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|  |  | Page 6381 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Thursday, March 7, 2013 |  |
| 2 | Upon commencing at 9:00 a.m. |  |
| 3 | THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning. We'll |  |
| 4 | reconvene. |  |
| 5 | This morning we have a number of |  |
| 6 | Manitoba Hydro officials who will be responding to |  |
| 7 | questions in respect of the possibility of |  |
| 8 | rerouting Bipole III to Dorsey or other places in |  |
| 9 | Southern Manitoba. |  |
| 10 | It's my understanding that there's no |  |
| 11 | presentation by Manitoba Hydro on this, that's |  |
| 12 | correct? |  |
| 13 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: That's correct. |  |
| 14 | THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So we'll jump |  |
| 15 | right into cross-examination. |  |
| 16 | Mr. Meronek? |  |
| 17 | MR. MERONEK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |  |
| 18 | Good morning, gentlemen. |  |
| 19 | Hearing no response, I'll carry on. |  |
| 20 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: Good morning. |  |
| 21 | MR. MAZUR: Good morning. |  |
| 22 | MR. NEUFELD: Good morning. |  |
| 23 | MR. MERONEK: It's my intention today |  |
|  | or this morning to go over the subject matter that |  |
|  | you have articulated, Mr. Chairman, but I will be |  |

keeping my powder dry, so to speak, with respect
to those components that deal with rebuttal
evidence for next Tuesday. There is sometimes not -- there's a Maginot line between the two, but I'll get as much done as $I$ can today. But I just want to start off with some timing questions, and I leave it up to anybody on the panel to answer. Just to put matters into perspective, the proposal that's presently before the Commission was approved by the Manitoba Hydro Board in September of 2007, roughly? MR. TYMOFICHUK: Yes, that's correct. MR. MERONEK: And I'm getting that from the EIS. And the environmental assessment proposal form, the acronym is EAPF, went to Manitoba Conservation roughly in December of 2009? MR. TYMOFICHUK: I believe that's correct.
MR. MERONEK: And the scoping document was approved by Manitoba Conservation approximately June of 2010?
MR. TYMOFICHUK: That's correct.
MR. MERONEK: And by December 2010,
there had been four rounds of consultation with respect to the preferred route, correct?

| 1 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: That's correct -- no, | Page 6383 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | I stand corrected, three rounds. |  |
| 3 | MR. MERONEK: The fourth round had |  |
| 4 | been initiated in 2010, correct? |  |
| 5 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: Right. I believe we |  |
| 6 | completed our work in the summer of 2011, which |  |
| 7 | identified the preferred final route. |  |
| 8 | MR. MERONEK: Now, Manitoba Hydro |  |
| 9 | filed with the Commission yesterday a report |  |
| 10 | that's entitled "The Ultimate HVDC Development of |  |
| 11 | Manitoba," and it's dated October 14, 2010. |  |
| 12 | You gentlemen are familiar with that |  |
| 13 | report? |  |
| 14 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: Yes, we are. |  |
| 15 | MR. MERONEK: Do you have copies in |  |
| 16 | front of you? |  |
| 17 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. |  |
| 18 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: Yes. |  |
| 19 | MR. MERONEK: And that report was |  |
| 20 | prepared in part by Mr. Mazur, correct? |  |
| 21 | MR. MAZUR: That's right. |  |
| 22 | MR. MERONEK: And signed off by you, |  |
| 23 | Mr. Neufeld? |  |
| 24 | MR. NEUFELD: That's correct. |  |
| 25 | MR. MERONEK: And distributed to |  |


|  | Mr Tymofichuk? | Page 6384 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: Correct. |  |
| 3 | MR. MERONEK: Did you sign off on it |  |
| 4 | too? |  |
| 5 | MR. NEUFELD: No, the executives on |  |
| 6 | the distribution list. |  |
| 7 | MR. MERONEK: All right. This report |  |
| 8 | was prepared in October of 2010 and signed by you, |  |
| 9 | Mr. Neufeld, on November 2, 2010, right in the |  |
| 10 | middle of the consultation process for the final |  |
| 11 | preferred route; is that correct? |  |
| 12 | MR. NEUFELD: Yeah, that's correct. |  |
| 13 | MR. MERONEK: And as I understand this |  |
| 14 | report, it was to deal with issues of future |  |
| 15 | transmission development, correct? |  |
| 16 | MR. NEUFELD: That's correct. |  |
| 17 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. |  |
| 18 | MR. MERONEK: And one of the big |  |
| 19 | components of that report dealt with the issue of |  |
| 20 | reliability, correct? |  |
| 21 | MR. MAZUR: I think it more so dealt |  |
| 22 | with the issue of reliability relative to whether |  |
| 23 | north to south transmission beyond Bipole III |  |
| 24 | would be AC or DC. |  |
| 25 | MR. MERONEK: But it's fair to say |  |


| 1 | that reliability was a major factor that wa | Page 6385 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | considered in that report in terms of what options |  |
| 3 | to promote and which options to disregard, |  |
| 4 | correct? |  |
| 5 | MR. MAZUR: The report looked at the |  |
| 6 | impact of reliability, essentially assuming that |  |
| 7 | if the Bipole III line was not built, what would |  |
| 8 | be some of the converter options? |  |
| 9 | MR. MERONEK: It's a simple question, |  |
| 10 | Mr. Mazur. Reliability was a significant |  |
| 11 | consideration in this report, was it not? |  |
| 12 | MR. MAZUR: Yes, it was, but in the |  |
| 13 | context of the Bipole III line not being there. |  |
| 14 | MR. NEUFELD: And I would also add |  |
| 15 | that the significant focus of the report had to do |  |
| 16 | with technology and what technologies might be |  |
| 17 | applicable. |  |
| 18 | MR. MERONEK: I understand that. |  |
| 19 | We've all read the report. |  |
| 20 | Now, there are two key findings in the |  |
| 21 | report. And if you go to page 2, at the top first |  |
| 22 | of all, it says: |  |
| 23 | "There is a pressing need from a |  |
| 24 | reliability perspective for the third |  |
| 25 | Bipole." |  |


| 1 | Do you see that? | Page 6386 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. |  |
| 3 | MR. MERONEK: And that forms the major |  |
| 4 | assumption for Bipole III in this hearing, |  |
| 5 | correct? |  |
| 6 | MR. MAZUR: This report essentially |  |
| 7 | assumes that Bipole III has been approved. We had |  |
| 8 | approval based on some 2006 planning reports that |  |
| 9 | Bipole III was going to be built and included in |  |
| 10 | the capital plan. |  |
| 11 | MR. MERONEK: Let me ask the question |  |
| 12 | again, Mr. Mazur. Reliability was the cornerstone |  |
| 13 | of promoting Bipole III in this particular |  |
| 14 | application, the EIS? |  |
| 15 | MR. MAZUR: This report deals with |  |
| 16 | what -- |  |
| 17 | MR. MERONEK: I'm not asking about |  |
| 18 | this report. My question relates to the EIS. |  |
| 19 | Reliability was a cornerstone for promoting Bipole |  |
| 20 | III, the final preferred route in the EIS; is that |  |
| 21 | not correct? |  |
| 22 | MR. MAZUR: That is correct, |  |
| 23 | reliability was -- and it was identified as two |  |
| 24 | reliability issues. The reliability to deal with |  |
| 25 | the common Bipole I and II corridor loss, and to |  |


|  | deal with the Dorsey converter loss. | Page 6387 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. MERONEK: Yes. And on the basis |  |
| 3 | of the conclusions drawn in the EIS, Manitoba |  |
| 4 | Hydro is promoting Bipole III, in the final |  |
| 5 | preferred route, or the alternative final |  |
| 6 | preferred route, whichever you choose, correct? |  |
| 7 | MR. MAZUR: That is correct, with the |  |
| 8 | line going on the final preferred route between |  |
| 9 | Keewatinoow and Riel station in the south. |  |
| 10 | MR. MERONEK: Right. |  |
| 11 | Now, it goes on to say that: |  |
| 12 | "If building Bipole III is delayed for |  |
| 13 | some reason, then at some point |  |
| 14 | relocating Bipole II will have to be |  |
| 15 | reconsidered to address the risk of a |  |
| 16 | Dorsey Station outage, even |  |
| 17 | considering the risks that moving the |  |
| 18 | Bipole II inverter entails." |  |
| 19 | Do you see that? |  |
| 20 | MR. MAZUR: Yes, I see that. |  |
| 21 | MR. MERONEK: Do you still subscribe |  |
| 22 | to that proposition? |  |
| 23 | MR. MAZUR: From what we know today, |  |
| 24 | it wouldn't be the first choice. |  |
| 25 | MR. MERONEK: Do you have an updated |  |


|  | study which would indicate what your first choice | Page 6388 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | would be? |  |
| 3 | MR. MAZUR: I think that, as we had |  |
| 4 | issued an IR, that will largely depend on the |  |
| 5 | future resource development plan. |  |
| 6 | MR. MERONEK: Have you done an updated |  |
| 7 | study to this 2010 report which would show your |  |
| 8 | change in thinking? |  |
| 9 | MR. MAZUR: As I said, we have done a |  |
| 10 | lot of preliminary work, and if the preferred plan |  |
| 11 | went ahead, then I think we would be moving to a |  |
| 12 | reliability solution that might involve an |  |
| 13 | export-import line, but nothing has been decided. |  |
| 14 | MR. MERONEK: So you do not have a |  |
| 15 | report, an engineered stamped report to replace |  |
| 16 | this report; is that correct? |  |
| 17 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct. But I'm |  |
| 18 | not sure there is an intent to do it until we have |  |
| 19 | some of the resource plans solidified. |  |
| 20 | MR. NEUFELD: I would also add that |  |
| 21 | nothing's changed. |  |
| 22 | MR. MERONEK: If for some reason, and |  |
|  | let me posit a reason, this Commission decides |  |
|  | that Bipole III, as it's presently constituted, |  |
| 25 | cannot go ahead because of impenetrable |  |

environmental concerns, you would be looking at other options, correct?
MR. MAZUR: That's correct. And I
think we had identified some options in the alternatives report that we studied, one being southern generation.
MR. MERONEK: All right. Southern generation was always on tap, wasn't it? I mean, southern generation was always a possibility at the time that this report was prepared?
MR. MAZUR: It was an alternative. MR. MERONEK: Right. And it's not in this report?
MR. MAZUR: This report was just looking at the concept of whether, beyond Bipole III, we could put more DC into the system or we would have to go to AC. And there's a lot of technical documentation in the report describing the issues and the reasons why.
MR. NEUFELD: Might $I$ also add that
this is a transmission written report. This is
about transportation of electrons. And if
southern system generation was contemplated, that would be done in a different business unit.
MR. MERONEK: But under one corporate

|  | umbrella, correct? | Page 6390 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. NEUFELD: That's correct. But |  |
| 3 | that's the reason why you wouldn't see generation |  |
|  | in a report such as this ultimate DC, or ultimate |  |
| 5 | DC development. |  |
| 6 | MR. MERONEK: Nor did you see in this |  |
| 7 | report the use of gas turbines as an option, |  |
| 8 | correct? |  |
| 9 | MR. NEUFELD: Correct, for the same |  |
| 10 | reason. |  |
| 11 | MR. MERONEK: Right. But yet gas |  |
| 12 | turbines and importation were reliability issues, |  |
| 13 | as comparables, to compare against the Bipole III |  |
| 14 | transmission line in the EIS, correct? |  |
| 15 | MR. MAZUR: That is correct. We did a |  |
| 16 | joint study with the resource planning section of |  |
| 17 | our company. |  |
| 18 | MR. MERONEK: And none of the options |  |
| 19 | that we are about to talk about today in this |  |
| 20 | report were placed in the EIS for comparative |  |
| 21 | purposes, correct? |  |
| 22 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct because |  |
| 23 | none of the options, other than the Bipole III |  |
| 24 | option, as planned and put into the capital plan, |  |
| 25 | addressed the corridor outage and the converter |  |



