:6, 12; 2553:20;
final [57] - 2494:3;	2715:6; 2726:6;	2510:4, 8, 15; 2511:1,	20, 25; 2720:7, 10-11,	2592:25; 2752:16

2552:17; 2553:2, 4, 6-7, 12; 2554:1, 6, 19, 21; 2556:19; 2558:23; 2562:17; 2563:12; 2575:19, 22; 2576:1, 22; 2585:22; 2586:1; 2587:23; 2593:2, 16, 18; 2594:1; 2619:2, 11, 13; 2646:21; 2648:16; 2686:21, 25; 2687:10; 2691:11; 2696:15; 2697:11, 17; 2698:1; 2700:11, 15; 2701:3, 22; 2702:4, 7, 11, 22; 2705:24; 2738:2, 15, 17, 20, 24: 2739:10, 16; 2740:11; 2751:21; 2752:11; 2753:6; 2754:1, 23; 2778:18; 2793.11 flowing [1] - 2665:16 flows [20] - 2548:22; 2551:13; 2553:10; 2557:4, 17; 2559:1, 5; 2576:19; 2621:14; 2648:5; 2654:6; 2686:9; 2695:17 2699:23; 2702:15, 17-19 2709 17 2742.23 flushed [1] - 2758:16 flushing [1] -2758.14 fluvial [1] - 2653:22 focus [8] - 2503:11; 2536:10; 2637:5; 2694:18; 2704:25 2734:15, 19; 2747:21 focused [4] -2520:17; 2539:12; 2587:3; 2615:13 folks [8] - 2493:13; 2496:20, 25; 2618:12; 2689:13; 2805:21; 2806.2follow [8] - 2508:21; 2531:23; 2538:25; 2543:6; 2594:18; 2639:21; 2678:9; 2769.12 follow-up [4] 2508:21; 2531:23; 2639:21; 2678:9 followed [3] -2529:18; 2595:25; 2784:23 following [25] -2502:20; 2507:19; 2557:20; 2564:8; 2571:3: 2572:2: 2596:11, 15; 2604:24; 2628:7; 2642:15; 2652:3; 2653:15, 21; 2671:8, 18; 2692:4; 2724:17; 2737:5, 13; 2743:3; 2767:19; 2798:17; 2807:15 follows [2] -2574:16; 2740:16 foot [1] - 2706:18 Foothills [1] -2702:23 foothills [1] -2781.22 footprint [5] 2639:11; 2756:16; 2758:8; 2775:6; 2803.2 for-profit [1] - 2657:7

Force [1] - 2698:17 force [3] - 2528:13; 2570.11 forceable [1] -2671:9 forced [3] - 2630:14; 2642:17; 2791:10 forecast [1] - 2738:7 forecasting [2] · 2687:2; 2718:24 forecasts [6] -2548:24; 2629:20; 2737:18, 23, 25; 2744:15 foregoing [1] -2669.25 foremost [2] -2622:17; 2634:13 foreseeable [1] -2789.22 forest [2] - 2753:1, 5 forget [1] - 2637:23 forgive [1] - 2784:5 forgotten [1] -2630:4 **form** [3] - 2500:7; 2576:17; 2760:16 **formal** [3] - 2531:11; 2545:4; 2796:20 format [2] - 2535:1; 2545.3formation [1] -2756:18 formations [2] -2590:21; 2762:4 formula [2] - 2506:1; 2599:23 formula...the [1] -2682:18 Fort [1] - 2666:6 forum [1] - 2804:9 forward [12] -2523:18; 2535:23; 2574:9; 2645:22; 2662:17; 2727:15; 2745:19; 2748:20; 2750:14, 23; 2799:9; 2805:15 forwarded [2] -2509:2; 2565:7 foundation [1] -2588:21 founded [1] -2764:21 **four** [5] - 2524:20; 2568:5; 2696:18; 2719:17; 2732:13 fourth [2] - 2617:6; 2696:3 fractures [1] -2757.16 frame [7] - 2610:9; 2692:2, 12; 2694:17; 2754:15; 2758:22; 2775:23 framed [1] - 2681:24 framework [4] -2499:22; 2505:15; 2574:17; 2596:1 franchise [19] -2580:7, 12, 14, 18, 20; 2581:1; 2789:1; 2793:17; 2794:3, 17, 20, 24; 2795:1, 4, 21; 2796:20; 2797:16, 19 Frank [4] - 2656:8; 2663:6, 18; 2752:24 frankly [3] - 2579:20; 2597:2; 2750:17 Free [6] - 2492:20;

2505:8: 2610:13: 2622:13; 2631:8; 2644.10 free [5] - 2613:11; 2638:25; 2670:19; 2778:16, 18 freeboard [4] 2558:13; 2562:24; 2563:4, 20 freely [1] - 2778:14 frequency [13] -2571:25; 2572:22, 25; 2596:24; 2597:19; 2601:22; 2728:6; 2749:10: 2772:10. 23-24 2773 14 frequent [3] -2574:2; 2648:9; 2773.9 frequently [1] -2654:8 friction [1] - 2766:15 Friday [1] - 2697:10 Friend [8] - 2492:11; 2493:18; 2495:2, 22, 24; 2497:7; 2786:25; 2798:20 friend [4] - 2547:10; 2659:12; 2660:7; 2784:2 **FRIEND** [6] - 2495:3, 18; 2496:12; 2659:14, 19: 2660:12 friendly [2] 2545:14; 2703:12 friends [1] - 2609:8 Frigo [9] - 2514:9; 2656:8; 2663:6, 18; 2696:14; 2701:11, 14; 2752:24; 2796:8 **fringe** [6] - 2556:11, 18; 2557:11, 16; 2558:8 frog [1] - 2804:10 frogs [1] - 2804:9 FROM [1] - 2660:9 front [8] - 2550:11, 23; 2569:2; 2616:3; 2683:4; 2727:8; 2754:4; 2755:1 FSL [1] - 2744:4 fugitive [11] -2596:10, 17; 2600:7; 2601:12; 2685:3; 2764:25; 2770:16; 2773:20; 2774:14; 2790:6 fulfil [1] - 2666:3 fulfill [1] - 2537:8 fulfilled [2] -2528:12; 2667:11 fulfillment [2] -2530:24; 2607:11 full [26] - 2551:21; 2553:16; 2564:2, 8, 15; 2575:5; 2644:4; 2670:11, 19; 2687:1; 2717:20; 2718:1, 8 16; 2721:3; 2741:16; 2742:13; 2743:12, 21; 2748:8; 2757:14, 25; 2758:13 full-time [1] -2718:16 **fully** [11] - 2517:22; 2530:7; 2578:4; 2621:7; 2640:9; 2641:20; 2642:12; 2737:13; 2748:9; 2782:18; 2801:9

fulsome [3] - 2504:9; 2530:6; 2670:15 function [3] 2741:14; 2743:13; 2774.4 functionality [1] -2781:14 functioning [1] -2505:5 fundamental [4] -2597:7; 2691:25; 2700:24; 2739:12 fundamentally [1] -2527.17 funded [1] - 2673:21 funding [14] -2534:23; 2536:20; 2537:19; 2539:22; 2540:1; 2545:21; 2636:24; 2638:1; 2672:4; 2678:6, 12, 14, 18; 2788:11 **funds** [4] - 2539:24; 2710:18, 24; 2711:24 furnaces [1] - 2629:5 furthermore [4] -2639:16; 2640:6; 2649:25; 2802:17 future [85] - 2511:22; 2512:1, 8; 2516:9; 2532:18; 2533:8; 2541:4; 2543:6; 2546:7, 9, 11, 16; 2547:4; 2571:21, 25; 2573:12; 2576:18; 2577:1; 2578:4; 2580:16, 21; 2611:9; 2613:21; 2615:12; 2618:3, 20; 2621:15; 2624:4: 2627:5: 2630:24; 2633:22; 2640:8; 2642:5; 2645:12; 2664:25; 2665:2; 2669:3, 9; 2675:3; 2679:7, 10; 2682:13; 2683:25; 2684:12; 2685:25; 2690:3, 8; 2691:12; 2692:20; 2693:23; 2694:1; 2695:7; 2696:4, 7, 11; 2712:5; 2721:4; 2723:19; 2726:4; 2727:11; 2728:8; 2732:2; 2734:7; 2735:1; 2739:7; 2742:15; 2745:19; 2746:9; 2749:3, 11; 2765:20; 2783:19: 2789:22: 2793:9; 2794:1, 12; 2795:14, 18, 22-23; 2796:24; 2797:3 Future [1] - 2532:17 G gain [2] - 2540:21; 2594:1 gained [1] - 2518:7 gallon [1] - 2788:23 gaps [1] - 2760:3 garbage [1] -2621:24 garble [1] - 2613:4 Gas [1] - 2542:16 gas [2] - 2555:14; 2573:19 gate [1] - 2743:6 gated [2] - 2549:23;

gates [13] - 2549:5, 24; 2550:7; 2551:21; 2552:12: 2552 2553:13; 2563:11, 19; 2564:13, 17; 2656:7; 2737:19; 2744:3 gather [1] - 2800:5 gathering [2] -2736:13, 15 Gavin [1] - 2492:16 gears [1] - 2734:14 **general** [5] - 2503:6; 2554:20; 2556:6; 2653:12; 2735:21 General [1] -2801.25 generalizations [1] -2576:13 generalized [3] 2513:11; 2768:21; 2769:5 generally [6] 29:6; 2557:16; 2593:7, 19; 2622:12; 2666:15 generated [1] -2702:22 generates [1] -2683:8 generating [5] -2506:16; 2515:15; 2520:19; 2682:25; 2751:7 generation [1] - 2743:17 generational [3] 2724:1, 13; 2725:22 generations [8] 2627:13; 2665:3; 2668:10; 2683:25; 2690:3; 2691:7; 2725:21; 2727:11 generators [1] -2629.3 generously [1] - 2722:25 geochemical [1] - 2758:23 geochemist [1] - 2760:21 geological [2] · 2653:18, 2757.6 geology [1] -2588:24 geometric [1] -2592:18 geomorphology [1] -2575:13 geotechnical [4] -2559:19; 2590:21, 24; 2591.3 Gerbrandt [4] 2493:6; 2494:1; 2659:7; 2807:18 Ghost [1] - 2670:8 Gino [1] - 2492:20 given [43] - 2502:16; 2520:9; 2538:10; 2555:8; 2566:6; 2569:10; 2574:6; 2576:1; 2577:1; 2580:22; 2591:1; 2606:23; 2622:22; 2638:20; 2649:10; 2653:10; 2656:16; 2685:13; 2696:6, 11-12; 2701:5; 2712:7; 2729:9; 2730:9; 2731:2; 2732:3, 12; 2736:21;

2750:9, 25; 2757:1,

AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

2550:5

12; 2761:1; 2762:19; 2763:14; 2775:1; 2789:11; 2797:12; 2800:17; 2804:1 glacial [2] - 2590:2; 2756:23 glacier [1] - 2656:17 glaring [2] - 2704:15; 2727:16 glass [1] - 2629:4 Glenmore [52] -2510:18; 2513:19, 25; 2521:6; 2547:25; 2551:13; 2553:24; 2554:2, 11, 13; 2555:2, 6; 2558:17, 23; 2559:4; 2576:4; 2619:4, 10; 2633:14; 2634:3; 2646:17; 2647:22, 24; 2648:4, 6, 12-13; 2651:21; 2654:6, 20-21; 2655:11; 2656:6; 2682:5; 2683:9; 2687:17, 21; 2688:9; 2696:16; 2702:16; 2712:9, 19; 2713:1; 2725:5; 2731:12; 2739:15; 2744:15; 2747:20; 2751:3, 24; 2782.21 glitch [1] - 2612:11 **GoA** [3] - 2802:19, 25; 2804:12 **goal** [8] - 2520:14; 2551:12; 2552:11; 2631:22; 2632:18; 2746:10, 14; 2748:24 goals [1] - 2641:15 Golder [1] - 2572:23 Golf [1] - 2685:5 golf [1] - 2708:22 governance [1] -2668:1 governing [1] -2670.7 government [29] -2502:5; 2510:5; 2513:13; 2516:4; 2528:23; 2533:20; 2608:15; 2636:23; 2637:19, 25; 2638:2; 2641:20; 2670:18; 2676:4; 2687:23; 2688:21; 2689:25; 2691:2; 2707:23; 2710:17, 22; 2711:23, 25; 2724:3; 2802:1; 2804:17, 19, 22 Government [1] -2707.22 government's [3] -2510:7; 2519:14; 2529:20 governments [1] -2636:22 Governor [1] -2607:4 gradient [1] -2699.21 grading [1] - 2716:11 graduate [1] - 2702:8 Grande [1] - 2542:18 grandfathered [1] -2558:2 grandparents [1] - 2724:9 grant [2] - 2713:17; 2788:12

granted [2] - 2525:9;

2764:2 grassland [2] -2780:25; 2781:4 grasslands [9] -2605:20; 2693:14, 17; 2704:18; 2780:1, 11, 14, 19, 22 grateful [1] - 2784:13 grave [2] - 2543:9; 2668:24 gravel [5] - 2646:19; 2756:21, 24; 2757:2; 2761:20 grazing [1] - 2546:14 Great [1] - 2496.18 Great [1] - 2496.8 great [12] - 2493.13; 2521:23; 2522:1; 2595:14; 2681:14; 2690:9; 2711:9; 2724:0- 2745:42 2724:9; 2745:12; 2765:6; 2789:24 greater [33] -2514:14; 2577:18; 2579:14; 2592:10; 2602:14; 2613:22; 2620:14; 2635:5; 2638:21; 2649:9; 2665:2, 7; 2705:25; 2709:17; 2712:4; 2747:25; 2749:10; 2750:10, 16; 2751:21; 2752:13; 2759:23; 2762:25; 2772:13, 18-19, 25; 2773:1, 12 greatest [1] -2657:18 **greatly** [3] - 2513:11; 2646:11; 2801:3 greenhouse [1] -2573:19 **grizzly** [2] - 2803:24; 2804:12 gross [1] - 2703:4 ground [2] - 2674:7; 2677:10 grounded [1] -2668:4 groundwater [22] · 2545:24; 2587:17, 22, 24; 2590:24; 2592:25; 2593:2, 6, 8, 25; 2594:12, 16; 2595:1, 3-4, 7, 10; 2705:23 2758:17; 2760:1, 10; 2761.4 **Group** [14] - 2492:20; 2493:1; 2505:8; 2610:5, 12, 24; 2611:11; 2616:11; 2617:17; 2622:13; 2631:7; 2644:10; 2659:13 **group** [6] - 2524:4; 2532:5; 2545:21; 2624:11; 2800:16 Group's [1] -2626:25 **groups** [26] - 2502:7; 2505:12; 2513:1; 2522:21; 2528:22; 2530:1; 2531:25; 2532:8; 2534:7, 9; 2535:2, 11, 13; 2544:15; 2574:21; 2607:21; 2608:14; 2638:6: 2666:15. 20: 2676:16, 23; 2677:3; 2678:8; 2717:24; 2731.4 groups' [1] - 2529:22 **grow** [2] - 2617:14; 2801:3 growing [2] - 2752:7; 2801:8 growth [6] - 2663:8; 2692:18; 2770:16; 2776:12; 2794:12; 2797:3 guess [5] - 2722:1; 2733:14; 2752:17; 2785:21, 24 guest [1] - 2789:20 guidance [15] -2532:18; 2541:22; 2679:12: 2768:14. 16. 18, 22; 2769:5; 2771:11-13; 2780:10, 17; 2798:21 guide [1] - 2769:2 guideline [5] -2569:8, 13, 17; 2598:21; 2769:6 Guidelines [4] -2562:21; 2563:1; 2707:20; 2741:4 **guidelines** [7] -2529:19; 2531:1, 21; 2563:21; 2566:16; 2730:3; 2744:19 Guiding [2] -2532:17; 2533:12 guiding [2] -2546:10, 18 н habitat [28] - 2509:9; 2575:2; 2581:6, 25; 2582:1, 5; 2583:7, 13, 17, 25; 2584:14; 2586:19, 24; 2604:14, 18; 2622:2; 2646:20; 2674:11, 13-14; 2715:3, 9; 2781:23; 2782.4 habitats [1] -2781:20 hairs [1] - 2626:21 **half** [9] - 2517:10; 2558:13; 2559:6; 2619:11; 2684:3; 2742:17; 2743:21; 2775:21; 2788:23 halfway [3] - 2730:9; 2733.19 hand [2] - 2547:10; 2597:23 haphazard [1] -2665.24 hard [4] - 2628:22; 2749:16; 2763:18; 2788.9 hardly [1] - 2759:19 harmed [3] 2729:21; 2730:2, 7 harmful [1] - 2509:8 harms [1] - 2730:6 harrowing [2] -2627:20; 2628:1 harvest [1] - 2544:10 harvesting [1] -2544:11 hauling [1] - 2777:24 hazard [11] -2511:20; 2555:12; 2556:11, 14, 22; 2557:3, 13, 23; 2572:23; 2706:22; 2708.5 hazards [1] -

2555.16 head [3] - 2743:13: 2752:15: 2753:7 heading [4] -2682:15; 2706:4; 2709:24; 2726:25 headings [1] -2610:22 heads [5] - 2498:3; 2499:6; 2681:5, 10; 2761 20 heads-up [4] -2498:3; 2499:6; 2681:5, 10 headwaters [1] -2702:22 headwork [1] -2754.13 headworks [1] -2754:20 health [30] - 2507:6; 2515:23; 2546:2; 2582:2; 2595:18, 21; 2596:8; 2600:7, 12 20; 2602:1; 2623:12; 2626:16; 2628:6, 20; 2649:13; 2709:12; 2725:24; 2751:9; 2758:12; 2764:19; 2765:4, 9, 14; 2772:3, 9, 13; 2775:7 Heaney [1] - 2492:9 **hear** [3] - 2497:6; 2538:7; 2626:23 heard [30] - 2500:25; 2505:9; 2510:23; 2513:16; 2516:2 2523:10; 2525:2 2529:23; 2532:14; 2534:1; 2535:21; 2560:3; 2614:24; 2644:17, 23, 25; 2646:6; 2657:12; 2660:21; 2665:23; 2667:6; 2701:3; 2715:7; 2716:5; 2753:9; 2763:14; 2779:7; 2801:16 Hearing [1] -2653:11 hearing [68] 2493:10; 2495:11, 17; 2498:9; 2499:1; 2502:2, 14, 19, 21; 2504:7, 10, 15; 2510:13, 22; 2524:24; 2526:8; 2535:22; 2538:23; 2547:2; 2548:2; 2554:8; 2560:20; 2562:3; 2584:24; 2585:2; 2602:4; 2605:19: 2606:24; 2609:4; 2610:15, 25; 2634:16; 2637:3, 12, 14; 2643:10; 2644:16; 2646:8; 2653:5; 2660:6; 2668:17 2671:10; 2680:11; 2681:22; 2686:5; 2696:22; 2700:8, 13; 2701:8; 2712:16; 2718:13; 2729:25; 2734:20; 2740:1; 2751:11; 2784:3, 6; 2785:9: 2788:1: 2798:18; 2800:10; 2805:23; 2806:21; 2807:8, 11, 25 hearings [5] -

2532:2: 2537:20: 2643:17; 2679:20; 2803.13 heart [1] - 2621:17 heartache [1] -2627:17 heavily [10] 2620:11; 2639:5, 22; 2641:10, 16; 2737:16; 2758:21; 2762:17; 2781:23; 2784:12 heavy [1] - 2646:2 Hebert [29] - 2501:4; 2504:15; 2508:19; 2510:11, 23; 2511:8; 2516:16; 2519:10; 2525:6, 12; 2526:14 17; 2527:19; 2529:23; 2535:21; 2547:2; 2554:23; 2559:8; 2574:18; 2596:19; 2603:4; 2635:10, 21 25; 2636:11; 2701:9; 2713:25; 2720:5; 2790:10 Hebert's [5] - 2516:3; 2525:2; 2527:1, 3, 6 hectare [2] -2599:23; 2716:2 height [2] - 2552:5; 2605.10heirlooms [1] -2627:12 held [7] - 2524:3, 7, 15, 25; 2593:17; 2789:5, 8 help [7] - 2550:12; 2573:11; 2579:2; 2623:9; 2643:16; 2756:12; 2803:24 helpful [1] - 2612:4 helping [1] - 2798:21 Henry [1] - 2539:7 Herald [1] - 2802:5 herbicides [1] -2735.16 herd [1] - 2735:12 **heritage** [6] - 2542:3; 2674:16, 19, 22; 2682:11; 2725:9 Heritage [1] -2788:17 hidden [3] - 2664:11; 2684:23; 2723:4 high [31] - 2502:3: 2550:25; 2560:7; 2571:9; 2578:25; 2602:18; 2606:7; 2613:19; 2646:1; 2685:19; 2687:3; 2703:6; 2738:15, 17, 24; 2739:10; 2751:5; 2754:17; 2760:25; 2765:20; 2773:11; 2774:4; 2779:10, 13-14, 16, 18, 24; 2788:15; 2803:6 High [1] - 2765:18 high-elevation [1] -2646.1 high-intensity [1] -2687:3 high-level [2] - 2502:3: 2739:10 high-risk [1] -2760.25 high-use [1] - 2751:5 higher [23] -2602:18; 2625:2; 2646:21; 2652:15;

2654:3. 21: 2656:16. 18; 2699:15; 2705:24; 2707:1; 2712:21-23; 2722:16; 2738:2; 2748:18; 2749:10; 2752:20; 2757:17; 2762:5; 2790:12 highest [7] - 2510:6; 2552:2; 2559:9, 14; 2566:18; 2662:22; 2699 3 highlight [2] -2607:14; 2645:18 highlighted [4] -2605:21; 2650:7; 2706:14; 2786:7 highly [7] - 2560:6; 2577:6; 2592:23; 2625:11; 2704:23; 2723:12: 2771:20 Highway [11] -2545:15; 2548:10; 2605:6, 11, 24; 2676:11; 2721:19; 2753:17; 2795:12 Highwood [4] -2691:13; 2695:20, 25; 2710.5 himself [1] - 2561:5 hire [1] - 2517:23 historic [5] - 2507:5; 2548:25; 2572:11, 24; 2577.4 Historic [1] - 2541:8 historical [20] -2529:9; 2543:2; 2608:5; 2621:16; 2665:20; 2674:3, 20; 2675:16, 19, 21, 25; 2731:17: 2732:1: 2736:2, 6, 8, 11, 13, Historical [11] 2541:12, 16; 2542:1 8; 2543:3, 14; 2674:5, 25 2675 5 9 11 historically [1] -2617:4 history [8] - 2524:10; 2657:6; 2724:1; 2731:21; 2732:6, 11; 2746:23 hit [2] - 2527:14; 2801:11 hitting [1] - 2527:25 hold [5] - 2535:12; 2579:13; 2652:3; 2684:5; 2753:2 holders [2] 2655:22; 2662:12 holding [2] -2536:22, 2652:8 holds [2] - 2600:10; 2749.3 hole [3] - 2690:22; 2691:5; 2711:19 Holloway [2] -2539:7; 2798:24 home [1] - 2627:21 homeowners [3] -2626:14; 2627:23; 2682:5 homes [12] - 2511:3: 2621:1; 2627:11, 24-25; 2689:15; 2707:12, 16; 2726:2; 2774:5; 2775:11 honestly [1] -2527:10 honour [1] - 2666:7

hook [1] - 2498:7 hope [12] - 2493:11, 16: 2610:18: 2680:12: 2723:16; 2774:12-14, 16-17. 19: 2784:4 hopefully [5] 2493:12; 2659:22; 2734:1; 2799:25; 2803.8 hopes [1] - 2711:25 **hoping** [3] - 2494:17; 2680:19; 2775:22 horizon [1] - 2655:18 Horn [2] - 2668:24; 2672.11 horse [1] - 2728:10 host [1] - 2644:14 hosting [2] -2534:10; 2545:21 hour [2] - 2709:20; 2742:18 hours [11] - 2515:16; 2560:9; 2622:25; 2623:5, 23; 2719:21; 2742:13, 20; 2744:5 house [3] - 2802:13, 23: 2803:1 houses [6] - 2523:1; 2524:4, 6-7, 12, 25 **how..** [1] - 2778:19 **huge** [6] - 2690:11, 15; 2704:9; 2724:16; 2739:6; 2752:19 human [23] - 2510:9; 2595:18, 21; 2596:8; 2600:7, 12, 19; 2602:1; 2613:23; 2650:8; 2657:9; 2758:11; 2760:11; 2762:14; 2764:19; 2765:4, 9; 2772:2, 4 9, 13; 2775:7; 2790:5 humanity [1] -2542.4 humble [1] - 2804:13 hundred [8] · 2647:4; 2684:6; 2690:18; 2709:21; 2719:18; 2745:8; 2794:21: 2801:7 hundreds [4] -2683:12; 2720:9, 25; 2755:18 hung [1] - 2682:7 hunt [2] - 2668:3, 9 Hunter [12] -2524:19; 2525:13; 2526:13, 15, 17; 2527:5; 2567:17; 2618:7; 2685:13; 2728:18; 2784:9; 2798 18 Hunter's [5] 2519:25; 2527:22, 25; 2686:1; 2737:3 hunters [1] - 2803:17 hunting [16] -2542:21; 2546:12; 2547:7; 2668:4; 2735:10, 13; 2803:5, 11, 14, 22; 2804:15; 2805:5 hydraulic [6] · 2589:3; 2592:10; 2759:9, 20; 2761:7, 19 hydro [2] - 2749:3; 2759:9 hydrogeologic [1] -2588:19

hydrogeological [3] 2587:16; 2758:22; 2759.1 hydrogeologist [2] -2756:9, 11 hydrogeology [10] -2507:3; 2575:2; 2587:1, 4, 6; 2588:5, 10; 2595:12; 2755:20, 25 hydrograph [1] hydrographs [2] -2737.18 2 hydrologic [1] -2648.9 hydrological [9] -2575:18; 2598:25; 2752:17; 2758:22, 25; 2769:12.14.19 hydrologist [1] -2756:2 **hydrology** [8] - 2507:3; 2575:1, 10, 12; 2579:6; 2595:13; 2656 2 2752 10 Hydrology [1] -2738:3 hydrometric [1] -2739:14 hydrotechnical [1] -2559:19 hyperbole [1] -2597.2 hypothetical [2] -2567:2; 2687:9 Ι i.e [2] - 2743:16: 2765.1 I/we [1] - 2799:3 **IAAC** [8] - 2507:13; 2508:16, 19, 24; 2529:21; 2530:1; 2537:7; 2745:1 lan [1] - 2737:2 IBI [4] - 2512:11; 2623:25; 2624:11; 2713:7 **idea** [3] - 2493:20; 2690:1; 2759:13 identification [1] -2608:20 identified [27] · 2499:25; 2501:21; 2504:17; 2506:12; 2511:1; 2530:1; 2532:6; 2536:14; 2540:10, 21; 2543:5, 18: 2585:13: 2602:12: 2623:10; 2669:16; 2672:2; 2681:17; 2682:24; 2690:14; 2723:6; 2727:7, 14; 2737:12; 2755:5; 2794.2.4 identifies [1] -2796:23 **identify** [4] -2540:24; 2544:9; 2777:16, 18 identifying [4] - 2540:12; 2679:7; 2728:2, 9 **IDF** [5] - 2562:24; 2563:3; 2564:1; 2573:15; 2743:22 idle [1] - 2684:4 Ifeoma [1] - 2493:1

Igic [5] - 2661:11; 2677:5, 9, 15; 2679:17 lanasius [1] -2783:16 ignored [3] -2598:25; 2769:22; 2804:16 ignores [2] - 2669:6; 2713:9 illegal [2] - 2547:7; 2803.9 illustrated [1] -2628.2 illustrations [1] -2729:20 imagination [2] -2747:16; 2748:15 imbalance [1] -2725:12 immeasurable [1] -2628:4 immediate [2] 2627:10; 2782:15 immediately [1] -2598.14 Impact [7] - 2507:12; 2508:7; 2541:9; 2543:3, 14; 2639:16; 2678 25 impact [51] 2504:23; 2505:1-3; 2506:22; 2524:14; 2544:16; 2571:25; 2575:17; 2581:6; 2583:12; 2585:6, 19; 2591:7; 2604:1; 2606:1, 21; 2614:8; 2617:23; 2621:22 2625:6; 2628:5, 20; 2629:21; 2635:16, 19; 2636:6, 9, 12; 2646:5; 2650:1; 2655:2; 2675:21; 2679:6; 2703:20, 25; 2704:16, 24; 2724:20; 2730:18; 2735:24; 2742:18; 2753:7; 2761:5; 2781:8. 12. 17 impacted [22] 2540:23; 2575:20; 2579:22; 2591:11; 2593:4; 2607:24; 2621:8, 19; 2626:9; 2628:12; 2630:1, 6, 9; 2640:11; 2650:14; 2677:13; 2705:5; 2717:9; 2725:16; 2730:17; 2731:1; 2774.2 impacting [2] 2761:8; 2771:23 impacts [128] -2501:21; 2504:19; 2506:18; 2507:7; 2510:25; 2512:20, 25; 2514:24; 2515:14, 18, 21; 2516:9; 2529:8; 2531:17; 2573:21; 2575:6; 2578:3, 17; 2579:17; 2580:6, 21; 2581:11; 2583:7, 16; 2584:13; 2585:23; 2590:23; 2594:13; 2595:15, 22; 2596:6: 2602:8: 2604:17: 2605:20; 2606:9, 12, 16; 2608:4; 2614:9; 2616:2, 6-7; 2617:20,

25; 2618:2, 25;

2797:15

2620:1, 3-4, 6, 17, 20; 2621:1, 12, 15; 2622:2, 6; 2623:15; 2629:17; 2630:4; 2631:23; 2632:20; 2635:13; 2636:4; 2638:23; 2639:1, 4, 12, 22; 2640:1, 7-8, 10, 13, 17-18; 2641:10; 2642:1, 5; 2644:24; 2648:21; 2649:18; 2650:10; 2652:21; 2653:1; 2664:20; 2667:9, 12, 17; 2668:12; 2669:16. 18 23 2672 2 2677:25; 2678:24; 2679:10; 2683:2, 9; 2700:21; 2704:4; 2708:3; 2709:14; 2723:24; 2725:8, 20; 2755:10; 2760:11; 2765:14; 2767:12, 19; 2768:4; 2770:19; 2772:13; 2776:14; 2778:16; 2779:20, 22; 2781:19; 2782:1, 4-5; 2789:19 impartial [2] -2505:18; 2771:8 impeached [1] -2587.7 impede [1] - 2715:17 implement [4] -2501:22; 2596:21; 2603:15; 2778:5 implementation [2] -2508:21; 2639:20 implementations [1] 2791:6 implemented [1] -2677:1 implementing [1] -2638 16 implications [12] -2512:7; 2576:15; 2578:11; 2587:21; 2598:20; 2600:6; 2602:5; 2638:22; 2714:16; 2728:3; 2745.4 imply [1] - 2666:19 importance [7] -2540:22; 2615:7; 2622:18; 2641:14; 2691:22; 2796:10 important [31] -2510:15; 2521:3; 2548:18; 2558:15; 2569:1; 2590:25; 2596:13; 2604:3; 2606:12; 2614:1; 2616:5; 2618:1, 5; 2620:22: 2624:16: 2626:6; 2628:13; 2641:18; 2644:16; 2656:21; 2657:5; 2665:1; 2686:15, 18; 2689:16; 2701:4; 2707:2; 2708:7; 2726:9; 2745:22; 2777:2 importantly [7] -2560:19; 2609:5; 2636:12; 2638:15; 2652:14; 2746:13; 2747.2 impose [3] 2580:25; 2742:10;

imposed [2] 2616:12; 2726:12 impossible [3] -2520:8; 2604:6; 2760.5impound [1] - 2552:6 impounded [2] -2549:8; 2720:2 improper [1] -2768:9 improve [4] · 2513:17; 2560:23; 2622:17; 2711:15 improved [5] -2532:12; 2545:11; 2729:22; 2800:12 improvement [1] -2630.18 improvements [2] -2646:19.22 in-depth [2] - 2590:4; 2612:5 in-flow [1] - 2562:17 in-flows [1] -2553:10 in-stream [11] -2504:11, 19; 2519:4; 2520:20; 2548:15; 2562:23; 2579:13; 2581:7; 2606:17; 2686:22; 2700:15 inaccessible [1] -2511:5 inaccurate [1] -2737:23 inadequate [2] 2668:19; 2730:17 inadvertently [1] -2763:8 inappropriate [2] -2598:23; 2694:25 incident [5] -2565:19; 2566:13, 17; 2798.6 incidents [1] -2566.22 include [38] -2504:10; 2521:5; 2531:2; 2538:19; 2545:23; 2556:19; 2579:11; 2581:23; 2603:9; 2607:15; 2634:1; 2644:20; 2660:23; 2661:21; 2662:6, 12, 20; 2668:1; 2671:18; 2672:23; 2675:1; 2676:20; 2679:2, 4; 2709:14; 2712:18; 2717:25; 2720:6; 2726:13; 2737:13: 2743:14; 2751:1; 2754:9; 2777:5, 10, 22·2782·19 included [25] 2501:8; 2507:2; 2523:19; 2526:4; 2536:7; 2539:12 2566:20; 2572:11; 2574:20; 2582:17; 2599:19; 2628:3, 19; 2665:4; 2700:4; 2712:3; 2713:22; 2715:8; 2716:23; 2718:14; 2722:10; 2726:17; 2779:1; 2794:14; 2795:20 includes [17] -2505:9; 2518:1; 2533:9; 2551:10;

