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(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 9:00 A.M.)
THE CHAIR: Good morning, everyone. Welcome Day 11, I think it's Day 11, the final day of the hearing and for Alberta Transportation's reply argument.

Before we start, though, I would ask if there's any preliminary matters anyone has to deal with this morning?

I'm hearing none.
And I'11 just maybe quickly check in.
Mr. Secord, are you online?
MR. SECORD: I am on1ine, yes, sir.
THE CHAIR:
Okay. And Ms. Louden? Or

09:00

MR. RAE: Yes, sir, it's Mr. Rae. We are here this morning.

THE CHAIR: So I think it's -- checking in, everybody's got -- their names are up for all the main

REPORTING GROUP
parties. So, Mr. Kruhlak, Mr. Fitch, Mr. Barbero, I'm not sure if it's a tag-team approach this morning or not, but whoever is leading off, the floor is yours. Please proceed.

MR. KRUHLAK:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's Ron Kruhlak, and I'11 lead off with some brief comments with respect to the submissions made by the Stoney Nakoda Nations, and then my friend Mr. Fitch wil1 speak to the comments that were provided by the SCLG . and noting in the initial paragraph, as we commented on in our reply document, which is Exhibit 325 and paragraph 223.

The Stoney Nakoda Nations make reference to their ongoing claim for Aboriginal title and rights in the

Court of Queen's Bench. And, as we have previously mentioned to the Board, we would respectfully suggest that this process declined comment on matters that are before the courts involved in that litigation. In paragraph 12, the Stoney Nakoda Nations submit that -- in the conclusion of their paragraph: (as read) "Over the last two weeks, the Board has heard evidence of Alberta's haphazard consultation process with the Stoney Nakoda amid the limitations created by COVID-19 on the Stoney Nakoda communities."

Mr. Chairman, obviously, we have to take exception to that characterization that, in fact, what the Board did hear in the last two weeks through the references to the record of consultation was what we would characterize as a complete and fulsome effort at consultation.

And I would indicate that that went on for a number of years, some five years prior to even the commencement of the COVID-19 situation which has impacted the Stoney Nakoda Nations.

So we obviously have made references to the degree of consultation and the quality of $i t$, and continue to be of a view that it was -- it was reasonable and, for the Board's purposes, we would submit that it was -- it
was adequate.
In paragraph 14, the Stoney Nakoda Nations, of their argument say: (as read)
"The consultation with Indigenous groups
generally is not consultation with the
Stoney Nakoda. Negotiations and
agreements with Tsuut'ina and other
distant First Nations bear no relevance
to the rights of the Stoney Nakoda. For
Alberta Transportation to imply that
consultation with unrelated Indigenous
groups constitutes consultation with the
Stoney Nakoda, is extremely
disrespectful."
Mr. Chairman, Alberta Transportation agrees that consultation with other Indigenous groups is not consultation with the Stoney Nakoda.

And, in fact, despite my searches through our documents and submissions, and checking with our consultation personnel, we cannot find any reference to that argument being advanced by Alberta Transportation.

So, again, it's clearly our position that we agree that that would not be a fair way to interpret consultation, but that is not anything that Alberta Transportation has advocated.

The Stoney Nakoda Nations' argument makes reference in their paragraph 17 and 18,20 , with respect to their assertion of Aboriginal and Treaty rights, and I think those are -- have already been responded to adequately in the reply -- Alberta Transportation's reply document, Exhibit 325, and I can refer to paragraphs 226 and 227.

Similarly, $I$ just want to briefly comment that the characterization of the duty to consult, and the explanation of it provided by the Stoney Nakoda in their paragraph 15 of their argument, would not meet what Alberta would describe as a fulsome discussion of the duty to consult. We provided references in our paragraph 246 of our reply, which is Exhibit 325, which footnotes the government of Alberta's consultation policy.

And for Board counse1, I'd simply refer also to a leading case, which is Behn v. Moulton Contracting Ltd. And Behn is B-E-H-N, and Moulton Contracting Ltd. of 2013, Supreme Court of Canada decision and those reports at page 26, paragraph 27, 29.

I want to briefly also comment on a reference which is referred to in paragraph 18 of the Stoney Nakoda's argument, and that is referring to Elder John Snow, Jr. He spoke of the trauma he still feels as a result of the flooding and desecration of Stoney Nakoda grave sites
resulting from the Bighorn Dam, and such a situation is intolerable and must not be permitted to happen again.

It's Alberta Transportation's information that's been provided in the record that no grave sites have been located to date in the SR1 PDA.

And, in fact, the map tendered by the Stoney Nakoda Nations in their evidence in Exhibit 288 essentially showed that there's no anticipated burials within the PDA based on the depiction they included within that map.

I thought it may be helpful, Mr. Chairman, just to provide the Board with some comments on the conditions that the Stoney Nakoda Nations advanced.

So you have Alberta Transportation's response to those proposals for the Board's consideration. And the first set of proposed conditions was at paragraph 22, which were under the preamble: (as read)
"In the event the Board approves the
project, the Stoney Nakoda submit that the construction of SR1 not be permitted

And then the first item deals with seeking to be made a party to the TransAlta and Province of Alberta Water Agreement; and the second item deals with a full assessment of all proposed flood and water control
structures on the Bow River upstream of Calgary.
Mr. Chairman, we submit that those issues involving TransAlta and the province, or the Bow River and potential future upstream control structures, were canvassed through this hearing and I thought had been concluded that they are not relevant to the issues before this Board in reviewing the SR1 project.

Further, there's a reference to the indication that Alberta must obtain the full and free and informed consent of each of the Stoney Nakoda Nations. And there's also reference in the following paragraph 23 to UNDRIP and Alberta's commitment to it; and I would just simply refer the Board back again to Alberta Transportation response to UNDRIP, which was in Undertaking Number 5.

There's also a lengthy set of conditions requested under paragraph 24. The list includes some 16 conditions, which I'11 just briefly speak to.

Condition 1: Completion of Stoney Nakoda traditional land use assessment. Alberta Transportation is in agreement with that, and, as it's tendered in its opening statement, and through the course of further submissions in our argument, it is looking forward to receiving the final traditional land use assessment from the Stoney Nakoda Nations.

Condition 2: Cultural awareness training. Alberta Transportation submits that this has already been proposed in the Indigenous participation plan. I think I can refer to the Board, Exhibit 216, PDF 13, which is a commitment to all First Nations, to which we welcome the Stoney Nakoda Nations being involved with.

Condition Number 3: Information sharing agreement. Alberta Transportation would be agreeable to developing that agreement between itself and the Stoney Nakoda Nations. It can't seek to compel Alberta Culture, Multiculturalism, and Status of Women to such an agreement through the course of this arrangement.

Condition Number 4 is in reference to an independent Indigenous monitor. And, based on the description of that condition, Alberta Transportation finds it unclear and would welcome further discussion with the Stoney Nakoda Nations with respect to that issue.

Condition Number 5: Stoney Nakoda traditional knowledge monitoring committee. Mr. Chairman, we'd submit that Alberta Transportation has already advanced extensive commitments to undertake a variety of forms of monitoring with respect to the project, and we would suggest that this also be an item deferred to further construction after Stoney Nakoda Nations submit their
final traditional land use assessment.
Condition Number 6: Stoney Nakoda archeological and heritage management plan. We can advise that Alberta Transportation has already made a proposal, which is made reference in its opening statement and further documents, with respect to providing Stoney Nakoda participation in the further archeological work which is planned to take place at the PDA.