| 1 | major north/south transmission | Page 6392 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | addition beyond Bipole III." |  |
| 3 | Correct? |  |
| 4 | MR. MAZUR: That's right. |  |
| 5 | MR. MERONEK: And that still stands |  |
| 6 | today? |  |
| 7 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. |  |
| 8 | MR. MERONEK: All right. And that |  |
| 9 | high capacity high voltage AC transportation line |  |
| 10 | would have to be a 500 kV AC line, would it not? |  |
| 11 | MR. MAZUR: At this point, it would |  |
| 12 | really depend on what future generation it was |  |
| 13 | going to be designed to provide outlet for. |  |
| 14 | MR. MERONEK: But you wouldn't put |  |
| 15 | something less than a 500 kV AC line coming from |  |
| 16 | the north to the south? |  |
| 17 | MR. MAZUR: Yeah, I think it would be |  |
| 18 | 500 kV . The question would be the capacity. |  |
| 19 | MR. MERONEK: Right. |  |
| 20 | MR. NEUFELD: And then the capacity |  |
| 21 | would be established as a requirement for |  |
| 22 | generation outlet. |  |
| 23 | MR. MERONEK: Right. And that 500 |  |
| 24 | kV AC transmission line would have to come down |  |
| 25 | the west side, correct? |  |


| 1 | MR. MAZUR: I don't think I would | Page 6393 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | presume where it would go at this point, but it |  |
| 3 | wouldn't go on the same corridor as the Bipole III |  |
| 4 | line. |  |
| 5 | MR. MERONEK: No, but it wouldn't go |  |
| 6 | down the east side, correct? |  |
| 7 | MR. NEUFELD: Well, we haven't |  |
| 8 | predetermined the corridor for this. This is the |  |
| 9 | future, this is future conceptual. |  |
| 10 | MR. MERONEK: It wouldn't go down the |  |
| 11 | east side, would it? |  |
| 12 | MR. NEUFELD: How would I know that? |  |
| 13 | MR. MERONEK: Okay. Because Bipole |  |
| 14 | III wasn't allowed to go down the east side. |  |
| 15 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct, Bipole III |  |
| 16 | wasn't, but we have no indication whether that |  |
| 17 | east side will be available in the future or not. |  |
| 18 | MR. MERONEK: So if it went down the |  |
| 19 | west side, it wouldn't go down the same corridor, |  |
| 20 | would you accept that it would get pretty crowded |  |
| 21 | in relationship to the Bipole III that's presently |  |
| 22 | proposed? |  |
| 23 | MR. NEUFELD: Well, from a |  |
| 24 | transmission standpoint, you are correct. If |  |
| 25 | we're talking about the central corridor or the |  |


|  |  | Page 6394 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | you've got big transmission lines like this coming |  |
| 3 | down, relative to the spacing required for |  |
| 4 | reliability. |  |
| 5 | MR. MERONEK: All right. Second key |  |
| 6 | finding: |  |
| 7 | "As a long-term reliability goal, |  |
| 8 | Splitting of the Dorsey Bipole I and |  |
| 9 | II inverters into two separate |  |
| 10 | converter station location shall be |  |
| 11 | considered to reduce the amount of |  |
| 12 | power loss due to catastrophic |  |
| 13 | events." |  |
| 14 | Do you see that? |  |
| 15 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. And I would also add |  |
| 16 | that, although this report didn't concentrate on |  |
| 17 | the corridor, it would also be a long-term goal to |  |
| 18 | split the Bipole I and II lines out of the same |  |
| 19 | corridor, otherwise you gain nothing. |  |
| 20 | MR. MERONEK: Right. And that issue |  |
| 21 | remains a problem, that you still got a Bipole I |  |
| 22 | and II at the same Dorsey Station with the same |  |
| 23 | risk? |  |
| 24 | MR. MAZUR: Absolutely, a very |  |
| 25 | significant problem. |  |

MR. NEUFELD: I would add that once Bipole III is in place, it becomes less of a problem. report is it not the case that, with that key finding, that it is still very much in the mindset of Manitoba Hydro to split Bipole I and II because you are not ameliorating the outage with respect to the Dorsey Station; is that not true?
MR. NEUFELD: With Bipole III, that risk becomes significantly suppressed.
MR. MERONEK: By a third, correct?
MR. MAZUR: I think the statement is talking about a long-term goal, it's not talking about a definitive plan or when. MR. MERONEK: I know it's -- you say it's a long-term goal. But is it not the case that if you split Bipole I and II, and you have three inverter stations, your reliability is enhanced over what you are proposing?
MR. MAZUR: In actual fact, it is not. The exposure to the Dorsey converter is reduced, but we still have significant exposure to the corridor loss.
MR. MERONEK: I'm not talking

```
MR. MERONEK: Mr. Neufeld, in this
```

|  | corridor, sir, I'm talking about the inverter | Page 6396 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | stations. |  |
| 3 | MR. MAZUR: You cannot talk about one |  |
| 4 | without the other. |  |
| 5 | MR. MERONEK: I am talking about one |  |
|  | without the other, and I'm asking you to confine |  |
| 7 | your answer to that. If you have Bipole I at one |  |
| 8 | station, Bipole II at another, and Bipole III at a |  |
| 9 | third, are you not reducing the impact of a loss |  |
| 10 | of Dorsey Station more than you would be by what |  |
| 11 | is being proposed here? |  |
| 12 | MR. MAZUR: Yes, you would, but you |  |
| 13 | don't address the corridor loss. |  |
| 14 | MR. MERONEK: Well, we'll get to that, |  |
| 15 | sir. |  |
| 16 | MR. MAZUR: I would also like to point |  |
| 17 | out in that same report, in the executive summary |  |
| 18 | at page 1, there is a statement that says: |  |
| 19 | "Bipole III is definitely the best |  |
| 20 | next addition to the system |  |
| 21 | considering the Bipole I and |  |
| 22 | catastrophic outage exposure. Risks |  |
| 23 | associated with moving Bipole II to |  |
| 24 | another location and the need for |  |
| 25 | further north/south transmission." |  |


| 1 | MR. MERONEK: I'm not going to leave | Page 6397 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | any stone unturned, I assure you, Mr. Mazur, we'll |  |
| 3 | come to that. |  |
| 4 | Over on page 3 in the conclusion of |  |
| 5 | this report at least, in the item number 3, last |  |
| 6 | sentence: |  |
| 7 | "If building the Bipole III |  |
| 8 | transmission line is significantly |  |
| 9 | delayed, then at some point relocating |  |
| 10 | Bipole II from Dorsey will have to be |  |
| 11 | considered." |  |
| 12 | Do you still subscribe to that proposition? |  |
| 13 | MR. MAZUR: Only in the context of the |  |
| 14 | previous sentences. |  |
| 15 | "The best development sequence from a |  |
| 16 | reliability perspective is to have the |  |
| 17 | third Bipole in the separate |  |
| 18 | corridor." |  |
| 19 | MR. MERONEK: If you can't do Bipole |  |
| 20 | III, and just humour me for a moment, if you |  |
| 21 | cannot, if you do not get the licence to build |  |
| 22 | Bipole III as it's presently constituted, will you |  |
| 23 | not have to look at a Bipole II relocation as an |  |
| 24 | option? |  |
| 25 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: Mr. Chairman, if |  |


|  | Bipole III is not licensed, we will have to | Page 6398 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | reconsider all options, including southern gas |  |
| 3 | generation, and this will be in the mix. We |  |
| 4 | cannot definitively say that this is the only |  |
| 5 | option. It's not a preferred option by far. |  |
| 6 | MR. MERONEK: And I'm not suggesting |  |
| 7 | that, sir, I'm just saying it is an option. It's |  |
| 8 | in here, and it's something that you would have to |  |
| 9 | look at, revisit? |  |
| 10 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: In the mix of all the |  |
| 11 | others. |  |
| 12 | MR. MERONEK: Yes, sir. |  |
| 13 | Now, let's go to the options that have |  |
| 14 | been discussed in this report. And we're starting |  |
| 15 | at page 8. And as I see in this particular |  |
| 16 | report, there are seven considerations, is that |  |
| 17 | correct? Status quo and six options? |  |
| 18 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct. |  |
| 19 | MR. MERONEK: And I think we can all |  |
| 20 | agree that the status quo of having Bipoles I and |  |
| 21 | II inverters located at Dorsey cannot be |  |
| 22 | sustained, correct? |  |
| 23 | MR. TYMOFICHUK: Correct. |  |
| 24 | MR. MAZUR: In the context of Bipole |  |
| 25 | III wouldn't be built, I would say that's correct. |  |


| 1 | MR. MERONEK: That's what the status | Page 6399 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | quo is, correct? |  |
| 3 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct. |  |
| 4 | MR. NEUFELD: Correct. It's highly |  |
| 5 | risky. |  |
| 6 | MR. MERONEK: Yes, I think we all |  |
| 7 | agree. |  |
| 8 | The first option is a Bipole II |  |
| 9 | inverter relocated at Riel. And might I add, |  |
| 10 | that's roughly what the Clean Environment |  |
| 11 | Commission was asking about, a relocation to Riel, |  |
| 12 | correct? We can call this more or less the CEC |  |
| 13 | inquiry? |  |
| 14 | MR. NEUFELD: I don't believe so. |  |
| 15 | Their proposal was to inject the Bipole III line |  |
| 16 | into Dorsey and move Bipole II converters to Riel. |  |
| 17 | MR. MERONEK: All right. In part they |  |
| 18 | were talking about it? |  |
| 19 | MR. NEUFELD: In part. |  |
| 20 | MR. MERONEK: Yes, I stand corrected. |  |
| 21 | Now, according to this report, from a |  |
| 22 | strict reliability point of view, it's an |  |
| 23 | improvement over the status quo; is that correct? |  |
| 24 | MR. MAZUR: It addresses the Dorsey |  |
| 25 | Station loss. |  |


| 1 | MR. MERONEK: Right. Reduces that | Page 6400 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | component of risk by 50 percent, correct? |  |
| 3 | MR. MAZUR: Approximately. |  |
| 4 | MR. MERONEK: The second option is |  |
| 5 | option two, the existing system plus Bipole III |  |
| 6 | with a Riel inverter. And that more or less is |  |
| 7 | the present proposal before this Commission, |  |
| 8 | correct? |  |
| 9 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct. |  |
| 10 | MR. MERONEK: The third option over on |  |
| 11 | the next page -- and just speaking to that, that |  |
| 12 | particular option provides enhanced reliability |  |
| 13 | and provides new transmission generation capacity. |  |
| 14 | So that's an enhancement over what options were |  |
| 15 | discussed above, correct? |  |
| 16 | MR. MAZUR: Yeah. Any north/south |  |
| 17 | transmission line will provide for future, or |  |
| 18 | potential future northern generation. |  |
| 19 | MR. NEUFELD: But in the context of |  |
| 20 | the earlier options that we reviewed, the Bipole |  |
| 21 | III alternative also covers for corridor loss, |  |
| 22 | whereas option two does not. |  |
| 23 | MR. MERONEK: I'm just going by this |  |
| 24 | report. I'm just trying to determine the issue of |  |
| 25 | reliability in this context. And option two |  |

appears to be better than option one, which appears to be better than the status quo?
MR. NEUFELD: That's correct.
MR. MERONEK: Yes. And option three
is similar to the Art Derry/Dennis Woodford proposal of having Bipole I at Dorsey, Bipole III at Riel, Bipole II at a new location. They have just reversed Bipole III being at another location and Bipole II being at Riel, but it's the same configuration, correct?
MR. MAZUR: That's correct.
MR. NEUFELD: That's a very expensive option.
MR. MERONEK: We'll get to that, Mr. Neufeld. I know you're anxious to get to the end of the story.
That option in terms of reliability in
this report indicates that from a converter station perspective, it's a better reliability option than option two. Am I reading that correctly?
MR. MAZUR: Yeah, that's correct.
MR. MERONEK: And it goes on to say
that the inverter station could be at or near LaVerendrye or along the future South Winnipeg
transmission corridor, correct?
MR. MAZUR: That's correct.
MR. MERONEK: So if you had a concern about the station being at LaVerendrye, there's nothing to prevent it being located further south and east along the transmission corridor, correct?
MR. MAZUR: Yes. This was conceptual
so we didn't look in detail at any particular site.
MR. MERONEK: Sure. Everything is conceptual in the sense that there hasn't been a full study in relation to any of these options, correct?
MR. MAZUR: Well, this study looked at it from a conceptual point of view.
MR. MERONEK: Right.
MR. MAZUR: And we ruled it out as being less of a preferred option compared to option two, and so we didn't pursue detailed studies.
MR. MERONEK: I know, and everybody can read the report, and I'll concede that, sir, but I'm just trying to walk through this. From a reliability perspective, as it relates to Dorsey, and I failed physics and I failed chemistry, so I