2552:9; 2556:17; 2571:6; 2582:8; 2594:17; 2595:4; 2608:1; 2668:3; 2669:9; 2713:11; 2721:11; 2722:22; 2758:18 including [80] -2500:5; 2504:18, 25; 2508:6; 2509:18; 2513:2; 2517:14 2519:2; 2522:22 2523:13, 24; 2524:18; 2525:20; 2531:11, 15; 2536:15, 20; 2539:19; 2544:17, 20; 2545:20; 2558:5; 2575:12; 2578:17; 2586:24; 2603:7; 2605:9, 12-13; 2609:8; 2623:12; 2624:19; 2625:14; 2627:10, 25; 2630:24; 2635:18; 2636:8, 23; 2637:21 2647:15, 22; 2648:22; 2651:14, 21; 2667:15; 2668:20; 2669:3; 2670:13; 2674:1, 5, 7, 10, 12, 23; 2675:5, 20: 2678:3: 2679:3: 2711:13; 2715:2; 2718:20, 23; 2720:1 24; 2722:2, 8; 2723:1, 5; 2725:10; 2735:12; 2745:6; 2753:12; 2757:15; 2769:13; 2776:10; 2777:14; 2778:22; 2782:25 including.. [1] -2696:2 inclusion [2] -2517:15; 2544:25 inclusive [1] -2541:20 incoming [1] -2777:17 inconsistent [2] -2719:9; 2803:15 incorporate [3] -2540:16; 2572:24; 2750.2 incorporated [2] -2645:20; 2754:2 incorporates [1] -2573.7 incorporating [1] -2758:7 incorporation [1] -2573:1 incorrect [4] -2751:13; 2772:20; 2776:23; 2794:23 increase [21] -2573:21; 2574:3; 2577:25; 2586:1; 2615:4; 2623:7; 2641:1, 21; 2648:18; 2651:3, 14; 2655:23; 2705:24; 2706:24; 2711:3; 2717:17; 2740:13; 2750:24; 2758:11; 2759:6; 2776:12 increased [11] -2518:8; 2566:1; 2572:4; 2578:9; 2649:12, 14; 2712:24; 2713:6; 2716:14; 2740:21; 2782:21 increases [2] -

2517:2: 2653:3 increasing [5] -2520:19; 2617:7; 2633:15; 2652:23; 2744.6 increasingly [1] -2801:6 incremental [6] -2651:10; 2654:16; 2663:10; 2679:6; 2706:2; 2781:24 incrementally [2] -2549:4, 25 incurred [1] - 2629:2 **indeed** [11] - 2496:7; 2519:25; 2573:12; 2574:21; 2625:16; 2628:16; 2633:18; 2643:4; 2645:9; 2655:13; 2728:10 indefinite [1] -2783:21 indefinitely [1] -2642:7 independent [4] -2559:23, 25; 2673:4, 6 independently [1] -2770:10 index [1] - 2581:25 Indian [2] - 2661:6; 2670:24 indicate [3] -2625:15, 18; 2790:24 indicated [19] -2499:18; 2515:2; 2538:10, 12; 2543:12; 2602:14; 2632:4; 2653:11; 2671:10; 2709:21; 2713:25; 2728:14; 2731:16; 2756:19, 22; 2757:18; 2758:5; 2772:8; 2805:24 indicates [3] -2508:20; 2590:1; 2639.7 indicating [2] -2592:13; 2792:10 indication [1] · 2601:16 Indigenous [44] -2502:7; 2505:12; 2513:1; 2528:22; 2529:5, 13-14, 21, 25; 2531:25; 2532:5, 8; 2534:2, 6-7, 9; 2535:2, 10, 13; 2537:22; 2544:8, 15; 2546:6; 2574:21; 2607:21; 2608:14, 23; 2662:13; 2666:13, 15, 20; 2667:5, 8; 2671:5; 2673:4, 6, 9; 2676:16, 23; 2677:3, 17, 20; 2678:8; 2717:23 indirect [2] 2721:11. 18 indirectly [2] -2513:5; 2711:2 indisputable [1] -2518:15 individual [4] 2512:14: 2627:8: 2629:1.9 individuals [3] -2601:8; 2611:1; 2638:7 indulging [1] -2805:13

industry [4] -2563:22; 2565:24; 2566:15; 2740:19 inevitability [1] -2750.8inevitable [3] -2617:2; 2626:21; 2642:1 inexcusable [2] -2700:25; 2701:2 inferior [4] -2707:17; 2748:4; 2752:1; 2783:21 infestation [1] -2778.25 Inflow [1] - 2743:19 inflows [1] - 2619:15 influence [3] · 2757:9, 16; 2776:21 inform [3] - 2531:4; 2543:8; 2679:7 information [45] -2502:10; 2507:11; 2508:5; 2522:22, 25; 2524:25; 2528:8; 2534:11, 25; 2537:25 2539:20; 2542:13, 22; 2554:5; 2570:23; 2572:19; 2573:1; 2577:1; 2591:17 2606:22; 2644:21; 2667:18; 2672:15, 20; 2675:18; 2693:10; 2708:14; 2727:13; 2738:22; 2744:13; 2754:19; 2759:20; 2760:3; 2761:1, 6; 2762:11; 2769:23; 2771:5; 2778:15; 2789:12; 2791:18, 23; 2792:9; 2794:20; 2800:6 informed [3] 2670:19; 2761:2; 2800:6 informs [1] - 2530:20 infrastructure [37] -2511:23; 2516:7, 10; 2517:6; 2594:19; 2615:6, 16; 2617:24; 2624:9, 19; 2626:2; 2629:13, 23; 2641:13, 22; 2642:20; 2645:16; 2647:15; 2649:1; 2650:13, 22; 2652:22; 2655:11, 19; 2657:5, 10; 2663:10; 2678:22; 2687:6; 2717:3; 2721:14. 18-19 2723:5; 2749:20, 22; 2794.14 infrequent [6] -2515:19; 2600:24; 2767:24; 2773:6, 17 infrequently [2] -2596:16; 2600:22 infringement [1] -2667:4 inherent [2] -2583:11, 19 inheritance [2] -2682:11; 2725:11 **initial** [7] - 2505:13; 2518:8; 2613:15; 2743:20; 2801:1, 22; 2802.6 injuries [2] 2622:20; 2623:1 injurious [1] - 2518:2 injury [1] - 2692:9

inlet [17] - 2549:6, 21; 2550:5, 7, 11, 19, 24; 2551:6, 21; 2553:9; 2563:11, 19; 2594:20; 2700:19; 2740:5; 2744:3, 8 inner [2] - 2629:15; 2709:6 innovation [2] 2567:18; 2782:16 input [14] - 2533:18; 2535:14; 2536:18; 2540:21; 2544:16, 19; 2545:22; 2560:15; 2603:10: 2607:20: 2718:4; 2772:2; 2795:6; 2802:24 inputs [2] - 2705:18; 2768.20 inquire [1] - 2779:3 inquired [1] -2770:10 inquiries [1] - 2771:3 inquiry [1] - 2612:6 insecurity [1] -2628.7 install [1] - 2676:10 installation [1] -2656.6 installed [1] -2585:17 installing [1] -2629:3 instance [5] -2684:19; 2719:7; 2732:8; 2741:20; 2742:4 instantaneous [1] -2586:1 instead [9] -2515:17; 2560:22; 2598:4; 2599:2; 2721:15; 2725:16; 2751:6; 2754:4; 2769 23 instill [1] - 2766:22 instructive [1] -2611.23 instrumentation [2] -2742:19; 2744:14 insurance [3] 2631:2; 2791:9, 11 insurer [1] - 2791:12 intact [7] - 2693:14; 2780:1, 11-12, 14, 19, 22 intake [5] - 2579:17; 2788:22; 2792:11, 20; 2793:5 intelligence [1] -2762.14intended [8] -2537:8; 2613:21; 2616:23; 2632:23, 25; 2651:8; 2687:7; 2796:4 intending [3] -2496:25; 2497:5; 2500:24 intends [2] -2541:14; 2579:3 intensifying [1] -2751:14 intensity [1] - 2687:3 intent [3] - 2496:21; 2527:4; 2793:19 intention [1] -2533:17 intentioned [2] -2555:18; 2586:11

interact [1] - 2653:22	interveners [10] -	25
interchange [1] -	2500:11; 2502:15;	25
2795:17	2504:1; 2519:20;	25
Interest [1] - 2682:16	2523:14; 2546:6;	25
interest [72] -	2547:3; 2596:9;	23
2501:12, 20; 2503:5,	2645:1; 2654:9	25
10. 18: 2505:22:	intervention [1] -	25
2506:2, 11; 2519:18; 2520:7; 2522:4, 21;	2564:17	26
2520.7 2522.4 21	interventions [1] -	26
2539:5; 2544:6;	2566:23	26
2606.25. 2610.10.		26
2606:25; 2610:19;	intolerable [3] -	
2611:13, 20; 2612:6;	2642:8; 2650:9;	26
2614:23; 2616:10;	2668:25	27
2620:7; 2624:5, 17,	introduce [2] -	27
24; 2625:17; 2631:22;	2739:13; 2776:17	27
2632:12, 18; 2634:9;	introduced [1] -	28
2636:18; 2639:3;	2778:23	is
2641:25; 2642:4;	introduces [1] -	25
	2577:13	25
2645:4, 8, 10;		
2653:10, 15; 2657:19;	introducing [1] -	26
2662:2, 6, 9, 11;	2699:19	27
2664:2, 8; 2666:9, 14;	introduction [3] -	27
2667:20; 2681:24; 2682:2, 13; 2683:11,	2777:4; 2788:3, 5	25
2682:2. 13: 2683:11.	introductory [3] -	is
13, 16, 23; 2684:3, 7,	2499:21; 2519:12;	24
	2547:21	25
16, 22, 25; 2685:2; 2691:4; 2694:11, 18;		
	intuition [1] -	25
2710:16, 21; 2711:22;	2793:19	25
2714:20; 2763:20;	intuitive [1] -	25
2783:23	2702:25	25
interested [6] -	inundation [1] -	26
2528:7; 2533:13, 20;	2568:9	26
2539:7; 2786:20;	invasive [1] -	26
	2776:11	26
2802:24		
interesting [5] -	invest [3] - 2684:3;	27
2576:20; 2693:7;	2711:23; 2754:3	27
2710:25; 2731:15;	investigated [3] -	27
2750:22	2753:12; 2754:8;	28
interestingly [1] -	2755:6	is
2734:25	investigation [2] -	it
	2584:12; 2728:15	26
interests [7] -	2304.12, 2720.13	
2506:8; 2533:14;	investigations [3] -	27
2615:1; 2666:25;	2674:2; 2675:4, 7	it
2667:13; 2668:15;	investing [1] -	25
2679:11	2710:18	it
interfaces [1] -	investment [10] -	25
2762:3	2514:11; 2516:6;	25
Interim [1] - 2517:11	2625:19; 2657:8;	26
interim [2] - 2538:1;	2663:11; 2690:2, 11,	26
2539:10	16; 2710:23; 2788:24	26
intermittent [1] -	invitations [1] -	27
2655:9	2544:5	
intermittently [1] -	invite [1] - 2541:4	24
2653:20	invited [3] - 2524:21;	_
international [1] -	2541:2; 2543:10	
2542:4	involve [1] - 2736:10	
interpretation [2] -	involved [11] -	J
2708:11; 2770:24	2524:2; 2538:16;	26
interrupt [2] -	2545:18; 2574:15;	Ĵ
2612:9; 2613:11	2587:16; 2664:22;	26
	2307.10, 2004.22,	
interrupted [1] -	2700:17; 2760:21;	je
2714:23	2798:17; 2800:18;	J
interruption [1] -	2805:16	27
2791:16	involvement [1] -	jo
intersect [1] -	2678:13	27
2780:22	involves [2] -	J
intersection [1] -	2557:7; 2667:2	Ĵ
2795:17	IR [1] - 2728:13	26
intersections [1] -	irreplaceable [1] -	
		jo
2713:16	2627:12	J
interval [1] - 2564:10	irrigation [3] -	23
intervals [5] -	2698:4; 2711:17;	23
2674:7; 2738:5;	2754:20	jo
2758:18; 2762:4, 6	isopleths [1] -	Ĵ
intervene [1] -	2775:11	Ĵ
2532:1	issuance [1] -	27
intervener [7] -	2530:13	27
2547:8; 2567:15;	issue [42] - 2502:18,	ji
2568:3; 2570:4;	21; 2514:16; 2534:17;	27
2783:8, 11	2536:4; 2545:8;	27

547:24; 2548:1; 553:22; 2561:3; 575:14; 2576:6; 579:15, 25; 2581:2, 3; 2584:23; 2587:4; 588:5, 10-11; 590:6; 2599:19; 500:9; 2603:1; 604:14, 20, 24; 607:4; 2611:13; 618:15; 2634:17; 638:12; 2699:19; 31:4; 2742:20; 52:17; 2753:6; 60:19; 2779:4, 23; 303.3 **issued** [14] **-**506:25; 2509:20; 524:20; 2612:1; 591:13; 2710:1; 36:20, 24; 2740:2; 41:9, 22; 2745:15, 5; 2774:25 **SSUES** [27] 99:24; 2507:2; 529:7; 2533:23 536:11; 2560:10; 562:6; 2567:13; 574:25; 2575:11; 590:20; 2596:4; 605:17; 2611:16; 512:5; 2613:10; 523:12; 2672:1; 581:16; 2704:7; '36:1; 2760:15; 61:18; 2762:3; 66:13; 2767:6; 304:15 ssuing [1] - 2531:7 items [5] - 2539:16; 627:13; 2691:21; 735:7; 2801:4 terative [1] -533:21 itself [13] - 2510:11; 517:6; 2530:3: 580:20; 2600:19, 23; 625:24; 2635:1; 647:22; 2650:24; 51:22; 2671:12; 19.20 wanyshyn [1] -92:12 J **Jan** [3] - 2685:16; 691:8; 2736:5 January [2] -698:18; 2708:13 jets [1] - 2802:3 **ob** [3] - 2561:19; 99:16; 2800:17 obs [2] - 2788:9; '98:11 Jobson [1] - 2579:7 John [2] - 2559:17; 68:22 ioins [1] - 2618:15 Joint [7] - 2691:19, 3; 2695:4, 13, 21, 3; 2710:1 olted [1] - 2627:16 **Jr** [1] - 2668:22 **JRP** [6] - 2710:7; 711:1, 21; 2726:25; 27.20 udgment [5] 04:1, 17, 25; 2705:9; 2762:16

judgments [1] -2664:10 **July** [3] - 2508:7; 2523:11; 2738:20 jumped [1] - 2728:16 June [1] - 2728:12 jurisdiction [3] 2505:17; 2521:13; 2637:17 jurisdictions [2] -2679:13; 2749:25 justifiable [6] -2613:17; 2614:19; 2616:17, 20, 22; 2619.22 justification [4] -2510:3; 2616:19; 2700:3: 2705:8 justifications [2] -2703:15 justified [4] - 2519:9; 2613:19; 2614:17; 2635:6 justifying [1] -2800:16 Justin [1] - 2492:14 Κ Kainai [1] - 2796:17 Kamp [1] - 2714:22 Kananaskis [1] -2504.12 Karen [2] - 2524:19; 2685:17 **Karin** [7] - 2524:19; 2685:13; 2686:1; 2728:18; 2737:3; 2784:9; 2798:18 keep [6] - 2494:9; 2585:5; 2629:11; 2748:13; 2754:21; 2802:12 keepers [1] -2668.17 keeping [1] -2497:12 keeps [1] - 2758:7 Kennedy [5] -2492:10; 2496:11; 2609:11; 2745:18; 2798:21 KENNEDY [3] 2496:10; 2806:6, 10 key [12] - 2508:21; 2557:20; 2574:21, 24; 2575:5; 2607:15; 2615:18; 2639:20; 2700:3; 2756:10; 2779.12 Keyes [9] - 2561:5, 24; 2562:14, 19; 2563:24; 2564:4, 7; 2739:23; 2744:17 Keyes' [1] - 2564:22 kicked [1] - 2734:18 kicking [2] 2734:23; 2745:17 kids [1] - 2689:18 killed [1] - 2803:7 kilometre [3] 2699:10, 13, 2774:5 kilometres [7] . 2552:3; 2582:14; 2625:7; 2701:21; 2702:6; 2703:1; 2781.8 **kind** [5] - 2594:10; 2612:19; 2643:15; 2775:20

Kiwanis [1] -2714:22 Klepacki [7] 2524:18; 2577:12; 2578:6; 2696:18; 2702:11; 2737:2; 2782:11 Klepacki's [1] - 2703^{-9} knowingly [1] -2724:25 knowledge [8] -2507:6; 2537:22; 2668:10, 17; 2673:12, 19; 2675:2; 2803:18 known [6] - 2570:25; 2696:4; 2722:24; 2746:23; 2754:20 knowns [3] -2746:24; 2747:2 knows [2] - 2561:15; 2803.17 KRUHLAK [15] 2494:21; 2495:7, 15 22; 2497:2; 2499:11; 2679:24; 2680:6; 2733:9; 2734:3; 2785:21; 2786:9; 2787:8; 2806:15; 2808.4 Kruhlak [32] 2492:16; 2494:20; 2496:9, 24; 2497:6 16; 2498:19; 2499:6. 8; 2547:12; 2604:21; 2609:16; 2614:24; 2679:24; 2680:4, 12 23; 2733:9; 2734:2, 5; 2785:17; 2786:15, 21; 2787:7; 2793:21; 2794:2, 4, 23 2795:24; 2803:10; 2806:14 Kruhlak's [2] -2739:17; 2793:18 L laboratory [3] -2591:10; 2759:11, 15 lack [12] - 2546:15; 2580:22; 2646:2; 2721:5; 2728:8; 2757:20; 2758:9; 2760:9; 2761:6; 2762:20; 2781:21; 2797:13 lacking [2] -2719:24; 2730:17 lacustrine [3] -2756:14, 17; 2757:13 Lancaster [2] · 2693:16; 2780:24 land [96] - 2515:11 2516:21; 2517:18, 21; 2518:7; 2522:15; 2529:2; 2532:4, 18, 20, 24; 2533:3, 7, 17, 22; 2535:9; 2538:2, 16-17; 2541:21; 2544:24; 2545:1 2546:7, 10-11, 16, 21, 25; 2547:4; 2556:15; 2558:18; 2605:23; 2607:16; 2608:3; 2662:12; 2667:23; 2668:5, 8; 2669:3, 9, 18; 2671:20, 23-24;

2672:5, 17; 2673:8,

16; 2676:13, 15, 18,

22: 2677:25: 2679:12: 2689:14; 2708:6, 9, 15; 2713:12; 2714:2, 8, 11, 13, 15; 2718:25; 2724:3, 9, 14, 16; 2725:22; 2726:6; 2732:2; 2734:7-9, 12, 16, 24; 2735:1, 4, 6, 14, 19; 2736:19; 2753:16; 2781:4; 2794:8; 2796:7, 19 Land [11] - 2506:15; 2532:17; 2533:24; 2555:21, 24; 2556:4, 12, 25; 2557:21; 2558:15 landfills [1] -2621:24 landowner [7] -2533:5; 2685:11; 2734:14; 2802:9, 24; 2803:16 landowners [38] -2517:20; 2518:4; 2522:14, 20; 2523:9, 13, 15, 24; 2524:13; 2525:3; 2538:18; 2594:24; 2607:25; 2608:2; 2628:10; 2640:19, 25; 2665:14; 2714:1; 2723:13, 20, 25; 2724:10; 2730:4, 17-19; 2734:11, 18 25; 2784:18; 2796:18; 2802:4, 8; 2805:8 Landowners [1] -2493:1 landowners' [2] -2525:24; 2782:10 Lands [4] - 2507:17; 2508:10; 2530:14; 2531.7 lands [16] - 2518:1; 2538:11; 2580:11; 2640:20, 23; 2661:12; 2668:20; 2677:2, 6, 9, 16; 2734:23; 2771:24; 2777:2; 2798:1 landscape [6] 2559:5; 2606:2; 2649:3; 2776:14; 2779:10, 17 landscapes [6] 2664:20; 2665:10; 2779:9, 16, 18, 24 laneway [1] - 2803:4 large [15] - 2500:3; 2520:21; 2572:11; 2624:20; 2633:8; 2652:3, 8; 2656:9; 2699:20; 2712:10; 2747:6; 2755:3; 2786:1; 2797:22 large-scale [1] -2712:10 largely [3] - 2543:17; 2560:14; 2807:4 larger [21] - 2521:4; 2522:16; 2571:22; 2573:12; 2601:14; 2620:16; 2633:24; 2648:1, 5; 2654:2; 2656:13, 16; 2701:6, 20, 22; 2748:22: 2767:25; 2769:13; 2770:4 largest [2] - 2617:6; 2735:18 last [21] - 2493:18,

24: 2498:10: 2501:1: 2502:9; 2515:5; 2541:3; 2557:10; 2595:17; 2609:11; 2632.8 2635.23 2683:19; 2702:13; 2719:18; 2753:1; 2764:13; 2775:17; 2787:3; 2788:20; 2798:10 **lasting** [1] - 2691:6 **lastly** [4] - 2495:23; 2500:16; 2587:1; 2592:24 late [10] - 2532:25; 2586:2, 11; 2684:18; 2688:20; 2690:1; 2728:20; 2738:20; 2760.4laudable [2] 2631:22; 2632:18 Laura [3] - 2492:11; 2495:18; 2798:20 lawn [1] - 2803:7 layer [5] - 2598:4; 2756:23, 25; 2757:8 layers [8] - 2592:4; 2756:15, 17, 19-20; 2757:17; 2758:4; 2761.17 **lead** [10] - 2504:16; 2587:6; 2599:11; 2601:25; 2602:22; 2623:4; 2647:7; 2711:2; 2747:4; 2774.16 lead-up [1] - 2623:4 leakage [4] - 2757:9; 2758:12; 2759:11, 22 learn [1] - 2600:2 learned [1] - 2805:15 learnt [1] - 2799:3 least [11] - 2566:5; 2570:7; 2609:11; 2650:5; 2717:18; 2756:13, 25; 2769:14; 2785:18; 2801:7; 2805:6 leave [3] - 2642:6; 2732:13; 2760:17 leaves [1] - 2707:11 leaving [4] - 2646:3; 2724:5; 2777:12; 2778:1 led [7] - 2504:17; 2562:6; 2600:6; 2601:24; 2727:10; 2746:19; 2759:21 Lee [5] - 2685:15; 2724:2; 2730:25; 2732:9: 2734:12 Leeds [2] - 2611:4; 2626:12 left [13] - 2511:5; 2550:6; 2584:24; 2601:21; 2604:8; 2728:10; 2744:3; 2761:3; 2775:15; 2800:8; 2802:16, 19, legal [6] - 2517:23; 2555:25; 2570:11; 2796:20; 2797:5; 2805:22 legislation [1] -2509.18 legislative [1] -2665:13 length [8] - 2552:3; 2554:8; 2699:8;

2717:20; 2718:1, 8; 2756:6 lengths [3] - 2519:2; 2522:1; 2765:6 lengthy [2] -2600:11; 2632:3 Leslie [1] - 2588:7 less [40] - 2504:18, 22-24; 2505:1; 2562:17; 2570:6 2581:6; 2602:15; 2634:25; 2635:13, 15-17, 19; 2636:3, 6-7, 9; 2638:4; 2642:19; 2652:5, 22; 2653:24; 2656:17; 2700:13; 2703:11 19-20, 25; 2704:4, 11, 16, 24; 2709:20: 2728:1; 2740:10; 2803:6 letter [8] - 2531:8; 2537:10; 2543:22; 2628:19, 22; 2642:15; 2739:17; 2745:1 **letters** [6] - 2627:1, 7; 2628:4; 2629:14, 17; 2630:20 letting [1] - 2664:17 **level** [58] - 2502:3; 2517:16; 2519:3; 2523:20; 2552:13, 17, 19; 2558:13; 2559:14; 2562:11; 2565:15, 23; 2566:15; 2567:7, 14; 2583:10, 18; 2603:16; 2637:1; 2652:15; 2682:10; 2687:18; 2700:7; 2703:3; 2707:19, 21, 24; 2712:22; 2713:3; 2715:16; 2722:17; 2727:9; 2731:2; 2739:10; 2740:18, 25; 2741:3, 17; 2742:5; 2743:8, 12, 17, 20-21; 2744:2; 2752:11, 14; 2778:8, 14; 2790:12 levels [14] - 2510:20; 2577:25; 2587:23; 2594:2; 2601:19; 2629:20; 2641:20; 2654:21; 2706:9; 2707:16; 2744:14; 2745:4; 2751:3; 2765.8 liaison [6] - 2528:17, 20; 2529:1; 2608:8, 13: 2718:25 licence [9] - 2507:22; 2655:22; 2656:4; 2692:16; 2727:25; 2794:5, 7, 10 licences [2] - 2692:8; 2794:6 licensed [2] 2559:18; 2663:11 licensing [1] -2655:19 Lieutenant [1] -2607:4 **life** [14] - 2510:9; 2581:24; 2613:23; 2615:14; 2650:8, 10; 2657:9; 2673:21; 2677:11: 2682:12: 2711:6; 2712:23; 2724:21; 2798:2 lifespan [1] -2783:21

lifestyle [1] - 2690:24 lift [1] - 2705:6 light [6] - 2569:12; 2605:4; 2622:7; 2723:7; 2728:12; 2776.16 likelihood [2] 2647:18; 2767:8 likely [19] - 2508:22; 2548:25; 2566:21; 2573:18; 2622:25; 2639:18; 2649:9; 2652:5; 2663:9; 2711:20; 2720:14; 2744:12; 2746:23; 2759:21, 23; 2767:8, 19; 2778:6, 24 limit [3] - 2558:16; 2679:8; 2738:7 limitation [2] 2700:10; 2746:18 limitations [8] 2647:5; 2665:25; 2685:23; 2745:2; 2748:13; 2750:9; 2762.24 2771.13 Limited [7] -2661:11; 2666:7; 2670:7; 2677:6, 9, 16; 2679 17 limited [21] - 2503:3; 2515:18; 2519:17; 2531:15; 2542:25; 2592:15; 2616:7; 2639:13; 2653:9; 2654:24; 2674:1, 24; 2675:1; 2679:5; 2748:7, 9; 2752:5; 2774:8; 2777:1; 2778:21; 2804:18 limits [7] - 2646:15; 2647:9; 2685:24; 2733:13; 2742:4; 2768:18; 2771:24 **line** [9] - 2588:22; 2590:13, 15; 2701:1; 2730:22; 2733:22; 2793:25 lines [3] - 2625:8; 2793:22 lingering [1] -2628:21 link [1] - 2729:13 linked [2] - 2705:16; 2713·5 liquids [1] - 2625:11 list [3] - 2562:3; 2676:25; 2735:1 listed [5] - 2509:16; 2691:21; 2718:17; 2720:8: 2730:5 listen [1] - 2640:15 listening [3] -2684:9; 2688:25; 2804:25 lists [1] - 2717:19 literature [3] -2729:5; 2749:2; 2770:2 live [3] - 2511:10; 2724:8; 2725:8 lived [3] - 2646:7; 2683:16, 22 livelihood [2] 2516:11; 2798:9 livelihoods [4] -2617:21; 2626:8, 20; 2633:8 lives [9] - 2516:11; 2617:21; 2622:23;

2626:8, 19; 2633:6; 2645:17; 2701:1; 2745.8 living [2] - 2709:2, 8 load [1] - 2591:12 loads [1] - 2579:8 local [38] - 2514:23 2515:16, 22; 2523:13, 23; 2525:1, 20; 2528:21-23; 2548:8; 2559:15; 2588:24; 2592:15; 2594:24; 2595:2; 2599:17; 2608:14; 2616:6; 2620:11; 2630:18; 2638:23; 2639:1, 12, 22; 2640:7; 2641:3, 10; 2716:25; 2726:13; 2729:25; 2751:7; 2760:9; 2798:12; 2803:18 localized [1] -2776:22 locally [1] - 2630:12 located [20] -2508:14; 2549:23; 2550:10, 15; 2551:17; 2558:12; 2582:13; 2583:1; 2590:1; 2594:19, 21; 2601:18; 2617:12; 2621:3; 2645:24; 2661:7; 2706:11; 2709:9; 2776:22; 2779:9 locating [2] - 2631:3; 2777:14 location [18] 2504:21; 2559:15; 2588:18; 2592:21; 2593:22; 2597:20; 2604:2; 2709:18; 2720:13; 2735:14; 2747:10; 2795:14; 2799:21; 2802:18; 2803:21, 25; 2804:6 locations [9] -2525:1; 2538:19; 2621:8; 2676:21; 2709:6; 2765:12; 2775:11; 2779:19 Locke [11] - 2583:2, 8; 2584:7, 11, 17; 2585:2, 24; 2586:4; 2754:3, 11, 25 Locke's [8] -2584:16; 2585:10, 16, 21; 2586:10; 2753:19, 21.23 locks [1] - 2799:22 logic [1] - 2750.25 logical [1] - 2747:13 logs [1] - 2536:12 long-lived [2] -2683:16, 22 long-standing [1] -2665:20 long-term [2] -2512:25; 2663:7 longer-term [1] -2656-1 longevity [1] -2770:11 look [19] - 2577:9; 2582:19; 2680:13; 2684:10; 2687:24; 2697:8; 2700:20; 2716:2, 2728:20, 2762:12; 2764:7; 2766:19; 2776:13; 2787:9, 14; 2799:9;