Condition Number 7: Previously recorded archeological and historic sites. We can advise that
that structure is necessary.
Condition Number 10: Crown land offsets measures plan. Again, Mr. Chairman, this -- this request appears to be more suitable to what might be a more typical project involving Crown land and would not be viewed to be necessary in the circumstances of this project and the nature of it being on largely private land.

Condition Number 11: Water monitoring for Woste Igic Nabi Ltd. 1ands. It's my understanding that that site is currently outside of the planned monitoring area having regard to its distance from the project development area.

Condition Number 12: Seeking to be Chair of the Indigenous advisory committee. Mr. Chairman, I think Alberta Transportation believes that that would be a matter that is best suited for discussion among all the interested First Nations when that committee is initially structured and set into operations.

Condition 13: Stoney Nakoda Nations communication plan. Mr. Chairman, Alberta Transportation has already committed to developing a communications plan that would be in place prior to construction, and encourages the Stoney Nakoda Nations and other Indigenous groups to be participating in that plan. That plan was presented in Exhibit 216, PDF 10 of 24.

Condition 14: Funding for participation and conditions or programs, and my response will also deal with the next condition, funding for consultation on conditions.

I think you've heard, Mr. Chairman, that Alberta Transportation has invited the Stoney Nakoda Nations, where they see that they need assistance, to review aspects of this project or to be involved. The practice has been to make a request and provide a budget for the expected resources required, and Alberta Transportation would be pleased to consider that and get back to them, as they have done in the past and as they have provided funding in the past.

Condition 16: Mr. Chairman, our review of that condition appears to be that it's more directed to the NRCB than Alberta Transportation, so we would -- we would defer comment on that.

Mr. Chairman, I just have some final comments with respect to these type of requests, and that is if the Board was to approve this project and is contemplating crafting conditions, we would encourage the Board to consider that Alberta Environment have the ability to actually be the party to fulfill those conditions, as it reminded me of perhaps some of the challenges that might be raised where conditions are -- fulfillment might be
left to a third party, which would make it perhaps difficult to ensure the condition could be achieved to maintain schedules which the project would be hoping to achieve.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, the Board finds itself in a situation with a federal review being undertaken and that review process also generating conditions, and we trust that the Board might consider that conditions may require some coordination between the respective agencies.

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, as I'11 be passing the mic over to my friend, Mr. Fitch. I echo his comments of thanks yesterday, and I wish the Board well in its deliberations.

THE CHAIR: Thank you, Mr. Kruhlak.
Mr. Fitch.
MR. FITCH: Yes. Good morning. I don't seem to be...can you hear me, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIR:
Yes, loud and clear.
MR. FITCH:
Okay. Good. So I will be providing reply argument on behalf of Alberta Transportation primarily with respect to the argument of the SCLG. I may have one or so comments in relation to Calalta and Mr. Wagner.

So, Mr. Chair, to begin, there was a bit of debate
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yesterday about the SCLG written -- the written version of their submissions and the fact that, let's be honest, they contain a lot of material that was not -- that Mr. Secord was not able to orally deliver within the allotted two and a half hours.

You know, I think our final position, having thought about it a bit more, is that we do think it pushed the boundary a little bit, but we certainly -- we're not going to object. You know, it's been marked as an exhibit, and that's fine.

The bigger issue, though, as we thought about it last night, is one reason that the argument was, frankly, too long for -- the written version of the argument was too long for Mr. Secord to deliver orally is that it seems quite clear that many paragraphs were added literally in realtime yesterday morning responding to Alberta Transportation's argument.

So, for example, you could look at paragraphs 346 to 360 of SCLG's written argument. These, it seems quite apparent, were written by Dr. Zelt responding to
paragraphs like that added by Dr. Fennell and potentially others.

The point of all this, Mr. Chair, is that the applicant always gets the right of reply, and as we lawyers know, the reason is that this, at the end of the day, is our application, and, you know, therefore we have the ultimate onus to persuade this Board that approval of the project is in the public interest.

Interveners don't have the right of reply in argument, and what's happened here is that by virtue of the fact that this is a virtual hearing, the SCLG essentially has provided reply argument in addition to their written argument.

And, you know, we all know that the rules, procedural rules, are quite flexible in administrative hearings like this, but there have to be some rules.

I'm just going to finish on this by saying that we think this was something new, I've certainly never seen it, where an intervener provides extensive reply argument in their argument, and we just ask the Board to keep in mind whether or not that really is something that's appropriate.

So the next thing I'm going to do, Mr. Chair, is just offer a few, really, I guess, high-level comments with respect to SCLG's written argument -- or, sorry,
oral argument and written argument, and those comments are as follows.

Alberta Transportation understands that members of the SCLG are opposed to this project, and we accept that like happens with many, if not most, resource projects, the impacts of the project are borne to a greater extent by the people that live closest to it. So, in this case, that would include members of the SCLG. So we do understand all that. It's not like we're deaf to all of this. We do understand it.

But, in our view, what we've seen here is this opposition to the project that sort of manifested itself through the SCLG has led to an intervention that essentially saw the SCLG trying to find something, anything, that they could latch onto to try to stop this project.

And what that resulted in is an intervention that -- whose hallmark, in my submission, was advocacy and argument right from the very beginning. And, again, we get it. We know that the SCLG doesn't want
the public interest. Because it really all kind of comes down to this -- this almost existential question of should it have been MC1 or some other project versus SR1.

But the reality is, Mr. Chairman, that horse left the barn a long time ago, and the real issue is whether approval of this project is in the public interest having regard to its social, environmental, and economic effects. And it's unfortunate, I think, that so much time and effort was focused in on this other issue, which, frankly, just isn't part of the Board's review. So those are just sort of our general high-level comments.

I'm now going to address some specific submissions that appear in the written version of the argument of the SCLG, beginning with their submissions on the public interest test.

At paragraph 3 the rhetorical question is asked: "Is this just simply better than nothing? Is that the public interest test?" And, Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation rejects that characterization. The public interest benefits of SR1 have been fully canvassed, we submit, in the evidence.

But to be clear, in our view, nothing is not acceptable. And you heard, for example, from CRCAG
about that. The status quo, no flood mitigation on the Elbow River, is not acceptable.

And further on in the submissions my friend alluded to the evidence of, I think it was Marshall Copithorne, to the effect that it's never too late to reverse course.

We disagree. We think it is too late, and we caution the Board about going down that road because no one can say with any certainty how long it would take -- if this project were not approved, how long it would take for some other project to be fully developed, applied for, and approved. And I think we can all agree it would be years, and likely many years. And, in our submission, that's simply not acceptable, given the urgency of this project.

Next, Mr. Secord referred in his argument to the Cougar Creek decision. And one of the reasons he referred to it, there's a passage in there that the Board has said that one of the factors it looks at when considering public interest is does the project have the support of the community, and Mr. Secord's argument was, no, it does not.

And we submit, actually, there is a lot of support for this project. Yes, again, we understand that members of the SCLG and the most local of the
communities are not all in favour, and many are strongly opposed. But in terms of the community, given the purpose of this project, which is to protect downstream communities, including the city of Calgary, in our submission there actually is significant support for this project: from The City itself, from CRCAG, from Flood Free Calgary, from the Erlton Community Association, and others. So, actually, Mr. Chair, we say there is a lot of support for this project.