|  | never got into engineering, but it seems | Page 6403 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | mathematically intuitive that if you have three |  |
| 3 | inverters as opposed to two, your reliability |  |
| 4 | against the risk of an outage at one with two |  |
| 5 | Bipoles is a lot better? |  |
| 6 | MR. MAZUR: That is correct, ignoring |  |
| 7 | the issue of the lines. |  |
| 8 | MR. MERONEK: Yes. And option four is |  |
| 9 | Bipoles I and II at Dorsey, Bipole III at Riel and |  |
| 10 | a fourth Bipole at a third inverter, correct? |  |
| 11 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct, and it's |  |
| 12 | one of the options that was really the focus of |  |
| 13 | what should the future north/south transmission be |  |
| 14 | for future generation that would require |  |
| 15 | additional transmission beyond Bipole III? |  |
| 16 | MR. MERONEK: Right. And that hasn't |  |
| 17 | been discarded? |  |
| 18 | MR. MAZUR: It remains a future |  |
| 19 | option. |  |
| 20 | MR. MERONEK: Okay. |  |
| 21 | MR. MAZUR: At this point we don't |  |
| 22 | know whether there's future northern generation or |  |
| 23 | not, that hasn't been approved. |  |
| 24 | MR. MERONEK: Option five is option |  |
| 25 | four, but with four inverters at separate |  |

locations providing the greatest DC related reliability improvements, correct?
MR. MAZUR: That's correct.
MR. MERONEK: And option six would be relocating Bipole II inverter at Riel, but further northern development on the AC line. Would that present the best option from a reliability point of view? I'm just trying to do it -- whether you can do it in sequence here?
MR. MAZUR: I think as you go through the report, option six provides some benefits in terms of southern inertia but it -- and it provides some benefits in terms of fault reduction.
MR. MERONEK: Okay. So would it be fair to say that in terms of reliability, going from status quo to option six would be going from worst to best, in terms of converter stations?
MR. MAZUR: I don't think that's
necessarily true. It really depends a lot on what the future generation development will be.
MR. MERONEK: Can you tell me why none of these options were put in the EIS report for the purposes of comparison, to give the parties and the Commission an idea of what options were
out there.

MR. MAZUR: I think the purposes of this report was to screen out the options and get down to options of future north/south transmission, which is back-up for the existing Bipole I and II, new southern generation, or import.

MR. MERONEK: Could I --

MR. MAZUR: And those were filed and put into the EIS.

MR. MERONEK: Could I propose another reason, and that would be that these are much more attractive than the options that were put into the EIS in relation to, as a comparison to Bipole III?

MR. MAZUR: I would disagree with that, because they do not address the corridor, except for option six, which is addressed in the EIS as the AC line being much more expensive. I think that's the \$4.188 billion line that Mr. Derry took note of.

MR. MERONEK: Now, over on page 10
under technical issues, there is a reference to reliability gains -- I'm in the first paragraph on page 10 , last sentence:
"Reliability gains accrue from the

|  |  | Page 6406 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | placement of new stations around the |  |
| 2 | hub and in completing transmission |  |
| 3 | rings at various voltage levels around |  |
| 4 | the city. Such advancements are |  |
| 5 | consistent with worldwide practice." |  |
| 6 | Do you see that? |  |
| 7 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. |  |
| 8 | MR. MERONEK: And so worldwide |  |
| 9 | practice would support having new stations around |  |
| 10 | the transmission rings around the city? |  |
| 11 | MR. MAZUR: I believe the worldwide |  |
| 12 | practice is the reference to the fact that |  |
| 13 | Manitoba Hydro to date has not established a |  |
| 14 | maximum station size, you know, which if we had, |  |
| 15 | we wouldn't have a 4000-megawatt Dorsey station. |  |
| 16 | MR. MERONEK: Now, the next several |  |
| 17 | pages deal with technical issues, correct? |  |
| 18 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct. |  |
| 19 | MR. MERONEK: And they're too |  |
| 20 | complicated for my plebeian mind to understand, |  |
| 21 | but obviously there are technical difficulties |  |
| 22 | associated with whatever you do, correct? Would |  |
| 23 | that be fair? |  |
| 24 | MR. MAZUR: There are technical |  |
| 25 | challenges with all options. |  |


| 1 | MR. MERONEK: Exactly. And they would | Page 6407 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | have to be addressed in a serious, meaningful and |  |
| 3 | detailed way, correct? |  |
| 4 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct. |  |
| 5 | MR. MERONEK: And it's clear that from |  |
| 6 | Hydro's perspective, there are more complicated |  |
| 7 | issues associated with relocation, rather than |  |
| 8 | Bipole III in and of itself? |  |
| 9 | MR. MAZUR: Absolutely. |  |
| 10 | MR. MERONEK: But they are not |  |
| 11 | impenetrable? |  |
| 12 | MR. MAZUR: I think all issues are |  |
| 13 | mitigable, but you have to consider the risk |  |
| 14 | associated with a heavily utilized existing |  |
| 15 | system. |  |
| 16 | MR. MERONEK: And in order to do that, |  |
| 17 | you'd have to do a pretty comprehensive study to |  |
| 18 | weigh those risks against the costs and against |  |
| 19 | the benefits, fair? |  |
| 20 | MR. MAZUR: We have looked at the |  |
| 21 | risks, we hired consultants to advise us. |  |
| 22 | MR. MERONEK: But you haven't done |  |
| 23 | that with respect to this particular report and |  |
| 24 | these options that are listed in that report, |  |
| 25 | correct? |  |

MR. NEUFELD: Well, that's true, we haven't. And the reason is that these, everything that's in this report doesn't describe alternatives to Bipole III, these are future plans.
MR. MERONEK: Well, Bipole III is in here and it's not a future plan, it's what you're proposing.
MR. NEUFELD: Well, it's as a reference.
MR. MERONEK: Starting at page 33, you get into the ultimate conclusions now in terms of the options, the effectiveness of the options in addressing reliability, and that's the heading. The status quo is right off the table, it's not even addressed there, correct?
MR. MAZUR: Can you repeat that, sir?
MR. MERONEK: Yes. In terms of ultimate conclusions and reliability, there's not even a reference to status quo, it's been discarded?

MR. MAZUR: That's correct.

MR. MERONEK: So you start with option one, and it talks about relocation of Bipole II at Riel. It's the earliest in-service date option,

|  |  | Page 6409 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | correct? |  |
| 2 | MR. MAZUR: I'm not sure how you make |  |
| 3 | that conclusion? |  |
| 4 | MR. MERONEK: Well, I'm just reading |  |
| 5 | from your report. It says: |  |
| 6 | "Also this option is expected to have |  |
| 7 | the earliest in-service date since it |  |
| 8 | does not require new north/south |  |
| 9 | transmission to be implemented." |  |
| 10 | MR. MAZUR: Yes, I see that. |  |
| 11 | MR. MERONEK: Yeah. So the impediment |  |
| 12 | with respect to Bipole II being relocated to Riel |  |
| 13 | as it relates to this particular option in this |  |
| 14 | particular report has to do with additional |  |
| 15 | transmission, correct? |  |
| 16 | MR. MAZUR: The other impediment is it |  |
| 17 | doesn't address the loss of the Bipole I and II |  |
| 18 | corridors. And that wasn't the focus of this |  |
| 19 | report. |  |
| 20 | MR. MERONEK: Well, I'm just getting |  |
| 21 | you to confirm, the loss of the corridors, you |  |
| 22 | won't find that in this narrative, in this option, |  |
| 23 | correct? |  |
| 24 | MR. MAZUR: The corridor is not |  |
| 25 | discussed in this option. |  |



|  | report? | Page 6411 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. MAZUR: There is no reference to |  |
| 3 | corridors. The purpose of the report was to |  |
| 4 | select technology after Bipole III, select |  |
| 5 | technology for possible future north/south |  |
| 6 | transmission. |  |
| 7 | MR. MERONEK: And then if you go over |  |
| 8 | to page 34, in reference to the option that |  |
| 9 | Manitoba Hydro is proposing, the last sentence |  |
| 10 | under option two says: |  |
| 11 | "This option would improve the LOLE |  |
| 12 | for many years but other steps would |  |
| 13 | need to be taken in the future as |  |
| 14 | system load becomes overly dependent |  |
| 15 | on the Dorsey station." |  |
| 16 | That's the future requirements for potential |  |
| 17 | additions to the system, correct? |  |
| 18 | MR. MAZUR: That would be correct. |  |
| 19 | MR. MERONEK: And if it was AC |  |
| 20 | transmission down the west side, that has not been |  |
| 21 | factored in as a cost, correct? |  |
| 22 | MR. MAZUR: This report doesn't really |  |
| 23 | deal with any costs. |  |
| 24 | MR. MERONEK: Well, it hasn't been |  |
| 25 | factored in anywhere, correct? |  |



| 1 | MR MERONFK: On page 35 | Page 6413 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct. |  |
| 3 | MR. MERONEK: Now, over on page 36, |  |
| 4 | there's even -- there's more narrative on this |  |
| 5 | subject which goes into the issue of what is |  |
| 6 | preferred. And you are dealing on page 36, or the |  |
| 7 | report is dealing, as I understand it, with the |  |
| 8 | problem of refurbishment, and that's under 5.4, |  |
| 9 | splitting the Bipole I and II inverters. |  |
| 10 | Do you see that? |  |
| 11 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. I don't know what |  |
| 12 | the, what you're -- where you are referring to |  |
| 13 | refurbishment? |  |
| 14 | MR. MERONEK: Yeah, in the first |  |
| 15 | paragraph it says: |  |
| 16 | "As can be expected after these many |  |
| 17 | years, Bipoles I and II are starting |  |
| 18 | to be renewed." |  |
| 19 | I call that refurbishment. |  |
| 20 | MR. MAZUR: Yes, thank you for the |  |
| 21 | clarification. |  |
| 22 | MR. MERONEK: And the report |  |
| 23 | identifies that there are problems that are |  |
| 24 | surfacing with respect to Bipole II, and certainly |  |
| 25 | the record in this hearing indicates that as well. |  |


|  | But I'm interested in the next paragraph. It | Page 6414 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | says: |  |
| 3 | "It would be tempting then, knowing |  |
| 4 | the present overconcentration of |  |
| 5 | facilities at the Dorsey Station..." |  |
| 6 | And by that you mean Bipoles I and II there, |  |
| 7 | correct? |  |
| 8 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. |  |
| 9 | MR. MERONEK: "...and the |  |
| 10 | deteriorating state of Bipole II, to |  |
| 11 | give weighting options which would |  |
| 12 | re-establish the Bipole II inverter at |  |
| 13 | a different location." |  |
| 14 | Options one, which is relocating Bipole II at |  |
| 15 | Riel, option three, which is more or less the |  |
| 16 | Coalition option, option five and six all include |  |
| 17 | this possibility. |  |
| 18 | Do you see that? |  |
| 19 | MR. MAZUR: Yeah, I see that. |  |
| 20 | MR. MERONEK: And one of the issues |  |
| 21 | here that the report emphasizes is that there |  |
| 22 | might be a temptation to, if there was a |  |
| 23 | catastrophic loss at Dorsey, to try to rebuild it? |  |
| 24 | MR. MAZUR: I think that would be one |  |
| 25 | of the issues. |  |


| 1 | MR. MERONEK: Yeah. And it's a | Page 6415 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | warning here that if there was that temptation, |  |
| 3 | there would be substantial reconstruction costs |  |
|  | and bottle generation, and a significant financial |  |
| 5 | impediment equivalent to a multi-year severe |  |
| 6 | drought, correct? |  |
| 7 | MR. MAZUR: Sorry, given the |  |
| 8 | catastrophic loss at Dorsey? |  |
| 9 | MR. MERONEK: Right? |  |
| 10 | MR. MAZUR: That would be true. |  |
| 11 | MR. MERONEK: Right. So given those |  |
| 12 | warnings, the report goes on over to the next page |  |
| 13 | and states in the last sentence of the first |  |
| 14 | paragraph: |  |
| 15 | "Planning preparation for an ultimate |  |
| 16 | split would seem prudent as it is not |  |
| 17 | likely that the high power levels |  |
| 18 | through Dorsey would be acceptable for |  |
| 19 | reliability in the foreseeable |  |
| 20 | future." |  |
| 21 | Do you see that? |  |
| 22 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. |  |
| 23 | MR. MERONEK: Okay. So whether it's |  |
| 24 | tomorrow or five years down the road, or 10 years |  |
| 25 | down the road, that's something that Manitoba |  |