2804:3; 2805:15;	Luigi [1] - 2492:20	2720:5: 2726:7:	2655:14; 2733:11;	2548:11; 2557:24;
2806:16	lunch [3] - 2493:21;	2727:3; 2735:21;	2763:16; 2777:17	2559:13; 2585:12;
looked [3] - 2577:23;	2498:22; 2658:2	2743:10: 2744:24:	math [2] - 2592:17;	2594:3; 2653:20;
			2742:16	
2689:7; 2753:15	Luzi [5] - 2575:11,	2745:17; 2766:22;		2654:4; 2740:24;
	14; 2576:21; 2577:21;	2777:3, 7, 9	matter [11] - 2510:6;	2743:14; 2780:9;
2566:20; 2629:19;	2578:3	manager [1] - 2539:9	2519:15; 2556:21;	2781:14
2691:12; 2711:1;		managers [3] -	2567:10; 2575:4;	meant [2] - 2762:13
2723:19; 2748:23	M	2497:12; 2498:4;	2593:19; 2595:12;	meanwhile [2] -
looks [3] - 2493:21;		2784:2	2731:9; 2744:10;	2682:6; 2704:14
2749:11; 2802:3	machine [1] -	manages [1] -	2769:22; 2799:10	measure [3] -
looming [1] -	2762:15	2683:24	matters [11] -	2576:18; 2648:8;
2723:22	magnifies [1] -	mandate [7] -	2494:11, 18; 2495:8;	2737:7
Lorelee [1] - 2493:5	2803:21	2503:2; 2519:16;	2498:11, 25, 2603:25;	measured [4] -
lose [1] - 2613:4	magnitude [14] -	2545:3; 2611:20;	2617:7; 2618:15;	2592:11; 2712:24;
loses [2] - 2682:10;	2511:14; 2512:2, 7;	2653:9; 2661:24;	2681:19; 2807:23	2748:19; 2761:19
2742:6	2573:3; 2588:2;	2670:15	Matthew [2] -	measurement [2] -
losing [1] - 2724:12	2613:22; 2620:16;	mandates [2] -	2527:19; 2790:10	2702:7; 2759:14
loss [24] - 2510:9;	2624:1; 2695:1;	2522:4; 2665:14	maximum [17] -	measurements [5] -
2564:24; 2604:14, 18;	2748:18; 2749:10;		2551:9; 2552:17;	
		manifested [1] -		2702:13; 2757:12;
2615:14; 2625:4;	2757:11; 2758:5;	2577:19	2562:15, 17; 2563:18;	2761:9, 15
2627:9, 17; 2629:10;	2763:17	manner [4] -	2564:11, 19; 2651:4,	measures [35] -
2630:9; 2650:8;	main [7] - 2500:13;	2516:19; 2535:1;	8, 18; 2687:10;	2501:23; 2507:7;
2676:15; 2677:2;	2501:6; 2546:14;	2539:2; 2746:14	2688:11; 2697:11, 25;	2508:22; 2532:12;
2692:9, 19;	2557:7; 2611:16;	manual [2] - 2739:5,	2740:5, 10	2535:15; 2539:21;
2725:9-11; 2731:20;	2735:14; 2759:18	20	mayor [1] - 2642:14	2540:25; 2541:24;
2781:24; 2796:5	mainstream [1] -	manuals [1] -	MC1 [93] - 2503:25;	2544:4; 2594:11;
losses [4] - 2613:24;	2702:12	2568:21	2504:8; 2514:13;	2596:22; 2603:9;
2615:18; 2630:8	maintain [3] -	map [1] - 2795:8	2519:21; 2520:2, 7,	2639:21; 2640:15;
lost [12] - 2622:23;	2505:14; 2553:14;	mapped [3] -	12-13, 17-18, 20, 24;	2641:3; 2647:21;
2623:23; 2627:21, 24;	2654:21	2779:25, 2780:19, 22	2523:17, 19; 2582:25;	2661:22; 2664:6;
2715:4, 25; 2725:21;	maintained [2] -	mapping [3] -	2587:14: 2634:10. 14.	2667:16; 2669:15, 17;
2745:8; 2781:12, 15;	2508:2; 2553:5	2568:9; 2582:5;	18, 20, 23; 2635:4, 6,	2672:2; 2676:13, 18;
2796:6	maintaining [3] -	2718:21	12; 2636:3, 19, 23;	2677:1; 2679:9;
Louden [9] -	2562:24; 2563:3, 20	maps [3] - 2542:19;	2637:15, 21, 25;	2702:11; 2715:12;
2492:22; 2609:9;		2676:21; 2795:9	2638:7, 12; 2653:6,	2717:20, 25; 2718:7,
	maintenance [6] -			
2658:4; 2659:6;	2553:1; 2558:1;	March [14] - 2507:10;	16, 25; 2654:3, 6, 10;	10; 2777:10; 2778:3
2660:4, 17; 2679:22,	2568:10, 21, 2651:25;	2517:11; 2523:22;	2686:7, 21-22;	mechanical [2] -
25; 2785:7	2699:25	2531:8; 2535:12;	2687:13, 25; 2688:3;	2629:4; 2651:15
LOUDEN [5] -	major [13] - 2559:2;	2537:10; 2684:18;	2691:6; 2696:18;	mediating [1] -
2658:6, 9; 2660:5, 18;	2572:17; 2579:18;	2686:5; 2698:15;	2700:5, 9; 2701:6, 13,	2790:17
2680:4	2613:25; 2617:12;	2701:11; 2746:7;	17, 24; 2702:4, 14,	mediation [3] -
Louis [3] - 2543:22,	2642:13; 2648:21;	2755:22; 2757:18;	19; 2703:1, 5, 20;	2790:7; 2791:5;
24; 2544:14	2652:3; 2653:21;	2758:3	2704:11, 13, 25;	2793:15
low [40] - 2517:16;	2728:4; 2741:18;	MARCH [1] - 2495:20	2706:3; 2712:3, 20,	medicinal [1] -
2548:9; 2552:13, 17,	2768:10; 2795:12	marching [1] -	24; 2713:2, 22;	2544:11
19; 2562:11; 2564:24;	majority [1] -	2800:18	2715:8, 23; 2716:2;	meet [20] - 2526:17,
2565:15, 23; 2566:15;	2582:12	margin [3] - 2551:10,	2721:15, 24; 2722:2,	21, 25; 2527:2, 6;
2567:7, 14; 2596:24;	make-up [1] -	23; 2552:9	15-16; 2727:8;	2532:8; 2544:24;
2603:16; 2619:14;	2664:12	marked [8] - 2495:1,	2728:14; 2729:16,	2551:12; 2562:20;
2653:18; 2695:17;	makers [1] - 2780:17	11; 2496:5; 2498:17;	19-20, 23; 2736:10;	2652:7; 2671:25;
2708:25; 2715:16;	makings [1] -	2500:7; 2739:17;	2737:23; 2748:3;	2693:1, 23; 2694:1,
2738:19; 2740:18, 25;	2800:13	2785:24; 2786:10	2751:25; 2784:12;	12; 2695:7; 2696:1;
2741:3: 2743:4. 8. 12.				
	malfunctions [1] - 2678:2	market [1] - 2517:25	2801:18; 2805:2	2712:1; 2727:24;
17; 2744:10; 2751:1;		Marshall [4] -	MC1's [1] - 2700:22	2801:20
2752:11, 14; 2754:16;	manage [10] -	2685:15, 20; 2688:19,	McDougall [1] -	meeting [5] -
2756:15; 2759:21;	2595:9; 2634:21;	23 Monutes 2524:10:	2524:15	2523:15, 25; 2537:14;
2778:8, 14	2685:19; 2686:11;	Mary [6] - 2524:19;	McKay [1] - 2666:6	2540:14; 2802:6
low-level [23] -	2724:20; 2765:5;	2685:14; 2717:8, 16;	McLean [6] -	meetings [5] -
2517:16; 2552:13, 17,	2766:20; 2777:4, 15	2732:8; 2736:2	2502:25; 2519:5;	2523:1; 2534:21;
19; 2562:11; 2565:15,	manageable [2] -	Mary's [1] - 2753:8	2582:15, 25; 2705:13;	2540:4; 2545:21;
23; 2566:15; 2567:7,	2578:21; 2655:10	masses [1] - 2798:8	2729:7	2605:1
14; 2603:16; 2715:16;	managed [1] -	Massey [3] -	Meadows [7] -	meets [6] - 2522:10;
2740:18, 25; 2741:3;	2766:17	2524:19; 2618:9;	2521:7; 2582:5;	2563:9, 21; 2573:6;
2743:8, 12, 17;	management [55] -	2685:17	2633:1; 2634:4;	2616:22; 2645:11
2752:11, 14; 2778:8	2496:17; 2506:20;	massive [5] - 2573:5;	2682:7; 2705:23;	Melissa [1] - 2492:18
lower [14] - 2571:10;	2508:1; 2514:7, 11;	2589:12; 2720:20;	2721:12	member [5] -
2589:3; 2619:15;	2519:23; 2520:15, 17,	2766:18; 2775:6	mean [15] - 2525:18;	2526:12; 2555:9;
2654:5; 2688:1;	21-22; 2541:21;	master's [1] -	2557:2, 11; 2592:18;	2599:10; 2677:19;
2722:14, 19; 2754:23;	2546:4; 2548:19;	2600:10	2634:24; 2684:14;	2762:19
2757:8; 2758:4, 8	2559:7; 2568:2, 6, 22;	match [1] - 2744:7	2693:10; 2697:22;	Member [3] - 2492:8
lowered [1] - 2751:4	2569:5; 2570:14;	material [13] -	2732:22; 2735:5, 7;	members [40] -
lowering [1] -	2571:3, 13; 2598:13;	2588:3; 2593:14;	2748:8; 2750:15;	2499:13; 2501:5;
2553:13	2603:6, 8; 2651:15;	2599:25; 2624:23;	2776:2; 2786:12	2505:9; 2510:10;
LRT [3] - 2621:5;	2654:8; 2656:25;	2653:19; 2660:24;	meaning [3] -	2522:15; 2523:3, 9,
2625:6; 2630:11	2663:2; 2670:8;	2680:22; 2684:22;	2554:18; 2603:21;	14, 24; 2524:18;
Ltd [8] - 2493:3;	2674:16, 19; 2685:19;	2685:1; 2756:24;	2648:15	2525:20; 2526:2, 4, 7,
2542:16; 2579:16;	2692:6, 25; 2693:22;	2769:23, 25; 2777:24	meaningful [5] -	11; 2547:14; 2606:19;
2788:6, 13; 2796:7;	2695:24; 2696:2;	materials [8] -	2529:16; 2533:18;	2610:10, 17; 2626:14,
2798:15	2710:4; 2715:9;	2501:2; 2515:3;	2534:2, 20; 2535:10,	25; 2644:7, 14;
lucky [1] - 2764:13	2717:3, 20; 2718:19;	2592:21; 2599:2;	means [11] -	2660:19; 2679:14;

2685:11, 18; 2698:16; 2730:24; 2760:23; 2766:6; 2776:19; 2779:8; 2784:1, 7, 19; 2789:20; 2798:20, 23 membership [1] -2626:6 membrane[1] -2788:25 mementos [1] -2627:12 memo [5] - 2568:13; 2569:21; 2584:17; 2588:6; 2718:9 memorandum [2] -2565.21.2569.16 memories [2] 2627:16; 2725:21 memory [1] -2784.13 Menninger [14] 2549:10; 2554:24; 2559:17; 2560:4, 6, 9; 2564:5; 2566:8, 14, 21; 2567:1, 9; 2709.21 Menninger's [2] -2560:12; 2763:2 mental [4] - 2626:16; 2628:5, 20; 2629:17 mentally [1] -2650 14 mention [3] 2704:21; 2723:25; 2752:2 mentioned [8] -2613:11; 2655:24; 2711:21; 2714:5; 2716:7; 2718:10; 2725:15 mentioning [1] -2633:11 mentions [1] -2726:1 Mercer [2] - 2492:19; 2609.10mere [2] - 2525:16; 2597:15 merely [1] - 2694:3 merit [5] - 2503:19; 2561:19; 2637:8; 2705:17; 2765:15 **merits** [3] - 2503:7; 2653:12; 2748:4 met [10] - 2523:12, 23; 2524:9, 17; 2525:4; 2534:9; 2535:2; 2645:10; 2663:9; 2775:23 met., [1] - 2696:4 meteorological 181 -2600:25; 2766:14; 2770:20; 2772:11; 2773:5, 8, 10; 2774:17 meteorologically [1] 2768:1 meteorology [5] -2767:18; 2768:16; 2769:4; 2771:16; 2772:23 method [1] - 2577:8 methodology [1] -2536:24 methods [3] -2583:5, 15; 2601:3 metre [3] - 2558:13; 2697:17; 2742:17 **metres** [63] 2548:23; 2551:9, 11,

14-15; 2552:2, 5, 8, 10, 18; 2553:3, 5, 7-8, 10, 15; 2554:2, 6, 16, 18-19, 21; 2558:24; 2559:2; 2562:16, 18; 2592:2, 6; 2619:1, 12, 14; 2646:17; 2648:16; 2651:11; 2687:11; 2688:12; 2697:12, 18, 24; 2699:10, 12; 2707:8-11, 14; 2712:25; 2738:9; 2739:2; 2752:20; 2756:13, 23; 2757:3; 2759:22; 2801:15, 17; 2804.2 Miami [5] - 2698:13, 21; 2699:4, 10; 2700.1Michael [2] -2492:12, 17 micrograms [1] -2790:6 Middle [1] - 2765:18 middle [3] - 2687:8; 2747:7; 2788:15 **might** [28] - 2496:4, 19; 2497:9; 2499:20; 2504:10; 2540:23; 2566:22, 25; 2569:13; 2591:16; 2593:4; 2607:7; 2612:12; 2638:7; 2667:5, 8; 2684:12; 2690:12; 2724:10; 2733:15; 2736:20, 23; 2745:16; 2774:25; 2778:16; 2786:20 migrate [1] - 2593:10 migration [2] -2593:1, 3 migratory [1] -2718:21 millimetres [2] -2699.5 million [58] - 2516:5; 2552:8, 10; 2622:1, 3; 2623:23; 2624:7, 13; 2625:2, 13, 22; 2646:17; 2647:12; 2649:2, 21; 2651:11; 2683:3; 2713:6-8, 11-14, 16-17, 20, 22-23; 2714:9, 12 2715:8; 2717:10, 12, 18; 2722:2, 6-11, 20-22; 2723:1; 2788:23; 2796:14; 2800:25; 2801:8 mimic [1] - 2761:19 mind [4] - 2557:18; 2650:12; 2749:21; 2796:10 minds [1] - 2766:20 mineralogy [1] -2762:7 minimal [2] - 2650:1; 2768:19 minimalist [1] -2774:11 minimalistic [3] 2768:18, 24; 2771:11 minimize [1] -2755:10 minimum [10] -2562:24; 2563:3; 2676:20; 2677:25; 2707:19, 21, 24; 2777:10; 2790:4; 2801:20

minister [1] - 2509:2 ministerial [1] -2570.13 ministries [1] -2531:14 **minor** [3] - 2498:14; 2576:3; 2733:13 minus [1] - 2757:3 minute [3] - 2632:3; 2764:1; 2775:21 minutes [9] - 2499:3; 2604:8; 2643:22; 2644:4; 2681:10; 2774:6; 2775:18; 2784:16 misguided [1] -2527: misleading [2] -2698:8; 2699:3 misleads [1] -2702:2 misrepresentation [1] - 2767:11 misrepresenting [1] 2802:2 misrepresents [1] -2770:24 miss [1] - 2761:24 missing [16] -2714:17, 22; 2715:2, 11, 17, 22; 2716:8, 12, 24; 2717:2, 6; 2719:25; 2720:23; 2722:5, 10; 2756:20 misspelled [1] -2756.1 misunderstanding [2] - 2588:18; 2589:1 mitigate [15] 2512:22; 2541:1; 2548:7; 2573:11; 2579:2; 2613:21; 2615:12; 2621:15; 2622:1; 2640:13; 2652:21; 2667:17; 2718:2; 2747:24; 2755.11 mitigated [12] 2566:23; 2575:8; 2596:7, 25; 2598:13; 2601:5; 2640:7, 9; 2650:1; 2655:17; 2667:9; 2773:20 mitigating [3] -2512:8; 2620:9; 2725 14 Mitigation [2] - 2646:23; 2698:17 mitigation [108] -2501:23; 2507:7; 2508:21; 2510:6, 16; 2514:4, 6, 19; 2516:9, 18; 2518:25; 2520:18; 2521:4, 24; 2532:7 2533:11; 2535:5, 15; 2536:24; 2539:21 2541:3, 5, 23; 2544:3, 16-17; 2545:19, 24; 2546:1, 3; 2549:12; 2574:22; 2582:3; 2594:9; 2596:22 2598:14; 2599:9; 2601:23; 2606:4, 9, 11; 2610:16; 2614:7, 13; 2615:17; 2616:6, 25; 2618:6, 24; 2619:7, 17; 2628:14; 2629:2, 11-12; 2632:5; 2633:17, 25; 2634:6, 11; 2638:17;

2639:20: 2640:9. 14. 17, 19; 2641:3, 5: 2642:20; 2646:25; 2647:2, 6; 2648:3; 2649:17, 20; 2650:11, 25; 2652:22; 2654:15; 2656:21; 2662:22; 2663:16, 22; 2664:6; 2667:16; 2669:14, 17; 2670:20; 2672:1; 2674:2, 9; 2675:7; 2679:9; 2683:14; 2685:19; 2694:19; 2698:3; 2705:24; 2707:19; 2712:10; 2715:12; 2729:18; 2760:3; 2764:25; 2782:1; 2791:2; 2798.13 mitigation.. [1] -2618:13 mitigations [9] 2536:10; 2539:13; 2540:12; 2586:22; 2597:20; 2598:10; 2601:23; 2669:19 mitigative [1] -2515:18 mix [1] - 2544:21 MNP [1] - 2492:14 mobilization [1] -2718.3 mode [1] - 2782:3 model [33] - 2512:13; 2582:2; 2587:21; 2588:25; 2589:2, 4, 17, 20; 2590:6, 10; 2592:8; 2593:2, 4; 2597:18; 2598:1, 21, 25; 2600:21; 2721:6; 2756:15, 20; 2757:1, 5; 2758:4, 7; 2761:5, 17, 22, 25; 2762:12, 17; 2779:4 modelled [7] -2590:8, 18; 2602:16; 2740:6; 2751:16; 2769:23: 2773:9 modelling [23] -2582:1; 2589:13; 2593:9, 12-13, 24; 2597:13; 2600:14; 2601:4; 2602:13; 2604:19; 2684:17, 19-20; 2753:2; 2755:4; 2759:1; 2768:11, 20; 2770:14, 23; 2774:20 models [11] 2570:24; 2587:23; 2590:17, 23; 2591:2; 2662:20; 2664:3; 2758:22; 2762:10, 13 modest [2] 2654:16; 2655:23 modifications [2] -2532:11; 2646:19 modified [3] -2605:8, 13; 2781:24 moment [3] -2514:21; 2525:11; 2634:17 moments [1] -2495:24 monetize [4] -2649:12; 2664:11; 2731:16, 20 **money** [3] - 2712:2, 9: 2800:22 monitor [10] -

2594:5; 2673:4, 6, 9; 2675:7; 2677:8; 2760:2; 2774:7; 2792.16 monitored [5] -2516:17; 2575:9; 2578:21; 2595:16; 2596:6 monitoring [40] -2539:14; 2544:18; 2545:18, 20, 24-25; 2546:1; 2574:22; 2582:2; 2593:21; 2594:7, 13, 16-18, 21, 23: 2595:3, 5, 8; 2601:17, 24; 2607:17; 2608:20; 2673:13, 19; 2674:6, 8, 12; 2677:5; 2720:4; 2725:13; 2726:7; 2757:23; 2760:3; 2790:3, 13, 21 monitors [1] -2530:17 month [1] - 2524:3 monthly [1] -2790:16 months [5] -2599:13; 2720:7, 14; 2742:14: 2802:5 **moreover** [6] -2521:12; 2577:7, 23; 2588:10; 2596:4; 2599.20 Morley [1] - 2672:11 morning [25] -2493:9, 25; 2494:2, 12; 2496:17, 23; 2497:15; 2498:8, 16, 19; 2499:12; 2500:22 24; 2547:14; 2610:10, 20; 2611:25; 2614:24; 2644:17; 2680:24; 2689:12; 2793:4; 2807:14, 25; 2808:3 morning's [2] -2688:25; 2803:10 Morris [1] - 2642:24 **most** [35] - 2498:7; 2515:11; 2521:16; 2532:14; 2539:2; 2552:4, 23; 2557:5; 2566:19, 21; 2575:8; 2598:5; 2605:23; 2626:6; 2628:18; 2629:9, 24; 2636:12; 2638:15; 2639:14; 2649:10; 2657:4; 2662:11; 2665:1; 2686:10, 15, 17; 2702:21; 2712:11; 2724:12; 2742:13; 2746:21; 2783:1; 2801.19 mountain [1] -2646:1 move [9] - 2593:6, 8; 2612:4; 2650:15; 2690:4; 2730:12; 2748:20; 2749:25; 2750:2 movement [7] -2545:11, 16; 2575:12; 2605:8, 11; 2676:11; 2699.22 moving [8] 2523:18, 2584:8; 2602:3; 2700:3; 2709:24; 2733:18; 2734:6; 2736:25

mowing [1] -	2633:17; 2673:10	Natural [4] - 2492:1;	2727:25; 2797:7	2778:9
2735:22		2637:11; 2645:2;	negative [7] -	non-guidance [1] -
MR [67] - 2494:21;	N	2684:1	2621:15; 2622:1;	2768:14
2495:7, 15, 22;	Nabi [5] - 2661:11;	naturally [1] -	2688:16; 2703:21;	non-guideline [1] -
2496:10; 2497:2, 4,		2758:15	2725:24; 2782:25;	2598:21
15; 2498:13, 24;	2677:5, 9, 15;	nature [11] - 2528:3;	2789:19	non-Indigenous [1] -
2499:11; 2547:13;	2679:17	2538:4; 2540:22;	negatively [1] -	2546:6
2604:11; 2609:21;	Naheed [1] - 2642:14	2603:13; 2616:8;	2655:2	none [8] - 2495:17;
2610:1, 3, 8; 2612:8;	Nakoda [70] -	2639:13; 2653:24;	negotiate [1] -	2499:1; 2526:7;
2613:8, 14; 2632:1,	2492:22; 2500:19;	2682:19; 2683:22;	2805:10	2696:9; 2766:23;
14; 2635:25; 2659:25;	2529:7; 2535:25;	2721:5; 2768:19	negotiated [1] -	2785:9; 2806:21;
2660:2; 2679:24;	2588:4, 10; 2604:20,	navigate [1] - 2638:9	2801:10	2807:25
2680:6, 10, 19;	25; 2608:18; 2658:5;	navigated [1] -	negotiating [1] -	Nonetheless [1] -
2681:7, 11, 13, 15;	2660:25; 2661:3, 6,	2636:25	2640:25	2700:22
2732:20; 2733:4, 7, 9,	12; 2662:1; 2665:17,	navigation [1] -	negotiations [2] -	nonsensical [1] -
19; 2734:3, 6; 2764:3, 9, 12; 2775:20;	21, 25; 2666:1, 16,	2784:11	2518:3; 2666:16	2714:15
	19, 21; 2667:1, 13;	NDA [1] - 2801:7	Nenshi [1] - 2642:14	normal [3] - 2517:6;
2776:4, 8, 10;	2668:1, 6-7, 15-16,	near [10] - 2524:6;	nervous [1] -	2551:19; 2698:9
2784:20, 25; 2785:3,	24; 2669:8, 13, 22,	2525:1; 2548:10;	2748:11	normally [1] -
14, 21; 2786:9, 11;	25; 2670:4, 9, 20, 23;	2594:22; 2617:12;	net [2] - 2649:8	2732:22
2787:8, 15, 24;	2671:8, 14, 19, 22,	2709:2, 8; 2743:24;	networks [2] -	north [1] - 2794:15
2799:17, 19, 25;	25; 2672:4, 6, 13, 17, 19; 2673:2, 8, 11-12,	2761:20; 2783:22	2647:16; 2778:14	notable [2] -
2806:5, 10, 15, 18,		near-term [1] -	never [10] - 2516:25;	2517:13; 2651:9
22; 2808:4	15, 19; 2674:15;	2783:22	2520:25; 2561:8;	notably [1] - 2730:24
MS [15] - 2495:3, 18; 2496:12: 2497:24:	2675:2, 7, 13, 18, 23;	nearby [1] - 2601:18	2591:22; 2630:7;	note [20] - 2505:15;
	2676:1, 4-5, 19;	nearest [1] - 2601:20	2688:19; 2689:25;	2542:11; 2561:6;
2643:20; 2644:3, 7;	2677:19, 21, 24;	nearly [7] - 2559:6;	2723:15; 2729:23;	2565:6; 2568:18;
2658:6, 9; 2659:14,	2678:11, 17; 2679:11	2637:23; 2646:8;	2800:8	2572:2; 2582:24;
19; 2660:5, 12, 18;	NAKODA [1] -	2647:10; 2697:25;	Nevertheless [1] -	2600:5; 2616:5;
2680:4	2785:11	2714:10; 2802:5	2748:11	2618:5; 2620:22;
mud [4] - 2690:22;	Nakoda's [1] -	necessarily [2] -	nevertheless [5] -	2660:20; 2671:10;
2691:5; 2694:5;	2661:7	2600:19; 2701:21	2555:17; 2573:6;	2707:2; 2708:7;
2711:18	name [5] - 2550:12;	necessary [13] -	2579:2; 2580:2;	2740:23; 2742:22;
multi [1] - 2724:1	2551:18; 2684:1;	2516:6; 2529:12;	2662:1	2755:15; 2764:10;
multi-generational	2755:25; 2756:1	2541:17; 2605:3;	new [21] - 2521:8,	2778:1
[1] - 2724:1	namely [3] - 2548:9;	2649:21; 2656:22;	19; 2604:19; 2634:1;	noted [62] - 2502:1;
Multiculturalism [2]	2587:14; 2615:4	2657:8; 2663:16, 22; 2761:2; 2772:2;	2656:7; 2659:8;	2506:3; 2507:10;
- 2540:19; 2672:25	narrative [1] - 2592:5		2663:3; 2696:15;	2508:18; 2514:9;
multigenerational	narrow [3] - 2694:20, 23; 2748:25	2778:22; 2790:3	2707:22; 2711:4, 18;	2516:16; 2517:20;
[1] - 2732:5	Nation [21] -	Need [1] - 2685:8	2717:19; 2722:6, 9,	2519:16; 2520:5;
multiple [7] -		need [45] - 2494:15;	13; 2723:2; 2727:13;	2535:6; 2537:18;
2520:15; 2587:10;	2492:22; 2531:13, 20;	2497:11, 17; 2501:18;	2730:2; 2782:19;	2539:4, 10; 2541:2;
2591:15; 2625:19;	2532:1, 15; 2533:8;	2510:2, 22; 2511:11;	2802:2; 2805:22	2543:10; 2549:10;
2651:13; 2756:4;	2588:5, 11; 2621:3;	2514:5; 2549:2;	newer [1] - 2802:22	2559:8; 2563:5;
2765:21	2661:1; 2666:6;	2565:18; 2566:11;	newly [2] - 2713:18;	2565:23; 2566:3;
multitude [2] -	2679:16; 2721:17;	2577:9; 2579:25;	2720:12	2569:16; 2576:5;
2623:11; 2669:10	2734:13; 2735:22;	2594:8; 2606:11;	news [3] - 2602:20;	2578:3; 2583:10, 14,
multiuse [1] - 2690:7	2783:9; 2796:15	2611:16; 2613:17;	2715:3; 2802:6	18, 23; 2584:3;
municipal [4] -	Nations [40] -	2614:2, 6-7; 2616:24;	newsletters [1] -	2589:10: 2590:22:
2521:13; 2693:24;	2500:19; 2515:13;	2617:1; 2618:23;	2523:2	2591:9; 2593:2;
2694:2; 2788:10	2529:8, 13, 24;	2643:24; 2644:4, 23; 2645:23; 2646:5;	next [25] - 2510:2;	2601:8; 2610:20;
municipalities [1] -	2530:11; 2533:2, 19,		2511:16; 2518:21;	2614:21; 2615:6;
2510:11	23-24; 2534:12;	2657:24; 2681:3;	2522:7; 2524:2;	2624:18; 2629:25;
Munkittrick [2] -	2535:25; 2544:6, 20,	2685:19, 22; 2686:3;	2529:2; 2547:10;	2636:11; 2640:2;
2492:18; 2609:11	24; 2545:1, 5, 17;	2692:16; 2695:19;	2556:25; 2623:17;	2651:16; 2691:10;
must [57] - 2503:11;	2546:24; 2604:20, 25;	2700:15; 2716:17; 2736:4; 2744:15;	2626:3, 21; 2642:13;	2692:14, 23; 2693:5,
2506:11; 2517:21;	2608:19; 2660:25;	2749:14, 19; 2760:16;	2643:18; 2647:4;	20; 2701:9; 2723:6;
2522:15; 2530:2;	2661:4; 2666:18,		2680:2; 2683:13,	2726:20; 2728:7;
2558:12; 2559:13;	23-24; 2670:9, 20;	2762:18; 2794:10	17-18; 2684:6;	2736:5; 2745:16, 18;
2562:23; 2563:2;	2671:4; 2676:7;	needed [18] -	2685:7; 2690:18;	2750:5; 2752:8;
2571:10; 2597:18;	2714:18; 2718:25;	2508:11; 2511:15;	2709:6; 2733:18	2754:11; 2766:8, 13;
2598:1; 2600:4;	2723:20; 2734:15, 19, 22; 2735:13; 2771:24;	2573:9; 2613:20;	nice [2] - 2493:16;	2776:15; 2780:2, 24;
2606:12; 2614:25;		2614:17; 2616:22;	2799:16	2800:10
2633:10, 13; 2639:3;	2796:17	2618:4, 6, 18;	night [2] - 2808:4	notes [19] - 2497:8;
2650:7; 2662:2, 6, 8, 11; 2664:8, 10;	NATIONS [1] -	2619:21; 2633:9;	nil [1] - 2737:11	2536:4, 13; 2537:5;
	2785:11	2638:16; 2639:11;	nine [2] - 2697:25;	2538:14; 2539:23;
2665:6, 8, 20; 2666:7;	Nations' [5] -	2640:20; 2645:16;	2775:15	2541:6, 21; 2542:5;
2667:5, 9, 11;	2521:13; 2672:21;	2646:11; 2728:3	Noble [9] - 2600:8, 10, 17; 2601:24;	2545:7; 2561:3;
2668:25; 2670:15;	2732:4; 2734:17;	needing [1] -		2573:24; 2578:23;
2672:9, 18; 2676:20;	2735:9	2654:19	2765:23; 2772:21;	2607:8; 2633:23;
2678:17; 2682:23;	native [10] - 2693:14,	needlessly [1] -	2773:1; 2775:9	2688:21; 2736:3;
2692:6, 25; 2693:22;	17; 2736:3; 2776:16;	2598:7	Noble's [3] - 2772:8,	2752:4; 2780:16
2694:12; 2709:12;	2780:1, 11, 14, 19,	needs [19] - 2498:20;	12, 19	noteworthy [1] -
2721:14; 2723:7;	22; 2781:24	2544:12; 2548:13;	nobody [1] - 2685:21	2526:6
2743:25; 2744:10;	natural [12] -	2654:22; 2655:20;	non [6] - 2546:6;	nothing [6] -
2773:22; 2777:6, 19,	2505:19; 2611:8;	2656:25; 2657:2;	2598:21; 2768:14;	2642:11; 2682:3;
23; 2778:10; 2780:5,	2627:3; 2646:3;	2665:3; 2678:24;	2773:24; 2778:9	2683:4; 2700:13;
10; 2795:20; 2804:8	2653:17; 2657:7;	2683:14; 2693:23, 25;	non-factual [2] -	2737:25; 2763:4
mute [1] - 2499:12	2704:18; 2725:12;	2694:1; 2695:7;	2768:15; 2773:24	notice [3] - 2612:10,
mutually [2] -	2781:23, 25; 2792:15	2705:7; 2712:5;	non-flood [1] -	18; 2790:1

2806:9

2494:16

2795:10

2706.25

2587:20

2781:9

2776:16

2786.9

2512:13

2806:15

2795:9

2799.2 5 7

6

2529:11

2528.12

2541.6

2800.3

2589.8

noticeable [1] -2601:15 notify [1] - 2774:7 **noting** [7] - 2519:25; 2540:10; 2576:20; 2589:17; 2633:5, 16; 2738:23 notion [2] - 2589:16; 2750:23 notwithstanding [6] 2519:19; 2563:23; 2564:14; 2572:3; 2584:10: 2587:7 NOVA [1] - 2542:16 novel [1] - 2533:6 November [4] -2507:9; 2524:15; 2534:8; 2538:10 nowhere [1] -2792.24 noxious [2] 2776:11; 2778:23 **NR** [3] - 2691:15; 2694:7; 2695:2 NR2018-01 [1] -NRCB [52] - 2503:11; 2505:16; 2521:17; 2530:2; 2531:9-12; 15; 2537:7, 10, 13, 20; 2542:10, 20, 25; 2638:10; 2664:17; 2666:3; 2678:23; 2687:23: 2691:3 13-14, 21; 2692:23; 2693:20; 2694:16; 2695:2; 2697:8, 14; 2726:24; 2728:13; 2736:24; 2737:14; 2738:23; 2739:19; 2742:8; 2745:1; 2760:23; 2762:16; 2783:7; 2789:11; 2790:13; 2792:9; 2793:13; 2798:19, 24; 2799:9; 2800:10; 2803:22; 2804:20 NRCB/CEAA[1] -2710.1 NRCBA [4] · 2503:23; 2505:17; 2780:3, 5 Number [37] 2495:4, 19; 2635:12; 2659:13; 2661:5; 2706:7; 2734:6; 2740:9, 14, 16; 2741:8, 10, 21; 2785:8; 2789:10, 25; 2790.20 2791.25 2792:2. 8-9: 2793:1 5, 17, 25; 2794:4, 17 19; 2795:7; 2796:6, 9, 13, 21, 24; 2797:11; 2805:7 number [33] 2505:12; 2512:24; 2518:5; 2523:13; 2532:10; 2533:10; 2543:15; 2545:10; 2549:18; 2591:10; 2603:6; 2604:25; 2622:20; 2635:8; 2641:1; 2644:25; 2702:3; 2713:10; 2730:6; 2736:18; 2740:4; 2742:25; 2745:13; 2753:9; 2754:17; 2757:19; 2765:16; 2774:22;

2775:8; 2786:22; 2734.13 17 2789:6; 2801:8; obviously [5] -2555:25; 2569:1; 2745:21; 2757:24; numbered [1] -2800:17 Numbers [1] occasions [4] 2545:11; 2587:10; numbers [6] -2496:4; 2497:20; 2617:5; 2756:4 occupy [1] - 2779:17 2623:20; 2625:18; occur [24] - 2514:25; 2533:15; 2558:19; 2564:11; 2566:22; numerical [1] -2570:20; 2578:24; 2579:11; 2591:17, 20; numerous [15] -2501:23; 2502:10; 2503:25; 2525:3; 2615:16; 2616:7; 2634:23; 2667:5, 8; 2526:14; 2536:17; 2689:4; 2724:24; 2580:19; 2607:8; 2741:1; 2759:12; 2608:1; 2640:14; 2762:3; 2774:13, 16 2653:5: 2668:18: occurred [13] -2526:11; 2537:13; 2584:22; 2616:6; 2621:9; 2634:23; 2685:10; 2761:21; nutrient [1] - 2579:8 nutrients [1] -2684:13; 2699:4; 2712:12; 2728:23; 2746:22; 2748:19; 0 2750:11 occurrence [2] object [4] - 2499:12; 2600:24; 2724:15 2512:13; 2732:25; occurrences [1] -2577:18 object-based [1] occurring [5] -2595:7; 2600:22; 2654:5; 2678:2; objection [7] 2732:24; 2787:6; 2758:15 2789:13; 2791:25; 2793:17; 2798:3; occurs [3] - 2548:17; 2554:5; 2586:6 Oceans [1] - 2509:5 Objection [1] -October [2] - 2524:8; 2538:9 objections [14] odd [3] - 2612:11; 2495:16; 2505:14; 2659:23, 25; 2660:5; 2733:8; 2785:9, 15, 2613:3; 2802:18 odds [4] - 2589:22; 2735:13, 22; 2742:3 odours [1] - 2627:14 OF [8] - 2496:13; 2659:17; 2660:13; 19; 2788:3; 2789:10; objective [10] 2506:5; 2600:18; 2785:10; 2786:23; 2606:13; 2614:21; 2787:20; 2806:22 2615:11; 2729:11; Off-Stream [2] -2499:16; 2606:25 2768:8; 2771:7, 16 objectives [2] off-stream [17] 2520:15: 2791:1 2504:18; 2508:15; objects [2] - 2676:2, 2548:6, 16; 2549:4; 2564:25; 2581:5; Objects [1] - 2676:7 2606:15; 2635:13; obligation [1] -2636:3; 2652:6; 2653:19, 24; 2655:7; 2696:25; 2704:4 obligations [1] offer [11] - 2567:2; 2648:4; 2672:12; obliged [2] 2673:1, 17; 2674:18; 2675:22; 2677:22; 2528:11; 2542:11 observations [1] -2678:11, 17; 2700:6 observe [4] - 2541:3; offered [4] - 2526:17; 2543:10; 2544:3 2532:7; 2640:21; observed [6] -2701:11 2588:24; 2590:8, 17; 2654:7; 2695:14 offering [4] -2526:21, 25; 2535:12; observers [1] -2545:20 offers [5] - 2527:2, 6; obtain [7] - 2522:24; 2645:19; 2648:8; 2532:8; 2535:3, 14; 2536:23; 2541:17; 2727:16 Office [2] - 2529:20; 2666.2 obtained [7] office [2] - 2565:8; 2518:4; 2533:16; 2742.4 2534:10; 2587:20; Official [1] - 2493:5 2670:18; 2757:13, 15 officials [3] obvious [2] -2522:21; 2528:24;