Next, my friend Mr. Secord refers, actually at some length, in his argument to the Board's decision, NR 2008-01, which is the revised Highwood Diversion Plan. And a number of submissions are made about what the Board said in that decision about the considerations that apply when a water management project is being -- is before the Board for consideration.

And, in response, Alberta Transportation says the following -- I mean, we don't need to tell this Board what it decided in one of its own previous decisions, but what we will simply point out for the record, and, again, which I'm sure you know, Mr. Chair, is that the Highwood Diversion project was not a flood control project; it was a water management project. That's why there are all those passages in that decision to what
the Board should consider when it is assessing a water management project.

But, again, this is a flood control project, and, again, we understand from the submissions of the SCLG that they actually wish this was not just a flood control project but, rather, also a water management project. But, again, that goes to, we have to deal with the project that's before us, and that's a flood control project. So at the end of the day, we submit that the -- our friend's references to the NRCB's 2008 decision in the Highwood Diversion are not of assistance in this case.

There's also reference made to the original Highwood/Little Bow decision from 1998, and that was in the portion of my friend's argument relating to alternatives.

And you might recall that there's a passage highlighted that suggests that 12 different alternatives were assessed in that case; but I'm sure you noticed, Mr. Chair, that if you actually kept reading the sentence that was highlighted, in fact, what it says is that there were 12 projects that had been reviewed by the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration in 1965, and that these 12 projects were reduced to eight and then, ultimately, to four for
consideration for further review.
And, in our submission, that's actually not much different from what's happened in this case, because, you know, before the ultimate decision to select SR1 was made, there were three different projects that had been advanced for some level of review; namely, MC1, Calgary Tunne1, and SR1.

Just one comment about a passage in paragraph 13 of the written version of the argument. SCLG states that Alberta Transportation, quote, "explicitly," end quote, refuses to disclose material costs. I'm not sure what was meant by the word "explicitly," but if the implication is that Alberta Transportation is intentionally refusing to disclose material costs, we reject that assertion, Mr. Chairman.

There are several places in the argument of the SCLG where they either explicitly or implicitly argue that MC1 is superior because it could handle larger floods, 1 in 500, 1 in 1,000, 1 in 2,000, or the probable maximum flood. And, to be clear, Mr. Chair,
various -- the discharges from that -- from MC1 in the various flood scenarios. And basically what it shows is that, once MC1 gets to its design flood, it will continue -- water will now pass, just as it will at SR1 and, indeed, just as it does at any dam.

And, in fact, what that table shows is that for a probable maximum flood, or PMF, the peak outlet discharge rate would be 1,000 cubic metres per second, not the 212 that my friends keep referring to.

And, you know, on this issue, while MC1, because it's an in-stream dam, we do know, the evidence was clear, that it can continue to discharge at a constant rate of 212 metres cubed per second up to the design flood.

And, of course, SCLG says that that makes it superior to SR1, but we remind the Board that this same characteristic increases risk. It increases risk in construction and in operation and in debris management and $i n$ the event of emergencies.

So the benefit associated with the constant discharge up to the design has to be weighed against that increased risk. So it's not nearly as simple as the SCLG would have you think.

Next, we were all struck in this room by the analogy our friend Mr. Secord drew to vaccines which
was pursued in a number of places in their argument. And let me suggest a different way of looking at that analogy.

Currently in Canada, to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic, there are four vaccines approved for use, I think we can all agree, and a lot of -- there's been a lot of speculation, or it's been reported in the media, that some people have been wondering, which one should I take? Is one better than another? And I think we can agree, Mr. Chair, that the answer that the public health experts have given is, take the first one that you can get, they're all effective, take the first one that you can get.

So if we apply that to this case, the first project that you can get to effectively deal with flood mitigation on the Elbow River is the one that's before us. And, again, if we don't take this one, we're looking at the passage of many years before we're going to get another.

Alberta Transportation also feels compelled to
cross-examination, really object to all of these characterizations, but I think Alberta Transportation does want to say for the record that this idea of the water being contaminated has no foundation in the evidence. None. The water that enters the reservoir is the same water that's in the river, and then it's going to get released and go back into the river. So this is just not correct, and it's a completely unfair characterization.

At paragraph 89 of the written version of SCLG's argument, there's what I would characterize as a reply to our position on the Rocky View County land use bylaw and Mr. Secord said there's no evidence in the record about the bylaw.

And in response, I say, it doesn't matter because it's a law. It's not evidence, it's a law, it's a legal authority. So it doesn't have to be in evidence.

And Mr . Secord also suggested the fact that it's a 2020 bylaw that just came into effect in I think January of 2021, is relevant and that it doesn't retroactively apply. And, in our submission, that entirely misses the point, which is that, in Rocky View County, as indeed elsewhere throughout Alberta, municipal districts either discourage or outright prohibit development within the 1 to 100-year flood
hazard zone.
And the relevance of this, as we've already said, is that by reducing flows from a design flood to the equivalent of a 1 in 50 -year flood, SR1 will protect the vast majority of properties, not just downstream of the reservoir but also upstream of Glenmore Reservoir.

With respect to costs, Mr. Chairman, the SCLG argument dwelt at considerable length, I would submit, on costs. And I think -- you know, our position on costs I think is pretty clear, but what I wanted to say just by way of -- I guess the final point we'd like to make is that it's quite clear what's going on here, which is all these questions about, well, what's the cost of this and what's the cost of that, there's all these unknown costs, these hidden costs, and all the other costs that we know about have increased. It's all ultimately in aid of the MC1 is better than SR1 argument, right? It's all about saying that one reason SR1 was chosen was because it had a higher benefit cost ratio than SR1 and now look, look at all these costs,
economics at this point."
Well, just think about that statement, Mr. Chair. MC1 is frozen in time. It was never more than a conceptual project, and it's basically frozen in time as of 2017. And to say -- and to embark on an exercise where you're looking at how the costs of SR1 progress every month, year, whatever, and then compare it to MC1 and say, aha, MC1 is now better, that's just not valid.

Finally, just one comment on the section of SCLG's argument on consultation. There's a suggestion that Alberta Transportation pitted neighbour against neighbour and that there was never any attempt made to find a win-win solution.

Mr. Chair, again, I don't think Ms. Hunter or anyone else at the SCLG would deny that the "win" for them is that SR1 doesn't proceed and that something else go ahead. And viewed in that context I ask, you know, how do you arrive at a win-win solution when one party just says this is the only win for us. So consultation is always difficult in terms of satisfying everyone that you carried out proper consultation.

But it is always the case, I would submit, Mr. Chair, that there are some people that are not going to ultimately be happy, who are going to consider that they weren't properly consulted. But, again, it's hard
to consult when someone's position is so fixed and inflexible.

With regard to design, safety, and risk, just a few comments. We noted that our friends asked that recommendations 1, 2, 15, and 17 from the Austin report be imposed as conditions.

And, Mr. Chair, we've already dealt in our argument with our position on all much the Austin recommendations. I just simply reiterate here that it is for the director of dam safety to review and decide whether those recommendations should be implemented or not, and so we don't think, therefore, it would be appropriate for the Board to impose any conditions related to the recommendations of Austin Engineering.