|  | O. And again that's been discarded. And you | Page 6417 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | have option one. And again, the caveat here that |  |
| 3 | Bipole III, as proposed by Manitoba Hydro, is the |  |
| 4 | preferred way to go, but if it's not doable, then |  |
| 5 | this option has to be looked at seriously and fast |  |
| 6 | forwarded, as it were. Is that a fair summary? |  |
| 7 | MR. MAZUR: That's a fair summary, |  |
| 8 | given the caveat that Bipole III is not a go. |  |
| 9 | MR. MERONEK: That is the underlying |  |
| 10 | assumption, of course. |  |
| 11 | And under option two, it's giving the |  |
| 12 | green light to the Manitoba Hydro proposal, which |  |
| 13 | in fact had already been chosen by Manitoba Hydro |  |
| 14 | before this report, correct? |  |
| 15 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. As I said, we were |  |
| 16 | doing several different evaluations in parallel. |  |
| 17 | Yeah. Bipole III overall addresses all the |  |
| 18 | issues. |  |
| 19 | MR. MERONEK: Right. And option |  |
| 20 | three -- and I'm paraphrasing -- over on page 39, |  |
| 21 | while attractive from a reliability perspective, |  |
| 22 | has considerable technical change, complexity, and |  |
| 23 | combined with a high cost, this option is not |  |
| 24 | favoured as the next step. But I am interested in |  |
| 25 | the following sentence: |  |


|  |  | Page 6418 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | "It can be considered a desirable |  |
| 2 | ultimate outcome and should be |  |
| 3 | technically protected to the extent |  |
| 4 | possible." |  |
| 5 | Does that mean that in any planning, you plan with |  |
| 6 | a potential prospect of having Bipole II |  |
| 7 | relocated? |  |
| 8 | MR. MAZUR: That means that at the |  |
| 9 | time when we have to make the next decision on |  |
| 10 | reliability, yeah, it would be one of the options. |  |
| 11 | But option two is beneficial because it provides |  |
| 12 | us the capacity and spare, so we have the |  |
| 13 | operating flexibility to be able to accommodate |  |
| 14 | doing other system enhancements. |  |
| 15 | MR. MERONEK: Right. But it seems to |  |
| 16 | imply here that this option certainly not be |  |
| 17 | discarded, and certainly not be put in a drawer |  |
| 18 | anywhere. In the back of the corporate mind, or |  |
| 19 | the engineering mind, this is very much something |  |
| 20 | that ultimately may well be considered. |  |
| 21 | MR. MAZUR: That's right. It would |  |
| 22 | really be related as well to when we might |  |
|  | consider corridor separation, which would likely |  |
|  | be near the end of life of the transmission lines. |  |
| 25 | MR. MERONEK: Now, just on that score, |  |

certainly this report, and as a matter of fact the EIS study says that from a reliability perspective, building of Bipole III at 3.28 or 3.92 billion, or whatever it is, only addresses the reliability factor out to 2025 , correct?

MR. MAZUR: Bipole III addresses the reliability effect until 2025, considering loss of the corridor -- and I need to point this out very clearly -- plus loss of the converter. Option three would basically be no different than status quo with respect to loss of the corridor.

MR. MERONEK: So in terms of
reliability, something would have to be done after 2025, correct?

MR. MAZUR: That is correct.

MR. MERONEK: And I think you're saying to the Commission that you don't know what that would be at this point?

MR. MAZUR: What we're saying to the Commission is that the choices will a lot depend on decisions on the future development. If there's no northern generation development, we're certainly not going to be building future north/south lines. At that point in time, our deficit for loss of Bipole I and II is zero. If
we follow the generation, or the load growth of some 80 megawatts a year, one option is to put an 80-megawatt southern generator in every year -I'm speaking from the point of view, and would address the reliability.
MR. MERONEK: Right.
MR. MAZUR: If there is northern
generation, there might be import options, because any northern generation will likely be related to some power sales and an export line. So the options are varied. And for us to come out and identify a specific option today wouldn't be appropriate.
MR. MERONEK: So in terms of reliability, forget about new sales or development, strictly from a reliability perspective, and the anticipated domestic load growth, the EIS clearly states that there will be an issue with respect to liability come 2025 ?
MR. MAZUR: That's correct.
MR. MERONEK: And so are you going to wait till 2025 or --
MR. MAZUR: No, we'll be knowing that once the generation resource plan is approved.
MR. MERONEK: And the intention,

| 1 | whether it comes to pass or not, is to have new | Page 6421 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | generation, correct? |  |
| 3 | MR. MAZUR: New generation is required |  |
|  | to continue to serve Manitoba load, yes. |  |
| 5 | MR. MERONEK: Right. |  |
| 6 | MR. MAZUR: And somewhere around 2021, |  |
| 7 | it varies from year to year. |  |
| 8 | MR. MERONEK: And the anticipation is |  |
| 9 | that there will be -- the hope and expectation of |  |
| 10 | Manitoba Hydro is that there will be new |  |
| 11 | north/south transmission, correct? Whether that |  |
| 12 | comes to pass or not, who knows? |  |
| 13 | MR. MAZUR: All 1 can say is that the |  |
| 14 | preferred plan put forward by Manitoba Hydro |  |
| 15 | assumes northern generation. |  |
| 16 | MR. MERONEK: Now, I want to move |  |
| 17 | briefly into the answers to -- that Manitoba Hydro |  |
| 18 | gave to the letter from the Commission dated |  |
| 19 | December 3. Have you got those in front of you? |  |
| 20 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. |  |
| 21 | MR. MERONEK: Can you take credit for |  |
| 22 | this response, Mr. Mazur, or should -- |  |
| 23 | MR. MAZUR: My team prepared it, yes. |  |
| 24 | MR. MERONEK: So, I should be speaking |  |
| 25 | to you about this? |  |


| 1 | MR. MAZUR: Yes, or if there's other | Page 6422 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | issues, my panel members will help out. |  |
| 3 | MR. MERONEK: Sure. |  |
| 4 | Now, as I understand this report, |  |
| 5 | clearly picking up Bipole II equipment and moving |  |
| 6 | it to Riel is a non-starter, correct? |  |
| 7 | MR. MAZUR: Picking up Bipole II |  |
| 8 | equipment and moving it is a non-starter, yes. |  |
| 9 | MR. MERONEK: I think we all agree |  |
| 10 | with that. |  |
| 11 | What I understand here in the rest of |  |
| 12 | the report is that there's another scenario, and |  |
| 13 | that is relocating Bipole II to Riel as a new |  |
| 14 | converter station. And that's scheme three. |  |
| 15 | MR. MAZUR: Yes, that was one of the |  |
| 16 | questions we were responding to. |  |
| 17 | MR. MERONEK: Right. And again, as I |  |
| 18 | understand it, it's technically feasible, with a |  |
| 19 | lot of complexities, technical difficulties that |  |
| 20 | you have identified in this response, correct? |  |
| 21 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. |  |
| 22 | MR. MERONEK: It's technically |  |
| 23 | feasible. And the cost of that you have |  |
| 24 | estimated, with all of the pluses and minuses, to |  |
| 25 | be roughly \$836 million? |  |


| 1 | MR. MAZUR: That would be -- | Page 6423 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. MERONEK: Incremental costs, |  |
| 3 | sorry? |  |
| 4 | MR. MAZUR: That would be the net |  |
|  | cost, assuming that we didn't build, for example, |  |
|  | a south paralleling line. And it was providing |  |
| 7 | credit for the expenditures expected on Bipole II |  |
| 8 | in the capital plan. |  |
| 9 | MR. MERONEK: Right. So this scenario |  |
| 10 | would increase the cost by approximately |  |
| 11 | \$836 million, if I read it correctly? |  |
| 12 | MR. MAZUR: By how much? Sorry, I |  |
| 13 | didn't hear. |  |
| 14 | MR. MERONEK: \$836 million, page 12? |  |
| 15 | MR. MAZUR: I believe that's correct. |  |
| 16 | Yes. Yes, that's correct. |  |
| 17 | MR. MERONEK: Now one of the -- |  |
| 18 | MR. MAZUR: Yes. And just to point |  |
| 19 | out that the 836 wouldn't address or provide |  |
| 20 | equivalent reliability with respect to paralleling |  |
| 21 | of Bipole I and II. |  |
| 22 | MR. MERONEK: Now, one of the |  |
| 23 | constraints that has been identified in these |  |
| 24 | answers is over on page 14. And that deals with |  |
| 25 | the need for an environmental impact assessment |  |


|  | for approximately 250 kilometres of line? | Page 6424 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MR. MAZUR: That's correct. |  |
| 3 | MR. MERONEK: Now, the 250 kilometres |  |
|  | is made up of the following, and I think it's |  |
| 5 | probably easier to look at figure 4 to the |  |
| 6 | answers, page 16. Have you got that, sir? |  |
| 7 | The 250 kilometres, and I think the |  |
| 8 | point here is that you'd have to build 250 |  |
| 9 | kilometres of line to ameliorate the 230 |  |
| 10 | kilometres that are proposed, correct? |  |
| 11 | MR. MAZUR: For this scheme, the way |  |
| 12 | we envision it, that is correct. |  |
| 13 | MR. MERONEK: Right, okay. So the |  |
| 14 | first component will be 80 kilometres straight |  |
| 15 | across to Dorsey, correct? |  |
| 16 | MR. MAZUR: Yeah. And that was the |  |
| 17 | proposed routing by the Commission. |  |
| 18 | MR. MERONEK: And the hundred |  |
| 19 | kilometres, has that been identified precisely to |  |
| 20 | be a hundred? |  |
| 21 | MR. MAZUR: No. It's an estimate |  |
| 22 | based on the fact that we wanted to maintain at |  |
| 23 | least 50 kilometres separation from Dorsey. |  |
| 24 | MR. MERONEK: Right, so it's probably |  |
| 25 | more than a hundred, isn't it? |  |


| 1 | MR. MAZUR: I can't tell you at this | Page 6425 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | point until we go out there and look at some |  |
| 3 | details of the routing. |  |
| 4 | MR. MERONEK: Right. And so is there |  |
| 5 | any reason why that juncture along existing Bipole |  |
| 6 | I and II can't be closer, closer to Dorsey? |  |
| 7 | MR. MAZUR: Well, we would be hoping |  |
| 8 | to maintain separation. The whole premise of the |  |
| 9 | reliability initiative is to provide redundant |  |
| 10 | separated facilities. And all our risk analysis |  |
| 11 | indicate that that is the best way to address our |  |
| 12 | existing problem. |  |
| 13 | MR. MERONEK: But you don't have any |  |
| 14 | separation of Bipole I and II at Dorsey right now? |  |
| 15 | MR. MAZUR: No, but we're making a |  |
| 16 | change and we're not going to be, you know, doing, |  |
| 17 | repeating the same, I'll call it mistakes, with no |  |
| 18 | disrespect to past decisions, that were made some |  |
| 19 | 40 or 50 years ago. |  |
| 20 | MR. MERONEK: Okay. Now, with respect |  |
| 21 | to the 70 kilometres, you have indicated here that |  |
| 22 | that isn't -- there's another way to skin the cat |  |
| 23 | so to speak, and it's to put a switching gate in |  |
|  | along Bipole II where the hundred kilometres |  |
| 25 | starts, and you'd save yourself approximately |  |