2608.16 offs [1] - 2523:1 offseason [1] -2790.16 offset [5] - 2676:13, 18, 25; 2715:23; 2796:4 offsets [1] - 2715:2 offsetting [4] · 2509:25; 2586:22; 2716:4, 6 often [5] - 2538:12; 2571:10; 2747:1, 4; 2799.22 oftentimes [1] -2760.4Ohio [4] - 2698:14, 16, 22; 2700:1 oil [1] - 2555:14 Okoye [5] - 2493:1; 2609:9; 2784:8, 10, 18 old [1] - 2698:14 oldest [1] - 2662:12 ominous [1] -2559:13 once [13] - 2497:6; 2530:20; 2532:21; 2549:1; 2564:10; 2591:19: 2593:18: 2762:2; 2799:1, 22; 2806:3; 2807:16; 2808.2 One [4] - 2792:1; 2796:9 one [75] - 2504:2; 2515:7; 2521:3; 2526:12; 2527:19; 2532:1, 14; 2539:15; 2555:3; 2556:25; 2561:14; 2564:20; 2570:7; 2577:5, 9; 2581:7, 21; 2585:3; 2589:14; 2590:23; 2601:13; 2613:4; 2618:8: 2627:9. 20: 2630:11; 2632:3; 2633:24; 2637:1; 2657:17; 2663:14; 2667:24; 2670:6; 2682:9; 2685:2; 2691:8; 2699:5; 2700:20; 2709:20; 2714:3; 2727:12, 14; 2728:4; 2729:3; 2730:4; 2733:18; 2740:4; 2742:17; 2743:16; 2746:9, 18; 2749:11; 2750:13, 19; 2757:13; 2759:17; 2762:22; 2774:6; 2779:9; 2788:7 2791:21; 2794:15; 2795:5, 16; 2798:6; 2802:9; 2804:21; 2805:1, 16 one's [1] - 2747:4 one-way [1] - 2802:9 ones [2] - 2706:17; 2731:11 ongoing [10] -2509:24; 2528:19; 2534:24; 2578:25; 2629:18; 2661:8; 2699:25; 2711:14; 2728:24: 2801:23 online [4] - 2556:4; 2599:6; 2628:23; 2799.18 onside [1] - 2734:20

open [15] - 2523:1; 2524:4, 6-7, 12, 24; 2539:2; 2564:13; 2581:2; 2585:15; 2743:6; 2744:3; 2797:17; 2807:24 opened [1] - 2630:7 **opening** [25] -2501:4, 7, 10; 2504:14; 2508:19; 2510:12; 2516:3; 2525:2; 2543:16, 19; 2549:6; 2596:20; 2597:6; 2603:5; 2611:5; 2618:8; 2626:13; 2627:19; 2629:25; 2630:13, 22; 2635:11; 2636:2; 2642:24; 2723:23 openings [1] -2501:6 operate [14] 2510:18; 2513:25; 2548:13, 21-22; 2549:1; 2551:20; 2552:23; 2554:17; 2560:21; 2596:16; 2704:14; 2719:20 operated [7] -2508:2; 2513:19; 2515:6; 2548:16; 2553:11; 2630:12; 2788.13 operates [1] -2651:20 operating [31] -2547:23; 2552:21; 2553:4, 18; 2564:15; 2588:17; 2631:2; 2652:2; 2704:15 2711:14; 2718:15 2721:2, 6, 9; 2723:7; 2737:12; 2738:14, 16, 24; 2739:1, 7-8, 13, 18-19: 2742:10: 2778:21; 2782:3; 2801.23 operation [40] 2504:22; 2508:12; 2548:19; 2549:24; 2550:7; 2552:25; 2564:13; 2568:10; 2575:19; 2578:24; 2580:10; 2600:23; 2603:23; 2604:16; 2611:21; 2616:13; 2618:3; 2624:3; 2639:12; 2643:3; 2651:9, 24; 2655:9; 2657:15; 2673:21, 25; 2737:15, 18; 2738:18; 2739:14; 2741:2; 2743:23; 2744:11; 2746:2; 2752:18; 2773:7; 2788:6; 2792.4 operational [12] -2620:5; 2623:16; 2635:14; 2636:5; 2639:14; 2642:13; 2651:16; 2652:10; 2654:1; 2706:22; 2739:20 operations [37] 2515:19; 2528:18;

2551:20; 2553:2, 21; 2568:21; 2575:21; 2576:2; 2587:22; 2594:14; 2596:12, 18; 2603:14, 21; 2608:5,

11: 2711:2: 2714:23: 2718:17; 2719:3, 25; 2720:1; 2724:6, 18; 2726:6; 2739:5, 11; 2742:24; 2778:15, 21; 2781:13 operator [8] 2532:19; 2549:2; 2567:25; 2570:19; 2598:16; 2671:13; 2692:15; 2706:23 opine [1] - 2588:9 opining [1] - 2739:1 opinion [5] -2505:21; 2569:10; 2746:19; 2760:18; 2804:13 opinions [1] - 2802:9 opportunities [15] -2513:2; 2520:20; 2528:9; 2533:2; 2534:5, 13; 2536:18; 2537:17; 2544:1, 8, 15; 2669:12; 2711:5, 18; 2734:22 opportunity [13] -2502:16; 2533:14; 2544:2; 2610:15; 2667:6; 2669:4; 2679:20; 2680:2; 2785:22; 2795:14, 22; 2797:2; 2799:2 **oppose** [2] - 2500:11; 2638:7 opposed [5] 2504:11; 2654:9; 2709:4; 2759:14, 22 opposes [1] - 2618:5 opposite [4] -2577:24; 2650:18; 2711:20; 2803:12 opposition [3] -2524:5; 2722:25; 2734.13 optimized [1] -2656.5 option [15] -2599:14; 2635:8; 2637.20. 2638.1. 2678:9; 2705:13, 17; 2729:4; 2747:9, 12; 2748:3, 22; 2750:14, 17 options [9] -2523:18; 2636:22; 2662:22; 2663:2; 2728:21; 2742:7; 2755:6; 2762:21; 2763:20 **Opus** [5] - 2704:13; 2705:3; 2728:11; 2729:13, 15 oral [10] - 2496:3; 2500:2, 21; 2513:18; 2515:3; 2528:2; 2537:22; 2644:20; 2668:16; 2779:7 orally [3] - 2733:1, 12; 2786:7 oranges [1] - 2702:2 order [7] - 2505:20; 2597:20; 2606:7, 13; 2662:2; 2751:4; 2760:2 Order [1] - 2691:22 orders [3] - 2757:10; 2758:4; 2800:18 organizations [1] -2630.16 original [4] -

2539:25; 2694:25; 2714:11; 2776:2 originally [1] -2602.16 Osko [4] - 2603:11; 2776:13, 15; 2778:5 Osko's [3] - 2603:12, 22; 2776:23 otherwise [3] 2571:15; 2628:15; 2642.5 ought [3] - 2520:7; 2653.6; 2654:10 ourselves [1] -2762.23 outages [2] - 2511:6; 2630:10 outcome [8] 2519:6; 2682:18; 2700:22; 2725:1; 2729:23; 2735:20; 2755:13; 2781:6 outcomes [15] 2573:18; 2616:23; 2631:14, 17; 2634:12; 2635:2; 2685:24; 2686:22; 2703:22; 2725:24; 2729:18 22-23; 2754:5; 2755:9 Outcomes [1] -2706.4 outcomes' [1] -2635:3 outcry [1] - 2729:25 outdated [1] -2589:21 outdoors [1] -2774:18 outflow [1] - 2700:20 outflows [1] -2700:16 outlet [33] - 2508:15; 2517:16; 2552:13, 17, 19; 2562:11; 2565:15, 23; 2566:3, 6, 9, 15; 2567:7. 14: 2576:4: 2603:16; 2697:5; 2715:16; 2716:14 2740:18, 25; 2741:3, 6; 2743:10, 12, 17; 2752:11, 14; 2758:19; 2778:8, 21 outlets [1] - 2743:9 outline [3] - 2497:7; 2584:8; 2612:3 outlined [8] - 2614:9; 2620:21; 2627:1; 2630:22; 2631:7; 2633:9; 2767:21; 2771.8 outlooks [1] -2649:19 output [1] - 2762:12 outset [2] - 2572:7; 2747:13 outside [9] 2493:14; 2557:14; 2597:14; 2603:21; 2647:8; 2649:16; 2678:4; 2749:6; 2753:16 outstanding [3] -2494:13; 2585:3; 2671:25 outward [1] - 2595:1 outweigh [3] -2518:20; 2625:20; 2641:10 outweighed [2] -2639:22; 2652:12

overall [5] - 2508:12; 2583:23; 2652:23; 2662:16; 2664:18 overbank [1] -2557:9 overcharged [1] -2737:10 overconfidence[1] -2763:16 overdesign [1] -2801:20 overestimate [1] -2593:9 overestimation [2] -2593.11 overlain [1] -2756:23 overland [6] 2510:19; 2554:5; 2555:16; 2556:19; 2647:23; 2648:1 overlapping [1] -2580:8 overlook [1] -2700:17 overpass [3] · 2604:21; 2676:9, 11 overpredictions [1] -2598:22 oversight [3] -2700:13, 24; 2797:2 oversights [1] -2747.4 oversimplification [1] - 2703:4 overtop [1] - 2744:5 overtopped [1] -2744:9 overview [1] - 2788:1 overwhelmingly [4] -2614:16; 2631:11; 2645:8; 2768:24 owed [2] - 2531:17; 2537.15 owing [2] - 2578:25; 2593.15 own [12] - 2512:23; 2538:12; 2558:18; 2567:20; 2599:4; 2647:1: 2649:18: 2666:24; 2769:12; 2794:10; 2801:3; 2805:9 owned [2] - 2630:12; 2661.11 owner [3] - 2721:14; 2800:4; 2804:18 owners [2] -2516:12: 2631:1 ownership [2] -2672:21; 2745:20 owns [3] - 2651:20; 2661:12; 2794:6 oxygen [1] - 2578:18 Ρ P.M [5] - 2658:12 14; 2659:3, 5; 2808:6 page [28] - 2496:4; 2569:7; 2582:17; 2680:25; 2686:12; 2688:23; 2691:16; 2693:6; 2701:10, 18; 2703:14; 2706:15; 2719.1.2726.25 2727:20; 2736:16; 2745:11; 2775:18, 22; 2780:20; 2790:20; 2792:10; 2793:5, 25;

2794:9: 2795:7: 2796:25; 2797:11 pages [9] - 2569:6, 24: 2715:6: 2717:11: 2729:14, 19; 2745:21; 2775:15; 2794:21 paid [1] - 2796:3 painfully [1] -2761:13 paleo [2] - 2576:17, 25 paleontological [1] -2674:21 pandemic [1] -2687:9 **Panel** [39] - 2499:13; 2547:14; 2562:2; 2569:19; 2599:10; 2643:12; 2644:8; 2653:10; 2660:19; 2679:14; 2684:24; 2686:11; 2694:14; 2695:4, 8, 13, 21, 23; 2697:4; 2698:17; 2705:7; 2706:7; 2710:1, 11, 19; 2716:2; 2722:15; 2723:8; 2724:24; 2726:12; 2777:5; 2779:3; 2783:13; 2784:1: 2797:15: 2800:3; 2805:12; 2807.2 panel [4] - 2580:24; 2601:7; 2644:13; 2756.11Panel's [1] - 2691:23 panels [1] - 2501:5 paper [4] - 2589:21; 2590:3; 2599:5 paragraph [20] 2523:5, 2615:8; 2682:15; 2730:14, 23; 2766:25; 2767:13; 2768:5; 2769:9; 2770:6, 21; 2771:2, 25; 2772:7; 2773:3, 19, 23; 2774:9; 2775.2.2785.25 paragraphs [6] · 2730:5, 22; 2732:14; 2733:17; 2742:25; 2785:16 parallel [2] -2548:10; 2571:4 parameters [2] -2578:17; 2746:4 paramount [3] - 2615:6; 2622:18; 2641.14 parcels [1] - 2556:8 **Park** [7] - 2685:5; 2709:8; 2788:6, 16, 20; 2789:4; 2798:15 park [3] - 2697:7; 2 721.18 PARK [1] - 2787:21 park-like [1] - 2697:7 parking [3] 2546:13; 2716:24; 2721:20 parkland [1] -2781:22 Parks [12] - 2506:25; 2530:16; 2546:23; 2671:14, 17; 2672:24; 2673:23; 2677:8, 15; 2678:11, 17; 2705:14 Part [2] - 2556:5, 8 part [27] - 2498:7;

2500:7; 2501:3; 2521:17; 2525:24; 2529:4; 2530:8; 2556:12; 2560:24: 2561:2; 2565:21; 2571:7; 2575:8; 2580:12; 2593:15; 2600:13; 2608:22; 2629:7, 9; 2662:15; 2668:6; 2670:14; 2673:7; 2708:21 2716:18, 20; 2742:15 **partial** [3] - 2748:21; 2764:25; 2770:16 partially [3] -2758:13; 2759:25; 2797:20 participant [3] 2537:19; 2570:7; 2608:21 participants [8] -2609:8; 2632:19; 2680:12; 2784:3; 2788:1; 2795:10; 2798:17; 2800:3 participate [8] · 2534:12; 2537:20; 2543:13; 2608:19; 2610:15; 2644:16; 2679:20: 2783:11 participated [1] -2611.2 participating [3] -2545:1, 5; 2610:25 Participation [1] -2534:7 participation [10] -2498:8; 2534:3; 2537:17; 2608:23; 2643:11; 2678:6, 8; 2798:22; 2799:14; 2805:25 particle [1] - 2766:15 particles [4] -2601:15: 2602:15. 17 particular [20] -2500:4; 2502:25; 2504:1; 2519:25; 2543:22; 2546:10; 2588:22; 2606:6; 2609:8; 2614:5; 2618:20; 2633:23; 2686:1; 2691:22; 2730:7; 2739:24; 2768:23; 2769:2; 2782.9 particularly [6] -2619:8; 2646:12; 2650:13; 2656:6; 2763 11 2805 20 particulars [1] -2599:18 particulate [1] -2769:21 parties [23] 2494:25; 2498:12; 2500:5; 2502:20, 23; 2504:10; 2528:7 2533:13; 2640:12; 2643:11; 2644:15, 17; 2660:20; 2670:14; 2679:19; 2712:14; 2728:23; 2732:24; 2783:11; 2787:2, 7; 2790 18 2793 16 partners [1] -2655:20 **party** [6] - 2600:5; 2670:9; 2792:19, 22; 2793:1; 2802:23

pass [7] - 2563:12, 17; 2603:18; 2651:7, 17; 2739:3; 2744:1 passage [11] - 2532:11, 13; 2545:9; 2550:13; 2581:23; 2584:2, 4; 2715:11, 17; 2741:18; 2778:17 passenger [1] - 2791:23 passing [6] - 2648:5; 2668:10; 2715:13; 2742:23; 2750:21; 2778:14 past [9] - 2644:22; 2665:23; 2717:16; 2730:1; 2746:23; 2748:19; 2763:15; 2800:10; 2801:2 patchy [1] - 2770:15 path ways [4] - 2511:7; 2594:4; 2716:25; 2721:20 patience [1] - 2644:15 Paul [1] - 2693:5 pausing [1] - 2790:6 pay [4] - 2625:24; 2685:9, 12 payments [9] - 2670:14; 2713:15; 2714:17, 20; 2722:12, 23-24; 2801:5, 9 payounts [9] - 2670:14; 2713:15; 2714:17, 20; 2722:12, 23-24; 2801:5, 9 payouts [1] - 2730:3 PDA [11] - 2538:6; 2543:5; 2545:12; 2588:2; 2597:14; 2714:14; 2753:17; 2776:23; 2777:1, 12 pdf [6] - 2691:16; 2693:6; 2726:25; 2727:20; 2738:12; 2764:22 PDF [1] - 2582:17 peace [1] - 2650:12 peak [14] - 2650:12 peak [14] - 2650:12 peak [14] - 2650:12 peak [14] - 2582:17 peace [1] -	6, 16, 18-19, 21; 2558:24; 2559:2; 2562:17; 2592:2, 6; 2599:23; 2619:2, 12, 14; 2648:16; 2687:11; 2688:12; 2697:12, 18, 24; 2699:10, 12; 2707:8-10, 12, 14; 2712:25; 2714:10; 2716:2; 2738:9; 2739:2; 2742:17; 2757:3; 2759:22; 2769:14; 2773:17; 2775:18, 21; 2801:15, 17 perceived [1]- 2588:23 percent [38]- 2551:10; 2552:9; 2573:8, 21, 23; 2586:1; 2598:22; 2619:6; 2627:25; 2640:3, 23; 2641:1; 2645:24; 2651:3; 2652:18; 2654:2, 25; 2687:12, 14, 16, 20, 25; 2689:3; 2701:25; 2702:3, 7, 15, 17, 20; 2708:1; 2719:7; 2722:18; 2765:2; 2770:18; 2790:5; 2770:18; 2790:5; 2770:18; 2790:5; 2770:18; 2790:5; 2770:17; performance [1]- 2591:12 performace [1]- 2591:12 performace [1]- 2591:21 performace [1]- 2591:21 performace [1]- 2591:22 periods [8]- 2577:19; 2762:7; periods [8]- 2577:19; 2765:24; 278:15; 770:6; 2787:13; 2806:14 period [1]- 2792:11 periods [8]- 2577:19; 2765:24; 2763:7; 2579:14; 2749:5; 2765:24; 2767:7, 25 periods [8]- 2577:19; 2679:14; 2769:7; 25 259:25; 2612:10; 250:24; 26579:19; 250:24; 2579:19; 250:25; 2712:10; 2514:25; 2571:9; 2545:13; 2594:22; 2636:12; 2665:1; 2700:6; 2737:13; 2806:14 peril [1]- 2792:11 perimeter [2]- 2545:13; 2594:22; period [19]- 2506:9; 2508:24; 2577:19; 2773:15; 77, 25; 2741:18; 2746:17; 2749:5; 2765:24; 2767:7; 25 periods [8]- 2577:19; 2579:14; 2591:22; 2579:	permanently [2] - 2548:12; 2781:11 permeability [3] - 2592:9; 2653:19; 2756:15 permit[2] - 2509:22; 2542:6 permitted [3] - 2557:24; 2669:1; 2670:5 permitting [4] - 2508:12; 2561:9; 2744:21 Person [4] - 2597:5; person [4] - 2597:9; 2600:14; 2601:11; 2608:11 person's [2] - 2597:17; 2598:19 personal [5] - 2510:9; 2515:25; 2617:19; 2629:2; 2691:10 personal [2] - 2510:9; 2515:25; 2617:19; 2629:2; 2691:10 personal [2] - 2525:3; 2802:11 persons [2] - 2525:3; 2802:11 persons [2] - 2522:14; 2524:17 perspectives [4] - 2535:3; 2536:18, 23; 2541:20 pertained [1] - 2536:5 pertaining [3] - 2533:23; 2542:21; 2599:22 pertains [1] - 2531:19 perusal [1] - 2732:14 persons [1] - 2732:14 persons [1] - 2732:14 persons [1] - 2732:14 persons [1] - 2732:14 pertained [1] - 2531:19 perusal [1] - 2732:14 perusal [1] - 2750:12 photos [1] - 2628:3; 2637:5; 2663:14 piling [1] - 2792:14 piling [1] - 2792:14	<pre>pivotal [1] - 2737:4 place [21] - 2508:13; 2539:2; 2541:1; 2543:11; 2558:6; 2564:19; 2586:22; 2594:11; 2596:13; 2597:20; 2604:1; 2647:18; 2655:6, 18; 2673:20; 2689:2; 2740:7; 2763:11; 2767:9; 27777:3; 2793:13 placed [1] - 2760:24 Plains [1] - 2699:16 plan [76] - 2506:16; 2508:1; 2516:4; 2520:16; 2521:4; 2532:21; 2533:17, 22; 2540:4; 2544:18; 2545:25; 2546:2; 2547:1, 23; 2552:21; 2553:4, 18; 2564:16; 2568:2, 6; 2570:14-16; 2571:3, 8, 13; 2584:7, 9; 2594:13, 16; 2595:3, 8; 2598:13; 2601:24; 2603:8, 10; 2607:16; 2608:23; 2623:5; 2633:25; 2652:19; 2662:16; 2669:3, 9; 2677:21, 23; 2690:7; 2695:6; 2698:7; 2715:9; 27727:22; 2734:7; 2735:4; 2739:1; 2742:16; 2745:17; 2754:24; 2766:22; 2774:20; 2777:3, 7, 10, 19; 2780:4; 2803:12 Plan(4] - 2534:7; 2691:14; 2710:3; 2779:25 planned [2] - 2580:1; 2735:24 planners [1] - 2617:13 plannig [6] - 2545:1; 2570:2, 5; 2572:7; 2679:12; 2738:14, 16, 19, 24; 2739:12; 242:16; 2745:19-21, 23; 2568:8; 2570:23; 2571:6; 2577:23; 2571:6; 25772:23; 2571:6; 25772:23; 2571:6; 25772:23; 2571:6; 25772:23; 2571:6; 25772:23; 2571:6; 25772:23; 2571:6; 25772:23; 2571:6; 25772:23; 2572:7; 2679:12; 2738:14, 16, 19, 24; 2738:14, 16, 19, 24; 2739:8, 18-19; 2738:14, 16, 19, 24; 2738:14, 16, 19, 24;</pre>	2499:14 plotted [1] - 2590:111 plus [6] - 2558:13; 2607:17; 2619:6; 2640:3; 2680:25; 2792:5 plus-page [1] - 2680:25 PM [8] - 2601:10, 14, 17; 2688:17; 2766:9, 11; 2790:1, 5 PMF [3] - 2738:1; 2744:1; 2752:1 pockets [1] - 2645:14 point [33] - 2498:16; 2502:19; 2520:9; 2527:21; 2528:19; 2551:15; 2552:3; 2564:6; 2567:10; 2591:4, 16, 19; 2608:11; 2635:11; 2636:1; 2637:13, 24; 2642:9, 14; 2687:6; 2701:19; 2702:21; 2703:17; 2722:4, 20; 2743:8; 2759:14; 2765:6; 2768:25; 2777:15; 2795:16; 2805:17 pointed [5] - 2524:11; 2520:25; 2576:12; 2590:10; 2730:24 points [9] - 2523:8; 2576:9; 2597:25; 2700:3; 2743:3; 2766:10; 2777:15; 2783:16; 2797:11 policies [1] - 2531:20; 2665:13; 2688:22 politics [2] - 2763:11; 2782:23 pollution [1] - 2688:17 pond [4] - 250:21; 2752:16; 2753:7; 2804:10 pool [2] - 2719:8; 2743:21 populations [3] - 2662:10; 2803:24 portions [3] - 2655:16; pose [1] - 2557:3, 8, 13; 2580:7; 2587:16; 2682:4 portions [1] - 2573:3; 8, 13; 2580:7; 2587:16; 2682:4 portions [3] - 2655:16; pose [1] - 2557:3, 8, 13; 2580:7; 2587:16; 2682:4 portions [1] - 2578:2; 2663:8; 2687:15, 21; 2752:7 populations [3] - 2662:10; 2803:24 portions [3] - 2662:10; 2803:24 portions [3] - 2662:10; 2803:24 portions [4] - 2575:3; 8, 13; 2580:7; 2587:16; 2682:4 postion [1] - 2575:3; 8, 13; 2580:7; 2587:16; 2682:4 postion [1] - 2575:3; 8, 13; 2580:7; 2587:16; 2682:4 postion [1] - 2575:5; position [16] - 2501:11; 2527:22; 2554:25; 2556:2; 2554:25; 2556:2; 2557:25; 2556:2; 2557:25; 2556:2; 2557:3; 8, 13; 2580:7; 2587:16; 2682:4 postion [1] - 2575:5; postion [16] - 2501:11; 2527:22; 2554:25; 2556:2; 2557:3; 8, 13; 2580:7; 2587:16; 2682:4 postion [16] - 2501:11; 2527:22; 2554:25; 2556:2; 2557:3; 8, 13; 2580:7; 2557:3; 8, 13; 2580; 14; 2557:3; 8, 13; 2580; 257:3; 8, 13;
2748:23, 25; 2755:16;	periodic [1] - 2606:7	Pine [9] - 2696:23;	2788:25; 2792:12, 21;	portions [1] - 2578:2
2760:16; 2774:18;	periodically [2] -	2697:2, 4, 8, 10, 25;	2794:6	pose [1] - 2655:16
2803:25	2514:25; 2571:9	2698:2, 11	plants [3] - 2544:10,	poses [1] - 2759:5
people's [3] -	periods [8] -	pioneering [1] -	12; 2776:16	position [16] -

П

Т

2671:3; 2681:21; 2798:11 positive [8] - 2505:3; 2512:25; 2516:8; 2530:12; 2623:2; 2636:11; 2649:18; 2755:13 posits [1] - 2564:7 possession [1] -2672:22 possessions [1] -2627:11 **possibility** [7] -2564:25; 2744:8, 10; 2749:11; 2753:13; 2793:8: 2803:6 possible [23] -2501:19; 2525:22; 2539:3; 2579:5; 2580:6; 2601:16 2640:13, 16; 2646:25; 2696:7, 11; 2705:20; 2716:5; 2724:24 2737:17, 20; 2742:1; 2747:20; 2754:6, 16, 21; 2774:6; 2777:20 possibly [2] · 2684:10; 2763:19 **post** [22] - 2543:24; 2544:3; 2594:15; 2599:13; 2602:24; 2604:2; 2674:1; 2678:1; 2719:3, 6; 2720:7; 2721:11, 18; 2735:15, 19; 2767:19, 25; 2770:2, 20; 2771:15; 2778:9; 2790:4 post-construction [1] - 2544:3 post-flood [15] -2594:15; 2674:1; 2678:1; 2719:3, 6; 2720:7; 2721:11, 18; 2735:15, 19; 2767:25; 2770:2, 20; 2771:15; 2778:9 posttraumatic [1] -2623:15 potable [7] 2654:22, 24; 2677:15; 2788:14; 2794:11; 2796:22; 2798:11 potential [60] · 2501:21; 2509:13, 25: 2521:8; 2529:8; 2531:17; 2532:6 2536:10, 19; 2540:9, 11: 2543:8: 2562:11: 2565:1; 2571:24; 2579:17; 2581:10; 2586:19; 2587:17; 2593:3; 2594:13, 24-25; 2596:6, 10; 2597:14, 21; 2598:9; 2600:15; 2602:1; 2615:18; 2617:7 2625:14; 2634:1; 2641:4; 2646:4; 2649:14; 2655:7 2663:20; 2667:12, 15, 22; 2668:14; 2679:10; 2694:22; 2724:17; 2727:5; 2745:7; 2754:8; 2760:10; 2767:6; 2768:4, 12; 2771:15; 2777:15; 2795:18, 22; 2796:23; 2801.17 potentially [9] -

2522:13; 2527:10; 2579:9; 2645:17; 2682:12; 2754:18; 2771:23; 2789:18; 2805.16power [4] - 2511:5; 2621:8; 2630:10; 2743:17 powering [1] -2665:17 PowerPoint [6] -2501:8; 2555:10; 2597:6; 2598:19; 2746:6; 2755:22 practical 121 -2656 1 2694 6 practically [1] -2579.5 practice [6] - 2533:9; 2563:22; 2569:14, 23; 2570:6, 8 Pradera [1] - 2788:19 Prairie [1] - 2542:18 prayers [1] - 2798:25 pre [8] - 2502:19, 21; 524:24; 2572:18; 2634:16; 2637:3; 2673:25; 2771:21 Pre [1] - 2653:11 pre-construction [1] 2673.25 pre-emptively [1] -2771:21 pre-hearing [5] · 2502:19, 21; 2524:24; 2634:16; 2637:3 Pre-Hearing [1] -2653:11 pre-record [1] -2572:18 precarious [1] - 2750:13 precedent [2] 2698:9; 2766:18 precious [3] -2627:12; 2654:23; 2683.24 precipitation [2] - 2656:18; 2773:13 precise [2] - 2754:13 precision [1] -2577:14 preclude [2] 2634:5; 2743:6 predefined [1] -2674.7 predicated [3] -2592:18; 2598:9; 2762.17 predict [3] - 2587:21; 2638.6 predicted [6] -2511:13; 2576:18; 2593:13; 2597:15, 19; 2665:2 predicting [1] -2754:12 predictions [5] -2598:6; 2767:16, 24; 2768:25; 2772:21 predicts [2] -2573:18; 2625:23 predominantly [2] - 2532:23; 2582:14 preemptive [1] -2603:9 prefer [1] - 2801:19 preferable [3] 2645:22; 2656:1, 15 preference [2]

2636:22: 2787:7 preferred [6] - 2564:6; 2567:10; 2587:9; 2637:20; 2663:2; 2756:8 prefiled [3] - 2737:1; 2746:5; 2755:21 prelim [1] - 2494:18 Preliminary [2] -2508:8; 2517:12 preliminary [2] -2494:11; 2498:11 premature [1] -2670:1 prematurely [1] -2729:9 premier [1] - 2795:14 premised [1] -2631:15 preparation [6] -2513:21; 2568:6; 2570:20; 2571:2; 2574:9 prepare [2] -2506:21; 2570:18 prepared [24] -2517:19; 2518:12; 2526:3; 2532:5; 2539:11, 18; 2542:12, 17: 2543:8: 2555:4: 2560:17; 2561:12; 2570:17; 2573:13; 2574:23; 2580:3; 2584:17; 2590:23; 2606:23; 2617:11; 2664:4; 2737:21; 2748:2; 2787:5 preparedness [3] - 2569:9; 2570:15; 2718:23 preparing [1] - 2559:20 prerequisite [1] -2531:6 presence [11] -2578:25; 2589:15, 25; 2590:7; 2591:6; 2594:2; 2601:17; 2602:15; 2757:8; 2770:15; 2803:20 present [12] -2496:2; 2499:14; 2599:24; 2713:10; 2773:15, 25; 2779:18, 24; 2781:5; 2788:2; 2799:2; 2801:21 presentation [15] -2499:19, 24; 2501:9, 16; 2555:10; 2597:6, 9; 2598:2; 2689:12; 2731:14; 2783:7; 2789:9; 2797:4; 2799:5; 2803:10 presentations [3] -2528:2; 2605:2 presented [18] -2522:25; 2563:16; 2570:4; 2704:11; 2729:12, 14; 2748:1; 2768:2, 11; 2770:3, 7. 11, 17; 2772:15; 2773:2, 12, 25; 2778:15 presenting [1] -2609.3presents [2] 2598:8; 2653:15 preserve [1] - 2751:4 preserving [1] -2747:21

president [3] -2525:13; 2526:18; 2798 18 pressure [1] - 2762:2 presume [2] 2680:17; 2732:18 prevent [10] -551:1; 2585:11; 2621:15; 2744:8; 2770:19, 25; 2777:3; 2778:10, 13 preventative[1] -2777:10 prevented [1] -2623:1 preventing [1] -2687:5 previous [2] -2505:25; 2681:21 previously [5] -2520:5; 2675:15, 19; 2757:4; 2793:2 Priddis [1] - 2729:8 primarily [4] -2494:12; 2528:20; 2561:6; 2608:12 primary [3] -2615:10; 2746:10; 2793.24 principal [2] -2611:24; 2619:24 principle [3] -2692:14, 23; 2693:20 principles [8] 2546:11, 18; 2547:1; 2597:7; 2671:4; 2672:21; 2692:5; 2735:6 Principles [3] · 2532:17; 2533:12; 2735:5 printed [1] - 2496:22 prioritization [1] -2709:13 prioritize [2] · 2709:12; 2777:19 priority [10] - 2510:7; 2527:13; 2528:1; 2544:9; 2559:9; 2662:9; 2732:3; 2739:15; 2789:4; 2797:23 private [17] 2515:24; 2532:23; 2533:7; 2538:16, 18; 2615:5; 2641:13, 21; 2647:14; 2648:25; 2676:15, 22; 2677:2; 2689:14, 16; 2714:19; 2765.20 proactive [1] -2750:1 proactively [2] - 2596:21; 2601:4 probability [2] -2743:4 probable [6] -2563:18; 2564:11, 19; 2580:16; 2651:8, 17 problem [6] -2496:20; 2549:11; 2704:9; 2724:19; 2745:16; 2785:19 problems [3] -2695:11; 2709:1; 2749.18 procedural [3] -2530:24; 2667:3, 10 procedurally [1] -2667:4

procedure [2] -2675:10; 2792:16 procedures [1] -2541:12 proceed [10] -2565:11; 2604:10; 2610:7; 2612:17; 2613:6; 2644:6; 2660:17; 2734:5; 2787:23; 2789:12 proceeded [1] -2532:21 **proceeding** [9] - 2560:18; 2574:13; 2575:17; 2611:2; 2611:2; 2619:23; 2637:6, 22; 2739:23: 2799:24 PROCEEDINGS [6] -2493:8; 2658:12, 14; 2659:5: 2808:6.8 proceedings [6] -500:4; 2536:1 2656:20, 24; 2763:17; 2799:15 Proceedings [1] -2492.1 proceeds [1] -2724:12 process [39] · 2505:18; 2512:11; 2518:6; 2522:23; 2531:15, 23; 2532:3; 2541:11; 2561:9; 2570:9; 2571:4, 7; 2572:7; 2574:11, 14; 2591:18; 2638:10; 2640:24; 2665:24; 2666:3; 2681:22; 2742:12; 2744:22; 2746:18; 2782:24; 2783:12; 2794:25; 2795:4, 10; 2798:22; 2800:12, 20; 2801:12; 2805:14, 23 processes [6] -2521:20; 2531:11; 2537:7, 13; 2595:23; 2637.1 procurement [1] -2570:21 producers [1] -2776:20 productive [3] 2602:10; 2781:9 productivity [1] -2690.25professional [1] -2559:18 professionals [1] -2763.5 profile [1] - 2631:3 profit [1] - 2657:7 profound [1] -2629.22 program [17] 2508:22; 2517:19; 2522:11; 2529:15, 17-18; 2532:12; 2546:4; 2587:20; 2589:23; 2590:5; 2594:5; 2622:1; 2639:21; 2672:14; 2678:10:2720:5 programs [4] -2546:3; 2582:3; 2678:7; 2757:8 progressed [1] -2517.4 prohibited [3] -2509:16; 2708:6;