My friend briefly referred to, in paragraph 263, to the fact that there was an error made by Mr. Wood in that snowpack data, you may recall, from the -- I think it was the Elbow summit station. And I just simply say that while Mr. Wood acknowledged that he had made an error, he also went on to say that it didn't change anything. It did not affect the analysis that had been carried out. It was something that actually arose at the hearing. And it does not change Alberta Transportation's climate change assessment results that used IDF data and hydrological modelling for climate
change impacts. So, in our view, Mr. Chair, it's a non-issue.

Just turning to water. I noticed Mr. Secord mentioned that his client Mary Robinson is concerned about the head pond backing up onto her property. And in reply, Mr. Chair, this was addressed directly during my redirect of the Topic 3-- sorry, the Topic 4-- no, it was Topic 3 witness panel.

And you recall there was a map that we were all looking at, Exhibit 131, PDF page 565. And what that map shows, Mr. Chair, is that the head pond does not get particularly close to Ms. Robinson's property. By that I mean her -- what I would call her home quarter, the southwest of 3 . The head pond doesn't even impinge at al1 on that property.

In paragraph 287 there is what I would characterize as a bit of a throw-away comment about the "absurdity," that was the word that was used, of Alberta Transportation's fish rescue plan.

And I would just simply say in reply that that assertion is contrary to the evidence of the SCLG's own expert, Mr. Locke, who clearly doesn't think it's absurd, but rather explicitly said it was reasonable.

There was quite a bit of argument from SCLG with respect to hydrogeology, just as there had been a lot of
cross-examination on the issue. And Alberta Transportation does want to make a specific reply to paragraph 290, that's 2-9-0, of the written version of SCLG's argument because that's where they characterize Mr. Yoshisaka as having been evasive. And Mr. Secord referred to the fact that sometimes he had to ask questions three different times.

Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation submits that's a completely unfair characterization. Mr. Yoshisaka was not evasive, in our submission. Rather, the reason Mr. Secord had to ask questions several times was because he just wasn't getting the answers that he was hoping he would get. And that happens all the time in cross-examination, as I'm sure you know.

In our submission, Mr. Yoshisaka was entirely credible. It was a long, tough cross-examination. He was quiet, calm, patient, thoughtful, and we are very comfortable leaving it to the Board to determine which expert on hydrogeology the Board thinks is more credible. In our submission, there's no doubt that Mr. Yoshisaka was an entirely credible witness.

Stil1 on hydrogeology, Mr. Chair, again, I think there were a number of paragraphs in the written version of the argument that were written in response to what Alberta Transportation said in its argument -- and I
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don't want to get into the details of which layer is above which layer and what the conductivity of the water is, et cetera.

But I do want to just, as an example, I guess, draw to the Board's attention paragraph 295 of the SCLG's argument, where a very basic assertion is made. The K value for the top three layers is indicated as being 7.2 times 10 to the minus 8 metres per second.

We11, that's just not correct, Mr. Chair. The K value in fact is 5.10 times 10 to the minus 6 . This is one of these points where Dr. Fenne11 had advanced his position and it was actually shown on cross-examination to be not correct, and yet here we see it again showing up in final argument. So it doesn't matter, you know, whether Dr. Fennell was right or wrong, it's his position.

And so the submission I guess I want to make about the portion of the SCLG's argument on hydrogeology is that it's obviously based on the evidence of Dr. Fennel1.

And, frankly, in our submission, Dr. Fennell was more an advocate than an independent expert. And you can see that because in these paragraphs of the SCLG's argument he continues to argue points that were demonstrated on cross-examination not to be correct, and
yet it doesn't seem to have made any difference whatsoever. And I'm just going to leave it at that.

So turning, then, to Topic Session 5. The suggestion was made beginning at paragraph 325 of the SCLG argument that there will be unsafe PM 2.5 levels at area schools.

And, in fact, Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation's air modelling does not show any exceedance of PM 2.5 at any of these schools. And this can be clearly seen at Slides 13 or 14 of the PowerPoint presentation of Mr. Person, which was part of the opening statement of Alberta Transportation in Topic Session 5.

But, to be clear, you know, this suggestion that the children at these schools are going to be exposed to unsafe, unacceptable levels of fugitive dust emissions, that's not at all, Mr. Chairman, what the evidence shows.

I think the only other thing I want to say on air is I've already drawn to your attention, Mr. Chair, that beginning at paragraph 346 of the written version of SCLG's argument, there's about 15 paragraphs where Dr. Zelt, I think it's quite clear, responded to our argument. And in those 15 paragraphs Dr. Zelt uses the word "bias" seven times.

And, Mr. Chair, Alberta Transportation understands
that, you know, in a contested hearing emotions can run high. Usually, though, that's something that happens with, you know, the interveners themselves. They're emotional because it affects them personally. It seems to us fundamentally different when you're talking about experts. Experts are supposed to be independent and objective, and, of course, experts disagree. We wouldn't have hearings if experts didn't disagree. If they all agreed, there would be no hearings.

But just because someone holds a different view, some qualified expert holds a different view from you, that does not make that person biased. Bias, Mr. Chair, in our view, is a serious allegation. And with all due respect to $\operatorname{Dr}$. Zelt, $I$ think -- I think this fairly indiscriminate use of the word "bias" discredits him. So that's all I'm going to say on that.

So you'11 be very happy to hear, Mr. Chair, we're basically at the end of our reply submissions. I just want to conclude by picking up on a few things my friend Mr. Kruhlak said, and that just relates to conditions.

Generally speaking, I guess I would say both the Stoney Nakoda Nations and the SCLG, and also Mr. Williams for Calalta and Mr. Wagner, have urged upon the Board that you impose a fairly lengthy set of conditions on an approval, if granted, for this project.

And Alberta Transportation just asks the Board to be cautious in assessing these requests for conditions.

And, in our view, in assessing the appropriateness of any given condition the Board should be asking itself the same question, really, as it asks itself with respect to the project generally, and that is, is this condition really required to make approval of the project in the public interest? In other words, conditions should not be imposed unless they contribute to making a project in the public interest.

So, for example, and this I think will be my only reference to Calalta, one of their suggested conditions is: (as read)
"We are asking Alberta Transportation to recognize and compensate for the lands that are sterilized for the life of this agreement (that's the franchise agreement) and our beneficial right
(that's again under the franchise agreement). (And then) We're requesting
the Board to make this a condition of approval."

Well, with respect, Mr. Chair, a condition that a proponent compensate another party for alleged sterilization of rights under an agreement is just
simply not an appropriate use of the condition power. So I just -- I use that just as an example. I think there are others.

But, again, we just simply say to the Board, look, we do understand there will be conditions -- in the event the project is approved, we understand and accept that there will be conditions attached to any approval. But we -- we -- we don't want to see conditions that don't actually contribute to the public interest. That's, I guess, the point I'd like to finish with.

So, Mr. Chair, I'm just going to ask, if I may, quickly consult with Mr. Hebert, but I think Alberta Transportation is done, but $I$ just would like to check if that's all right with you, sir.

THE CHAIR: Absolutely.
MR. FITCH: Thank you.
(DISCUSSION OFF THE RECORD)
MR. FITCH:
Mr. Chairman, Board members, that is, indeed, the end of the reply submissions of Alberta Transportation.

Like my learned friend, Mr. Kruhlak, I want to reiterate the thanks of Alberta Transportation for the Board's patience during these last 11 days.