\$55 million?

```
MR. MAZUR: That is correct, on the caveat that now we wouldn't be able to parallel for that portion of line, because there's no way to cover it if it's lost.
MR. MERONEK: Unless you kept it open, unless you kept that line -- you are anticipating that you wouldn't keep that line from the switching gate to Dorsey, correct?
MR. MAZUR: Well, if the hundred kilometre line is lost, you have no way to get to Dorsey.
MR. MERONEK: And so in terms of that outage, we're talking hours perhaps, or days, not months, correct?
MR. MAZUR: We're not talking hours.
I think we have repeatedly said, you know, that we would need six to eight weeks and it could be more, depending on the location and nature of the damage.
MR. MERONEK: You haven't done any studies to pin that down, correct?
MR. MAZUR: We have responded to
several IRs on that, and that is our best estimate. So I wouldn't agree that we haven't --
we did the studies.

MR. MERONEK: If you did the
switching, then you wouldn't need the 70
kilometres, correct, underneath?
MR. MAZUR: If we accepted the
reduction in the reliability of the parallel
scheme, that's correct.

MR. MERONEK: Correct me if I'm wrong, but that 70 kilometres, that that connection from Riel to Dorsey is anticipated in the future in any event, correct?

MR. MAZUR: No, it is not. It would be a paralleling line, it would have to be reserved for DC operation.

MR. MERONEK: In your EIS, you put in a figure, 1-2, that has an existing undeveloped right-of-way from Riel to LaVerendrye, and then an existing developed right-of-way up to Dorsey.

That would imply to me that there's some contemplation that there's going to be a ring around the city?

MR. MAZUR: There is an existing right-of-way. Actually, we don't even own all of the right-of-way at this point, but there is an existing designated right-of-way between Dorsey
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & and LaVerendrye, and LaVerendrye all the way & Page 6428 \\
\hline 2 & around the city to St. Vital, Riel. & \\
\hline 3 & MR. MERONEK: Right. So if that gets & \\
\hline 4 & built, you'd have to pay for that in any event, & \\
\hline 5 & correct? & \\
\hline 6 & MR. MAZUR: I don't follow your & \\
\hline 7 & question. Can you repeat? & \\
\hline 8 & MR. MERONEK: Well, you're saying & \\
\hline 9 & there's no contemplation of connecting Riel to & \\
\hline 10 & Dorsey. And I'm just saying it looks like there's & \\
\hline 11 & something in the plans to that effect. & \\
\hline 12 & MR. MAZUR: No, there's nothing in the & \\
\hline 13 & plans. It's just prudent to be able to secure & \\
\hline 14 & these right-of-ways. I think just from the fact & \\
\hline 15 & that we've been here in these hearings, it's a & \\
\hline 16 & difficult task these days to obtain right-of-way. & \\
\hline 17 & MR. NEUFELD: I might add that, if I & \\
\hline 18 & understood the question correctly, perhaps you can & \\
\hline 19 & confirm. Is the question that was asked whether & \\
\hline 20 & the intention was to have a DC paralleling line & \\
\hline 21 & following that south route corridor extending from & \\
\hline 22 & Riel to Dorsey? & \\
\hline 23 & MR. MERONEK: No, I'm looking at & \\
\hline 24 & figure 4, trying to understand what that 70 & \\
\hline 25 & kilometres is. And it looks to me like it's a & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & line that's ringing the city? & Page 6429 \\
\hline 2 & MR. MAZUR: Figure 4 depicts the & \\
\hline 3 & transmission that would require to implement this & \\
\hline 4 & scheme -- & \\
\hline 5 & MR. MERONEK: Right. & \\
\hline 6 & MR. MAZUR: -- and obtain the same & \\
\hline 7 & reliability for paralleling, which includes the & \\
\hline 8 & hundred kilometre line, reroute the Bipole II and & \\
\hline 9 & the line from Riel to Dorsey, which would be the & \\
\hline 10 & DC line that would be required to connect Riel in & \\
\hline 11 & Bipole II to Dorsey Bipole I in the event that we & \\
\hline 12 & wanted to parallel. & \\
\hline 13 & MR. NEUFELD: That south loop corridor & \\
\hline 14 & is intended for future lines which we have on our & \\
\hline 15 & plans, which include St. Vital to LaVerendrye, St. & \\
\hline 16 & Vital to Lettelier. Perhaps if the new export & \\
\hline 17 & line might be 500, it would follow through that & \\
\hline 18 & route. If there was a western grid, such as what & \\
\hline 19 & had been contemplated, it would probably reside on & \\
\hline 20 & that corridor. So that's the type of & \\
\hline 21 & transmission. We haven't got in our plans a & \\
\hline 22 & paralleling line to go on there. & \\
\hline 23 & MR. MERONEK: And the export line that & \\
\hline 24 & you are talking about, or that you would & \\
\hline 25 & visualize, is a 500 K line that goes from the & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|l}
\hline 1
\end{tabular}\(\quad\) THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not sure of the \(\quad\) Page 6431
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & at Riel, and then from Riel go on to U.S. & Page 6432 \\
\hline 2 & A second option is that the line would & \\
\hline & come out of Dorsey and go directly to U.S. And in & \\
\hline 4 & that case, there wouldn't be a ringing line so to & \\
\hline 5 & speak. & \\
\hline 6 & MR. MERONEK: Okay. But that is an & \\
\hline 7 & option? & \\
\hline 8 & MR. MAZUR: It definitely is an & \\
\hline 9 & option. & \\
\hline 10 & MR. MERONEK: Thank you panel, thank & \\
\hline 11 & you Mr. Chairman. & \\
\hline 12 & THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Meronek. & \\
\hline 13 & Mr. Williams? & \\
\hline 14 & MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning members of & \\
\hline 15 & the panel and members of the Hydro panel. & \\
\hline 16 & MR. MAZUR: Good morning. & \\
\hline 17 & MR. WILLIAMS: I'll be focusing for a & \\
\hline 18 & few minutes on the October 14th, 2010, ultimate & \\
\hline 19 & HVDC report. & \\
\hline 20 & Mr. Tymofichuk, just a housekeeping & \\
\hline 21 & question for you. I see on the front page of this & \\
\hline 22 & report that you are on the distribution list, but & \\
\hline 23 & one doesn't see Mr. Brennan or the other & \\
\hline 24 & vice-presidents of Manitoba Hydro on this & \\
\hline 25 & distribution list. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: That is normal for & Page 6433 \\
\hline 2 & these types of reports of Hydro. & \\
\hline 3 & MR. WILLIAMS: And that's just my & \\
\hline 4 & question, sir. You are kind of where the buck & \\
\hline 5 & stops in terms of where this report went, it & \\
\hline 6 & didn't go higher up into the executive management & \\
\hline 7 & committee level? & \\
\hline 8 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: We did present this & \\
\hline 9 & to our full executive, including the president. & \\
\hline 10 & MR. WILLIAMS: Now, Mr. Mazur, I'm not & \\
\hline 11 & going to concede that I had challenges with & \\
\hline 12 & chemistry like Mr. Meronek did, but I'm not an & \\
\hline 13 & engineer. So just in terms of the significance of & \\
\hline 14 & the engineer's stamp that I see on the front page & \\
\hline 15 & of this document, am I correct in suggesting to & \\
\hline 16 & you, sir, that when we see that engineer stamp, it & \\
\hline 17 & signifies that the engineer takes full & \\
\hline 18 & responsibility for the conclusions of this report, & \\
\hline 19 & and that it signifies that the conclusions are & \\
\hline 20 & bound by a strict code of ethics and adhere to the & \\
\hline 21 & proper standards of engineering? & \\
\hline 22 & MR. MAZUR: I think I would agree, & \\
\hline 23 & yes. & \\
\hline 24 & MR. WILLIAMS: And Mr. Mazur, in terms & \\
\hline 25 & of the issue canvassed in this report of & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & relocating Bipole II to Riel, I would be accurate & Page 6434 \\
\hline 2 & in suggesting to you that under the engineering & \\
\hline 3 & seal, you have described it as a worthy goal, & \\
\hline 4 & correct? & \\
\hline 5 & MR. MAZUR: I think that's true. We & \\
\hline 6 & covered that with Mr. Meronek, I believe. & \\
\hline 7 & MR. WILLIAMS: And indeed, sir, you & \\
\hline 8 & described that option of relocating Bipole III to & \\
\hline 9 & Riel as attractive, correct? & \\
\hline 10 & MR. MAZUR: Pardon, I didn't hear the & \\
\hline 11 & last word? & \\
\hline 12 & MR. WILLIAMS: The last word was & \\
\hline 13 & "correct" but I think you were probably -- & \\
\hline 14 & MR. MAZUR: The second last word. & \\
\hline 15 & Thank you. & \\
\hline 16 & MR. WILLIAMS: You described the & \\
\hline 17 & option, sir, of relocating Bipole II to Riel as & \\
\hline 18 & attractive, correct? & \\
\hline 19 & MR. MAZUR: In terms of addressing the & \\
\hline 20 & converter loss, that's correct. & \\
\hline 21 & MR. WILLIAMS: And sir, just to start, & \\
\hline 22 & if I can direct your attention to page 37 of your & \\
\hline 23 & report, and I want to just ask you to look at a & \\
\hline 24 & paragraph that I don't think you discussed with & \\
\hline 25 & Mr. Meronek, which is the paragraph that appears & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & just -- the second full paragraph just above & Page 6435 \\
\hline 2 & section 6. I'll give you just a second to look at & \\
\hline 3 & that paragraph, okay, Mr. Mazur. & \\
\hline 4 & MR. MAZUR: Yes, I see it. & \\
\hline 5 & MR. WILLIAMS: And indeed, sir, this & \\
\hline 6 & is the paragraph in which you describe the & \\
\hline 7 & relocation of the Bipole II inverter as & \\
\hline 8 & attractive, agreed? & \\
\hline 9 & MR. MAZUR: That's right. & \\
\hline 10 & MR. WILLIAMS: And, sir, despite the & \\
\hline 11 & attractive nature of that option, you recommend & \\
\hline 12 & that it not be given priority over Bipole III, & \\
\hline 13 & correct? & \\
\hline 14 & MR. MAZUR: That's right. & \\
\hline 15 & MR. WILLIAMS: Am I correct in & \\
\hline 16 & suggesting to you, sir, the second full paragraph, & \\
\hline 17 & or sentence of this paragraph, that the first two & \\
\hline 18 & things you cite are that current load growth and & \\
\hline 19 & committed sales would dictate that the corporation & \\
\hline 20 & must grapple with new transmission. Those are the & \\
\hline 21 & first two things you cite; agreed, sir? & \\
\hline 22 & MR. MAZUR: Yeah, that's right. & \\
\hline 23 & MR. WILLIAMS: Now, in terms of & \\
\hline 24 & current load growth, sir, I take it you would be & \\
\hline 25 & relying upon the 2009 or 2010 load forecast; & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & agreed? & Page 6436 \\
\hline 2 & MR. MAZUR: I believe at that time & \\
\hline 3 & that would probably be correct. & \\
\hline 4 & MR. WILLIAMS: There wouldn't be any & \\
\hline 5 & report more current than the 2010 load forecast in & \\
\hline 6 & October of 2010, sir? & \\
\hline 7 & MR. MAZUR: I don't believe, but & \\
\hline 8 & subject to check. & \\
\hline 9 & MR. WILLIAMS: And in terms of & \\
\hline 10 & committed sales, sir, what committed sales at that & \\
\hline 11 & point in time were you referring to? & \\
\hline 12 & MR. MAZUR: At the present moment, & \\
\hline 13 & Manitoba Hydro has some 1200 megawatts of & \\
\hline 14 & long-term sales, plus additional shorter term & \\
\hline 15 & seasonal and yearly sales to a level of about & \\
\hline 16 & 1800 megawatts. & \\
\hline 17 & MR. WILLIAMS: Now, sir, I guess the & \\
\hline 18 & reason I ask that, sir, is because in 2010, of & \\
\hline 19 & course, with Wisconsin Power as well as Minnesota & \\
\hline 20 & Power, those weren't committed sales, those were & \\
\hline 21 & simply term sheets, agreed? & \\
\hline 22 & MR. MAZUR: I believe so, but I'm not & \\
\hline 23 & totally familiar with the history of that. & \\
\hline 24 & MR. WILLIAMS: And indeed the & \\
\hline 25 & Wisconsin power term sheet was for a significantly & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & higher quantity of power than & Page 6437 \\
\hline 2 & agreement signed some one year later, agreed? & \\
\hline 3 & MR. MAZUR: If I recall from the & \\
\hline 4 & public information, I believe it was 500 megawatts & \\
\hline 5 & for the Wisconsin sale, plus I think the Minnesota & \\
\hline 6 & power sale was in the 250-megawatt range. & \\
\hline 7 & MR. WILLIAMS: And of course, now it's & \\
\hline 8 & only 100 megawatts for Wisconsin, correct? & \\
\hline 9 & MR. MAZUR: I cannot confirm that & \\
\hline 10 & information. I am on the transmission side, not & \\
\hline 11 & in sales. We are not allowed to talk to the & \\
\hline 12 & marketers -- standards of conduct. & \\
\hline 13 & MR. WILLIAMS: I want to spend a & \\
\hline 14 & couple moments, gentlemen, talking about, and I'll & \\
\hline 15 & direct your attention to page 29, but I want to & \\
\hline 16 & talk for a couple of moments in terms of the & \\
\hline 17 & timing of Bipole III and the corporation's plans. & \\
\hline 18 & And Mr. Mazur, I am correct in suggesting to you & \\
\hline 19 & that way back at the time of Limestone, back in & \\
\hline 20 & the late '80s, early '90s, the idea of a Bipole & \\
\hline 21 & III, or a stage of Bipole III was on the drawing & \\
\hline 22 & board way back then; correct, sir? & \\
\hline 23 & MR. MAZUR: Bipole III was on the & \\
\hline 24 & drawing boards several times associated with an & \\
\hline 25 & Ontario sale. I believe it was scheduled for some & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
time in the early 2000, '98 to 2000.
MR. WILLIAMS: So it's been on the plans for quite some time with Manitoba Hydro, sir?