2778:23 2675:20, 22; 2676:24; prolonging [1] - Prosper [1] - 2666:6 2781:4; 27 Project [5] - 2499:16; 2677:10, 12; 2678:1, 2756:6 protect [23] - 2559:9; 2791:12; 2 2606:25; 2685:8; 3-4, 9, 20; 2679:6; promised [2] - 2619:4; 2621:16, 18; provided 2709:25; 2726:24 2682:19, 24; 2683:4, 2640:15; 2734:25 2629:7, 23; 2633:2, 2502:0, 2 project [409] - 12, 15, 17, 22, 24; promises [1] - 2645:15; 2647:13; 17, 2537:2 2500:11; 2684:4, 7, 16; 2734:15 2662:4; 2687:24; 2538:1; 25 2500:4, 14; 2503:4, 7, 2690:17; 2692:4, 12; 2550:13 2689:2; 2706:6; 2554:9; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 27781:12, 15 proofing [2] - 2709:5; 2748:23; 2556:2; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2762:; 2782:17 2752:3; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 21; 2706:14; 2707:5; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2595:1 25, 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15;	2795:23 1 (48) - 2508:5;); 2536:3, 2; 21; 2541:24; 355:22; 360:25; 2580:15; 2588:13; 2594:12; 399:1; 2605:18; 2605:18; 2661:18; 201:14; 2716:1, 4;
Project [5] - 2499:16; 2677:10, 12; 2678:1, 2756:6 protect [23] - 2559:9; 2791:12; 2 2606:25; 2685:8; 3-4, 9, 20; 2679:6; promised [2] - 2619:4; 2621:16, 18; provided 2709:25; 2726:24 2682:19, 24; 2683:4, 2640:15; 2734:25 26297; 7, 23; 2633:2, 2502:20; 2 project [409] - 12, 15, 17, 22, 24; promises [1] - 2645:15; 2647:13; 17, 22, 32 2501:18, 21, 24; 2685:22; 2686:3; promote [1] - 2662:4; 2687:24; 2538:1; 25 2502:4, 14; 2503:4, 7, 2690:17; 2692:4, 12; 2550:13 2689:2; 2706:6; 2554:9; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; proofing [2] - 2709:5; 2748:23; 2556:2; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:21; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 2698:8; 2700:3; propagating [1] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 252; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; propagating [2] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; propagating [2] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 <	2795:23 1 (48) - 2508:5;); 2536:3, 2; 21; 2541:24; 355:22; 360:25; 2580:15; 2588:13; 2594:12; 399:1; 2605:18; 2605:18; 2661:18; 201:14; 2716:1, 4;
2606:25; 2685:8; 3-4, 9, 20; 2679:6; promised [2] - 2619:4; 2621:16, 18; provided 2709:25; 2726:24 2682:19, 24; 2683:4, 2640:15; 2734:25 2629:7, 23; 2633:2, 2502:20; 2 project [409] - 12, 15, 17, 22, 24; promises [1] - 21; 2641:5, 7, 21-22; 2524:4, 10 2499:23; 2500:11; 2684:4, 7, 16; 2734:15 2645:15; 2647:13; 17; 2537:2 2501:18, 21, 24; 2690:17; 2692:4, 12; 2550:13 2689:2; 2706:6; 2554:9; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2762; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2706:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2706:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2760:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20; 2508:1, 2611:4; 2626:10; 2590:20; 2 2595:1 4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 21; 2706:14; 2707:5; propagation [2] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:1	1 [48] - 5508:5;); 2536:3, 2; 21; 355:22; 360:25; 2580:15; 2588:13; 2584:12; 399:1; 2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 201:14; 2716:1, 4;
2709:25; 2726:24 2682:19, 24; 2683:4, project (409) - 2682:19, 24; 2683:4, 12, 15, 17, 22, 24; 2640:15; 2734:25 2629:7, 23; 2633:2, 21; 2641:5, 7, 21-22; 2502:0; 2 2499:23; 2500:11; 2501:18, 21, 24; 2684:4, 7, 16; 2685:22; 2686:3; promises [1] - 21; 2641:5, 7, 21-22; 2524:4, 10 2502:4, 14; 2503:4, 7, 2502:4, 14; 2503:4, 7, 2505:5, 14, 16; 2699:17; 2692:4, 12; 2550:13 2689:2; 2706:6; 2554:9; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2776:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2776:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2506:2, 10, 12, 19-20; 2698:8; 2700:3; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2595:1 2611:4; 2626:10; 2590:20; 2 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 24; 2513:3, 7, 10; 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:1; 2713:2 2655:24; 2 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; proper [y] 3 - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2771:2	2508:5;); 2536:3, 2, 21; 355:22; 360:25; 2580:15; 2588:13; 2598:12; 399:1; 3005:18; 3005:18; 3005:18; 2661:18; 201:14; 2716:1, 4;
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $); 2536:3, 2, 21; 555:22; 560:25; 5580:15; 5588:13; 5994:12; 5994:12; 599:1; 2605:18; 2636:1; 26661:18; 201:14; 2716:1, 4;
2499:23; 2500:11; 2684:4, 7, 16; 2734:15 2645:15; 2647:13; 17; 2537:2 2501:18, 21, 24; 2685:22; 2686:3; promote [1] - 2662:4; 2687:24; 2538:1; 25 2502:4, 14; 2503:4, 7, 2690:17; 2692:4, 12; 2550:13 2689:2; 2706:6; 2554:9; 25 13, 22, 24; 2504:2, 5; 2693:13; 2694:12, 15, proofing [2] - 2709:5; 2748:23; 2556:2; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20; 25; 2696:2; 2726:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2566:25; 2 2505:2, 10, 12, 19-20; 2698:8; 2700:3; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2590:20; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2595:1 2611:4; 2626:10; 2590:20; 2 2590:20; 2 4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 21; 2706:14; 2707:5; propagating [2] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 254:4; 2513:3, 7, 10; 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:1; 2713:2 2655:24; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 1	2, 21; 541:24; 555:22; 560:25; 5580:15; 588:13; 2594:12; 599:1; 6005:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
2499:23; 2500:11; 2684:4, 7, 16; 2734:15 2645:15; 2647:13; 17; 2537:2 2501:18, 21, 24; 2685:22; 2686:3; promote [1] - 2662:4; 2687:24; 2538:1; 25 2502:4, 14; 2503:4, 7, 2690:17; 2692:4, 12; 2550:13 2689:2; 2706:6; 2554:9; 25 13, 22, 24; 2504:2, 5; 2693:13; 2694:12, 15, proofing [2] - 2709:5; 2748:23; 2556:2; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20; 25; 2696:2; 2726:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2566:25; 2 2505:2, 10, 12, 19-20; 2698:8; 2700:3; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2590:20; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2595:1 2611:4; 2626:10; 2590:20; 2 2590:20; 2 4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 21; 2706:14; 2707:5; propagating [2] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 254:4; 2513:3, 7, 10; 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:1; 2713:2 2655:24; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 1	2, 21; 541:24; 555:22; 560:25; 5580:15; 588:13; 2594:12; 599:1; 6005:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
2501:18, 21, 24; 2685:22; 2686:3; promote [1] - 2662:4; 2687:24; 2538:1; 25 2502:4, 14; 2503:4, 7, 2690:17; 2692:4, 12; 2550:13 2689:2; 2706:6; 2554:9; 25 13, 22, 24; 2504:2, 5; 2693:13; 2694:12, 15, proofing [2] - 2709:5; 2748:23; 2556:2; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2726:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2566:25; 2 2506:2, 10, 12, 19-20; 2698:8; 2700:3; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 2703:11; 2705:8, 12, 2595:1 2611:4; 2626:10; 2590:20; 2 4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 21; 2706:14; 2707:5; propagation [2] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 24; 2513:3, 7, 10; 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:21; 2713:2 2655:24; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:6; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; properly [3] -	541:24; 555:22; 560:25; 588:15; 588:13; 2594:12; 599:1; 2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 201:14; 2716:1,4;
2502:4, 14; 2503:4, 7, 2690:17; 2692:4, 12; 2550:13 2689:2; 2706:6; 2554:9; 25 13, 22, 24; 2504:2, 5; 2693:13; 2694:12, 15, proofing [2] - 2709:5; 2748:23; 2556:2; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2762:; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2506:2, 10, 12, 19-20; 2698:8; 2700:3; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 2710:1; 2705:8, 12, 2595:1 2611:4; 2626:10; 2590:20; 2 4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 21; 2706:14; 2707:5; propagation [2] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 2513:3, 7, 10; 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:21; 2713:2 2655:24; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14; 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:6; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; properly [3] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	555:22; 560:25; 2580:15; 2588:13; 2594:12; 599:1; 2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 201:14; 201:14; 2716:1, 4;
13, 22, 24, 2504:2, 5; 2693:13; 2694:12, 15, proofing [2] - 2709:5; 2748:23; 2556:2; 25 2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2726:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2506:2, 10, 12, 19-20; 2698:8; 2700:3; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 2703:11; 2705:8, 12, 2595:1 2611:4; 2626:10; 2590:20; 2 4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 21; 2706:14; 2707:5; 2592:14 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:62; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; proper [4] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	560:25; 5580:15; 5584:12; 5994:12; 599:1; 2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 201:14; 2716:1, 4;
2505:5, 14, 16; 19-20, 25; 2696:2; 2726:2; 2782:17 2752:23; 2782:20 2565:25; 2 2506:2, 10, 12, 19-20; 2698:8; 2700:3; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 2703:11; 2705:8, 12, 2595:1 2611:4; 2626:10; 2590:20; 2 4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:6; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; proper [4] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	2580:15; 2588:13; 2594:12; 399:1; 2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
2506:2, 10, 12, 19-20; 2698:8; 2700:3; propagating [1] - protected [10] - 2586:12; 2 2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 2703:11; 2705:8, 12, 2595:1 2611:4; 2626:10; 2590:20; 2 4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 21; 2706:14; 2707:5; propagation [2] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 2; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 254:15, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:6; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; properly [3] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	2588:13; 2594:12; 399:1; 2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
2507:15, 20; 2508:1, 4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 22; 2511:11, 15, 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2541:2; 2510:2, 7, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, 2541:2; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, 2541:2; 2541:2; 2542:14, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, 2541:2; 2542:14, 2542:14, 2626:10; 2529:14, 2639:9; 2666:12; 2529:14, 2529:14, 2626:10; 2639:9; 2666:12; 2629:2; 2620:2; 2620:2; 2604:22; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2714:2; 2715:22; 2604:22; 2715:22; 27	2594:12; 599:1; 2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
4, 17, 22; 2510:2, 7, 21; 2706:14; 2707:5; propagation [2] - 2639:9; 2666:12; 2597:5; 25 22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 24; 2513:3, 7, 10; 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:1; 2713:2 2655:24; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:6; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; properly [3] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	599:1; 2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 24; 2513:3, 7, 10; 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:21; 2713:2 2655:24; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:6; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; proper [4] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
22; 2511:11, 15, 2708:16; 2709:15; 2592:14 2682:4; 2688:10; 2604:22; 2 17-18, 21; 2512:10, 2710:4, 9, 12, 15, proper [4] - 2588:21; 2706:14; 2707:13; 2635:10; 2 24; 2513:3, 7, 10; 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:21; 2713:2 2655:24; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:6; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; proper [4] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	2605:18; 2636:1; 2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
17-18, 21; 2512:10, 24; 2513:3, 7, 10; 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 24; 2515:6, 14;2710:4, 9, 12, 15, 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:12;<	2636:1; 2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
24; 2513:3, 7, 10; 19-20; 2711:1, 10, 2596:14; 2597:21; 2712:21; 2713:2 2655:24; 2 2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:6; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; properly [3] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	2661:18; 701:14; 2716:1, 4;
2514:5, 8, 11, 21-22, 13-14, 16, 22, 24; 2771:12 protecting [7] - 2672:6; 27 24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; properly [3] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	701:14; 2716:1, 4;
24; 2515:6, 14; 2712:1, 3, 11, 23; properly [3] - 2615:15, 25; 2629:22; 2715:22; 2	2716:1, 4;
2516:2, 18; 2517:4, 2713:4, 9; 2714:8, 19; 2755:5; 2759:20; 2641:12; 2645:14; 2729:13; 2	.740:22;
7-8, 13; 2518:10, 13, 2716:3; 2717:4, 14, 2767:2 2763:5; 2798:9 2754:19; 2	.761:9;
24; 2519:4, 18; 17; 2721:6; 2722:3, properties [12] - Protection [1] - 2762:5, 20): 2771:5:
2520:25; 2521:17, 19; 16, 24; 2723:4, 9; 2511:23; 2554:3, 9; 2506:23 2776:24; 2	785:7:
2522:5, 13, 22; 2724:2, 12-13, 19, 25; 2555:1, 6; 2558:4; protection [41] - 2788:13; 2	
2524:1, 20, 22; 2725:4, 7, 19; 2726:6, 2624:8; 2626:8, 20; 2512:3; 2513:4; 2794:16, 1	
2525:4, 9, 15, 19; 9, 12; 2727:12, 16, 2700:25; 2706:11; 2521:11; 2524:3, 9, provides	
2527:18, 20; 2528:8, 24; 2731:2, 23; 2707:7 12; 2555:5; 2615:5; 2517:7; 25	
10, 13, 25; 2529:8, 2732:7; 2734:7, 10; property [23] - 2618:19; 2630:24; 2548:18; 2	
15; 2530:14, 21; 2735:5; 2736:5; 2510:21; 2516:12; 2631:20; 2632:10, 16, 2557:22, 2	:5; 2558:3;
2532:11, 15, 19, 21, 2737:14; 2739:6, 20; 2524:10; 2558:10; 25; 2634:25; 2646:19; 2617:19; 2	619:7;
23; 2533:1, 6, 16; 2745:20; 2746:2, 12; 2615:5; 2617:21, 23; 2652:15; 2657:9, 17; 2675:12; 2	
2534:25; 2535:3, 16; 2750:13; 2754:20; 2626:2; 2629:10; 2661:15, 18, 22; 2719:2; 27	
2536:15, 24-25; 2755:9; 2760:17; 2633:7, 21; 2641:13, 2662:7; 2655:1; 2780:17	55.10,
	a (10)
2539:20; 2540:9, 24; 2762:17; 2763:19, 21; 21; 2647:14; 2689:15, 2675:12; 2682:9; provide	
2541:11; 2542:17; 2765:15; 2766:16; 17; 2746:8; 2748:23, 2687:18; 2688:6, 15; 2497:7; 25	
2543:4; 2544:1, 16; 2767:23; 2770:4, 19; 25; 2752:16; 2753:10; 2700:7; 2706:9; 2536:20; 2	
2545:2, 14; 2546:7, 2771:23; 2773:7; 2790:14; 2791:13 2707:14, 21, 24; 2549:12; 2	:584:4;
13, 21; 2547:7, 23; 2774:6; 2777:7, 21; proponent [32] - 2712:4; 2716:18; 2614:13; 2	2652:14;
2548:20; 2565:11; 2779:9, 19, 21; 2521:15; 2526:21, 24; 2722:18; 2746:8; 2664:16; 2	
2567:25; 2569:10; 2780:1, 11, 13, 15, 2528:6, 13; 2583:6, 2751:23; 2798:10 2751:22	,
2570:6, 21; 2571:16; 21; 2781:5, 8, 12, 20; 11, 15; 2584:20; protects [2] - 2631:1; Province	161 -
15, 23, 25, 2575:17, 2783:4, 15, 21; 2712:16, 20; 2713:8; protocols [3] - 2642:17; 2	
21; 2576:15; 2577:15; 2791:16; 2798:8; 2715:15; 2719:4; 2529:22; 2541:20; province	
2578:1, 8, 11, 23-24; 2799:8; 2805:1 2720:15; 2721:13; 2675:14 2493:14; 2	:506:13;
2579:1; 2580:8, 11, project's [13] - 2723:23; 2724:14, 22; protracted [1] - 2510:11; 2	2621:25;
17; 2581:8, 11; 2504:15; 2517:14; 2729:24; 2731:20; 2746:17 2629:7, 12	2630:3:
2582:25; 2583:19; 2552:11; 2575:6; 2734:10, 14, 20; proud [1] - 2788:7 2633:8, 20	
2584:13; 2586:19, 21; 2578:16; 2595:14; 2737:21; 2738:7; proven [5] - 2596:21; 2643:4; 26	
2587:11, 18; 2588:2; 2603:14; 2614:20; 2741:23; 2742:1; 2599:8; 2601:2; 2690:9, 17	
	ewithout
2594:19, 23; 2595:6, 2657:14; 2674:23; proponent's [6] - provide [71] - [1] - 2682:2	
10, 24; 2597:1; 2779:22 2503:16; 2661:22; 2493:23; 2497:17; provinci	
2600:23; 2601:9, 12, project-related [3] - 2687:19; 2705:9; 2499:21; 2505:18; 2507:16; 2	
18; 2602:5, 8; 2574:8; 2595:6, 24 2729:17; 2783:18 2511:18; 2513:15; 2529:19; 2	537:8;
2604:15, 17; 2605:4, project-specific [1] - proponents [1] - 2514:13, 18; 2516:8; 2543:7; 25	81:17, 19,
	21; 2636:21;
2608:5, 22; 2611:18; project [1] - proportional [1] - 2521:10; 2522:22; 2637:1; 26	
2613:17; 2614:18, 22; 2682:21 2669:15 2523:25; 2525:15; 2730:2; 27	
2615:1, 3, 11, 13, 20; Project/Highwood proposal [1] - 2528:7; 2531:10; provision	
2616.12, 17, 22; [1] - 2710:2 2543:13 2537:22; 2539:18; 2539:21; 2	
2632:22; 2634:11, 14, projections [1] - proposed [34] - 2551:23; 2554:25; 2780:6, 18	
24; 2636:14, 20, 24; 2573:20 2510:7; 2528:8; 2555:5; 2558:8; proximit	
2637:5, 16-17; projects [38] - 2533:25; 2535:14, 23; 2559:3, 24; 2560:22; 2559:15; 2	
2638:3, 5, 9, 14, 24; 2502:18; 2503:21; 2536:24; 2539:20; 2565:17; 2594:25; 2661:12; 2	:757:1;
2639:4, 11; 2640:20, 2505:19, 21, 23; 2540:12; 2544:3; 2610:20; 2619:17; 2760:8	
23: 2641:11, 15, 19. 2516:25: 2520:8: 2584:3: 2595:9: 2628:10: 2635:4: proxy 11	- 2669:21
24; 2642:4, 10; 2521:9, 12; 2542:23; 2601:17; 2612:2; 2649:21; 2650:13; prudent	
2644:25; 2645:5, 11, 2606:1, 4; 2633:17, 2613:19; 2640:14; 2652:16; 2654:16; 2743:14	• •
	- 2507:17;
	2007.17,
2653:13; 2654:9; 2638:24; 2649:24; 2661:14; 2662:4; 2663:15, 21; 2669:4; 2508:10; 2	.000.14,
2657:8, 16, 2661:7, 2662:4; 2663:14, 24; 2669:2, 17; 2670:11; 2672:3; 2675:17; 2631:7;	io∠.10,
13-14, 17, 20, 25; 2664:2, 23; 2665:5, 2677:20; 2691:24; 2676:3, 17; 2677:15; 2716:24	
2663:3, 13, 20, 25; 19; 2679:10; 2692:6, 2692:3; 2695:5, 9; 2680:1; 2686:6; public [13	37] -
2666:9, 11; 2667:13, 25; 2693:22; 2700:21; 2706:12; 2715:13; 2691:6; 2697:2; 2501:12, 1	9; 2503:5,
19, 22; 2668:12; 2703:23; 2707:22; 2718:24; 2731:23; 2701:12; 2711:4, 18; 10, 17; 250	05:21;
2669:3, 7-8; 2670:2, 2728:18; 2782:17, 19 2765:22; 2795:11 2715:11, 18; 2721:6; 2506:2, 11	; 2507:6;
	2510:10, 15;
2673:21; 2674:4, 6; 2591:8 2638:16 2773:4, 13; 2775:5; 2511:6; 25	

2516:6, 10; 2519:18;	2803:1; 2807:3	2642:8	2706:24; 2707:7;	2787:23
2520:6; 2522:4, 8-10,	putting [1] - 2750:23	quote [7] - 2626:13,	2738:2, 4	real [10] - 2518:16;
22; 2548:3; 2559:9; 2567:22; 2606:24; 2610:10: 2611:12: 20:	Q	23; 2692:24; 2693:21; 2694:8; 2695:22; 2609:19	rather [15] - 2536:11; 2538:16, 22; 2580:13; 2614:25: 2623:1;	2637:18; 2655:15; 2694:6; 2759:10,
2610:19; 2611:13, 20; 2612:6; 2614:22;	Q.C [3] - 2492:16, 20	2698:18 R	2614:25; 2633:1; 2636:19; 2687:19; 2604:22: 2704:25	13-14; 2760:25; 2804:7
2615:3-5, 24; 2616:9;	qualification [1] -		2694:23; 2701:25;	reality [5] - 2589:22;
2617:24; 2620:6-8,	2772:22		2707:16; 2747:6;	2598:24; 2629:10;
10, 14; 2622:5, 10,	qualifications [1] -	radical [1] - 2567:18	2767:23; 2787:2;	2642:9, 11
17; 2623:12; 2624:4,	2561:4	radically [1] -	2801:20	realize [1] - 2775:14
17-18, 20, 24;	qualified [2] -	2698:22	rating [2] - 2507:25;	realized [2] -
2625:17; 2631:21;	2760:21; 2767:24	Rae [2] - 2492:22;	2566:19	2578:20; 2741:2
2632:12, 18; 2634:9;	quality [84] - 2507:2;	2609:9	ratio [7] - 2625:21;	really [11] - 2496:17; 2500:22; 2680:25;
2636:18; 2639:2;	2546:3; 2575:1;	rail [3] - 2625:8;	2649:5; 2721:24;	
2641:12, 19, 21, 24;	2578:15, 20; 2579:15;	2647:16	2722:3, 5, 14	2689:11; 2693:7;
2642:4; 2645:4, 8-9;	2587:17, 23; 2594:17;	rain [2] - 2751:15;	ratios [1] - 2642:11	2701:19; 2733:2;
2647:13; 2648:25;	2595:7, 10, 13, 18,	2773:14	RCP [1] - 2573:16	2747:4; 2749:7;
2652:23; 2653:3, 10,	21; 2597:5, 8;	rain-on-snow [1] -	re [2] - 2630:7;	2750:20; 2755:8
14; 2654:15; 2657:8,	2600:16, 18; 2601:1,	2751:15	2787:4	reapplication [1] -
19; 2662:2, 6, 9, 11;	3, 12; 2608:3; 2655:1,	rainfall [7] - 2634:21;	re-adjourn [1] -	2599:14
2664:2, 8; 2666:9, 14;	8, 16; 2657:15;	2635:1; 2646:2;	2787:4	reason [7] - 2504:6;
2667:20; 2681:24;	2677:8, 13; 2682:12; 2684:20; 2704:22;	2654:4; 2699:3;	re-opened [1] -	2628:22; 2654:9;
2682:2-4, 13;		2751:2	2630:7	2671:1; 2691:8;
2683:11, 13, 16, 23;	2711:5; 2720:4;	raise [3] - 2588:5;	reach [5] - 2527:3;	2701:5; 2748:20
2684:3, 7, 16, 22-23,	2724:17, 19, 21;	2591:6; 2654:6	2553:3; 2559:6;	reasonable [20] -
25; 2685:2; 2691:4;	2725:8; 2726:7;	raised [22] - 2505:13;	2697:23; 2774:5	2584:7; 2598:1;
2694:11, 18; 2705:18;	2727:14; 2752:24;	2518:12; 2531:24;	reached [1] -	2670:25; 2672:12;
2709:12; 2710:16, 18,	2753:8; 2757:22;	2535:25; 2546:12;	2691:18	2673:1, 18; 2674:18;
20, 23; 2711:22, 24;	2760:10, 15;	2547:3; 2549:25;	reaches [1] - 2693:5	2675:6, 22; 2676:3;
2714:19; 2723:21;	2764:15-17; 2765:8;	2550:8; 2579:16;	reaching [4] -	2677:22; 2678:12, 17;
2728:22; 2730:13, 16;	2766:2, 5, 8; 2767:4,	2580:5; 2588:11, 14;	2512:7; 2591:13;	2711:3, 6; 2753:25;
2734:21; 2735:14;	6-8, 10, 17, 19;	2590:6; 2603:2;	2601:20; 2612:19	2755:6; 2771:17;
2745:6, 11, 14, 23;	2768:25; 2769:6, 11,	2604:20; 2681:19;	react [2] - 2594:10;	2778:3; 2801:7
2751:9; 2763:6;	15; 2770:14, 22, 25;	2708:18; 2729:24;	2754:4	reasonably [5] -
2766:7; 2774:7;	2771:9, 15, 21;	2764:19; 2783:14;	reacting [1] - 2755:2	2533:23; 2536:14;
2783:23; 2795:4;	2772:2, 6, 9, 16, 18,	2792:8; 2804:15	read [74] - 2502:21;	2567:7; 2585:10;
2800:14; 2803:23	20; 2775:11; 2789:13, 15; 2790:4, 25;	raising [3] - 2549:5;	2503:14; 2506:4;	2721:21
public's [1] -		2629:5; 2706:25	2510:13; 2515:4;	reasons [7] -
2763:19	2804:3	ranch [4] - 2524:11; 2724:9; 2734:11;	2525:6; 2527:7; 2534:17; 2535:6;	2519:10; 2579:10; 2630:24; 2638:19;
published [3] - 2702:11, 13; 2801:5	quantifiable [2] - 2620:20; 2621:12	2753:8	2537:11; 2546:20;	2663:25; 2669:25;
pull [1] - 2497:5	quantified [2] -	ranchers [1] -	2556:14; 2557:2, 12;	2735:12
pulling [1] - 2624:9	2710:10; 2711:11	2776:20	2563:7, 15; 2584:18;	reassessment [2] -
pumps [1] - 2629:3	quantities [1] -	ranching [6] -	2594:6; 2599:25;	2740:12; 2767:17
pungent [1] -	2702:14	2532:24; 2724:1, 4, 6;	2611:5; 2615:9;	recalculations [1] -
2627:14	quantity [8] -	2732:6, 9	2618:10; 2626:13;	2684:17
purchases [1] -	2575:13; 2587:18;	Range [2] - 2713:19;	2632:9; 2642:15, 25;	recap [1] - 2756:10
2640:24	2594:17; 2595:10;	2793:22	2663:6, 18; 2666:10;	receipt [3] - 2539:17;
purport [1] - 2664:12	2633:13; 2677:8, 13;	range [13] - 2592:6;	2682:16; 2688:24;	2540:7; 2738:21
purpose [15] -	2725:8 quarter [2] - 2610:7;	2598:22; 2599:12;	2689:10, 22; 2690:20; 2691:17; 2692:24;	receive [6] - 2540:15; 2612:24; 2638:11;
2505:18; 2510:14; 2520:18; 2523:25;	2764:11	2623:21; 2624:9; 2648:19; 2664:9;	2693:21; 2694:8;	2722:18; 2732:19;
2619:24; 2645:12;	quarters [1] -	2685:25; 2688:16;	2695:3, 12, 22;	2788:11
2654:14; 2661:14;	2742:17	2737:17, 20; 2757:15;	2696:3; 2697:15, 21;	received [14] -
2686:3; 2694:19;	Queen's [1] -	2761:7	2698:19; 2705:11;	2502:25; 2505:6;
2709:5; 2715:1;	2661:10	Ranger [1] - 2705:6	2706:16; 2708:20;	2528:10, 24; 2532:9;
2720:16; 2743:16	questioned [2] -	rank [1] - 2662:21	2710:7, 14; 2715:19;	2533:19; 2537:19;
Purpose [1] - 2685:8	2527:7; 2698:10	rapid [6] - 2565:18;	2716:15; 2717:21;	2627:1, 7; 2628:3,
purposes [4] -	questioning [2] -	2566:11, 23; 2567:1;	2727:1, 21; 2729:2;	24-25; 2643:16;
2520:22; 2590:24;	2588:22; 2745:10	2646:2; 2728:16	2730:22; 2731:5;	2680:12
2610:23; 2677:16	questions [18] -	rapidly [1] - 2745:3	2733:21, 25; 2737:5;	receives [2] -
pursuant [3] -	2522:23; 2524:22;	rare [5] - 2587:24;	2738:13; 2740:17;	2509:20; 2530:18
2505:17; 2541:22;	2528:9; 2546:12;	2600:21; 2773:5, 7;	2741:12; 2745:21;	receiving [3] -
2678:25	2547:3; 2588:20;	2783:2	2749:2; 2752:4;	2532:4; 2707:25;
pursue [2] - 2637:25;	2601:6; 2604:14;	rate [23] - 2551:9, 12;	2764:23; 2765:23;	2722:17
2782:17	2706:8; 2751:16;	2552:17; 2553:14;	2766:3; 2769:12;	recent [5] - 2506:3;
pursued [1] -	2756:4; 2763:17;	2554:21; 2562:17;	2790:23; 2796:2;	2510:17; 2572:23;
2633:20	2776:24; 2793:18, 20;	2573:8; 2575:19;	2806:18	2750:2; 2804:9
pursuing [1] -	2802:16, 19	2593:9; 2619:13;	readily [3] - 2588:8;	recently [2] -
2783:20	quick [4] - 2496:15; 2612:16; 2737:18;	2648:16; 2651:4;	2591:4; 2599:3	2688:21; 2801:6
purview [2] -		2687:10; 2698:1;	readiness [1] -	receptors [4] -
2567:11; 2782:18	2764:3	2700:11; 2701:22;	2534:10	2594:24; 2597:14;
put [18] - 2512:3;	quickly [4] -	2702:7, 22; 2707:15;	reading [4] -	2758:19; 2760:11
2578:10; 2594:10;	2498:22; 2596:21;	2742:5, 17; 2743:9	2569:20; 2732:15;	recognition [4] -
2645:22; 2656:9;	2604:12; 2784:5	rates [18] - 2553:2, 6;	2786:18; 2794:25	2572:7; 2647:5;
2662:17; 2680:24;	quiet [1] - 2747:8	2554:1, 6; 2558:23;	readings [3] -	2732:5, 10
2685:20; 2690:15;	quite [5] - 2548:1;	2575:23; 2585:23;	2703:7; 2742:18;	recognize [4] -
2731:4; 2747:9;	2746:11; 2750:22;	2631:2; 2686:22;	2744:14	2662:8; 2689:1;
2750:14, 17; 2777:3;	2762:19; 2804:8	2700:16; 2701:3;	ready [6] - 2643:2, 5;	2797:25; 2805:20
2786:13; 2793:13;	quo [2] - 2515:25;	2703:3, 8; 2705:25;	2658:7; 2785:1;	recognized [13] -

AMICUS REPORTING GROUP

reduce [19]

reduces [2]