And we know the job you now have is challenging, and we're happy to leave it in your capable hands and
we look forward to receiving a decision in due course. THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Fitch, and thank you, Mr. Kruhlak.

I do have some closing remarks on behalf of the Pane1, and, really, a lot of it is our notes of appreciation and I think they're warranted. I'11 only be about five, six minutes, but $I$ think they're warranted given the length of time and commitment that all of the participants have shown through the last, essentially, two weeks of hearing.

And I think Mr. Wiebe is going to throw up the Panel members in these different speaker views and gallery views. I think we've been somewhat recognizable because of our backgrounds, but sometimes it may be hard to find us, including our legal counsel Ms. Vance and Mr. Kennedy.

And I'm also appreciative of the fact that we were able to have a YouTube feed for the public, and I certainly hope that, you know, that worked out well for those that, of course, weren't able to join within sort of the virtual hearing room that we had. I know that their views, in terms of the virtual view that YouTube can provide, is a little bit different, so it may have been a bit more awkward for some YouTube viewers to sort of kind of figure out the parties as we were
$09: 55$
switching back and forth, but, hopefully, after at least some time they got somewhat familiar with the names and some of the faces and were able to piece that together virtually.

And perhaps there's some, and perhaps many folks that were able to participate via YouTube that may not have been able to participate at all if we were in our old school in-person hearing. And thanks for the technology and MNP for having that -- or allowing that to happen.
document managers up on screen last week to thank them, but I did want to, once again, acknowledge their hard work over the course of the two-week hearing.

And a big thank you to Mr. Justin Wiebe with MNP who Zoom hosted the entire hearing.

Mr. Wiebe, you flew solo the entire hearing and did so remarkably well. You had participants up almost instantaneously into speaker views. You arranged the speaker views in order to make sense for those viewing, and every day you started admitting participants pretty early in the morning and we concluded fairly late in the day, and you did that all on your own, and we really do appreciate it. So on behalf of the NRCB and all the hearing participants, I'd like to give you a big thank you.

As many of you have mentioned in your closing remarks, Ms. Friend has been an incredible resource and help to you. On top of the work that she's done with all of you, she also supports the Board and Board staff.

Ms. Friend -- and Mr. Wiebe, you could perhaps bring Ms. Friend up on the screen as well -Ms. Friend, if you could have your video on, you've been an amazing support to the entire hearing process, and on behalf of the Panel and again all the
participants, a big thank you.
And, of course, for the Board, we have Ms. Vance and Mr. Kennedy, our legal counse1. This is Ms. Vance's first hearing with the NRCB and she flattened a pretty steep learning curve because with her sharp intellect and plain old hard work. Ms. Vance is an extremely capable legal counsel and an extremely hard worker.

Mr. Kennedy, you have been, and continue to be, a huge asset to the Board and our stakeholders.

For those of you that don't know, Mr. Kennedy joined the NRCB way back -- and, sorry, Mr. Kennedy, this will perhaps age you a little bit -- but you joined the Board upon its inception in 1991, some 30 years ago. Many of you have come across Mr. Kennedy in the past hearings, with the NRCB perhaps, or in some of Mr. Kennedy's work with the ERCB or the AUC, and you know him to be calm under fire, well-reasoned, and an even-handed approach to his counsel.

So, Mr. Kennedy, I would like to thank you for your guidance and assistance that you provided this Panel and to me personally as Chair.

And I know all of you have thanked the court reporters, and what an incredibly difficult job they have. We all rely upon those transcripts heavily, both
by the participants, the parties through the hearing process as you prepare for each day; but also, of course, for the Panel in our deliberations we rely heavily on those transcripts.

A big thanks to Ms. DiPaolo, Ms. Gerbrandt. And Ms. Vespa, who's with us again today, and I think you, Ms. Vespa, have spent the most time during this hearing process, and it's been delightful working with you. Thank you very much.

And the Pane1 has benefited -- you don't see these folks, you might see their names on the hearing panels, but our environmental technical experts with the NRCB have been a huge help to the Board in terms of reviewing the EIA and assisting us with technical questions and matters that we have: Mr. Mike Iwanyshyn, Ms. Stephanie Fleck, Mr. Scott Cunningham and Ms. Carina Weisbach have attended the entirety of the hearing, and they all bring their unique expertise to assist the Panel in the review of the EIA and also the evidentiary portions that we receive throughout the hearing. So a big thanks to our technical staff.

And, of course, the Panel would like to thank all of you, all of the parties, for your participation in this review process, including all the legal counsels who have been excellent.

We would like to thank all the parties for the enormous amount of work that you put in to preparing for the hearing, and, indeed, the amount of energy many of you put into advocating your positions on the project since 2014. You did so professionally, constructively, and respectfully, and we appreciate that.

And I would like to thank, on behalf of all of us, and send our appreciation to the Stoney Nakoda elders that participated and shared their views in the hearing, but also for their prayers. So thank you, Elders Jackson Wesley, Elder Henry Holloway and Elder John Snow.

And given that this is the last day of the hearing, and with only Alberta Transportation's reply on the agenda, it's clearly a short day and I expect that there may be applicant and intervener experts and impacted landowners that may or may not have been able to join via YouTube today.

So I would ask that respective counsels pass along the Panel's sincere gratitude for all the work they have done for this process and the commitment to their cause over the years.

The Panel is keenly aware that this decision weighs heavily on landowners. Should the project be
approved, there is direct impacts to those landowners who must give up land and, in some cases, heritage ranches. If the project were to be denied, further delay of flood mitigation would clearly weigh heavily on many landowners and businesses impacted by the 2013 flood.

The entire Pane1, all the parties, have our heartfelt appreciation for the time, effort, and emotional investment that all landowners have put into this process.

So the Panel takes our responsibility seriously. We understand that our decision to determine whether this project is in the public interest will impact many people for years to come.

The entirety of the record, including transcripts and submissions to this hearing, will be considered in reaching our decision.

And our long-standing performance target of the Board is to release decisions under the NRCB Act within 80 working days of concluding the hearing. This is not the review of SR1.
$\qquad$

on this Board and to serve Alberta, alongside Panel members Mr. Ceroici, Dr. Heaney, and Ms. Roberts for