MR. MAZUR: It's been in the plans and out of the plans based on proposed power export sales. And it's, up to this point, never proceeded based on generation. Which is why, in 2001, we established a plan to build a line initially on the east side and put that into our capital plan, which was to be followed by converters. Although we never got there because of external agencies with regard to moving us to the west.

MR. WILLIAMS: Fair enough, sir.
Back at the time of Limestone, and certainly you discussed Limestone and Bipole III in this report, at that point in time you were not planning to bring Bipole III into Dorsey, correct? You were planning to bring it into a different converter station in the south?

MR. MAZUR: Planning of Bipole III and the termination has been going on for a long, long time, and Riel was established as the optimum site.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MR. WILLIAMS: And Riel was & Page 6439 \\
\hline 2 & established as the optimum site quite some time & \\
\hline 3 & ago, sir; agreed? & \\
\hline 4 & MR. MAZUR: That is correct. & \\
\hline 5 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: May I add to be & \\
\hline 6 & clear, the Ontario Hydro sale in the late '80s was & \\
\hline 7 & tied to Conawapa and a line south. I'm hearing & \\
\hline 8 & Limestone, and perhaps that needs to be clarified. & \\
\hline 9 & MR. WILLIAMS: Well, Mr. Tymofichuk & \\
\hline 10 & and Mr. Mazur, you'll agree with me that in your & \\
\hline 11 & report on page 29, you note that Bipole III, or a & \\
\hline 12 & stage of Bipole III, as a step for significantly & \\
\hline 13 & improved reliability would have had a & \\
\hline 14 & significantly negative effect on Limestone's & \\
\hline 15 & economics, correct? & \\
\hline 16 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: Sorry, could you & \\
\hline 17 & orient us on the paragraph? & \\
\hline 18 & MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. If you go to just & \\
\hline 19 & above section 5.1, the second last paragraph, and & \\
\hline 20 & the last three or four lines of that paragraph. & \\
\hline 21 & MR. MAZUR: Yes, okay, I see it. And & \\
\hline 22 & sir, your question, sir, if you can clarify again, & \\
\hline 23 & please? & \\
\hline 24 & MR. WILLIAMS: So first of all, sir, & \\
\hline 25 & the point you make in the paragraph in question is & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
that the Bipole III option, or an incremental or stage of Bipole III option would have made the -had a significantly negative effect on Limestone's economics, correct?
MR. MAZUR: Yes.
MR. WILLIAMS: So notwithstanding the fact, sir, of the recognition of its availability for improved reliability, it was not on the agenda for Limestone, given the potential impact on the economics of Limestone, correct?
MR. MAZUR: Limestone went ahead
without Bipole III.
MR. WILLIAMS: And the point you make in this paragraph, sir, is that twinning Limestone and Bipole III, notwithstanding its improved reliability effects, would have had a detrimental effect on the economics; agreed?
MR. MAZUR: Yes. I think the last
sentence summarizes the intent, that any reliability impacts would have been incremental and worked against the catastrophic susceptibility which is more fully understood today. So at that point in time, based on what we understood and knew, that was a conclusion.
MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. And on page 33,
if \(I\) can direct your attention to a paragraph that you have already discussed with Mr. Meronek, Mr. Mazur, I'm focusing your attention on option one?

MR. MAZUR: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Mr. Mazur, am I correct
in interpreting this paragraph as one of the points being, that if one was looking for a quick fix in terms of the risk of a catastrophic option at Dorsey, the quickest fix would have been a relocation of the Bipole II inverter to Riel, certainly as compared to the challenges associated with bringing down new north/south transmission; agreed?

MR. MAZUR: That's the conclusion when you consider the converters alone. Manitoba Hydro had conducted three different reliability risk reports, which we filed as the Teshmont reports 2006 -- or 2001, 2006 and 2012. And one cannot just make that decision on the converter without considering the corridor. And our final decision, in our opinion, is that we have to address both the corridor and the converter loss. We have got a single corridor that carries 70 percent of the power, and we need to diversify. And Bipole III
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & allows us to reduce that dependency on a single & Page 6442 \\
\hline 2 & corridor to about 50 percent. & \\
\hline 3 & MR. WILLIAMS: And I thank you for & \\
\hline 4 & that, Mr. Mazur. But let's just make sure I have & \\
\hline 5 & a yes to my question first of all, and then you & \\
\hline 6 & can go back to your notes. & \\
\hline 7 & The question was, sir, if one was & \\
\hline 8 & looking for the quickest fix to the risk of a & \\
\hline 9 & catastrophic outage at Dorsey, the insight offered & \\
\hline 10 & from this report is that that quickest fix would & \\
\hline 11 & have been offered by relocating the Bipole II & \\
\hline 12 & inverter to Riel, agreed? & \\
\hline 13 & MR. MAZUR: That's right. & \\
\hline 14 & MR. NEUFELD: But that doesn't solve & \\
\hline 15 & the problem. & \\
\hline 16 & MR. WILLIAMS: We are going to get to & \\
\hline 17 & that. & \\
\hline 18 & So the decision made by Manitoba Hydro & \\
\hline 19 & was to accept the risk of a fix that was not as & \\
\hline 20 & quick, and to choose one that it felt was more & \\
\hline 21 & holistic. Agreed? & \\
\hline 22 & MR. MAZUR: Decision made by Manitoba & \\
\hline 23 & Hydro was to choose a solution that addressed both & \\
\hline 24 & the corridor loss and the Dorsey loss. & \\
\hline 25 & MR. WILLIAMS: And fair enough, sir. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

But in doing so, you had to live with the risk of a catastrophic failure at Dorsey for a few more years. Agreed?

MR. MAZUR: I believe so, yes.
MR. WILLIAMS: And Mr. Mazur, you made
this point at the start of your evidence and \(I\) wasn't sure if \(I\) heard you correctly. But in terms of this actual report, your evidence was that you had thought Manitoba Hydro had filed it as part of its disclosure in this hearing, but that it was not due to an oversight.

Did I hear you correctly, sir?
MR. MAZUR: From my recollection, we
had received a list of several references cited in the EIS, and I believe that was one of them. And so we forwarded it for filing. I can't tell you why it wasn't filed.

MR. WILLIAMS: I thank you for that, sir. And Mr. Chair, no further questions.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,

Mr. Williams.

Just to add a little bit on your very
last question and Mr. Mazur's response, I found it interesting in his response to my letter, Mr. Bedford -- the question I had posed or
referred to was Mr. Neufeld, in November, saying that some time past, there had been a study of some of these options. In his response to me, Mr. Bedford referred to a 2004 study but never referenced the 2010 one. So perhaps they didn't want us to know about it. Makes one wonder.
Anyhow, we'll take a break right now and we'll come back in 15 minutes. There will be some more questioning.
(Hearing recessed at 10:30 a.m. and reconvened at 10:45 a.m.)
THE CHAIRMAN: We'll reconvene. It appears that we may not be here all that much longer today. We were just informed that York Factory First Nation, who was to make a presentation this afternoon, has withdrawn. And there's no other business that we can really address today. So once we are finished the questioning on this matter, I think that may be it for the day, so...
Panel members have a few questions. I'm going to start off and ask, is Bipole III, or will Bipole III, if and when completed, will it have sufficient capacity to transmit all of the power from Conawapa, if and when it is completed?

MR. TYMOFICHUK: Mr. Chairman, if Bipole III is in service and if Keeyask and Conawapa are in service, we will need to add at the final stages of Conawapa incremental AC transmission, not a complete north/south link, but add to our existing system, mostly in Western Manitoba, Northern Manitoba.

THE CHAIRMAN: In this ultimate report you refer to, I think it mentions the need for a fourth or a fifth Bipole. And the other thing, I hadn't heard or read Gillam Island referred to for many years until \(I\) saw it in this report. Is it still in Hydro's long-term plans?

MR. TYMOFICHUK: It's a known resource from that point of view, but there's no definitive market for it, whether it's domestic or non-domestic.

THE CHAIRMAN: But it is a long-term possibility still?

MR. TYMOFICHUK: Right, correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: And if \(I\) am not mistaken, that would be -- or maybe I should ask it as a question rather than stating it. Would that be the last significant generating station on the Nelson River?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: That is correct. & Page 6446 \\
\hline 2 & THE CHAIRMAN: And so if it were to & \\
\hline 3 & go, Gillam Island, then you would definitely need & \\
\hline 4 & another Bipole or a high capacity AC line? You'd & \\
\hline 5 & need more major transmission line from the north? & \\
\hline 6 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: Yes, we would need a & \\
\hline 7 & new link. Studies to date indicate that our & \\
\hline 8 & system is not capable of accepting more than three & \\
\hline 9 & Bipoles, for technical reasons. So if I were to & \\
\hline 10 & look into the crystal ball, it probably would be & \\
\hline 11 & an AC line. & \\
\hline 12 & THE CHAIRMAN: Or I think it is & \\
\hline 13 & referenced in this ultimate report as well that & \\
\hline 14 & there is the possibility of a DC line going & \\
\hline 15 & directly to another jurisdiction? & \\
\hline 16 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: You are correct, & \\
\hline 17 & Mr. Chairman. & \\
\hline 18 & THE CHAIRMAN: For example, if an & \\
\hline 19 & Ontario major sale were to come to pass again, you & \\
\hline 20 & might run it straight across to Ontario or & \\
\hline 21 & something? & \\
\hline 22 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: You are correct, & \\
\hline 23 & Mr. Chairman, it would be an express line. & \\
\hline 24 & THE CHAIRMAN: And Keeyask power will & \\
\hline 25 & be handled by the existing Bipoles I and II, or I & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
or II?
MR. TYMOFICHUK: No. Our capacity in
the two Bipole system is maxed out with the existing generation, so as soon as new northern generation comes on, we need more transmission to bring it down.
THE CHAIRMAN: So you will need Bipole III for Keeyask -- not specifically for Keeyask, but you'll need additional capacity?
MR. TYMOFICHUK: That's correct, yeah.
Just for the record, today we only have three megawatts of spare on the DC system.
THE CHAIRMAN: Three?
MR. TYMOFICHUK: 300 megawatts.
THE CHAIRMAN: Oh, 300.
MR. TYMOFICHUK: That's all that's left.
THE CHAIRMAN: Now, we have had a fair bit of discussion this morning and a couple of days ago about the perhaps inevitable splitting of Bipoles I and II from Dorsey. Two days ago we heard about the window of opportunity that sometime in the very near future, Bipole II, or I guess the converters, or inverters for Bipole II at Dorsey will need to be completely refurbished.

Mr. Mazur referred to that earlier today. When do you think that will happen?

MR. TYMOFICHUK: For planning
purposes, we have identified a point in time. But that's today. If we keep the equipment maintained, that could change. And we need Bipole III to give us that insurance that as we look at replacing inverters on Bipole II, we have that back-up.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I guess where I
want to go with this is the window of opportunity.
MR. MAZUR: I'll explain that a bit
more. What is in the capital plan is to replace the converter valves and the control system going from -- and we have identified that cost as \$234 million, I believe. There's some numbers of 272 million in some of this documentation. So the window, there's ongoing expenditures. I think even as Mr. Woodford pointed out in his presentation, we have had lots of problems with both the Bipole I and II transformers, for example, and there's been purchases to replace those transformers. But we also keep a stock of spares. And I'm not sure \(I\) would call it a window of opportunity, because it's an economic decision

1 of whether you want to spend a certain amount, or spend the 1.2 billion to relocate.

THE CHAIRMAN: But I think the window of opportunity would, you know, if you go ahead in five or 10 years, whenever, and do refurbish the Bipole II stations, and you have spent this quarter of a billion dollars, then you're going to be reluctant to do that splitting until that equipment has sort of served its purpose, which we were told the other day could be as much as 40 years. Is that a correct assumption?

MR. MAZUR: That's correct, yeah. But you also have to keep in mind that without addressing the line, we still have a gigantic problem. So it becomes a question of what is the right thing to do first, which is why we put Bipole III forward.