2705.25

2651:13

2569.25

2721:12

2796:1

 $2775 \cdot 10$

2712:10

2538:14; 2543:23; 2624:14; 2628:14; 2634:15; 2637:4; 2646:9; 2767:3; 2770-22: 0704 16 2770:22; 2794:13; 2797:6 recognizes [4] -2530:2; 2571:24; 2769:7; 2807:2 recommend [3] -2607:4; 2657:20; 2729:3 recommendation [15] - 2531:10; 2565:20: 2568:7-9. 11; 2603:15; 2716:13; 2740:5, 9, 14, 16; 2741:8, 10, 21 recommendations [24] - 2531:3; 2535:4; 2539:12; 2543:17; 2544:21; 2560:23; 2561:1, 19-20; 2562:2, 4; 2568:5, 12, 20; 2584:11, 16; 2716:12; 2739:25 2740:4; 2753:20, 23; 2778:5; 2804:24 recommended [2] -2566:5; 2782:2 recommends [1] -2742.2 reconsider [1] -2642:17 reconstruction [1] -2621:2 reconvene[1] -2658:11 record [29] · 2494:15; 2500:3, 7; 2504:9; 2515:5; 2530:7; 2534:18; 2536:5; 2540:25 2542:13; 2556:21; 2559:16; 2571:15; 2572:8. 16. 18: 2577:20; 2614:16; 2620:23; 2628:16; 2637:15; 2651:4; 2708:10; 2732:15; 2739:3; 2749:6; 2784:11; 2786:14 recorded [5] -2675:15, 19; 2693:18; 2699:7: 2781:1 records [6] 2548:25; 2570:24; 2576:17; 2577:7; 2589:11; 2734:18 recourse [1] -2580:20 Recovery [1] -2698:16 recovery [2] 2512:9; 2757:20 recreation [9] -2504:12; 2519:23; 2520:15, 22; 2635:19; 2665:1; 2688:6, 15; 2694 22 recreational [10] -2505:2; 2520:19; 2621:17; 2636:10; 2704:16, 19; 2705:1, 4: 2711:4. 18 recurrence [1] -2564.9 REDD [1] - 2582:4 redeeming [1] -

2755:8

2698:13. 15: 2713:8 redirected [1] refiltration [1] -2778.20 2510:19; 2511:21; reflect [2] - 2518:10; 2513:11; 2532:7; 2535:19 2540:12; 2584:13; reflected [1] -2619:9; 2622:20; 2531:25 2624:11; 2629:10; reflective [4] 2704:17; 2719:8; 2757:5; 2761:23 2641:4; 2667:17; 2705:23; 2717:25; 2718:4; 2757:10; reflector [1] - 2704:7 2764:25; 2779:15, 20 reflects [2] -2529:15; 2541:12 reduced 191 - 2513:5: 2553:21; 2575:22; refreshed [1] -2623:16; 2639:24; 2646:23; 2647:20; 2764.7 refused [2] 2714:18; 2756:3 2652:25: 2737:10 refuses [1] - 2684:25 refute [1] - 2761:20 2548:14; 2633:13 reducing [11] regard [23] · 2511:19; 2513:24; 2518:16; 2551:13; 2505:22; 2508:10; 2510:22; 2517:18; 2521:18; 2523:19; 2559:1; 2615:14; 2619:10; 2621:14; 2530:5; 2565:15; 2645:12; 2652:23; 2569:4; 2572:2; 2578:22; 2584:2, 6; 2585:19; 2607:1; reduction [9] -2554:1; 2555:1; 2559:3; 2566:4; 2645:4; 2689:13; 2743:8, 18; 2766:24; 2573:25; 2631:1, 3; 2718:7; 2741:1 2771:12: 2782:7 **regarding** [22] -2510:24; 2531:12, 17; 2562:13; 2591:6; redundancies [1] redundant [1] -2596:10; 2600:6; 2602:23; 2603:6; Redwood [7] 2604:12; 2643:7; 2521:7; 2582:5; 2633:1; 2634:4; 2675:18; 2677:24; 2697:20; 2705:21 2682:7; 2705:22; 2708:11, 15; 2734:16; 2755:8; 2760:10; refer [17] - 2499:17 2765:11; 2791:19 2555:25; 2556:13, 25; regardless [2] -2557:10; 2581:14; 2611:25; 2660:24; 2514:17; 2670:22 regards [3] -2686:1; 2730:22; 2745:9, 20; 2775:8; 2731:13; 2789:25; 2799.5 regime [6] - 2570:5; 2781:16; 2782:6, 8 2575:18; 2587:23; 2593:25; 2594:1; reference [23] -2496:3; 2506:25; 2507:1; 2518:23; 2648:9 2521:22; 2545:4; region [11] 2506:13; 2589:21; 2645:17; 2657:7; 2679:2; 2682:24; 2556:3; 2633:5; 2692:3, 12; 2694:17 2701:18; 2715:18, 21; 2718:7; 2739:17; 2683:7; 2702:23; 2743:3; 2764:22; 2774:3; 2775:1; 2711:6; 2746:22; 2771:22 region-wide [1] -2589:21 referenced [2] -2630:13; 2718:6 regional [10] · 2506:15; 2647:14; references [10] -2655:3, 20; 2657:9; 2496:1; 2610:22; 2678:21, 23; 2711:19; 2780:4; 2794:16 2644:19; 2660:23; 2693:16; 2715:19; 2733:23, 25; 2775:8 Regional [1] referred [21] 2779:25 regions' [1] -2503:25; 2504:5; 2519:10; 2523:4; 2655:21 2545:6; 2552:24; register [1] - 2577:10 2554:8; 2555:20; regret [1] - 2763:9 **regular** [6] - 2508:3; 2509:24; 2525:12; 2576:9; 2613:23; 2672:18; 2673:8, 16; 2675:3; 2696:24; 2697:9; 2701:7, 16; 2544:25; 2607:23; 2627:16 2720:6; 2726:4; regularly [1] -2734.12 referring [4] regulated [1] -2497:19; 2689:6; 2725:20; 2795:25 2648:14 regulation [4] refers [4] - 2590:7; 2570:12; 2676:2, 6

regulations [2] -2543:7; 2556:6 regulators [8] 2502:7, 11; 2516:22; 2573:14; 2607:21; 2638:25; 2717:23; 2783:13 regulatory [12] -2504:4; 2522:23; 2527:14; 2528:1; 2541:11; 2542:1; 2571:3; 2574:10; 2650:21; 2717:15; 2789:6; 2797:2 rehabilitated [1] -2646.20 Reid [1] - 2597:5 reiterate [2] - 2504:1; 2606:14 reiterated [1] -2547:2 reiterates [4] -2514:15; 2515:20; 2553:17; 2580:3 reiterating [1] -2566:14 reject [1] - 2783:24 rejected [2] -2715:15; 2803:14 rejecting [2] -2782:15; 2783:19 rejects [4] - 2554:14; 2571:23; 2703:16; 2729.17 relate [2] - 2719:6; 2735:10 related [13] - 2512:9; 2555:13; 2574:8, 15; 2580:25; 2586:10; 2595:6, 10, 24; 2612:5; 2630:15; 2750:7; 2791:13 **relates** [4] - 2610:16; 2662:18; 2678:9; 2762.2 relating [8] - 2674:3; 2675:4; 2721:8; 2736:15; 2745:2, 23; 2773:11; 2784:11 relation [8] - 2612:1; 2614:5; 2678:2; 2696:10; 2710:25; 2723:17; 2781:19 relationship [1] -2772.17 relative [6] - 2503:6; 2592:21; 2638:21; 2653:12; 2702:4; 2721:24 relatively [4] -2593:15; 2653:21; 2661:16; 2704:14 relaxing [1] -2493.12 release [16] - 2579:4; 2580:1; 2585:7, 19; 2586:2, 8, 10-11, 14; 2587:25; 2753:24; 2754:1; 2793:10; 2802:6 released [4] -2508:19; 2549:9; 2552:13; 2579:8 releasing [1] -2579:18 relevance [2] 2503:9; 2666:18 relevant [14] -2501:12; 2503:17; 2534:25; 2556:12;

2576:21; 2612:5; 2634:8, 14; 2636:17; 2653:14; 2721:7; 2722:15; 2726:22; 2744 23 reliable [1] - 2514:19 reliance [2] - 2700:8, 11 relied [7] - 2589:24; 2590:3; 2705:14; 2751:13; 2753:18; 2758:21; 2784:12 relies [2] - 2739:12, relocating [2] -2629:4; 2724:6 relocation [4] 2517:16; 2713:25; 2714:4, 24 **rely** [12] - 2526:10; 2531:14; 2537:12; 2542:15; 2606:7; 2666:3; 2701:1; 2737:1; 2744:24; 2746:5; 2749:5; 2755 20 relying [3] - 2563:10, 18: 2647:13 remain [10] · 2554:19; 2581:2; 2611:25; 2642:23; 2681:21; 2763:18; 2767:9; 2768:15; 2780.12.2782.2 remained [3] -2499:12; 2546:15; 2562:7 remaining [2] -2539:24; 2732:14 remains [7] -2518:12; 2580:3; 2592:1; 2628:7; 2637:15; 2710:21; 2748:11 remarkably [1] -2609.3remarks [15] · 2500:2; 2501:15; 2519:12: 2556:3: 2603:5; 2609:13; 2612:15; 2618:8; 2643:15; 2644:12; 2681:23; 2685:7; 2782:11, 14; 2807:14 remediate [2] -2692:17; 2760:6 remedy [2] - 2695:6, 10 remember [3] · 2521:3; 2665:13; 2693.9 remembered [1] -2511:9 reminders [1] -2627:17 reminds [1] - 2653:8 remiss [1] - 2608:24 remnants [1] -2770:15 remote [3] - 2652:4, 11 removal [2] -2545:12; 2716:9 remove [2] 2603:18; 2619:1 removed [2] · 2575:25; 2732:6 removes [1] -2577:14 renegotiate [1] -

2805.5 renewed [1] - 2670:8 repair [1] - 2627:25 repairing [1] -2622.3 repairs [3] - 2558:2; 2721:11; 2723:5 repatriation [2] -2676:2,6 Repatriation [1] -2676.8 repeat [3] - 2523:6; 2630:21:2646:5 repeated [2] -2514:12; 2642:2 repeatedly [5] -2589:17; 2656:19; 2701:8, 16; 2744:11 repeating [1] -2552.23 replace [1] - 2762:14 replaced [1] -2646:20 replacement [3] -2713:20; 2715:3, 23 **reply** [23] - 2500:10, 12, 14, 23; 2501:14; 2523:4; 2526:4; 2536:8; 2539:16; 2543:19; 2560:24; 2565:22; 2582:18; 2585:12; 2588:13; 2597:12; 2603:3; 2698:13; 2785:22; 2786:20; 2807:9, 15 Report [8] - 2508:7; 2517:11; 2653:11; 2691:20; 2698:15; 2738:3 report [63] - 2508:20, 24-25; 2531:16; 2538:2; 2539:19; 2540:1, 7; 2542:11, 25; 2555:4; 2560:17, 19; 2561:1, 12, 21; 2562:1, 19; 2563:1; 2565:6; 2568:16; 2569:4, 6, 25; 2572:23; 2583:8, 23; 2584:16, 19; 2589:6; 2590:11; 2599:20; 2634:16; 2637:3; 2639:18; 2693:16 2697:9, 14; 2698:18; 2700:4; 2703:10; 2704:13; 2705:1, 3, 10; 2706:10; 2710:2; 2713:7, 22; 2727:20; 2728:11; 2729:1, 3, 13. 15: 2737:4: 2738:12; 2753:21; 2764:17; 2780:2: 2783:16; 2792:9; 2799.9 reported [1] - 2542:7 **RÉPORTER** [2] -2612:23; 2632:9 reporter [5] - 2494:6; 2610:21; 2612:10; 2613:5; 2659:7 Reporters [1] -2493:5 reporters [6] 2497:18; 2609:1; 2643:8; 2644:14; 2798:23: 2807:20 reporting [6] -2718:18, 21; 2720:3; 2760:13; 2790:14

reports [6] -

2542:16; 2568:4; 2581:22; 2675:18; 2771.5 represent [4] -2569:22; 2570:1; 2617:18; 2629:16 representation [3] -2528:21; 2588:25; 2608:14 representations [1] -2767:22 representative [12] -2528:17; 2598:6; 2608:9; 2767:22; 2768:4, 12; 2769:3, 5; 2770:2; 2771:9; 2772:23 representatives [6] -2523:11, 22; 2524:9 17; 2538:25; 2540:18 represented [4] -2610:6; 2661:3 2784:19; 2805:21 representing [3] -2630:19; 2658:4; 2783.8 represents [1] -2622:15 request [11] -2530:22; 2543:24; 2607:3; 2681:1; 2715:15; 2774:24; 2775:19; 2791:3, 9; 2802:7; 2803:13 requested [14] -2525:4; 2643:23; 2644:5; 2675:10; 2736:12, 17, 22; 2745:7, 13, 23; 2753:20; 2774:21; 2791:12, 24 requesting [5] -2537:3; 2790:12; 2791:14; 2793:13; 2798.3 requests [11] 2502:11; 2507:11; 2543:22; 2573:14; 2606:23; 2671:14; 2685:9, 12; 2726:11; 2783:23; 2791:7 require [11] 2507:16; 2518:24; 2563:2; 2567:1; 2570:13, 23; 2643:22; 2716:3; 2777:9; 2779:3; 2780:17 required [37] 2506:21; 2507:15; 2521:21; 2528:7; 2531:6; 2538:18; 2539:22; 2540:2; 2541:13, 15, 22; 2551:12; 2552:11; 2567:3, 7; 2568:1; 2571:8; 2577:15; 2583:24; 2621:2 2651:12; 2667:16; 2695:23; 2701:19; 2717:2; 2720:24; 2722:11; 2726:9; 2741:15; 2755:10; 2767:5; 2769:7; 2790:7; 2792:24; 2802:10; 2803:19 requirement [3] -2563:11; 2678:19; 2720:14 requirements [13] -2509:25; 2541:23;

2542:1; 2562:20; 2650:21; 2696:8, 11; 2718:18; 2728:1; 2741:6, 23; 2768:19; 2801.20 requires [9] 2507:19, 21-22, 24; 2522:4; 2530:12; 2642:21; 2742:4; 2780:3 requiring [2] -2562:22; 2777:11 rescue [8] - 2532:12; 2546:2; 2582:2; 2584:6: 2720:18. 22: 2754:24; 2755:16 rescuers [1] -2720:23 rescues [1] -2622:24 research [5] · 2576:12; 2577:23; 2578:6; 2770:8 reseeding [1] -2692:18 Reseeding [1] -2719:7 reserves [1] - 2661:6 Reserves [1] -2670.24 reserving [2] -2696:6, 10 Reservoir [49] 2499:16; 2510:18; 2513:19, 25; 2521:6; 2547:25; 2551:13; 2553:24; 2554:2, 11, 13; 2555:2, 6; 2558:17, 23; 2559:4; 2576:4; 2606:25; 2619:4, 10; 2633:14; 2634:3; 2646:17; 2647:24; 2648:4, 6, 12; 2651:21; 2654:6, 20 2655 11 2656 6 2670:8: 2682:5: 2683:10; 2687:17, 21; 2696:16, 23; 2697:11; 2698:2; 2702:16; 2712:9, 19; 2725:5; 2731:12; 2747:21; 2751:3; 2782:21 reservoir [98] 2508:12, 15; 2510:20; 2513:21; 2515:12; 2520:22; 2548:6, 8; 2549:4, 8, 17; 2551:7, 16, 20, 22, 25; 2552:6, 12, 19 2553:14, 20; 2554:4; 2562:18: 2563:5. 13-14, 17; 2564:2, 8, 14; 2565:1, 19, 25; 2566:12, 24; 2573:8; 2576:1; 2579:9, 18; 2581:5; 2582:23; 2585:7, 20, 24; 2586:5; 2588:1; 2591:25; 2592:19, 22; 2593:17; 2594:22; 2596:11; 2598:14; 2604:4; 2619:5; 2663:3; 2687:1; 2692:17; 2696:25; 2697:6, 12; 2704:3; 2706:12; 2709:20, 23; 2716:10; 2719:24; 2724:21; 2732:3; 2735:18, 21; 2740:21, 25; 2741:16; 2742:5,

16; 2743:11, 15, 20, 24; 2744:1, 4, 11; 2751:19, 22, 25; 2755:17; 2756:13; 2757:7, 10; 2758:13, 16; 2759:18, 24; 2766:18; 2778:11; 2788:24 Reservoirs [1] -2743:19 reservoirs [3] · 2662:21; 2741:7; 2766:19 reside [1] - 2628:12 residence [1] -2601.19 residences [5] -2601:20; 2615:15; 2639:10; 2645:15; 2792.6 resident [1] - 2774:1 residential [7] -2605:25; 2617:22; 2624:8; 2629:21; 2747:8; 2793:24; 2795 15 residents [41] · 2515:23; 2516:11; 2518:17; 2607:25; 2617:18; 2626:15; 2627:8; 2628:10: 2629:1, 16, 19; 2633:7; 2640:16; 2657:16; 2665:5, 15; 2682:6; 2688:9, 18; 2708:3, 12, 17, 21; 2709:5, 14, 19; 2723:13; 2724:21 2725:4, 17; 2729:21; 2730:2; 2731:1; 2751:7, 22-23; 2760:9; 2783:8, 14; 2803.23 residual [5] - 2507:7; 2554:13; 2558:16; 2707:4; 2767:8 residuals [2] -2590.12 resilience [2] -2647:8, 21 resilient [1] - 2629:4 resolution [1] -2723:21 resolve [4] -2522:17; 2525:22; 2761:14; 2792:23 resort [1] - 2600:1 resource [11] -2535:9: 2654:24 2667:23; 2669:18; 2675:21; 2683:24; 2690:23; 2692:22; 2732:1: 2752:5 Resource [1] -2541:8 resources [17] 2503:21; 2505:20; 2507:5; 2516:6; 2529:9; 2543:2; 2608:5; 2637:9; 2652:20; 2657:7; 2669:21; 2674:22; 2690:16; 2736:2, 11, 13.15 Resources [15] -2492:1; 2541:13, 16; 2542:1, 8; 2543:3, 14; 2637:11; 2645:3; 2674:5, 25; 2675:6, 9, 11; 2684:1

respect [50] 2499:15; 2514:22; 2516:2; 2519:1; 2529:7, 21; 2536:11; 2542:9; 2543:2; 2546:7; 2550:20; 2551:5; 2552:21 2564:4, 21; 2571:16; 2578:15; 2579:16; 2580:6; 2602:4, 21; 2603:24; 2605:19; 2607:7; 2634:13; 2650:17; 2654:13; 2668:5; 2691:20; 2692:7; 2694:14; 2725:19; 2743:2; 2754.6; 2767:13; 2768.5; 2769.9; 2770:6, 21; 2771:2, 6, 25; 2772:7; 2773:3, 19, 23; 2774:9; 2797:15; 2805:9 respected [2] 2529:17; 2583:2 respectful [11] -2539:2; 2614:15; 2616:9, 16; 2618:1; 2619:20; 2626:4; 2628:17; 2638:19; 2642:6: 2807:6 respectfully [2] -2501:16; 2607:3 respecting [2] · 2647:6; 2651:15 respective [1] -2502.7 respiratory [1] -2804:1 respond [8] 2525:15; 2528:11; 2531:24; 2591:15; 2616:17; 2623:3; 2652:17; 2680:23 responded [8] -2502:12; 2539:15; 2543:21; 2565:20; 2566:14; 2567:1; 2568:12; 2569:15 responding [1] -2543:7 responds [2] -2500:15, 18 response [67] 2504:7, 22; 2510:8; 2514:12; 2526:25; 2532:9, 15; 2540:8, 15; 2541:19; 2542:2, 14; 2560:25; 2562:5, 25; 2563:5, 23; 2565:7, 19; 2566:3; 2567:3, 23; 2568:8, 16, 22; 2569:14; 2570:16; 2573:14; 2579:10; 2581:20; 2584:17-19; 2588:12; 2591:9; 2593:1 2595:4, 9; 2601:11; 2604:22; 2623:5, 7-8; 2635:15; 2636:5; 2649:12; 2652:19, 25; 2670:16; 2701:13, 24; 2703:14; 2708:18; 2714:1; 2737:16; 2740:23; 2745:6, 12; 2750:12; 2760:1; 2764:16; 2765:11; 2766:3; 2786:16; 2803:18 responses [13] -2494:23; 2532:5;

2549:14; 2561:25; 2568:14; 2581:13, 18, 21; 2583:24; 2006:22; 2628:24; 2706:8; 2776:24 RESPONSES [1] - 2495:5 responsibility [5] - 2570:18; 2683:21; 2710:21; 2783:17; 2789:2 responsible [5] - 2531:4; 2532:20; 2561:16; 2595:12; 2735:3 responsive [4] - 2518:11; 2529:16; 2669:15; 2671:3 rest [4] - 2565:9; 2574:10; 2731:13; 2747:18 restrict [1] - 2778:18 restrict [1] - 2509:8; 2510:20; 2512:4, 24; 2538:19; 2558:4; 2669:10; 2678:1 result [43] - 2509:8; 2510:20; 2512:4, 24; 2526:2; 2566:4; 2569:24; 2573:1; 2577:18; 2578:8; 2579:17; 2580:7; 2586:23; 2588:16; 2598:21; 2602:9; 2606:15; 2617:15; 2626:18; 2627:21; 2655:8; 2667:15; 2686:19, 23; 2676:24; 2699:28, 18; 2709:22; 2711:17; 2715:5; 2717:22; 2728:9, 13; 2745:8; 2771:13; 2745:8; 2775:17; 2758:14; 2764:18; 2765:3; 2771:13; 2745:8; 2778:24 resulte [7] - 2510:8; 2520:3; 2573:21; 2575:5; 2586:5; 2596:3; 2778:24 resulte [7] - 2510:8; 2520:3; 2573:21; 2575:5; 2586:5; 2596:3; 2778:24 result [1] - 2509:16; 2512:6; 2649:4; 2668:24; 2677:25; 2778:24 result [1] - 2559:24; 2560:16; 2699:5 resumption [1] - 2673:14 retained [7] - 2559:24; 2560:16; 2569:16; 25583:2;	returning [4] - 2556:24; 2568:5; 2588:15; 2613:14 reveal [1] - 2756:3 revealed [1] - 2588:16 revegetate [1] - 2781:3 revegetation [7] - 2546:1; 2602:23, 25; 2693:15, 17; 2780:23, 25; 2693:15, 17; 2780:23, 25; 2693:15, 17; 2780:23, 25; revenue [1] - 2500:19 revenues [1] - 2630:25 reversed [1] - 2593:18 reversible [3] - 2587:25; 2655:10 Review [7] - 2691:19, 23; 2695:4, 13, 21, 23; 2710:1 review [52] - 2499:22, 24; 2501:13; 2502:6; 2504:2, 9; 2505:15, 19; 2508:24; 2520:6; 2524:1; 2530:19; 2537:7; 2540:3, 7, 20; 2543:1; 2545:21; 2559:23; 2571:6; 2583:4, 14; 2607:9; 2612:16; 2615:22; 2637:22; 2662:3; 2663:25; 2664:1; 2665:4; 2671:24; 2680:3; 2682:18; 2684:24; 2694:24; 2703:5; 2729:5; 2733:12; 2738:21; 2739:8, 21; 2741:24; 2742:2, 9; 2744:20; 2766:8; 278:20; 2806:12 review community [1] - 2632:20 review community [1] - 2632:10; 2584:16; 18; 2589:10; 2604:24; 2611:19; 2702:11; 274:20; 2569:8, 21; 255:23; 2534:20; 255:23; 2534:20; 255:25; 2717:24; 2709:20; 255:25; 2717:24; 2709:20;	Ridge [3] - 2582:4, 6; 2648:13 ridiculous [1] - 2689:5 rifle [4] - 2803:3, 5, 8; 2805:6 rights [31] - 2531:18; 2533:3, 10; 2536:14, 19; 2537:1, 4; 2661:9; 2662:8, 12; 2665:5; 2666:12, 18, 25; 2667:4, 8-9, 13, 26; 2667:4, 8-9, 13, 26; 2607:1, 2676:18; 2662:8, 2665:5, 15; 2692:7, 2693:24; 2694:2, 2698:25; 2752:13; 2781:17; 2782:4 riprap [7] - 2517:17; 2605:14; 2716:9; 2741:11, 13, 19; 2801:14 rise [3] - 2579:9; 2600:19; 2601:1 risig [2] - 2712:6; 2789:20 Risk [2] - 2509:12, 15 risk [72] - 2509:17, 22; 2512:1, 8, 17; 253:20; 2555:1, 13; 25573; 11; 2574:1; 2579:7; 2582:12; 2584:22, 19; 2553:20; 2555:1, 13; 25573; 11; 2574:1; 2579:7; 2582:12; 2584:23; 2592:24; 2600:12; 2613:23; 2615:14; 2617:8, 14; 2619:9; 2631:3; 2657:14; 2639:24; 2600:12; 2613:23; 2615:14; 2617:8, 14; 2619:9; 2631:3; 2657:14; 2639:24; 2600:12; 2613:23; 2615:14; 2617:8, 14; 2619:9; 2631:3; 2657:14; 2679:14; 2779:7; 2737:1; 2739:13; 2741:1; 2743:10; 2744:24; 2745:24; 2714:24; 2745:24;	23; 2617:16; 2629:20; 2650:5; 2664:18; 2699:9; 2700:11; 2702:19; 2706:25; 2707:12; 2708:24; 2709:3, 6, 9; 2744:13; 2778:7; 2792:15 River [156] - 2492:20; 2502:23; 2504:12, 24; 2510:5, 16; 2511:14, 20; 2512:2, 5, 12; 16-17, 22; 2513:17, 25; 2514:6, 10, 20; 2516:10; 2519:4; 2521:5, 8, 11, 25; 2536:11; 2548:7, 10-11, 18, 23; 2549:3, 12, 23; 2550:17; 2551:23; 2552:16; 2554:20; 2558:5; 2572:9, 12, 14, 17; 2575:20; 2576:3; 2577:10; 2578:2; 2601:16; 2610:5, 11; 2619:2, 5, 15-16, 18; 2621:2, 2618:7; 2619:2, 5, 15-16, 18; 2621:2, 2618:7; 2619:2, 5, 15-16, 18; 2621:14, 19; 2624:6; 2625:9; 2627:23; 2631:15; 2633:3, 25; 2634:2, 22; 2635:16; 2636:7; 2644:9; 2645:15, 25; 2646:12, 14; 2647:3; 2649:17, 24-25; 2650:5, 15, 20-21; 2659:12; 2661:19, 23; 2662:16, 19, 21; 2663:4, 12, 19, 21; 2670:12, 21; 2661:19, 23; 2698:14, 20; 2699:4, 10, 12; 2701:23; 2702:8, 12, 2697:21, 23; 2698:14, 20; 2699:4, 10, 12; 2701:23; 2702:8, 12, 2773:24; 2788:20; 2778:24; 2788:20; 2778:24; 2788:20; 2792:1; 2793:6; 2792:1; 2793:6; 2770:2	2722:11; 2734:24; 2748:6; 2801:22 Road [4] - 2713:19; 2793:22; 2795:13 roads [6] - 2504:22; 2625:7; 2635:15; 2636:5; 2723:2; 2735:15 roadways [1] - 2511:7 Roberts [2] - 2492:8; 2736:14 Robinson [9] - 2524:9, 19; 2593:23; 2685:14; 2717:8, 16; 2732:8; 2736:2; 2752:15 Robinson's [1] - 2753:16 robust [7] - 2534:19; 2567:17; 2568:2; 2586:20; 2601:23; 2737:7; 2748:17 Rocky [26] - 2505:12; 2513:1, 4; 2555:21; 2556:5, 24; 2705:10; 2708:6, 9-10, 15, 22; 2713:15; 2717:5; 2721:16; 2723:14; 2729:1, 21; 2730:6; 2748:10; 2783:7; 2796:14; 2797:6 Roger [1] - 2739:23 role [4] - 2527:13; 2531:11; 2587:11; 2751:14 Ron [3] - 2492:16; 2679:24; 2733:9 roof [2] - 2656:9 rooted [1] - 2699:20 rough [2] - 2592:22; 2780:25 roughly [3] - 2548:10; 2554:22; 2651:2 roughness [1] - 2766:14 Round [4] - 2581:16, 18; 20 round [2] - 2728:13; 2780:25 roughness [1] - 2766:14 Round [4] - 2581:16, 18; 20 round [2] - 2728:13; 2780:25 roughness [1] - 2766:14 Round [4] - 2581:16, 18; 20 round [2] - 2728:13; 2780:25 roughness [1] - 2766:14 Round [2] - 2728:13; 2780:25 roughness [1] - 2766:14 Round [2] - 2728:13; 2780:25 roughness [1] - 2766:14 Round [2] - 2728:13; 2780:25 routed [1] - 2493:5; 2625:7; 2725:16 routes [5] - 2511:6; 2625:7; 2725:16 routes [5] - 2511:6; 2625:7; 2725:16 routes [1] - 2728:13; 2780:25 routes [1] - 2728:14; 2602:5; 2646:2; 2743:24; 2744:1 Roxboro [2] - 2628:1; 2709:8 RPR [1] - 2493:5 rubric [1] - 2686:1 ruling [1] - 2723:9 run [7] - 2552:14; 2609:5; 2646:2; 2743:24; 2744:1 Roxboro [2] - 2628:1; 2709:8 RPR [1] - 2493:5 rubric [1] - 2686:1 ruling [1] - 2723:9 run [7] - 2552:14; 2609:5; 2646:2; 2743:24; 2744:1 Roxboro [2] - 2628:1; 2709:8 RPR [1] - 2493:5 rubric [1] - 2686:1 ruling [1] - 2723:9 run [7] - 2552:14; 2609:5; 2646:2; 2743:24; 2744:1 Roxboro [2] - 2628:1; 2709:8 RPR [1] - 2493:5 rubric [1] - 2686:1 ruling [1] - 2723:9 run [7] - 2552:14; 2609:5; 2646:2; 2743:24; 2744:1 Roxbor
retained [7] - 2559:24; 2560:16;	2602:13; 2695:25; 2717:24; 2769:20	2515:24; 2616:13; 2646:14; 2652:12; 2704:22; 2737:12; 2750:7; 2758:23; 2759:4; 2773:1; 2793:12 river [34] - 2508:14; 2549:9; 2550:1, 11, 16; 2553:3, 6, 10;	2617:4; 2621:21; 2631:21; 2632:12, 17;	ruling [1] - 2723:9 run [7] - 2552:14;
return [5] - 2573:4; 2609:18; 2738:5; 2754:22	Richard [3] - 2493:1; 2497:4; 2660:2 Rideau [1] - 2709:8	2554:21; 2559:6; 2575:25; 2577:5; 2579:4, 23; 2585:20,	2664:17, 24; 2698:25 road [8] - 2647:15; 2713:18, 25; 2720:2;	rural [8] - 2662:10; 2665:10, 12; 2723:13; 2731:8; 2803:16

Т

rush [1] - 2783:3 Ruth [1] - 2739:23 RVC [6] - 2722:23; 2729:12, 14-15, 18; 2730:2	satisfactory [1] - 2723:21 satisfied [1] - 2565:12 satisfy [3] - 2530:3; 2531:16: 2618:23	10, 20; 2779:1, 8; 2780:16; 2782:8; 2783:5, 23; 2784:7; 2786:23 SCLG's [12] - 2500:16: 2525:24	2497:4, 16; 2498:19; 2499:11; 2555:22; 2560:10; 2566:9, 25; 2588:19; 2591:5; 2593:22; 2609:9; 2660:1-3; 2679-23;	seepage [3] - 2591:25; 2592:1, 5 sees [1] - 2797:19 select [2] - 2519:8, 14 selected [10] -
Ruth [1] - 2739:23	2723:21	2780:16; 2782:8;	2499:11; 2555:22;	2591:25; 2592:1, 5
RVC [6] - 2722:23;	satisfied [1] -	2783:5, 23; 2784:7;	2560:10; 2566:9, 25;	sees [1] - 2797:19
2729:12, 14-15, 18;	2565:12	2786:23	2588:19; 2591:5;	select [2] - 2519:8,
2746.3; 11, 14, 22, 2746.3; 2763:12; 2789:4; 2790:5; 2798:5; 2802:25; 2803:23 sample [1] - 2757:24 samples [1] -	2688:21; 2696:21; 2703:14, 16; 2708:18; 2711:12, 25; 2715:7; 2716:1; 2718:6; 2723:3, 21; 2725:2, 7; 2726:11; 2729:17, 24;	2805:3 secondary [4] - 2533:10; 2740:24; 2743:14; 2793:25 secondly [7] - 2502:18; 2549:16;	2697:9; 2721:1; 2723:21; 2733:2; 2736:14; 2737:3; 2739:24; 2740:7, 14; 2747:15; 2749:25; 2757:21; 2774:2;	2709:18; 2728:3, 7, 17; 2765:15 seriously[3] - 2521:25; 2529:13; 2655:1 serve [10] - 2509:21;
2757:21	2730:15, 24; 2736:12,	2557:25; 2564:11;	2808:2	2528:19; 2540:12;
sampling [1] -	21-22; 2737:1;	2619:15; 2754:22;	seed [2] - 2544:21;	2598:7; 2608:11;
2760:13	2739:22, 25; 2741:7,	2778:12	2604:5	2664:2; 2666:13;
sand [10] - 2589:18,	21, 25; 2742:8, 22,	seconds [1] -	seeds [6] - 2720:12	2682:13; 2690:17;
20, 25; 2590:1;	25; 2743:2; 2744:24;	2635:23	seeds [6] - 2603:17;	2767:20
2602:15, 19; 2756:21,	2745:12, 22; 2746:5,	SECORD [24] -	2778:6, 22	served [5] - 2580:11;
24; 2757:2; 2761:20	11; 2747:11, 15;	2497:4; 2659:25;	seeing [2] - 2752:21;	2682:3; 2684:22, 25;
Sandi [1] - 2492:8	2749:19; 2750:22, 25;	2660:2; 2680:10, 19;	2763:18	2685:2
sands [1] - 2589:15	2751:2, 16; 2752:10;	2681:7, 11, 13, 15;	seek [1] - 2539:5	serves [4] - 2538:3;
Sara [2] - 2492:18,	2753:11, 18; 2755:12,	2732:20; 2733:4, 7,	seem [10] - 2578:7;	2590:13; 2797:21;
22	15, 20; 2756:6;	19; 2734:6; 2764:3, 9,	2612:21; 2613:10;	2798:8
Saskatchewan [1] -	2761:4; 2763:14, 18;	12; 2775:20; 2776:4,	2698:9; 2731:8;	service [15] - 2549:5,
2779:25	2764:19; 2765:7, 13;	8, 10; 2784:20;	2747:13; 2748:13;	20, 22, 24; 2550:4, 8,
Saskatchewan's [1]	2774:24; 2776:18;	2785:14; 2786:11	2765:14; 2801:23;	18, 23-24; 2553:4, 13;
- 2750:2	2777:4, 8, 22; 2778:4,	Secord [25] - 2493:1;	2802:23	2621:7; 2741:17;