I would like to thank everyone once again, and with that this hearing is now closed.
(PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 10:05 A.M.)
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| deferred [1] - | document [3] - | 2846:19 | 2818:9 | floods [1] - 2833:19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2821:24 | 2815:22; 2818:5; | energy [1]-2852:3 | explicitly [4] | floor [1] - 2815:3 |
| degree [1] - 2816:22 | 2849:1 | Engineering [1] - | 2833:10, 12, 17 | Ws [1] - 2837:3 |
| deliberations [2] - | docume | 2839:14 | 2840:23 | focused [1] - |
| 2825:14; 2851:3 delightful [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2817:19; 2822:6; } \\ & \text { 2848:25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { enormous [1] } \\ & \text { 2852:2 } \end{aligned}$ | exposed <br> 2843:14 | 2829:10 <br> folks [3] - 2848:5, |
| 2851:8 | done [4] - 2824:12; | ensure [1] - 2825:2 | extensiv | 17; 2851:11 |
| deliver [2]-2826:4, | 2846:13; 2849:18; | enters [1] - 2836:5 | 2821:22; 2827:19 | following [2] - |
| 14 | 2852:22 | entire [3] - 2849:5, | extent [2]-2822:11; | 2820:11; 2831:19 |
| ${ }_{2842: 25}^{\text {demonstrated [1] }}$ | Do |  | 2828:7 | follows [1] - 2828 |
| deny [1] - 2838:15 | Douglas | 2836:22; 2841:15, 21 | 2817:13; 2850:7 | $2818: 14$ |
| depiction [1] - | 2813:21 | :17 |  | forms [1] - 2821:22 |
| 2819:9 | down [2]-2829:2; | Environment [1] - | F | [1]-2848:1 |
| describe | 2830:8 |  |  | 820.23. |
| 2818:11 descript | downstream [2] <br> 2831:4; 2837:5 | environmental [2] 2829:8; 2851:12 | faces [1] - 2848:3 <br> fact [13]-2816:14; | 2820:23; 2847:1 |
| 2821:15 | Dr [9]-2826:20 | equivalent [1] | 2817:18; 2819:6; | 2836:4 |
| desecration [1] - | 2827:1; 2842:11, 15 , | 2837:4 | 2826:2; 2827:1 | ur [2]-2832:25; |
| 2818:25 | 20-21; 2843:22; | ERCB [1] - 2850:17 | 2832:21; 2834:6 | 2835:5 |
| design [6]-2833:24; | 2844:14 | Erlton [1] - 2831:7 | 2836:18; 2839:16; | franchise [2] - |
| 2834:3, 13, 21; | draw [1] - 2842:4 | error [2] - 2839:16, | 2841:6; 2842:10; | 2845:17, 19 |
| 2837:3; 2839:3 | drawn [1] - 2843:19 |  | 2843:7; 2847:17 | frankly [3]-2826:13; |
| despite [1] - 2817:18 <br> details [1] - 2842:1 | drew [1] - 2834:25 | essentially $[5]-$ 2819:7: $2822: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { factors }[1]-2830: 19 \\ & \text { facts }[1]-2815: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 2829:11; 2842:21 Free $[2]$ - 2813:20; |
| determine [1] - | 2847:1 | 2827:12; 2828:1 | fair [2]-2817:23; | 2831:7 |
| 2841:18 | during [4]-2835:25; | 2847:10 | 2826:25 | free [1] - 2820:9 |
| determining [1] - | 2840:6; 2846:23; | et [1] - 284 | fairly [3] - 2844:14 | frequent [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2828:25 } \\ & \text { develope } \end{aligned}$ | 2851:7 dust [1] | evasive [2] - 2841:5, <br> 10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 24; 2849:11 } \\ & \text { familiar }[1]-284 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2835: 22 \\ & \text { Friend }[3]-2813: 11 \text {; } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2830:12 | duty [2]-2818:8, 12 | even-handed [1] | Farm [1] - 2832:23 | 2849:22 |
| d | dwelt [1] - 2837:8 | 2850:19 | favour [1]-2831:1 | friend [11]-2815 |
| 2821:8; 2823:21 development | E | 2 | feed [1] - 2847:18 | 2831:10; 2834:25; |
| 2823:12; 2836:25 |  | dence [14] | Fennell [5] - 2827: | 2837:22; 2839:15; |
| difference [1] - | early [1] - 2849:11 | 2816:8; 2819:7; | 2842:11, 15, 20 | 2844:19; 2846:21; |
| 2843:1 | echo [1] - 2825:12 | 2822:24; 2829:23; | few [4]-2827:24; | 2849:17, 21 |
| different [12] - | economic [1] - | 2830:4; 2834:11; | 2839:3; 2844:19; | friend's [3] - |
| 2832:18; 2833:3, 5; | 2829:9 | 2836:5, 13, 16-17; | 2848:20 | 2832:10, 15; 2835:25 |
| 2835:2; 2837:21; | economics [1] | 2840:21; 2842:19; | figure [1] - 2847:25 | friends [2] - 2834:9; |
| 2841:7; 2844:5, | 2838:1 | 2843:16; 2848:15 | final [11] - 2814:10; | 2839:4 |
| 10-11; 2847:12, 23; | Edmonton [1] - | evidentiary [1] - | 2815:12, 18; 2820:24; | frozen [2] - 2838:3 |
| 2848:11 | 2813:2 | 2851:20 | 2822:1; 2824:18; | fugitive [1]-2843:15 |
| difficult [3]-2825:2; | effect [2] - 2830:5; | examination [7] - | 2826:6, 21; 2837:11; | fulfill [1] - 2824:23 |
| 2838:20; 2850:24 | 2836:19 | 2836:1; 2841:1, 14 | 2842:14; 2848:15 | fulfillment [1] - |
| DiPaolo [1] - 2851:5 | effectiv | 16; 2842:13, $25 ;$ | finally [1] - 2838:9 | 2824:25 |
| direct [1] - 2848:14 | 2835:12 | 2848:15 | fine [1] - 2826:10 | full [2] - 2819:24; |
| directed [1] - | effectively [1] - | example [5] - | finish [2]-2827:17; | 2820:9 |
| 2824:15 | 2835:15 | 2826:18; 2829:25; | 2846:10 | fully [2] - 2829:22; |
| directly [1] - 2840:6 director [1] - | effects [1] - 2829:9 effort [2]-2816:17; | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2842:4; 2845:11; } \\ & \text { 2846:2 } \end{aligned}$ | Fiona [1] - 2813:10 fire [1] - 2850:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 2830: 11 \\ & \text { fulsome }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2839:10 ${ }^{\text {[ }}$ | 2829:10 ${ }^{\text {e }}$ - ${ }^{\text {2816.17, }}$ | exceedance ${ }_{[1]}$ | first [6] - 2819:16, | 2816:17; 2818:11 |
| disagree [3] - | EIA [2] - 2851:14, 19 | 2843:8 | 22; 2835:11, 14; | fund [1] - 2822:17 |
| 2830:7; 2844:7 | eight ${ }_{[1]}$ - 2832:25 | excellent [1] - | 2850:4 | fundamental [1] - |
| disagreements [1] - | either [2]-2833:17; | 2851:25 | First [3] - 2817:8; | 2815:16 |
| 2815:16 | 2836:24 | exception [1] | 2821:5; 2823:17 | fundamentally [1] - |
| discharge [3] - | Elbow [3] - 2830:2; | 2816:13 | fish [1] - 2840:19 | 2844:5 |
| 2834:8, 12, 21 discharges [1] - | 2835:16; 2839:18 Elder [3]-2818:23; | exceptions [1] - | $\begin{gathered} \text { Fitch [6] - 2813:16; } \\ \text { 2815:1, 8; 2825:12, } \end{gathered}$ | funding [4]- $2822: 20 ; 2824:$ |