THE CHAIRMAN: And so the differential cost between refurbishing Bipole II now and building new is the difference between 1.16 billion and 240 , or whatever it is, million? MR. MAZUR: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Now, I'm still not quite clear, Mr. Meronek explored this a fair bit. The additional, the 70K DC line that
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & would run from Dorsey to Riel, why would that be & Page 6450 \\
\hline 2 & needed? & \\
\hline 3 & MR. MAZUR: Pardon me? & \\
\hline 4 & THE CHAIRMAN: The 70K DC line from & \\
\hline 5 & Dorsey to Riel, assuming that you were to do the & \\
\hline 6 & Bipole I and II split that we inquired about in & \\
\hline & our December 3rd letter, why would that 70K line & \\
\hline 8 & be needed? & \\
\hline 9 & MR. MAZUR: In the document that we & \\
\hline 10 & supplied, we identified two approaches. One & \\
\hline 11 & approach would be to put that line in, and that & \\
\hline 12 & provides a connection between Dorsey and Riel & \\
\hline 13 & converters. And if you don't do that, and you & \\
\hline 14 & lose the overhead line from the tap off to Riel, & \\
\hline 15 & you can't parallel. So there's some additional & \\
\hline 16 & risk. & \\
\hline 17 & Alternatively, you can put a switching & \\
\hline 18 & station in and not build that line, and accept & \\
\hline 19 & that risk. Loss of that portion of line from & \\
\hline 20 & Bipole II tap to Riel, you wouldn't parallel it. & \\
\hline 21 & So it's not -- the line gives you more equivalent & \\
\hline 22 & reliability that we have today than if you didn't & \\
\hline 23 & build it. & \\
\hline 24 & THE CHAIRMAN: Somewhere in, I think & \\
\hline & it was one of the options in the ultimate report, & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & it talked about in the future when you come to & Page 6451 \\
\hline 2 & split Bipoles I and II from Dorsey, running Bipole & \\
\hline 3 & II to LaVerendrye or somewhere near LaVerendrye, & \\
\hline 4 & would that line just sort of then be extended & \\
\hline 5 & directly, sort of skip over Dorsey and go to this & \\
\hline 6 & LaVerendrye or near LaVerendrye site? & \\
\hline 7 & MR. MAZUR: I would imagine we would & \\
\hline 8 & have to take that Bipole line and, yes, & \\
\hline 9 & generically speaking, it's not the right term, & \\
\hline 10 & skip over Dorsey and get to LaVerendrye, or quite & \\
\hline 11 & likely something further south along that & \\
\hline 12 & corridor. & \\
\hline 13 & THE CHAIRMAN: I understand that skip & \\
\hline 14 & over is not exactly an engineering term, but it's & \\
\hline 15 & one that I understand. & \\
\hline 16 & I think that all the significant & \\
\hline 17 & questions that I had have been addressed. So & \\
\hline 18 & Ms. MacKay, you had a question? & \\
\hline 19 & MS. MacKAY: Actually I have I think & \\
\hline 20 & just one question, which I'm sure will be a & \\
\hline 21 & repetition for you of much of what you have said, & \\
\hline 22 & but could you just go through for me one more & \\
\hline 23 & time? All of your choices have Bipole I or & \\
\hline 24 & Bipoles I and II at Dorsey, and Bipole III going & \\
\hline 25 & into Riel. You do not ever use the option that, & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & for example, the Coalition suggested of taking & Page 6452 \\
\hline 2 & Bipole III into, for example, LaVerendrye. Why & \\
\hline 3 & does it seem so important to you to bring Bipole & \\
\hline 4 & III all the way around the city and into Riel & \\
\hline 5 & instead of something on the other side? & \\
\hline 6 & MR. MAZUR: Well, the best place to & \\
\hline 7 & inject the Bipole III power is into Riel. And if & \\
\hline 8 & you inject it into LaVerendrye, now you have to & \\
\hline 9 & build additional transmission to get the power to & \\
\hline 10 & Riel. And so, in essence, it's more expensive, & \\
\hline & and it's more efficient to just run the DC line & \\
\hline 12 & into Riel. & \\
\hline 13 & MS. MacKAY: Okay. To follow that up & \\
\hline 14 & then, can you explain to me why you have to get & \\
\hline 15 & the power to Riel? & \\
\hline 16 & MR. MAZUR: Well, I think way back in & \\
\hline 17 & November sometime, Mr. Neufeld did a little bit of & \\
\hline & an explanation. But all that the major power & \\
\hline 19 & coming into the network, or at least 70 percent of & \\
\hline 20 & it is at Dorsey. So all the power is flowing & \\
\hline 21 & really from Dorsey towards loads, and a lot of the & \\
\hline 22 & load is on the east side of Winnipeg. So we've & \\
\hline 23 & got all the underlying transmission that's loading & \\
\hline & up. And unless we get an injection point on that & \\
\hline 25 & side, we're really going to be just building & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & additional transmission from the west toward - & Page 6453 \\
\hline 2 & northwest toward the east. And on, you know, well & \\
\hline 3 & into the future. So the best option is to inject & \\
\hline 4 & some DC power into that southeast corner. & \\
\hline 5 & THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gibbons? & \\
\hline 6 & MR. GIBBONS: Yes, actually I want to & \\
\hline 7 & follow up on a couple of things, one in regards to & \\
\hline 8 & Mr. Sargeant's question. Yesterday, one of the & \\
\hline 9 & Coalition witnesses, I think it might have been & \\
\hline 10 & Mr. Derry, actually cited a year by which he & \\
\hline 11 & thought the work regarding Bipole II's & \\
\hline 12 & refurbishment would need to be done. I think he & \\
\hline 13 & used the year 2019. Is that a close approximation & \\
\hline 14 & of -- in fact, he used that in the context of the & \\
\hline 15 & window of opportunity -- is that a close & \\
\hline 16 & approximation of the life of the equipment as you & \\
\hline 17 & see it? & \\
\hline 18 & MR. MAZUR: I don't believe it's an & \\
\hline 19 & approximation of the life of the equipment. We & \\
\hline 20 & would undertake to do something after Bipole III & \\
\hline 21 & is in service so we have the spare capacity to do & \\
\hline 22 & it. Otherwise, there's additional outage costs & \\
\hline 23 & and lost opportunity of power sales. & \\
\hline 24 & MR. GIBBONS: Let me pose a & \\
\hline 25 & hypothetical then, if I may? If Bipole III were & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
to go ahead, would the splitting off of Bipole II need to be done by 2019 , or is there a longer or shorter time frame that you have in mind?

MR. MAZUR: Well, the next decision point is 2025, where we would, of course somewhere a few years prior to that, make some decision on an evaluation of options as to how we would address additional reliability.

MR. GIBBONS: 2025, okay, thank you. The Coalition's proposal differs from option three largely in two ways, it seems to me. One is they foresee Bipole II being split off and going to Riel and Bipole III going into LaVerendrye. And the other has to do with the timing. They would prefer to see Bipole II split first. We have heard from Manitoba Hydro, I think it might have been Mr. Bedford who made reference to this, that Hydro would be reluctant, highly reluctant to split off Bipole II if Bipole III weren't in place, in order to cover off I suppose the potential for outages and so on.

If Bipole III were in place, let me assume the following scenario, if we assume that Bipole III went forward, then it opens up a better opportunity for splitting off Bipole II. And for

1 the moment I'm only going to focus on splitting it
        from Dorsey, separate from the broader corridor
    issue. In the context of option three, there
    really isn't much difference in whether or not one
    then takes Bipole III into LaVerendrye and Bipole
    II into Riel, as opposed to the original idea
    which was the reverse. And in some respects it
    seems to me, from the longer term perspective of
    the corridor issue, bringing Bipole II, if you are
    moving it not only from Dorsey but widening the
    corridor for reliability reasons, wouldn't it make
    more sense to bring Bipole II into Riel rather
    than into LaVerendrye, thereby opening up the
    possibility that Laverendrye becomes the terminus,
    or somewhere near Laverendrye, somewhere southwest
    in other words, becomes the more logical terminus
    for Bipole III. And in that scenario, there is
    the benefit I suppose of, A, shorter lines, B,
    less prime agricultural land being disrupted. But
    certainly as you look at the map, if one is
    worried about the corridor eventually, bringing
    Bipole III to Riel means then you don't have to
    cross over or skip over Bipole I to get to
    LaVerendrye. So it strikes me that at least from
    that perspective, there's a certain logic to the
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & Coalition's perspective if we put aside the & Page 6456 \\
\hline 2 & timing issue. And even if we assume the point & \\
\hline 3 & about timing that Bipole III needs to be done & \\
\hline 4 & first, wouldn't the location at least that the & \\
\hline 5 & Coalition talks about make more sense? & \\
\hline 6 & MR. MAZUR: Well, as you mentioned, & \\
\hline 7 & timing is a big issue, number one. And secondly, & \\
\hline 8 & it's still more expensive, in that you've got to & \\
\hline 9 & extend a lot of transmission that wouldn't need to & \\
\hline 10 & be built if you went and put Bipole III into Riel. & \\
\hline 11 & MR. GIBBONS: But from a reliability & \\
\hline 12 & perspective, two going to Riel and three going to & \\
\hline 13 & LaVerendrye or thereabouts makes more sense than & \\
\hline 14 & the reverse, does it not? Speaking now only about & \\
\hline 15 & reliability, in that you get better line & \\
\hline 16 & separation by moving two farther east and bringing & \\
\hline 17 & down to Riel and so forth, rather than having it & \\
\hline 18 & cross over Bipole I on its way to LaVerendrye? & \\
\hline 19 & MR. MAZUR: Well, I guess the & \\
\hline 20 & crossover is only something you need to deal with & \\
\hline 21 & if and when the decision is to relocate Bipole II. & \\
\hline 22 & MR. GIbBONS: But that's part of the & \\
\hline 23 & scenario that I'm painting here, and it's part of & \\
\hline 24 & the scenario that the Coalition is talking about. & \\
\hline 25 & I'm sorry, unlike some of the speakers & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & today, I was president of my high school physics & Page 6457 \\
\hline 2 & club, so I perhaps have one percent more knowledge & \\
\hline 3 & about physics than they do, maybe a half a & \\
\hline 4 & percent. That is not saying much, I admit. It & \\
\hline 5 & strikes me, though, that if you are concerned & \\
\hline 6 & about the closeness of lines, having a line skip & \\
\hline 7 & over another line, it's about as close as you can & \\
\hline 8 & get. So having more physical separation strikes & \\
\hline 9 & me as more reasonable. & \\
\hline 10 & MR. MAZUR: I don't think that there & \\
\hline 11 & is much of a difference in that case, however, & \\
\hline 12 & because both Bipole I and II converge at Dorsey. & \\
\hline 13 & MR. GIBBONS: But we are talking about & \\
\hline 14 & them in the context of splitting them? & \\
\hline 15 & MR. MAZUR: Yes. & \\
\hline 16 & MR. GIBBONS: So if you are splitting & \\
\hline 17 & them, wouldn't it, in the context of splitting & \\
\hline 18 & them, make more sense of having them farther apart & \\
\hline 19 & rather than having them crossing over? & \\
\hline 20 & MR. MAZUR: I guess it depends how you & \\
\hline 21 & did it, but you're still starting from Dorsey & \\
\hline 22 & where the two lines are converged. So I'm not & \\
\hline 23 & sure, there may be a reliability advantage. & \\
\hline 24 & MR. GIBBONS: Well, as I understand & \\
\hline 25 & the 2010 report and some of the comments that have & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
been made today, ultimately you would like further separation between Bipole I and Bipole II in order to address the corridor loss problem. In that context, if one looks at the map, the more likely scenario in terms of separation is to move Bipole II farther east, isn't it, as opposed to putting it to the west side? So putting it in closer proximity to the Riel station?

MR. MAZUR: Well, in terms of the corridor separation, yes.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. That's essentially where \(I\) was going with that.

Last question, and only because I'm trying to visualize how the planning process is moving forward. If this separation in the corridor does occur -- and I'll be retired from the Clean Environment Commission before this happens I imagine -- but are you envisioning then a line -- where would the line separation begin? Presumably it's going to begin far before you get to Dorsey, so presumably it's what, Teulon, Riverton? I mean, where would you see a split-off occurring? At the very top of the Interlake?

MR. MAZUR: You are referring to the tapping of the Bipole II and moving it to Riel?
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MR GIBBONS: Yes & Page 6459 \\
\hline 2 & MR. MAZUR: I believe something like & \\
\hline 3 & St. Andrews comes to mind. & \\
\hline 4 & MR. GIBBONS: That close to the city, & \\
\hline 5 & okay, St. Andrews then. & \\
\hline 6 & MR. MAZUR: I think it was within 50 & \\
\hline 7 & kilometres or so of Dorsey, to the north. & \\
\hline 8 & MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Thank you. & \\
\hline 9 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: Mr. Chairman, if you & \\
\hline 10 & visualize St. Ambroise on Lake Manitoba, that's & \\