Т

T

Т

Т

0005 40, 0000 4	00.04.0554.4.47.40	0507 44 0500 40	0750 0 04 0754 5 0	0500 40 0500 45
2625:18; 2696:1;	23-24; 2551:1, 17, 19;	2587:14; 2596:16;	2750:9, 24; 2751:5, 8,	2568:12; 2569:15;
2724:14; 2737:15;	2553:5, 13; 2562:10,	2598:11; 2603:20;	18, 23; 2752:1, 8, 16,	2584:15; 2589:7, 10;
2763:6	14, 16, 22; 2563:2, 9,	2606:1, 15; 2611:1, 4,	18, 23, 25; 2753:2, 7,	2590:5; 2600:8;
sounding [1] -	16, 25; 2565:5, 12;	10, 13, 17; 2614:5,	14; 2755:14; 2756:16;	2602:3; 2766:10;
2637:14	2567:14; 2613:20;	12, 17; 2615:23;	2757:7, 9; 2758:8, 11,	2789:7
sounds [3] - 2498:6;	2651:17; 2706:19;	2616:9, 16, 19, 24;	23; 2759:4, 6, 21;	Stantec's [8] -
2559:12; 2627:14	2716:14, 16; 2740:10,	2618:3, 6, 18, 23;	2760:14; 2762:2;	2561:25; 2564:2;
source [6] - 2519:24;	12; 2743:18; 2744:7	2619:1, 7-8, 10;	2764:17; 2780:13;	2565:6; 2569:20;
2520:16; 2617:13;	spiritual [3] -	2620:5, 13-14;	2782:23, 25; 2783:19,	2584:18; 2588:25;
2656:1; 2657:14;	2668:21; 2674:3;	2621:3, 14; 2622:5, 9,	24; 2784:12; 2789:17;	2589:20; 2590:9
	2798:25			
2777:16		12, 14, 16-17, 20;	2791:16; 2792:19;	stark [2] - 2598:20;
sources [1] - 2523:1	split [1] - 2494:4	2623:2, 7, 16, 19;	2793:10; 2796:7;	2640:4
sourcing [1] -	spoken [3] - 2525:3;	2624:3, 11; 2625:2,	2800:12, 14, 20;	start [8] - 2494:17;
2804:22	2625:6; 2646:8	15-16, 18, 20, 22-23,	2802:3; 2803:2, 13,	2499:5, 19; 2610:4;
south [3] - 2605:24;	sports [1] - 2765:21			
		25; 2626:4, 10;	21-22; 2805:5, 9	2644:8; 2659:6;
2706:12; 2794:15	spread [5] - 2493:14;	2627:2, 6; 2628:10,	SR1's [10] - 2650:23;	2807:25
South [1] - 2779:25	2775:4; 2776:25;	24; 2629:22; 2630:20,	2651:8, 14; 2653:23;	started [3] - 2499:1;
southern [5] -	2777:1; 2778:11	23; 2631:6, 11, 13;	2654:2; 2657:11;	2530:10; 2795:2
2623:23; 2641:7;		2632:22; 2633:9, 11,	2701:6; 2709:18;	
	spring [4] - 2513:20;			starting [6] - 2499:4;
2650:6; 2666:24;	2586:6; 2629:19;	16, 24; 2634:5, 9, 20;	2722:5, 21	2575:10; 2730:13;
2696:23	2751:15	2635:5, 9, 13; 2636:3,	SSRP [4] - 2780:6,	2744:1; 2749:25;
sp [1] - 2804:10	Springbank [36] -	11, 16, 19, 21, 24;	10, 16, 20	2788:5
space [1] - 2776:16	2493:10; 2499:16;	2637:4, 7, 20; 2638:1,	staff [13] - 2499:13;	state [7] - 2621:10;
span [1] - 2605:9	2513:1, 4; 2522:16;	14, 24; 2639:2, 6, 9,	2609:1, 17; 2643:8,	2657:2; 2707:20, 24;
spawning [1] -	2524:5; 2525:14;	13-14, 18, 22; 2640:2,	15; 2644:13; 2679:18;	2735:18; 2780:12;
2582:3	2526:18; 2527:12;	6, 10; 2641:10, 15,	2718:16, 23; 2784:1;	2797:12
		20; 2642:2, 10, 12,		
speaking [4] -	2569:11; 2606:24;		2798:23; 2805:12	statement [30] -
2497:7; 2643:19;	2607:25; 2683:6;	15-16; 2643:4;	Staff [6] - 2492:11	2501:7; 2504:14;
2746:25; 2784:5	2685:3; 2688:17;	2644:23; 2645:4, 8,	stage [6] - 2541:11;	2508:19; 2510:12;
speaks [2] - 2628:20;	2706:11; 2720:13;	14, 19, 21; 2647:11,	2638:5; 2660:17;	2516:3; 2525:2;
2663:1			2727:13: 2728:19. 25	2542:2: 2543:16. 20:
	2723:24; 2725:2, 17;	13, 18, 20, 25;		
special [1] - 2522:21	2730:19; 2744:25;	2648:3, 5, 7, 12, 16,	stages [1] - 2581:24	2596:20; 2597:6;
Species [2] -	2745:24; 2765:17;	20; 2649:1, 13, 21-23;	staggering [2] -	2611:5; 2626:13;
2509:12, 15	2778:25; 2783:14;	2650:16; 2651:1, 7,	2620.20; 2648.20	2627:20; 2629:25;
	2788:14-17; 2789:2;	9-10, 19; 2652:1, 10;		2630:13, 23; 2635:11;
species [6] -			stakeholder [4] -	
2509:17, 21; 2581:24;	2791:19; 2795:13	2653:2, 7, 9, 16-17,	2517:2; 2723:11;	2636:2; 2642:24;
2582:12; 2699:1;	springs [1] - 2594:3	19; 2654:10, 14, 16,	2801:9	2669:6; 2709:4, 7;
2776:11	Springs [1] -	18; 2655:2, 5, 9, 17,	stakeholders [18] -	2723:23; 2766:25;
specific [23] -	2788:19	24; 2656:22; 2657:3,	2502:8; 2503:1;	2767:14; 2769:10;
2529:7, 22; 2535:4,	spur [1] - 2782:15	19; 2661:13, 25;	2522:18; 2524:20;	2772:1; 2773:24;
16; 2536:24; 2540:20;	square [3] - 2701:20;	2662:15, 20; 2663:3,	2525:8, 17, 20;	2774:10
2542:14, 22; 2544:21;	2702:6; 2703:1	13, 20, 25; 2667:12;	2526:1; 2528:20;	statements [7] -
2600:11; 2622:14;	squarely [1] -	2670:2, 5, 2671:2, 7,	2533:9; 2546:24;	2501:4, 10; 2525:24;
2676:21; 2677:24;	2783:17	13; 2672:20; 2682:1,	2574:20; 2607:22;	
				2685:11; 2750:21;
2683:11; 2718:14;	Squaw [1] - 2727:23	7; 2683:6-9, 12, 17;	2608:12; 2717:24;	2782:10
2726:19; 2769:8;	SR1 [490] - 2493:1;	2685:23; 2686:7, 10,	2723:15; 2735:3;	states [11] - 2537:11;
2771:10, 17; 2772:24;	2499:17; 2502:6, 24;	20, 23; 2687:1, 4, 15,	2801:5	2546:19; 2662:23;
2773:16; 2774:22	2503:4, 10, 18;	17, 20, 2688:7, 10,	stalls [1] - 2705:5	2697:14, 20; 2704:1;
		17, 20, 2000.7, 10,		
specifically [20] -	2504:5, 17; 2505:13;	13, 16; 2689:1, 4, 7;	Stampede [1] -	2716:15; 2721:13;
2537:3; 2547:24;	2506:19; 2507:19;	2690:6, 12; 2691:3;	2505:11	2791:19, 21; 2796:2
2558:4; 2563:7;	2509:19; 2510:1, 14,	2692:12, 15; 2693:12;	stand [7] - 2611:3;	stating [2] - 2637:5;
2576:9; 2578:22;	18; 2512:3, 19;	2694:1, 3, 16; 2696:9,	2626:10, 20; 2639:9;	2783:1
2581:14; 2593:23;	2513:15; 2514:2,			
		21, 24; 2697:2;	2650:12; 2689:20;	station [5] - 2703:7;
2602:5; 2614:6;	14-15, 18; 2515:11,	2698:7, 9, 11; 2700:5,	2787:5	2705:6; 2790:21, 24
2619:1; 2637:5;	20; 2516:4, 8, 13, 16,	9-10, 18; 2701:6, 13,	standard [12] -	Station/Glenmore
2681:19; 2701:3;	24; 2517:3; 2518:3,	17; 2702:4, 16, 18,	2563:22; 2572:3;	[1] - 2703:7
2714:4; 2726:17;	14, 19, 2519.7, 14,	20; 2703:1, 5, 11, 17,	2600:18; 2650:25;	stations [5] - 2621:5;
2736:23; 2738:23;	18, 22; 2520:2, 6, 10,	19-20, 22, 25; 2704:4,	2651:1, 25; 2657:13;	2739:14; 2777:14;
2752:3; 2798:20	13, 18, 24; 2521:3,	6, 10-11, 15-16, 21,	2679:1, 9; 2742:1;	2790:3, 13
specification [1] -	18; 2522:9; 2523:15;	24; 2705:10, 12;	2749:22; 2790:5	statistical [1] -
2801:22	2527:22; 2529:15;	2706:5, 8, 12;	standardized [2] -	2572:22
specifications [2] -	2534:3; 2547:25;	2707:10; 2708:19;	2574:17; 2595:25	statistics [2] -
2770:9, 12	2548:6, 13, 16, 21,	2709:5, 23; 2711:15,	standards [9] -	2626:12; 2773:13
	2570.0, 10, 10, 21,			
speculation [1] -	25; 2549:1, 10, 14;	17; 2712:7, 10, 18-19,	2565:24; 2566:16;	status [2] - 2515:25;
2572:18	2552:1, 21, 23, 25;	22, 24; 2713:1, 6;	2600:16; 2648:15;	2642:8
speculative [1] -	2553:11, 18, 23;	2715:5, 10, 24;	2707:18; 2740:20;	Status [2] - 2540:19;
2578:11	2554:1, 9, 11, 16-17,	2716:3; 2721:23;	2749:19; 2789:6, 8	2672:25
speed [2] - 2494:7;	25; 2555:5; 2558:16,	2722:1. 13. 25:	standing [3] -	stay [2] - 2719:21;
2774:4	22; 2559:2, 4, 8, 11,	2723:3, 20; 2725:22;	2665:20; 2789:11;	2805:18
Speller [2] - 2765:5,	16, 21-22; 2560:1, 8,	2727:9, 15, 17;	2799:1	steep [1] - 2646:1
12	20; 2563:8; 2566:22;	2728:14, 18; 2729:16,	standpoint [3] -	step [4] - 2524:2;
spend [1] - 2527:18	2567:16, 18; 2568:2;	22; 2735:2; 2736:13,	2712:14; 2714:15;	2535:8; 2749:6, 15
spending [2] -	2570:13, 17; 2571:3,	25; 2737:5, 15, 22,	2759:1	Stephanie [1] -
2754:25; 2755:1	10, 12, 19, 22, 24;	24; 2738:1, 7, 10;	stands [2] - 2620:23;	2492:13
spent [4] - 2519:20;	2572:10, 16; 2573:6,	2739:5, 11, 15;	2640:4	stepped [1] -
2576:5; 2622:3;	23, 25; 2574:2;	2740:2; 2742:6, 16;	Stantec [21] -	2587:10
2712:3	2577:16; 2578:12;	2744:4, 11, 20;	2559:17; 2560:25;	stepping [1] - 2806:4
				stops 101 0594.0.
spillway [36] -	2579:14, 18; 2580:1,	2745:2, 9; 2746:15;	2562:5, 25, 2563:5, 7,	steps [3] - 2584:8;
2549:5, 20, 22, 25;	11, 17; 2581:5;	2747:6, 12, 17;	15; 2565:20, 23;	2641:3; 2778:10
2550:4, 8, 18, 21,	2582:13, 15, 21, 23;	2748:4, 7; 2749:23;	2566:18; 2567:9;	sterilization [1] -

2602.10 sterilized [3] -2796:7; 2797:5; 2798.1 Stewardship [1] -2506:15 sticks [1] - 2690:14 still [29] - 2495:25; 2539:23; 2562:7; 2563:24; 2566:5; 2573:3; 2577:13 2626:23; 2643:22; 2650:13; 2662:3; 2668:22; 2680:17, 19; 2689:4; 2703:14; 2705:22; 2706:1; 2709:1; 2711:8; 2727:15; 2737:5 2741:19: 2761:20: 2765:3; 2771:22; 2782:2; 2800:2 stipulates [1] -2570: STONEY [1] -2785:11 **Stoney** [73] - 2492:22; 2500:19; 2529:7; 2535:25; 2588:4, 10, 14; 2604:20, 25; 2608:18: 2658:4; 2660:25; 2661:3, 6-7, 12; 2662:1; 2665:17, 21, 25; 2666:1, 16, 19, 21, 25; 2667:13; 2668:1, 6-7, 15-16 24; 2669:8, 13, 22, 25; 2670:4, 9, 20, 23; 2671:8, 14, 19, 22, 25; 2672:4, 6, 10, 13, 17, 19; 2673:2, 8, 11-12, 15, 19; 2674:15; 2675:2, 7, 13, 18, 23; 2676:1, 4-5, 19; 2677:19, 21, 24; 2678:11, 17; 2679:11 stopped [1] -2727.15 storage [37] 2513:16; 2552:1, 7, 9-10; 2559:11; 2602:18; 2619:3; 2646:3, 11, 16; 2651:10; 2652:8; 2656:16, 20; 2662:21, 24; 2670:21; 2691:7; 2694:6; 2695:19; 2696:15, 25; 2700:4, 9, 17; 2701:1: 2716:10; 2727:6; 2737:6, 16; 2744:5, 8, 15 store [4] - 2630:12; 2705:5; 2710:4; 2752:8 stored [3] - 2552:12; 2694:4; 2741:16 storm [3] - 2598:9; 2646:21; 2687:4 storm-like [1] -2598:9 storms [2] - 2597:2; 2687:3 stormwater [3] -2778:13, 17 story [2] - 2597:16; 2602:20 straight [1] - 2719:22

straightforward [2] ·

2553:19; 2756:4 strange [1] - 2714:13 strategies [1] -2656.25 Strategy [1] -2780:18 strategy [2] 2655:13; 2723:11 stream [30] 2504:11, 18-19; 2508:15; 2519:4; 2520:20; 2548:6, 15-16; 2549:4; 2562:23; 2564:25; 2579:13; 2581:5, 7; 2606:15, 17; 2635:13; 2636:3; 2646:18; 2652:6; 2653:19, 24; 2655:7; 2686:22; 2696:25; 2700:15; 2704:4; 2781:9 Stream [2] - 2499:16; 2606:25 street [2] - 2528:6; 2630:10 strength [1] -2599:16 stress [3] - 2623:15; 2628:6; 2629:18 stretch [1] - 2764:3 striking [1] - 2725:13 stringent [3] -2650:21; 2651:24; 2657.13strive [1] - 2748:16 **strong** [4] - 2599:8; 2767:11; 2771:14; 2773:14 strongly [4] · 2554:14; 2558:25; 2586:7, 15 strove [1] - 2529:21 structural [1] -2559:20 structure [25] -2521:8; 2545:3; 2549:15, 19, 23 2550:5, 21; 2551:2, 4; 2552:2; 2566:4; 2584:3; 2605:3; 2606:15; 2611:22; 2613:20; 2634:2; 2655:7; 2709:16; 2741:2; 2742:24; 2744:20; 2759:5, 12; 2760.24 structures [14] 2578:13; 2579:13; 2584:4; 2646:21; 2651:21; 2670:12, 21; 2674:20; 2736:6, 8; 2743:16; 2753:14; 2754:10.13 struggles [1] -2750:25 struggling [1] -2802:11 studied [1] - 2585:8 studies [4] - 2532:4; 2534:23; 2583:22; 2625.19 study [8] - 2523:18; 2536:21; 2623:25; 2647:7, 11; 2728:17, 22: 2800:14 stuff [2] - 2498:5; 2681.6 **sub** [6] - 2589:9; 2593:1, 10, 16; 2679:4; 2762:1

sub-surface [5] 2589:9; 2593:1, 10, 16:2762.1 subcomponents [1] 2549:18 subject [9] - 2575:4; 2595:12; 2599:13; 2607:5; 2637:22; 2646:1; 2674:24; 2675:5; 2762:9 subjected [5] -2502:6, 15; 2504:4; 2548:17; 2559:22 subjective [1] -2705.15 submission [30] -2500:10; 2526:6; 2540:3; 2542:10, 20; 2548:13; 2549:11; 2555:7; 2565:10, 22; 2568:15; 2571:23; 2575:16; 2585:12; 2588:13; 2597:13; 2603:4, 12; 2605:18; 2614:15; 2615:21; 2619:20; 2620:13; 2622:7; 2657:4; 2733:15; 2801:3; 2804:20; 2805:9; 2806:19 submissions [31] -2500:11, 21, 23; 2501:3, 15; 2502:3; 2503:15; 2514:12; 2520:1; 2523:4; 2526:5; 2536:3, 8; 2537:5; 2542:9; 2560:25; 2582:18; 2628:3; 2643:6; 2644:11, 18, 20; 2653:15; 2657:21; 2681:22; 2685:10; 2709:11; 2779:7; 2782:12; 2807:1 submit [16] -2501:16; 2522:6; 2558:14; 2598:3, 23; 2601:24; 2606:11; 2639:5; 2644:18; 2662:1; 2670:4; 2692:11; 2708:14; 2778:10; 2791:24; 2806:6 submits [46] -2514:17; 2516:5, 23; 2518:18; 2519:13; 2520:11; 2521:2; 2522:8; 2526:9; 2530:5, 21; 2531:22; 2533:1; 2535:18; 2537:24; 2542:24; 2559:1; 2560:5, 11; 2561:17; 2567:4, 24; 2570:4; 2571:23; 2575:3; 2579:24; 2580:24; 2586:9; 2587:5; 2606:20; 2645:7, 11; 2649:2; 2650:17; 2652:10; 2670:1; 2711:12; 2756:7; 2766:16; 2777:5, 8, 22; 2778:20; 2779:1, 3; 2797:14 submitted [20] -2494:23; 2495:9, 23; 2507:8, 11; 2519:8; 2525:16; 2530:8; 2555:10; 2656:19; 2704:8; 2786:25;

2790:3; 2792:2, 7; 2794:3; 2804:24; 2806.12 submitting [2] -2508:6; 2612:14 subregion [2] -2781:23, 25 subsection [2] -2556:8 subsequently [1] -2536:22 substantial [10] -2516:8; 2518:5, 15; 2554:25; 2559:3; 2581:9; 2648:8; 2720:17; 2726:1; 2782:16 substantially [3] -2511:19; 2518:19; 2705.24 substantive [3] -2573:2; 2667:3, 10 Substantively [1] -2667:7 substrate [1] -2716:10 subtopic [1] -2726:19 subtopics [1] -2547:22 SUCCESS [3] 2693:15, 19; 2780:25 successful [4] · 2555:12; 2614:12; 2693:18; 2800:4 successfully [3] -2531:24; 2636:25; 2638:9 suffer [2] - 2626:18; 2627:3 suffered [2] · 2626:17; 2627:18 suffering [1] -2690.5 sufficient [7] -2583:15; 2641:5; 2646:3; 2700:5; 2758:9; 2761:15; 2770.19 sufficiently [1] -2576:23 suggest [5] -2571:15; 2577:24; 2594:7; 2595:6; 2622:18 suggested [15] - 2547:8; 2566:9; 2567:17; 2569:13; 2572:10; 2577:17; 2592:24; 2696:14; 2702:1: 2752:24: 2768:20; 2770:9; 2771:19; 2804:9 suggesting [3] -2591:7; 2708:3; 2778:13 suggestion [3] -2571:20; 2586:10; 2603:22 suggestions [3] -2585:16; 2597:1; 2650:16 **suggests** [7] -2550:12; 2551:18; 2578:7; 2741:23; 2743:20; 2746:8; 2773.16 suitability [2] -2581:25; 2582:3 suitable [1] -

2572:19 suite [2] - 2519:22: 2520.12 suited [1] - 2514:18 suites [1] - 2639:9 sum [1] - 2586:16 summarize [2] -2501:10; 2529:9 summarized [1] -2519:10 summarizes [1] -2738:4 **summary** [5] -2571:12; 2595:11; 2702:21; 2718:9; 2723.3 summer [6] · 2524:21; 2540:5; 2541:6; 2720:13; 2789:17; 2798:10 sump [1] - 2629:3 sunk [1] - 2690:5 superior [8] 2584:5; 2653:16; 2686:8, 22; 2700:22; 2701:13; 2728:14; 2729:18 supersede [1] -2665:11 superseded [1] -2569.17supervising [2] -2720:24; 2755:16 supplement [3] -2771:5; 2787:12; 2792.9 supplemental [2] -2500:22; 2606:22 supplier [2] · 2599:17: 2600:2 supplies [1] -2654:24 **supply** [12] - 2514:1; 2633:15; 2654:17; 2655:1; 2656:14; 2711:16; 2741:17 2743:17, 21; 2752:3, 6:2796:11 support [23] 2505:6; 2508:11; 2530:15; 2539:18; 2579:20; 2587:13; 2589:25; 2609:2; 2611:1, 11; 2627:2; 2628:24; 2630:20; 2678:12, 18; 2682:20; 2683:6; 2704:12; 2735:13; 2746:15; 2761:5; 2763:15; 2805 12 supportable [1] -2778:12 supported [7] -2542:22; 2559:18; 2567:19; 2590:19; 2597:3; 2641:20 supporters [1] -2626:7 supporting [7] 2578:12; 2580:23; 2642:15; 2653:16; 2725:23; 2797:13 supports [5] 2501:17; 2514:18; 2580:16; 2614:16; 2644.11 supposed [3] 2558:19; 2752:23 suppression [4] -2694:22; 2718:17;

2720:6; 2735:23 Supreme[1] - 2669:24 surface [18] - 2507:3; 2545:25; 2550:1; 2575:1, 13; 2578:15; 2589:9; 2593:1, 10, 16; 2595:13; 2752:24; 2757:1; 2758:18; 2761:20; 2762:1; 2766:14; 2791:25 surficial [3] - 2589:15, 20, 25 surge [1] - 2686:25 surprised [2] - 2586:4; 2746:11 surrounding [7] - 2538:15; 2698:5; 2704:21; 2723:20; 2724:21; 2771:23; 2777:1 surveillance [2] - 2568:10; 2651:24 surveys[2] - 2582:20; 2628:23; 2693:9 surveys[2] - 2582:4; 2718:21 susceptible [1] - 2653:24 suspension [1] - 2653:24 suspension [1] - 2655:21; 2796:12; 2797:23 sustainablity [3] - 2655:21; 2796:12; 2797:23 sustainable [6] - 2692:2, 11; 2694:16; 2695:10, 18; 2712:2 sustainable [6] - 2592:21; 2796:12; 2797:23 sustainable [6] - 2692:2, 11; 2694:16; 2695:10, 18; 2712:2 sustainable [6] - 2692:2, 11; 2694:16; 2695:10, 18; 2712:2 sustainable [6] - 2692:2, 11; 2694:16; 2695:10, 18; 2712:2 sustainable [6] - 2592:14 systems[1] - 2592:14 systemic [2] - 2590:10, 14 systems[3] - 2651:16; 2717:2; 2798:17	takeoffs [1] - 2791:22 tall [1] - 2552:2 tandem [1] - 2629:5 target [1] - 2629:5 target [1] - 2629:5 target [1] - 2637:19 task [3] - 2643:9; 2645:2; 2744:19 Task [1] - 2698:16 tasked [1] - 2800:15 taxpayers[3] - 2513:13; 2727:11; 2748:10 taxpayers' [1] - 2690:5 teaching [1] - 2689:18 team [9] - 2507:18; 2508:4; 2527:20; 2559:18; 2591:9, 15; 2680:24; 2789:20; 2798:23 teams [3] - 2504:22; 2635:15; 2636:5 TEC [1] - 2717:8 technical [16] - 2524:13; 2565:21; 2568:13; 2569:16; 2583:4, 25; 2584:17; 2603:25; 2609:2; 2646:9; 2705:15, 17; 2729:6, 10 technical [1] - 2588:9; 2803:9 Technologies [1] - 2492:14 Teghtmeyer [2] - 2685:16; 2691:10 temperatures [1] - 2712:6 temporary [9] - 2507:21; 2508:13; 2514:25; 2575:8; 2595:16; 2616:8; 2630:11; 2639:13; 2737:6 ten [7] - 2511:15; 2515:6; 2549:1; 2604:8; 2719:18; 2775:25; 2776:1 tender [1] - 2516:20 tendered [2] - 2542:19; 2786:3 tens [1] - 2650:11 term [1] - 2516:20 tendered [2] - 2542:19; 2786:3 tens [1] - 2650:11 term [1] - 2512:25; 2576:4; 2580:18; 2656:1; 2603:7; 2690:8; 2764:18; 2765:4, 9; 2783:22	2763:21; 2766:8, 24; 2768:14; 2775:3, 13; 2781:7; 2799:21 terrain [4] - 2507:4; 2602:3; 2646:1; 2786:13 terrestrial [2] - 2547:19; 2595:19 terrible [1] - 2511:9 territory [2] - 2661:8; 2665:17 Terry [1] - 2604:13 Test [1] - 2604:13 Test [1] - 2604:13 Test [1] - 2606:5; 2614:21; 2682:1, 3; 2683:11, 23; 2686:10; 2694:17; 2712:1; 2757:25; 2759:17 tested [6] - 2644:22; 2743:11, 13; 2759:15; 2761:12; 2762:7 testified [20] - 2526:7, 13; 2561:24; 2566:21; 2576:21; 2584:18; 2585:2; 2590:9; 2591:13; 2596:19; 2599:12; 2601:11; 2602:4; 2606:3, 5; 2696:22; 2769:17; 2772:9; 2776:12; 2781:7 testimonies [1] - 2779:7 testimony [17] - 2500:25; 2519:21; 2562:0; 23; 2527:25; 2537:23; 2560:20; 2563:23; 2566:2; 2563:13; 2569:19; 2570:1; 2589:6; 2602:11; 2757:18; 2772:10; 2757:18; 2772:10; 2759:10, 17 testig [3] - 2587:20; 2773:19; 2759:10, 17 testig [3] - 2587:20; 2771:10; 2759:10, 17 testig [themselves[1]- 2748:2 theoretical[1]- 2726:8 theoretical[1]- 2726:8 thereafter[2]- 2571:9; 2677:11 thereby[1]- 2633:15 therefore[30]- 2513:24; 2561:18; 2571:22; 2574:1; 2580:22; 2588:19; 2592:22; 2593:16; 2601:16; 2607:3; 2612:14; 2616:11; 2618:23; 2619:22; 2620:7; 2634:20; 2636:15; 2638:14; 2642:3; 2649:24; 2642:3; 2649:14; 2651:23; 2661:21; 2670:1; 2671:15; 2772:12; 17; 2778:12; 2772:12; 17; 2778:12; 2772:12; 17; 2768:12; 2772:12; 17; 2768:12; 2772:12; 17; 2763:3 thinking[1]- 2749:6 thinks[2]- 2735:25; 2761:14 third[7]- 2630:6; 2670:14; 2693:20; 22; 2792:19; 22; 2793:1 third-party[1]- 2793:1 thirdy[4]- 2549:16; 2564:12; 2754:24; 2778:19 thorough[2]- 2583:24; 2729:10 thoroughway[1]- 2795:12 thousands[6]- 2534:21; 2610:25; 2650:11; 2720:10; 2721:1; 2755:18 threat [3]- 2655:16; 2670:13; 2502:9; 2508:14; 2517:10; 2549:14; 17; 2556:13; 2557:18; 2564:17; 2572:11, 15; 2594:18; 2621:23; 2625:25; 2663:21; 2640:25; 2641:20; 2650:6; 2670:18; 2694:12;	2679:7 THROUGH [1] - 2495:6 throughout [8] - 2651:6; 2653:5; 2656:19, 24; 2700:8; 2731:6; 2799:14, 23 thrown [1] - 2804:13 Thursday [1] - 2751:11 tie [1] - 2797:2 tied [1] - 2793:24 Tier [3] - 2594:18, 21 tiered [1] - 2594:18, 21 timeline [6] - 2520:4; 2703:13; 2712:14; 2725:20; 2775:5; 2776:2 timelines [2] - 2703:17; 2729:19 timely [3] - 2514:18; 2516:18; 2534:25 timing [6] - 2493:20; 2570:19; 2655:4; 2680:16; 2699:23; 2730:11 title [1] - 2536:21 TLU [1] - 2536:21 TLU [1] - 2536:21 TLU [1] - 2539:25 TLUA [1] - 2530:25 TLUA [1] - 2530:25 TLUA [1] - 2530:25 TLUA [1] - 2540:7 TO [4] - 2493:17, 19; 2494:4; 2498:16; 2499:14; 2611:15; 2644:20; 2657:2; 2681:20; 2683:5; 2713:8; 2726:16; 2737:5; 2754:19; 2788:2; 2806:25; 2807:7 together [4] - 2521:10; 2629:16; 2680:24; 2723:15 tolerance [1] - 2637:12 toll [1] - 2518:17 tomorrow [11] - 2785:22; 2786:10, 20; 2787:4; 2807:8, 10, 14-15; 24-25; 2808:2 tone [1] - 2609:6 took [6] - 2526:8; 259:19; 2535:7; 2543:11; 2756:14, 19-20; 2788:7; 2688:7; 2688:7; 2688:7; 2688:7; 2688:7; 2688:7; 2688:7; 2687:12; 2687:8, 10, 14-15, 24-25; 2808:2 tone [1] - 2508:7; 2688:11; 2756:14, 19-20; 2788:7; 2688:7; 2788:7; 2788:7; 2788:7; 2788:7; 2788:7; 27
Т	terms [42] - 2494:7; 2506:25; 2507:1;	2657:23; 2658:7, 10; 2659:6, 16, 21;	2699:6; 2720:19; 2728:20; 2729:14, 19;	2800:13; 2804:25 top-down [1] -
T'ina [1] - 2783:9 Table [5] - 2511:25; 2701:18; 2719:1; 2757:4; 2758:5 table [4] - 2524:5; 2542:14; 2590:11, 15 tackifier [9] - 2599:12, 22; 2720:7; 2770:9, 11, 15; 2775:3, 6 tackifiers [7] - 2599:8; 2600:2; 2720:9; 2735:16; 2770:8; 2771:3	2518:23; 2521:22; 2545:4; 2570:9; 2584:12; 2598:20; 2604:18; 2613:17; 2633:12; 2640:10; 2641:3; 2643:15; 2654:1; 2656:14; 2680:15; 2681:1; 2684:11; 2692:14; 2728:6; 2731:25; 2733:5; 2734:7; 2735:1; 2736:2; 2744:24; 2746:24; 2751:19; 2752:10; 2753:18; 2754:16;	2660:1, 3, 6, 10, 13, 15; 2679:22; 2680:8, 15; 2681:4, 8, 12, 14; 2732:17, 21; 2733:5, 8; 2734:4; 2764:2, 4, 7, 10; 2775:18, 24; 2776:5, 9; 2784:17, 21; 2785:1, 4, 7, 10, 12, 15; 2786:8, 17, 24; 2787:18, 22; 2799:13, 18, 20; 2805:19; 2806:8, 11, 17, 20, 24; 2808:5 theme [2] - 2627:9; 2731:6	2740:4; 2742:17; 2756:5, 14, 17, 19-20; 2757:12; 2759:9, 17; 2761:8, 14; 2788:3; 2789:10, 17; 2799:5; 2804:25 three-quarters [1] - 2742:17 three-tiered [1] - 2594:18 three-year[1] - 2728:21 threshold [2] - 2648:18; 2766:15 thresholds [1] -	2800:13 topi c [11] - 2499:25; 2501:6; 2596:20; 2681:17; 2732:13; 2736:19; 2737:2; 2752:2; 2763:24; 2764:13 Topi c [26] - 2501:8; 2545:6; 2574:4; 2576:7; 10; 2587:4; 2601:7; 2611:16; 2618:8; 2635:12; 2636:2; 2685:7; 2686:1; 2726:18;