| 2834:1 | 2852:12 | exercise [1] - 2838:5 | 16; 2847:2 |  |
| disclose [2] - | elders [1] - 2852:9 | exhibit [1] - 2826:10 | FITCH [4] - 2825:17, | future [1] - 2820:4 |
| 2833:11, 14 discourage [1] - | Elders [1] - 2852:12 elsewhere $[1]$ - | Exhibit [9]-2815:13, 22: 2818:6, 13 : | $\begin{gathered} \text { 20; 2846:16, } 18 \\ \text { five }[2]-2816: 19 ; \end{gathered}$ | G |
| 2836:24 | 2836:23 | 2819:7; 2821:4; | 2847:7 |  |
| discredi | embark [1] - $2838: 5$ | 2823:25; 2833:2 | fixed [1] - 2839:1 | gallery [1] - 2847:13 |
| 2844:15 | emergencies [1] - | 2840:10 | flattened [1] - 2850:5 | Gavin [1] - 2813:16 |
| discussion [3] - | 2834:19 | existential [1] - | Fleck [2] - 2813:13; | general [2] |
| 2818:11; 2821:16; | emissions [1] - | 2829:2 | 2851:16 | 2815:14; 2829:12 |
| 2823:16 | 2843:15 | expect [1]-2852:16 | flew [1] - 2849:6 | generally [3] - |
| DISCUSSION [1] - | ${ }_{\text {2 }}^{\text {emotional }}$ [1] - | expected [1]- |  | 2817:5; 2844:21; 2845:6 |
| disrespectful $_{[1]}$ - | ${ }_{\text {emotions }}{ }^{\text {[1] - }}$ | expert [4] - 2840:22; | 2831:7 | ${ }_{\text {2 }}$ generating [1] - |
| 2817:14 | 2844:1 | 2841:19; 2842:22; | flood [15] - 2819:25; | 2825:7 |
| distance [1] - | encourage [1] - | 2844:11 | 2830:1; 2831:23; | Gerbrandt [2] - |
| 2823:11 | 2824:21 | expertise [1] - | 2832:3, 5, 8; 2833:20; |  |
| distant [1] - 2817:8 districts [1]- | encourages [1] $2823 \cdot 22$ | 2851:18 | 2834:2, 7, 14; <br> 2835:15. 2836.25 . | Gino [1] - 2813:20 <br> given [6] - 2830:15 |
| 2836:24 | end [6] - 2827:5; | 2835:11; 2844:6-8; | 2837:3 | 2831:2; 2835:11; |
| Diversion [3] - | 2828:23; 2832:9; | 2851:12; 2852:17 | flooding [1] - | 2845:4; 2847:8; |
| 2831:12, 23; 2832:11 | 2833:10; 2844:18; | explanation [1] - | 2818:25 | 2852:14 |
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| vince [1] | ```2819:4; 2831:21; 2836:3,13 recorded [1] - 2822:9 redirect [1] - 2840:7 reduced [1] - 2832:25 reducing [1] - 2837:3 refer [6]-2815:20; 2818:6, 16; 2820:13; 2821:4; 2833:22 reference [11] -``` | ```requested [1] - 2820:16 requesting [1] - 2845:20 requests [3] - 2824:19; 2845:2; 2848:16 require [1] - 2825:9 required [3] -``` | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & \text { Ron }[2]-2813: 15 ; \\ & \text { 2815:6 } \\ & \text { room }[2]-2834: 24 ; \\ & \text { 2847:21 } \\ & \text { RPR [1] - 2814:5 } \\ & \text { rules [3] -2827:14 } \\ & \text { run [1] }-2844: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & \text { set }[4]-2819: 16 ; \\ & \text { 2820:16; 2823:18; } \\ & \text { 2844:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2819:23 |  |  |  |  |
| rovince [1] - 2820:3 |  |  |  |  |
| ovisions [1] - |  |  |  |  |
| 2822:14 |  |  |  | seven [1] - 2843:24 <br> several [3] - 2815:20; |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 2829:1, 7, 17, 20, 22; |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2833:16; 2841:11 } \\ & \text { shared [1] - 2852:10 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2830: 20 ; 2835: 10 \\ & 2845: 8,10 ; 2846: 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | sharing [1] - $2821: 7$ <br> sharp [1] - $2850: 6$ |
| 2847:18 |  | 2824:10; 2845:7; | S |  |
| purpose [1] - 2831:3 |  | 2848:14 |  | short [1] - 2852:16 show [1] - 2843:8 <br> show [1] - $2843: 8$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { purposes [1] - } \\ & \text { 2816:25 } \end{aligned}$ |  | escue [1] - 2840 | sacred [1] - 2822:16 |  |
|  | 2815:24; 2817:20; | voir | safety [2]-2839:3, | showed [2] - 2819:8; |
| pursued [1] - 2835:1 pushed [1] - 2826:8 put [2]-2852:2, 4 | 2818:1, 21; 2820:8 | 2836:5; 2837:6 | 10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2848:22 } \\ & \text { showing [1] - } \\ & \text { 2842:14 } \\ & \text { shown [2]-2842:12; } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 11; 2821:13; 2822:5, | Reservoir [1] - | Sandi [1] - 2813:8 |  |
|  | 21; 2832:13; 2845:12 | 2837:6 | Sara [2]-2813:18, |  |
| Q | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2815:20; 2816:15, 22; } \\ & \text { 2818:12; 2832:10 } \\ & \text { referred [6] - } \end{aligned}$ |  | satisfying [1] - |  |
|  |  | Resources [2] - | 2838:20 | 2847:9 <br> shows [5] - 2833:25; |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q.C [3]-2813:15, } 19 \\ & \text { qualified [1]- } \end{aligned}$ |  | $2813: 1 ; 2822: 14$ | saw | 2834:2, 6; 2840:11; |
|  | 2818:22; 2830:16, 18; | rc | 2835:2 | 2843:17 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ |
| 2844:11 | 2837:22; 2839:15; | 2824:10 | scenarios [1] - |  |
| quality [1] - 2816:23 | 2841:6 | espect [16] | 2834:2 | 2831:5 |
| quarter [1] - 2840:13 | referring | 12; 2818:2; 2821:17, | schedules [1] - | similar [1] - 2815:14 |
| Queen's [1] - 2816:1 | 2818:23; 28 | 23; 2822:6, 13; | 2825:3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { similarly [1] -2818:7 } \\ & \text { simple [1] }-2834: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| questions [5] - | fers [1] - 2831:10 | 2824:19; 2825: | school [1] - 2848:8 <br> schools [3] - 2843:6, |  |
| 2828:22; 2837:13 | reform [1]-2822:18 | 2827:25; 2837:7 |  | simple [1]-2834:22 <br> simply [11] - |
| 2841:7, 11; 2851:15 | refuses [1] - 2833:11 | 2840:25; 2844: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 9, } 14 \\ & \text { SCLG }[22]-2815: 10 ; \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2818: 16 ; 2820: 13 \\ & 2829: 19 ; 2830: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| quickly [2] - | refusing [1] - | 2845:6, 23; 2848:2 |  |  |
| 2814:17; 2846:12 | 2833:14 | respectfully [2] - | 2825:23; 2826:1; | 2831:21; 2833:21; |