T

2728:18; 2734:6; 2736:25; 2763:22; 2774:23; 2789:9 topics [4] - 2501:11; 2502:2; 2547:17; 2608:3 topographic [1] -	2733:25; 2745:21; 2756:3; 2775:1, 8; 2781:6 Transcript [6] - 2686:12; 2688:23; 2701:10; 2715:6; 2736:16; 2745:11	2633:23; 2635:7, 10; 2636:1, 16; 2639:21; 2640:11, 14, 21-22; 2644:9; 2649:7; 2650:19; 2653:6; 2654:11; 2662:14; 2664:3, 14; 2665:8;	2508:14; 2702:12 tributary [1] - 2702:8 tried [2] - 2782:24; 2786:14 triumph [1] - 2782:23 trouble [3] - 2747:3,	2583:22 typical [4] - 2538:16; 2541:10; 2583:21; 2743:15 typically [3] - 2557:7; 2579:12; 2593:7
2653:17	transcripts [2] -	2666:19; 2667:22;	15; 2764:14	U
topography [3] - 2548:8; 2650:2; 2701:23 total [10] - 2524:19, 24; 2578:18; 2618:11; 2630:6; 2663:1; 2714:8; 2719:17; 2796:19; 2801:7 totality [1] - 2717:13 totally [2] - 2749:8; 2800:20 totals [1] - 2713:14 touch [1] - 2653:4 touchdowns [1] - 2791:22 touched [1] - 2577:3 tough [1] - 2724:7 tougher [2] - 2724:7; 2807:19 tour [2] - 2524:10; 2698:15 tourism [5] - 2505:3; 2635:19; 2636:10; 2704:24; 2788:8 tourist [2] - 2711:6,	2495:10; 2612:16 transit [1] - 2605:5 translate [1] - 2701:21 Transmission [1] - 2542:16 transparency [1] - 2529:17 transparent [2] - 2607:24; 2664:10 transport [3] - 2575:14, 24; 2777:16 TRANSPORTATIO N [1] - 2496:14 Transportation [270] - 2492:16; 2494:13; 2496:24; 2499:2, 15; 2500:5, 9; 2501:2, 22; 2500:21; 2507:12, 17; 2509:4, 6, 11, 14, 23; 2514:14, 17; 2515:20; 2516:5, 23; 2517:19, 21; 2518:4, 6, 11, 18, 24; 2519:1, 13;	2669:2, 14, 16; 2671:6, 11, 15, 21, 23; 2672:3, 12, 18, 24; 2673:1, 5, 10, 17, 22; 2674:17; 2675:17, 22; 2676:3, 10, 14; 2677:7, 14, 22; 2678:10, 16; 2684:9; 2706:5; 2717:22; 2751:12; 2758:21; 2783:10; 2789:7; 2790:10, 22; 2791:1, 8, 11; 2792:18, 23; 2793:4, 14; 2797:8, 14, 18-19, 25; 2805:12 transportation [4] - 2614:1; 2624:19; 2625:4, 14 Transportation's [45] - 2500:12; 2501:11; 2504:16; 2515:2; 2517:24; 2519:6; 2523:4; 2525:18; 2526:1; 2520:14; 2757.	trout [9] - 2509:13, 17; 2582:12, 14, 21-22; 2586:25; 2693:4; 2755:13 trucks [1] - 2777:24 true [2] - 2714:21; 2715:1 truly [2] - 2538:20; 2749:13 trust [1] - 2762:18 try [7] - 2632:6; 2681:4; 2723:16; 2734:19, 21; 2754:15; 2799:21 trying [5] - 2747:1; 2749:13; 2754:4; 2761:14; 2783:10 TSP [1] - 2773:25 TSI [4] - 2578:19, 22, 24; 2579:2 TSI [4] - 2783:9 TSI [4] - 2783:9 TSI [4] - 2783:9 TSI [4] - 2783:9 TSI [5] - 2666:17; 2713:17; 2721:17; 2722:23; 2796:15	ultimate [1] - 2800:23 ultimately [7] - 2521:9; 2550:1; 2560:1; 2561:16; 2635:7; 2638:10; 2664:7 ultra [1] - 2788:25 unable [6] - 2512:21; 2694:1; 2697:3; 2718:6, 13; 2801:13 unacceptable [8] - 2506:16; 2683:1, 8; 2724:18, 25; 2764:18; 2765:3, 9 unaccessible [1] - 2679:8 unaffected [1] - 2671:25 unanswered [1] - 263:18 unavailable [1] - 2684:24 unbelievable [1] -
19	2520:11; 2521:2, 14,	2529:14; 2530:9, 17;	Tuesday [1] - 2753:1	2750:18
toward [1] - 2551:23	23; 2522:1, 3, 8, 12,	2536:7; 2543:19;	tunnel [2] - 2523:17;	uncertain [6] -
towards [3] -	15, 19; 2523; 12, 23;	2544:23; 2554:24;	2613:20	2577:1, 7; 2578:14;
2524:16; 2584:8;	2524:2, 8, 17, 23;	2555:7; 2560:24;	turn [6] - 2510:2;	2684:23; 2713:24;
2749:25	2525:7, 23; 2526:3, 9;	2565:22; 2574:19;	2574:24; 2622:12;	2714:8
town's [1] - 2615:10	2527:16, 24; 2528:7,	2576:12, 16; 2578:19;	2630:25; 2631:12;	uncertainties [1] -
Township [1] -	12, 16-17; 2529:10,	2579:6; 2581:20;	2638:23	2767:2
2713:19	18; 2530:2, 5, 12, 20;	2582:18; 2586:18;	turned [2] - 2588:20;	uncertainty [10] -
toxicology [1] -	2531:5, 22; 2532:3,	2592:1; 2595:11, 20;	2764:20	2546:15; 2577:14;
2600:11	10; 2533:1; 2534:2, 6,	2597:4, 12; 2601:7;	turning [6] - 2523:5;	2580:22; 2583:12,
Tracey [1] - 2685:14	19; 2535:2, 7, 18;	2602:22; 2603:3;	2559:7; 2567:22;	20-21; 2597:18;
tracked [1] - 2590:18	2536:2, 9, 13, 17;	2604:13; 2620:2;	2574:4; 2581:4;	2754:12; 2783:19;
traction [1] - 2747:12	2537:2, 5, 24; 2538:7,	2626:1; 2716:20;	2763:24	2797:12
traditional [46] -	14, 22-24; 2539:4, 15,	2790:19; 2791:5;	turns [1] - 2648:6	unchanged [1] -
2507:5; 2531:19;	23, 25; 2540:2, 6, 14,	2792:25; 2797:10;	tweak [1] - 2748:14	2604:18
2532:4; 2533:3, 10;	17; 2541:2, 10, 14,	2807:9, 15	Twelve [1] - 2727:5	unclear [2] -
2534:23; 2535:9;	16, 21, 25; 2542:5,	transported [2] -	twice [1] - 2713:25	2714:12; 2716:22
2536:14, 20-21;	24; 2543:3, 6, 12, 15,	2575:25; 2777:21	two [48] - 2495:7;	uncommon [1] -
2537:4, 25; 2538:2, 5;	21, 23; 2544:7, 13,	transpose [1] -	2501:1; 2502:13;	2724:16
2539:6, 11, 17;	19; 2545:7, 9, 17;	2709:7	2520:8; 2524:3, 7, 25;	unconsolidated [1] -
2540:20; 2544:10, 12;	2546:17; 2547:6, 16;	trauma [2] - 2668:18,	2528:6; 2536:22;	2757:23
2581:6; 2661:8;	2553:17; 2554:14;	22	2561:4; 2562:8, 12;	uncontroverted [3] -
2665:16; 2667:23;	2555:17; 2557:19;	travel [3] - 2650:3;	2567:13; 2582:22;	2578:19; 2602:7;
2668:8; 2669:5, 7, 18;	2558:21, 25; 2559:10,	2774:3	2585:2; 2590:22;	2620:23
2671:20, 22, 24;	24: 2560:5, 11:	traverse [1] -	2591:2; 2612:13;	unconventional [1] -
2672:5, 17; 2673:8,	2561:3, 17; 2565:3, 8;	2605:15	2613:4; 2619:18;	2599:4
12, 16, 19; 2675:2;	2566:10; 2567:4, 24;	treated [2] - 2731:10,	2632:6; 2636:25;	under [58] - 2499:25;
2676:24; 2732:4;	2570:3; 2571:23;	12	2644:22; 2650:3;	2503:22; 2504:2;
2734:19; 2735:17,	2573:13, 24; 2574:7;	treatment [7] -	2665:23; 2670:11;	2505:17; 2506:19, 22;
22-23; 2736:4	2575:3; 2578:16, 23;	2647:15; 2655:11;	2686:4; 2700:20;	2507:16, 19, 23;
traffic [2] - 2608:4;	2579:3, 24; 2580:2,	2656:2; 2788:25;	2703:23; 2717:9;	2508:17; 2509:3, 7,
2791:23	23; 2581:2, 9, 14;	2792:11, 21	2719:23; 2720:19;	12, 14, 18; 2541:12;
train [1] - 2625:11	2583:9; 2584:15, 25;	treaty [1] - 2669:5	2729:20; 2735:14;	2545:15; 2551:13;
training [6] - 2534:4;	2585:4, 9, 15, 21;	Treaty [13] - 2529:24;	2743:8; 2757:10;	2568:1, 23; 2570:12;
2600:11; 2672:7, 10,	2586:9, 12; 2587:5;	2530:10, 17; 2533:3,	2759:18; 2763:15;	2573:16; 2579:19;
13; 2718:23	2588:12; 2593:20, 25;	9; 2536:14, 19;	2764:1; 2774:6;	2580:6; 2588:17;
TransAlta [3] -	2594:12; 2595:8;	2537:4; 2661:5;	2775:17; 2785:25;	2589:7; 2591:1,
2670:7; 2795:25;	2596:2, 5, 12, 20;	2667:25; 2668:13;	2800:10; 2801:2, 11;	11-12, 15; 2599:21;
2796:3	2597:22; 2598:15, 18;	2669:11, 23	2803:25; 2804:25	2605:12; 2614:3;
TransCanada [2] -	2599:2, 11; 2600:4, 6;	tree [2] - 2576:18, 20	two-minute [1] -	2615:22; 2637:10;
2795:12, 17	2603:5; 2604:22, 24;	tremendous [1] -	2764:1	2645:2; 2671:4;
TRANSCRIPT [2] -	2606:10, 20; 2607:8,	2784:10	two-way [1] - 2528:6	2675:8, 11; 2676:6;
2495:21; 2660:8	23; 2608:8, 17, 25;	Tribe [3] - 2543:23;	two-week [1] -	2682:15, 20; 2686:3,
transcript [14] -	2609:14; 2611:12;	2544:14; 2796:18	2502:13	23; 2706:4; 2714:10;
2498:14; 2610:23;	2614:10; 2618:16;	Tribe's [1] - 2543:24	type [2] - 2502:3;	2726:25; 2732:23;
2659:19; 2715:18-20;	2623:10; 2624:5;	tribunals [1] - 2646:7	2782:19	2738:13; 2743:13;
2717:10; 2721:1;	2625:23; 2631:8, 18;	tributaries [2] -	types [2] - 2538:13;	2751:5; 2759:16, 21;

2763:22; 2770:19; 2779:6; 2804:13; 2806.14 underdesigned [2] -2578:13; 2650:17 underestimating [1] 2767:12 undergo [1] -2672:10 underlain [2] -2653:18; 2756:13 underlie [1] -2592.19 underlying [6] -2592:4, 10; 2597:7; 2758:15, 17; 2761:7 underpass [1] -2545 15 underpredicts [1] -2771:14 undersized [1] -2571:22 understated [1] -2628:13 understatement [1] -2587.2 understood [6] -2575:7; 2578:5; 2595:16; 2604:3; 2706 21 2792 19 undertake [4] -2647:1; 2675:24; 2701:11: 2791:2 undertaken [12] · 2530:6; 2541:3, 5; 2583:16; 2590:5; 2596:3; 2602:24; 2633:18; 2647:2 2673:7; 2675:21; 2679:12 undertaking [6] -2604:23; 2606:4; 2714:2; 2720:20; 2791:8, 19 undertakings [4] -2494:14, 19; 2509:8; 2736.21 UNDERTAKINGS^[1] 2495.6 Undertakings [1] -2494:23 undertook [4] 2532:4; 2578:16; 2581:9; 2591:10 underway [1] -2716:17 undisturbed [2] -2693:19; 2780:12 undoubtedly [1] -2624.4 Unequal [1] - 2706:4 unequal [6] -2554:12; 2631:14; 2635:2; 2685:24; 2706:9 unequivocal [1] -2577:21 unfavourable[1] -2738:2 unfettered [2] -2803:11; 2804:14 unfetterred [1] -2547:7 unfold [1] - 2656:3 unfortunate [1] -2538.20 unfortunately [6] -2525:21; 2627:22; 2646:25; 2762:22, 24; 2764:20

unimpeached [1] -2560:13 unintended [3] -2747:5; 2754:5; 2755.2 unintentional [2] -2798:6 uninterrupted [1] -2545:16 unique [8] - 2538:15; 2605:18; 2627:22; 2646:3; 2721:5; 2747:6; 2754:9; 2804 21 United [1] - 2671:4 units [2] - 2588:19; 2592:9 University [1] -2702.9 unjustified [1] -2736:9 unknown [7] -2696:7, 11; 2735:19; 2746:25; 2747:2; 2796:19 unknowns [3] · 2747:3; 2760:20 unlawful [1] - 2542:2 unless [7] - 2548:13; 2565:11; 2647:2; 2661:18; 2670:8; 2732:24; 2787:5 unlike [1] - 2652:1 unlikely [2] -2754:13 unmitigated [4] -2512:20; 2515:22; 2598:12; 2655:13 Unnamed [11] 2548:9; 2552:15; 2715:12, 15; 2717:21; 2718:2, 4, 8; 2752:12; 2756:21, 24 unobstructed [1] -2604.5unoccupied [3] -2676:15, 22; 2677:2 unprecedented [1] -2696.21 unprotected [1] -2642:23 unproven [1] -2693:15 unrealistic [2] -2564.21 unreasonable [1] -2767:16 unrelated [1] -2666:20 unresolved [1] -2525.17 unrestricted [1] -2538:11 unsafe [3] - 2765:8; 2766:2.5 unsubstantial [1] -2716:22 unsubstantiated [1] 2769:16 unusual [1] - 2517:3 **up** [69] - 2494:9, 14; 2496:19, 21, 25; 2497:1, 5; 2498:3; 2499:2, 6; 2508:21; 2521:3; 2527:5; 2531:23; 2538:25; 2553:7; 2554:18; 2559:2; 2573:21; 2592:9; 2612:20; 2623:4; 2639:21;

2643:18; 2644:1; 2648:17; 2651:11; 2652:2; 2664:12; 2678:9; 2681:5, 10; 2689:21; 2696:17; 2700:16; 2703:21; 2704:5; 2709:21; 2724:6; 2737:8; 2751:17; 2752:16, 19, 21; 2754:4, 25; 2757:2, 10, 22; 2758:2; 2760:17; 2761:3, 10; 2762:15; 2768:21; 2776:1; 2786:14; 2792:14; 2793:21: 2794:23: 2795:24; 2800:5; 2801:6; 2804:10; 2806:4; 2807:1 update [3] - 2523:25; 2722:1; 2729:13 Updated [1] -2532:16 updated [8] 2546:10; 2612:2; 2717:6, 15; 2722:7 2769:19; 2801:4, 23 updates [4] · 2524:20; 2525:15; 2530:19: 2534:24 upfront [1] - 2672.3 upgrade [1] - 2521:5 upgrades [4] -2510:17; 2634:2; 2713:19; 2717:2 upland [1] - 2781:20 upper [1] - 2738:6 uppermost [1] -2756:18 upside [1] - 2800:20 upstream [41] -2547:25; 2553:23; 2554:10, 13; 2555:6; 2558:16; 2582:13, 15; 23; 2618:24; 2629:10; 2634:20; 2640:9; 2646:11; 2648:11, 13; 2649:17, 20; 2650:3; 2656:16, 20; 2662:7, 10, 21, 24; 2665:5, 14; 2670:12, 21; 2682:6; 2683:7 2687:15; 2705:21; 2706:3; 2709:14; 2712:19; 2713:2; 2723:5; 2726:2 2741:11; 2747:23 **urban** [5] - 2655:15; 2662:10; 2665:11; 2723:14; 2731:9 urge [1] - 2611:12 urgency [1] - 2767:5 urges [1] - 2657:20 US [1] - 2743:18 usage [4] - 2734:14, 19; 2735:1; 2793:10 useful [2] - 2499:20; 2534:14 useless [2] - 2688:7, 13 users [2] - 2533:19; 2665:6 uses [22] - 2531:19; 2532:19: 2533:3. 10-11; 2536:14, 20-21: 2537:4: 2546:7, 16; 2557:24; 2669:5, 10; 2693:25; 2694:3; 2695:16; 2703:15; 2719:7;

2734:24; 2735:23; 2764:23 usual [2] - 2573:17; 2751.4utilities [3] - 2629:6; 2647:16; 2655:14 Utilities [1] - 2670:7 utility [5] - 2704:19; 2794:13; 2795:23; 2796:24; 2797:21 utter [1] - 2760:9 V **vaccine** [9] -2687:12, 14, 20, 24-25; 2688:1, 3; 2707:25; 2722:19 valid [1] - 2577:8 validated [2] -2767:17 validity [1] - 2576:25 **valley** [3] - 2548:9; 2756:22, 25 Valley [2] - 2672:11; 2765.17 valuable [1] - 2664:7 **value** [21] - 2516:24; 2518:1; 2542:25; 2566:19; 2576:17; 2591:23; 2592:3, 11; 2664:10; 2705:19; 2713:10; 2754:17; 2756:18; 2757:2, 8; 2761:15; 2779:10, 16, 18, 24 value-based [1] -2705:19 valued [3] - 2574:17; 2596:1; 2627:11 values [23] - 2505:2; 2589:3; 2590:8, 17-18; 2635:20; 2636:10; 2665:10; 2704:16, 24; 2705:16; 2731:17; 2757:5, 13, 15, 17; 2758:3, 8-9; 2768:16, 20; 2770:3 valuing [1] - 2731:25 Vance [7] - 2492:10; 2601:7; 2603:15; 2604:3; 2609:12; 2789:25 Vanderjagt [3] -2542:9, 15, 19 vanishingly [1] -2652:11 variability [2] - 2578:9; 2656:18 variants [3] - 2688:4, 7, 13 variety [3] - 2522:25; 2735:11; 2781:4 various [19] 2499:25; 2500:15, 18; 2501:4; 2502:1, 22; 2527:1; 2547:22; 2578:17; 2591:11; 2596:5; 2603:25; 2664:16, 23; 2679:13; 2726:4; 2737:25; 2765:22; 2783:5 vast [1] - 2582:11 vastly [1] - 2686:8 vectors [2] -2776:25: 2777:20 vegetation [20] -2507:4; 2542:21; 2544:17, 22; 2545:25; 2595:21; 2599:11;

2602:21; 2605:13; 2674:11, 14; 2692:18; 2770:13, 16; 2775:13; 2776:10, 22; 2779:6; 2782.6 vehicles [2] -2777:11, 13 velocity [1] - 2766:15 verbatim [2] -2746:4; 2787:16 verification [2] -2674:9; 2758:10 vernacular[1] -2763.2 version [3] - 2556:2; 2748:9; 2787:11 versus [3] - 2666:6; 2703:5; 2722:9 **Vespa** [13] - 2493:5, 25; 2494:2, 9; 2496:5, 8; 2612:12, 19, 21; 2632:7, 14; 2784:4 via [1] - 2753:14 viability [4] 2611:17; 2613:17; 2725:6; 2746:4 viable [5] - 2614:17; 2616:23; 2618:18; 2619:21; 2642:10 vicinity [2] - 2580:11; 2601.9 video [2] - 2627:19; 2799:21 **View** [24] - 2505:12; 2513:1, 4; 2555:21; 2556:5, 24; 2705:10; 2708:6, 10, 22; 2713:15; 2717:5; 2721:16; 2723:14; 2729:1, 21; 2730:6; 2748:10; 2783:7; 2789:3; 2795:2, 7; 2796:14; 2797:6 **view** [22] - 2506:10; 2526:19, 23; 2563:25; 2577:21; 2598:8; 2616:9, 16, 20; 2618:1; 2626:4; 2628:17; 2631:11, 13; 2633:10; 2636:15; 2638:19; 2642:6; 2655:25; 2684:23; 2721:4; 2749:1 View's [2] - 2708:9, 15 viewed [1] - 2542:3 views [3] - 2610:17; 2667:6 virtual [1] - 2609:3 virtually [2] - 2492:2; 2647.23virtue [1] - 2780:5 virus [2] - 2687:9, 13 vis-à-vis [1] -2589.20 visible [1] - 2774:1 visibly [1] - 2774:2 visitor [2] - 2721:20; 2803:1 visits [13] - 2534:22; 2538:9, 15, 17; 2539:1, 8, 20, 25; 2540:18; 2543:25; 2544:1, 9; 2675:23 vital [1] - 2647:16 viva [4] - 2685:13; 2746:6; 2753:19; 2755:22 vocation [1] -2803:17

V000 (1) 0695.10	2606.7. 2609.4.	wood (10) 260216	wholeseler	2540.20. 2672.25
voce [4] - 2685:13;	2606:7; 2608:4;	weed [19] - 2603:6,	wholesale [1] -	2540:20; 2672:25
2746:6; 2753:19;	2617:12; 2622:24;	8, 11, 17-18; 2604:5;	2734:9	wonder [1] - 2775:15
2755:22	2629:5, 11; 2633:12,	2726:8; 2776:12, 25;	wholly [2] - 2661:11;	Wood [9] - 2513:18;
voice [3] - 2611:3;	15; 2634:21; 2639:15;	2777:3, 6, 9, 15, 17;	2798:14	2554:23; 2686:12;
2612:11; 2626:11	2646:22; 2647:15;	2778:6, 22	wholly-owned [1] -	2696:22, 24; 2708:19;
	2650:2; 2652:4;		2661:11	
voided [1] - 2739:13		weeds [7] - 2603:1;		2719:17; 2753:15;
Volume [3] - 2492:4;	2654:13, 17, 22-24;	2776:11, 14-15, 21;	wide [3] - 2589:21;	2778:2
2581:15; 2659:1	2655:1, 3, 5, 8, 11-12,	2777:20; 2778:11	2688:16; 2700:24	woody [1] - 2699:20
volume [8] - 2552:7,	16, 22-23; 2656:4, 10,	week [6] - 2493:18,	wider [1] - 2498:20	word [5] - 2566:11;
9; 2573:8; 2575:19;	13-14, 24; 2657:15;	24; 2495:10; 2502:13;	widespread [1] -	2612:13, 20; 2764:23;
2652:8; 2700:17;	2662:24; 2665:2, 19;	2515:17; 2683:19	2647:19	2765:6
2701:22; 2702:22	2670:7, 12, 21;	weekend [5] -	width [2] - 2605:10;	words [7] - 2570:1;
volumes [11] -	2674:10, 13; 2677:5,	2493:12, 16; 2803:2;	2697:17	2573:17; 2591:21;
2513:9; 2575:23;	8, 13, 15; 2683:24;	2807:1, 4	Wiebe [2] - 2492:14;	2613:4; 2616:23;
2686:20; 2696:19;	2688:5, 14; 2691:7,	weekly [1] - 2790:15	2807:22	2626:23; 2765:5
2700:4; 2701:4;	11; 2692:6, 8-9,	weeks [11] - 2498:10;	wildlife [25] - 2507:4;	works [5] - 2493:22;
2703:3, 8; 2744:15;	16-17, 19, 21, 25;	2501:1; 2593:19;	2532:12; 2539:13;	2552:13; 2738:19;
2763:15	2693:22; 2694:4;	2621:25; 2644:22;	2545:9, 11, 14, 16,	2740:18; 2741:6
voluminous [2] -	2695:8, 17, 25;	2665:23; 2742:20;	24; 2595:22; 2604:12;	workshops [4] -
2662:17; 2784:11	2696:2, 7, 11; 2698:7;	2763:15; 2800:11;	2605:8; 2674:11, 13;	2534:10, 22; 2535:13;
voluntary [1] -	2700:18; 2701:22;	2801:2; 2804:25	2676:9; 2718:19;	2536:22
2640:24	2704:2; 2710:3;		2720:18; 2735:24;	world [1] - 2691:9
		weigh [1] - 2641:16		
vulnerable [4] -	2711:16; 2712:5;	weighed [2] -	2779:12; 2782:9;	worried [2] -
2504:24; 2635:17;	2718:18; 2719:23;	2620:11; 2785:17	2804:13	2690:22; 2706:20
2636:7; 2642:7	2720:3, 15; 2725:8;	weighing [1] -	William [1] - 2492:10	worry [2] - 2613:2;
-	2727:2, 6; 2737:6;	2624:23	WILLIAMS [5] -	2783:2
W		weight [5] - 2555:8;	2784:25; 2785:3;	worse [2] - 2613:12;
	2741:15; 2742:18;		2107.20, 2100.0,	
	2743:17; 2745:3;	2599:23; 2622:7;	2787:15, 24; 2799:17	2617:7
Wagner [8] - 2493:4;	2750:24; 2751:3, 8;	2638:20; 2786:5	Williams [12] -	worst [7] - 2611:7;
2546.9; 2735:11;	2752:3, 5-6, 8, 21,	weight-per-hectare	2493:3; 2579:19;	2627:3; 2684:8, 13;
2784:23; 2799:18;	24-25; 2753:3, 8-9,	[1] - 2599:23	2580:9; 2581:3;	2749:13; 2751:16;
2805:19; 2806:6	17; 2757:20, 22, 25;	weir [1] - 2744:14	2784:22, 24; 2785:5;	2760:6
WAGNER [5] -	2758:12, 18; 2759:6;	Weisbach [1] -	2786:24; 2787:10, 16,	worst-case [5] -
2799:19, 25; 2806:5,	2760:15; 2761:10;	2492:13	22; 2799:13	2684:8, 13; 2749:13;
18, 23	2763:21; 2776:17;	welcome [6] -	willing [1] - 2802:25	2751:16; 2760:6
wait [2] - 2645:9;	2782:25; 2788:14, 23,	2493:9, 25; 2544:19;	willingness [2] -	worth [4] - 2621:24;
2787:3		2659:7; 2660:16	2527:3; 2778:4	2633:5, 11; 2738:23
	25; 2791:25; 2792:3,			
walker [1] - 2803:2	11, 20-21; 2793:10;	welcomed [1] -	Willow [2] - 2697:10;	worthwhile [1] -
walking [1] - 2524:9	2794:5, 8, 11;	2539:4	2698:3	2728:17
Wallis [9] - 2605:16;	2796:10, 22; 2797:16,	welcomes [4] -	win/win [1] - 2723:16	worthy [2] - 2694:13,
2606:3, 8, 17; 2780:2,	22; 2798:12; 2802:12	2539:16; 2540:2;	wind [2] - 2773:14;	17
24; 2781:7; 2782:2, 5	Water [13] - 2507:16,	2543:13; 2545:22	2774:4	Woste [5] - 2661:11;
Wallis's [2] -	18, 20; 2508:3, 6;	wellbeing [2] -	winds [3] - 2774:4;	2677:5, 9, 15;
2693:16; 2781:16	2530:14; 2531:7;	2641:22; 2763:12	2790:8	2679:17
Walter [1] - 2492:8	2568:24; 2570:12;	wells [15] - 2555:13;	windy [2] - 2720:13;	wrap [2] - 2775:25;
wandering [1] -	2571:7; 2716:21;	2593:21, 23; 2594:2,	2773:11	2776:1
2755:16	2792:1; 2796:9	18, 21, 23, 2608:4;	wins [1] - 2682:9	writ [1] - 2633:8
wants [3] - 2561:22;	waterborne [1] -	2753:10; 2757:23;	wipe [1] - 2724:4	write [1] - 2628:22
2618:9; 2656:25	2623:12	2761:11; 2788:22;	wiped [2] - 2724:2;	writing [1] - 2500:6
warn [1] - 2711:25	watercourse [2] -	2793:5	2732:11	written [13] -
warped [1] - 2694:20	2556:16; 2557:8	Wesley [4] - 2661:2,	wire [1] - 2545:12	2500:10, 22; 2528:2;
warrant [2] -	watering [2] -	4, 2679:16, 2798:25	wisdom [1] -	2532:5; 2536:3;
2514:11; 2548:24	2720:12, 14	west [3] - 2580:12;	2514:15	2540:8, 15; 2556:2;
warranted [1] -	waterline [2] -	2605:23; 2779:17	wish [5] - 2604:23;	2644:18; 2660:22;
2710:24	2793:21; 2804:2	westerly [1] - 2790:8	2610:14; 2631:24;	2733:15; 2786:2;
washed [1] - 2625:8	waterlines [1] -	wetland [3] -	2632:21; 2643:6	2787:11
washrooms [1] -	2794:1	2713:20; 2715:23	withdrawal [1] -	wrote [2] - 2630:20;
2721:21	waters [3] - 2579:8;	wetlands [15] -	2722:25	2710:7
waste [2] - 2646:22;	2665:16, 22	2507:23; 2544:17;	withdrawn [1] -	-
2647:15	watershed [4] -	2546:1; 2605:20;	2555:11	Y
				÷
wastewater [1] -	2514:10; 2663:1;	2674:12, 14; 2715:25;	withdrew [1] -	0=10.00
2705:5	2753:4; 2779:13	2776:22; 2779:6;	2570:2	year [9] - 2513:23;
water [199] -	watersheds [1] -	2781:7, 10-11, 13, 15,	withstand [2] -	2541:4; 2548:22;
2506:20; 2507:3;	2663:15	20	2651:7; 2749:22	2649:2; 2696:19;
2511:7; 2513:16, 23;	Waterworks [7] -	Wetlands [2] -	Witness [1] - 2706:7	2728:21; 2731:7;
2514:1; 2519:24;	2493:3; 2579:16;	2507:23; 2508:7	witness [9] - 2501:5;	2788:9; 2801:18
2520:16, 22; 2545:25;	2788:13; 2789:5;	wetlands' [1] -	2504:16; 2541:7;	year-round [1] -
2547:18; 2549:6;	2791:10; 2796:7;	2781:14	2560:6; 2579:6;	2788:9
2550:1, 8, 23, 25;	2798:16	wetted [1] - 2594:22	2587:6; 2663:5, 17;	years [50] - 2502:10;
2551:1, 22; 2556:16;	WATERWORKS [1] -	whereas [5] -	2756:2	2505:4; 2511:12, 15;
2557:15; 2570:12;	2787:21	2564:2; 2699:11;	witnessed [1] -	2515:1, 5, 11;
2571.10, 2010.12,				2517:10; 2549:1;
2574:4, 8, 24; 2575:1,	ways [1] - 2499:7	2769:22; 2770:23;	2798:14	
12-13; 2578:15, 17,	weak [1] - 2762:4	2773:15	witnesses [9] -	2552:23; 2564:10;
20; 2579:4, 13, 15,	weather [10] -	whereby [1] - 2694:4	2537:21; 2555:3;	2571:11; 2572:6, 15;
17-18; 2581:1, 17;	2493:13, 15; 2504:25;	Whitson [3] - 2602:3,	2561:4; 2571:18;	2573:4; 2580:10;
2585:7, 20; 2586:5;	2548:24; 2577:18;	11, 19	2576:12, 16; 2654:12;	2583:3; 2636:13;
2587:1, 23, 25;	2629:19; 2635:17;	Whitson's [1] -	2779:8; 2784:8	2637:24; 2639:14;
2591:25; 2593:16, 18,	2636:8; 2652:5;	2602:7	Woloshyn [1] -	2646:9; 2647:4, 10;
			2492:7	2649:4; 2665:18;
21, 23; 2594:1;	2653:25	whole [3] - 2601:13;		
2595:13, 20; 2602:18;	Webber [1] - 2765:20	2731:7; 2802:16	Women [2] -	2683:12, 14, 17-18,

20; 2684:6; 2690:19; 2717:7, 13, 16; 2719:16, 19; 2730:1; 2742:14; 2764:20; 2783:15; 2788:7, 21; 2789:23; 2794:25; 2798:10; 2802:14 years' [1] - 2621:23 yield [1] - 2761:11 Yoshida [1] - 2755:25 Yoshisaka [8] - 2587:7; 2599:8, 16; 2590:8, 22; 2592:7; 2593:2; 2594:6 Yoshisaka's [2] - 2587:9; 2590:19 young [1] - 2766:1 younger [1] - 2668:10
Z
Zelt [31] - 2597:11, 23; 2598:3, 8, 18, 20, 25; 2600:4; 2720:8; 2766:13; 2767:21, 24; 2768:2; 2769:4, 6; 2770:3, 7, 9, 22; 2771:3, 8, 19; 2772:5; 2773:8, 10, 15; 2775:3 Zelt's [12] - 2599:20; 2764:17; 2766:8; 2767:1, 4, 14, 17; 2768:7, 9; 2770:17; 2771:7, 16 zero [1] - 2590:13 zone [5] - 2731:18; 2803:5, 14; 2805:6 zones [2] - 2597:2; 2630:19 Zoom [2] - 2644:14; 2808:1