| quiet [1] - 2841:1 | gard | 2816:2; 2852:6 | 2827:11; 2828:4, | 2839:9, 18; 2840:20; |
| quite [6] - 2826:15, | 2829:8; 2839:3 | respective [2] | 13-14, 20; 2829:16; | 2846:1, 4 |
| 20; 2827:15; 2837:12 | regulation [1] | 2825:9; 2852:20 | 2830:25; 2832:4; | sincere [1] - 2852:21 |
| 2840:24; 2843:22 | 2822:16 | responded [2] - | 2833:9, 17; 2834:15 | site [1] - 2823:10 |
| $\text { quo [1] - } 2830: 1$ | Rehabilitation [1] | 2818:4; 2843:22 | 23; 2835:21; 2837:7; | sites [3] - 2818:25; |
|  | 2832:23 | responding [2] | 2838:15; 2840:24; | 2819:4; 2822:10 |
| R | 1846:22 [2] 2839:9; |  | SCLG's [10] |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 2846: 22 \\ & \text { reject }[1]-2833: 15 \\ & \text { rejects }[1]-2829: 21 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 816:20; 2819:1; |
| Rae |  | 2 | 2836: | X [1] - 2847:7 |
| 2814:21 | related [1] - 2839:14 | 2831:18; 2836:15 | 2840:21; 2841:4 | Slides [1] - 2843:10 |
| RAE [1] - 2814:22 | relates [1] - 2844:20 | 2841:24 | 2842:5, 18, 23; | Snow [2] - 2818:23; |
| raised [1] - 2824:25 | relating [1]-2832.15 | restrict | 2843:21 | 2852:13 |
| rate [2] - 2834:8, 13 | relation [1] - 2825:23 | 2822:12 | Scott [4] - 2813: | snowpack [1] - |
| rather [3] - 2832:6 | relativ | result [1] - 28 | 2814:4; 2851:16 | 2839:17 |
| 2840:23; $2841: 10$ | 2815:11 | resulted [1] - | screen [2]-2849: | so.. [1] - 2815:12 |
| ratio [1] - 2837:20 | leased [1] - 283 | 2828:17 |  | ocial [1] - 2829:8 |
| read [5] - 2816:6; | relevance [2] - | sulting [1] - 2819:1 | searche | solo [1] - 2849:6 |
| 2817:3; 2819:17; | 2817:8; 2837:2 | results [1] - 2839:24 | 2817:18 | solution [2] - |
| 2837:24; 2845:13 | relevant [2] - 2820:6; | retroactively [1] - | second | 2838:13, 18 |
| reading [1] - 2832:21 | 2836:20 | 2836:21 | 2819:24; 2834:8, 13 | someone [1] - |
| real [1] - 2829:6 | rel | verse | 2842:8 | 2844:10 |
| reality [1] - 2829:5 | 285 | review [10] - 2824:7, | secondly | sometimes [2] - |
| really [9]-2827:21, | remarkab | 14; 2825:6; 2829:12; | 2825:5 | 2841:6; 2847:14 |
| 24; 2829:1; 2836:1; | 2849:7 | 2833:1, 6; 2839:10; | Secord [13] - 2814 | somewhat [2] - |
| 2845:5, 7; 2847:5; | remarks | 2851:19, 24 | 18; 2826:4, 14, 22; | 2847:13; 2848:2 |
| 2848:23; 2849:13 | 2849:17 | reviewed | 2830:16; 2831:10; | sorry [3] - 2827:25 |
| realtime [1] - | remind [1] - 2834:16 | 2822:25; 2832:23 | 2834:25; 2836:13, 18; | 2840:7; 2850:12 |
| 2826:16 | reminded [1] - | reviewing [2] - | 2840:3; 2841:5, 11 | sort [4] - 2828:12 |
| reason [4] - 2826:12; | 2824:24 | 2820:7; 2851:14 | SECORD [1] - | 2829:12; 2847:20, 25 |
| 2827:5; 2837:18; | repatriati | revised [1] - 2831:12 | 2814:19 | southwest [1] - |
| 2841:10 | 2822:16 | rhetorical [1] - | Secord's [1] - | 2840:14 |
| reasonable [2] - | reply [18] | 2829:18 | 2830:21 | speaker [3] - |
| 2816:24; 2840:23 | 2815:15, 22; 2818:5, | Richard [1] - 2814:1 | section [1] - 2838:9 | 2847:12; 2849:8 |
| reasoned [1] - | 13; 2825:21; 2827:4, | rights [4]-2815:25; | see [7] - 2824:7; | speaking [1] - |
| 2850:18 | 9, 12, 19, 2836:11; | 2817:9; 2818:3; | 2833:25; 2842:13, 23; | 2844:21 |
| reasons [1] - | 2840:6, 20; 2841:2; | 2845:25 | 2846:8; 2851:10 | specific [3] - |
| 2830:17 | 2844:18; 2846:19; | risk [4]-2834:17, | seek [1] - 2821:10 | 2815:20; 2829:14; |
| receive [1] - 2851:20 receiving [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2852:15 } \\ & \text { report [2] - 2833:? } \end{aligned}$ | 22; 2839:3 | seeking [2] 2819:22; 2823:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2841:2 } \\ & \text { speculation [1] - } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2820:24; 2847:1 | 2839:5 | River [5] - 2813:1 | seem [2] - 2825:1 | 2835:7 |
| recognizable [1] - | reported [1] - 2835:7 | 2820:1, 3; 2830:2; | 2843:1 | spent [1] - 2851:7 |
| 2847:14 | reporters [1] - | 2835:16 | select [1] - 2833:4 | SR1 [16] - 2814:1; |
| recognize [1] - | 2850:24 | road [1] - 2830:8 | send [1] - 2852:9 | 2819:5, 20; 2820:7; |
| 2845:15 | Reporters [1] | Roberts [1] - 2813:8 | Senek [1] - 2813:17 | 2829:4, 22; 2833:4, |
| recommendations | 2814:5 | Robinson [1] - | sense [1] - 2849:9 | 2834:4, 16; 2837:4, |
| [4]-2839:5, 9, 11, 14 | reports [1] - 2818:19 | 2840:4 | sentence [1]- | 17, 19-20; 2838:6, 16 |
| RECORD [1] - | request [3] - | Robinson's [1] | 2832:21 | staff [3] - 2848:24; |
| 2846:17 | 2822:17; 2823:3; | 2840:12 | serious [1] - 2844:13 | 2849:20; 2851:21 |
| record [5] - 2816:16; | 2824:9 | Rocky [2] - 2836:12, | Session [2]-2843:3, | Staff [5] - 2813:11 |
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| stakeholders [1] - | supposed [1] - | 2843:12, 25; 2845:1, | Vance [4] - 2813:10; | 2841:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2850:10 | 2844:6 | 14; 2846:13, 20, 22; | 2847:16; 2850:2, 6 | Woloshyn [1] - |
| start [1] - 2814:13 | Supreme [1] - | 2848:19 | Vance's [1] - 2850:4 | 2813:7 |
| started [1] - 2849:10 | 2818:19 | Transportation's | variety [1] - 2821:22 | Women [1] - 2821:11 |
| statement [5] - | switching [1] - | [10] - 2814:11; 2818:5; | various [2] - 2834:1 | wondering [1] - |
| 2815:14; 2820:22; | 2848:1 | 2819:3, 14; 2826:17, | vast [1] - 2837:5 | 2835:8 |
| 2822:5; 2838:2; |  | 21; 2839:24; 2840:19; | version [8] - 2826:1, | Wood [2] - 2839:16, |
| 2843:11 | T | 2843:7; 2852:15 | 13; 2829:15; 2833:9; |  |
| states [1] - 2833:9 |  | trauma [1]-2818:24 | 2836:10; 2841:3, 23; | word [4] - 2833:12; |
| station [1] - 2839:18 | Table [1] - 2833:25 | Treaty [1] - 2818:3 | 2843:20 | 2840:18; 2843:24; |
| Status [1] - 2821:11 | table [1] - 2834:6 | tremendous [1] - | versus [1] - 2829:3 | 2844:15 |
| status [1] - 2830:1 | tag [1] - 2815:2 | 2848:22 | Vespa [3] - 2814:5; | words [1] - 2845:8 |
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