\hline 11 & about the western point, and take a line straight & \\
\hline 12 & east and it probably comes out somewheres at & \\
\hline 13 & St. Andrews. & \\
\hline 14 & THE CHAIRMAN: There is a map attached & \\
\hline 15 & to Mr. Bedford's response to my letter that shows & \\
\hline 16 & it. & \\
\hline 17 & Mr. Kaplan? & \\
\hline 18 & MR. KAPLAN: Contrary to my colleagues & \\
\hline 19 & today who either failed physics or were at the & \\
\hline 20 & head of their class in physics, I can't even & \\
\hline 21 & recall taking physics. It doesn't help anybody & \\
\hline 22 & that much. & \\
\hline 23 & Yesterday I started off with a & \\
\hline 24 & question, but I was asked to hold it by & \\
\hline 25 & Mr. Bedford, waiting for the engineers to arrive. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & I'm going to assume you are the engineers, that & Page 6460 \\
\hline 2 & you have arrived, and that I can ask my question & \\
\hline 3 & that I don't think is that difficult, just for & \\
\hline 4 & clarification purposes, if I could. & \\
\hline 5 & From the Coalition presentation, and & \\
\hline 6 & I'd refer you to a page number of Mr. Woodford's & \\
\hline 7 & presentation, but there are no page numbers, so & \\
\hline 8 & you're going to have to rely on me to quote two & \\
\hline 9 & quotations from his presentation. And this deals & \\
\hline 10 & simply with analog versus digital. And I will & \\
\hline 11 & have three minor questions attached to the overall & \\
\hline 12 & question. I quote for you for consideration: & \\
\hline 13 & "Today BP I, Bipole I and Bipole II & \\
\hline 14 & are analogue (30 year old technology) & \\
\hline 15 & which eventually must be replaced." & \\
\hline 16 & A second quote from the same page without a number & \\
\hline 17 & states: & \\
\hline 18 & "Tomorrow Bipole I, Bipole II and & \\
\hline 19 & Bipole III controls will be digital, & \\
\hline 20 & state of the art." & \\
\hline 21 & My questions, if you could, relate to what the & \\
\hline 22 & present plan of Hydro is for the digital & \\
\hline 23 & conversion. And I think, Mr. Mazur, you spoke & \\
\hline & about control system shortly before this question, & \\
\hline 25 & with a changeover cost of 234 million to & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

272 million. I take it control changeover is what we're talking about?

MR. MAZUR: The valve groups and the controls, and those controls certainly will be digital when that gets changed over. Bipole III certainly will be digital. All our protection and control systems, other than the DC, right now is a mix of old relays and old control systems. But everything we buy today that's for new equipment or replacement of equipment is digital.

MR. KAPLAN: And if I can ask you the time to change over, what is involved in that? Are we talking a day, a week, a month, a year?

MR. MAZUR: We have an estimate of about six weeks per valve group.

MR. KAPLAN: I'm sorry, six weeks
per --
MR. MAZUR: Per valve group. So on Bipole II, there's four valve groups on each converter station.

MR. KAPLAN: And when you said 234 million to 272 million, more specifically what is that related to? All of the changeovers?

MR. MAZUR: That includes the valve group changeovers, which is the bigger component,
and the controls. And that 230 is at Dorsey for the Bipole II, just to be clear.
MR. KAPLAN: All right. If you could just briefly highlight to me the benefits of the digital versus the analogue. MR. MAZUR: Well, there's certainly
advantages. Like all the digital controls are programmable. So in terms of ease of settings and flexibility of making operating changes, you know, things like that, they are certainly much more flexible, I mean, as compared to analogue controls which still require revisions to printed circuit boards and things that are -- the art is lost these days as to how to modify, and ease of modification, et cetera.
MR. KAPLAN: In the unfortunate incident of a power outage, does digital help Hydro to do something to get the system back up a lot easier, I assume, than analogue?
MR. TYMOFICHUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is, because we can interrogate in front of a computer, from a remote distance, data to see what has gone wrong. We can reset. In the old system we pretty much have to have people in the station to look at what may have burnt out, what cards are
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & failed, and then install new cards, that sort of & Page 6463 \\
\hline 2 & thing. & \\
\hline 3 & MR. KAPLAN: Thank you. & \\
\hline 4 & THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Before we & \\
\hline 5 & close off this panel, I invite any of the other & \\
\hline 6 & participants or members of the public who might & \\
\hline 7 & have questions of these gentlemen specific to this & \\
\hline 8 & issue? Anybody? & \\
\hline 9 & Mr. Bedford? & \\
\hline 10 & MR. BEDFORD: If we are about to & \\
\hline 11 & close, I do have a comment I would like to make. & \\
\hline 12 & THE CHAIRMAN: Go ahead, sir. & \\
\hline 13 & MR. BEDFORD: With respect, & \\
\hline 14 & Mr. Sargeant, to your speculation just before we & \\
\hline 15 & broke -- & \\
\hline 16 & THE CHAIRMAN: I was being facetious. & \\
\hline 17 & MR. BEDFORD: -- as to why my client's & \\
\hline 18 & report on ultimate HVDC development in Manitoba & \\
\hline 19 & was not filed before this week, I'll admit that I & \\
\hline 20 & have, since I heard your speculation been sitting & \\
\hline 21 & here, speculating upon my own future. And I had & \\
\hline 22 & been helped by our staff who have reminded me that & \\
\hline 23 & in July, Mr. Meronek's client sought production of & \\
\hline 24 & that report through IRs, and also asked a number & \\
\hline 25 & of IRs on this general subject of alternatives to & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Bipole II. And I have a letter sent by the Clean Environment Commission dated July 27, 2012, which tells us all that the particular questions, including the ones that sought production of this report were "Outside the mandate or scope of the hearing as provided in the terms of reference." And we will now quickly remember that Mr. Meronek challenged that decision through a motion filed in August, and that particular motion was dealt with in part through clarification from the Minister of Conservation of this Commission's mandate.
So I have grown happier in my contemplations, because \(I\) know that should some day I stand trial, having been accused of suppressing a document that the Clean Environment Commission wanted, that in that trial I'll stand in the docket in the happy company of some Commissioners from the Clean Environment Commission. And I'll predict that should such trial ever unfold, that we will all be quickly acquitted. Because the ultimate reason why this report was not filed at an earlier date was because the Minister of Conservation did say that he was not inclined and did not want this
Commission to explore need for an alternative for the Bipole III project.
And I think we can also all be
forgiven, given the thousands of pages of paper that's been filed at this hearing, given all of the dozens and dozens of exhibits. Human beings do have difficulty recalling a particular document and a reference to that document that was made in an IR over half a year ago. And I think we can also all be understanding and forgiving that, notwithstanding the Minister's clarification of your mandate, curiosity gets the better of most of us at times, and these subjects are to a degree relevant, we certainly appreciate that they are vitally important to Mr. Meronek's client. And so I don't regret that you have ultimately had my engineering colleagues back here today, and that we have heard from some of their predecessors at Manitoba Hydro on Tuesday. But \(I\) hope that with respect to your speculation as to why this report didn't surface until this week, that we at least appreciate that there's a more complicated explanation as to why it didn't surface.
THE CHAIRMAN: I thank you for that clarification, Mr. Bedford. I'd just like to say
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & that if your future with Manitoba Hydro is not & Page 6466 \\
\hline 2 & secure, I would encourage you to go into writing & \\
\hline 3 & because -- I do not say this facetiously -- your & \\
\hline 4 & way with words is one of the pleasures of sitting & \\
\hline 5 & through some of these long days. & \\
\hline 6 & Mr. Meronek and I have actually had a & \\
\hline 7 & little bit of a discussion off the record on this & \\
\hline 8 & matter. In his motion in January and in a letter & \\
\hline 9 & to the Commission earlier, he referred to me as & \\
\hline 10 & having truncated his line of questioning some & \\
\hline 11 & number of months back. And I had to admit that I & \\
\hline 12 & was partly at fault in that, and so was he. I had & \\
\hline 13 & jumped to the conclusion -- the Coalition came & \\
\hline 14 & into this process initially seeking to consider & \\
\hline 15 & the east/west argument, which we all know is not & \\
\hline 16 & on the table. I asked, in the transcript from & \\
\hline 17 & whenever that was that I truncated Mr. Meronek's & \\
\hline 18 & questioning, I asked him if he was going to go & \\
\hline 19 & into a full tilt NFAT, and he said yes. I jumped & \\
\hline 20 & to the conclusion that he was going to bring up & \\
\hline 21 & the east side. He didn't debate that point with & \\
\hline 22 & me. If he had pointed out that he wanted to look & \\
\hline 23 & at alternatives within the study area, I would & \\
\hline 24 & have allowed it. & \\
\hline 25 & That was how we interpreted the & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Minister's response as well, that a broad NFAT, particularly for issues outside of the study area were not on, but alternatives within the study area are on, and that is why we are here today. That's why we welcomed, if \(I\) can use that word, but perhaps \(I\) should say that is why we allowed Mr. Meronek's motion in January, because we felt that alternatives within the study area were certainly within our scope. But thank you for that clarification, and I'll take back my comments about wondering why this report wasn't filed earlier. It was a very interesting report, although I must admit that the middle parts of it that were strictly on engineering stuff, I had difficulty with and skimmed over the sort of the front and back, and when it got into the planning stuff was quite interesting. So thank you for filing that yesterday.

So we have another free afternoon. We will resume on Monday morning in this same space. Monday morning, we anticipate that Wuskwi Sipihk will make a presentation. We also will have a short presentation from the Manitoba Lodges and Outfitters Association. The afternoon will be
devoted to the Manitoba Metis Federation, who will make a presentation on the rerouting matters, and then make their final argument, as that is the only day that Mr . Madden is available.
Tuesday morning at this time, we have what we are referring to as leftovers, questions from the panel for hydro officials. We will endeavour to let Manitoba Hydro know, probably by tomorrow, what if any experts we would like to see so that we can ask questions of them.
Following that we'll get into Manitoba Hydro's rebuttal. And then Wednesday and Thursday, the various parties will make their final arguments, and we will adjourn some time on Thursday afternoon.
Madam secretary, do you have documents to file?
MS. C. JOHNSON: Yes, I do. The document that was subject to questioning today is MH 118 from Manitoba Hydro. And I have a couple leftovers from yesterday, from Pine Creek, PCFN number 3 is the map of the RM of Mountain; PCFN number 4 is the property ownership map for the Duck Bay area. And I also have Mr. Meronek's letter of March 4th, which will be BPC 17, it was
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & & Page 6469 \\
\hline 2 & (EXHIBIT MH 118: Ultimate HVDC & \\
\hline 3 & Development of Manitoba) & \\
\hline 4 & (EXHIBIT PCFN 3: Map of the RM of & \\
\hline 5 & Mountain) & \\
\hline 6 & (EXHIBIT PCFN 4: Property ownership & \\
\hline 7 & map for Duck Bay area) & \\
\hline 8 & (EXHIBIT BPC 17: Mr. Meronek's letter & \\
\hline 9 & of March 4th) & \\
\hline 10 & THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Williams? & \\
\hline 11 & MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. & \\
\hline 12 & THE CHAIRMAN: More questioning? & \\
\hline 13 & MR. WILLIAMS: Only of you, Mr. Chair. & \\
\hline 14 & In terms of York Factory, I think I heard this & \\
\hline 15 & morning words to the effect that they had & \\
\hline 16 & withdrawn, and so I guess I have two questions. & \\
\hline 17 & One is, I take it now we're not expecting a & \\
\hline 18 & presentation from York Factory? And secondly, & \\
\hline 19 & that if memory serves me right, there was some & \\
\hline 20 & supporting material filed by York Factory, and I'm & \\
\hline 21 & presuming that that would still remain on the & \\
\hline 22 & record of the hearing, but I'm just seeking & \\
\hline 23 & clarification from the panel? & \\
\hline 24 & THE CHAIRMAN: That's a good question. & \\
\hline 25 & They have already provided -- & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MS. C. JOHNSON: Not officially. & Page 6470 \\
\hline 2 & THE CHAIRMAN: Not officially, so Mr. & \\
\hline 3 & William's question is, is that to stay on the & \\
\hline 4 & record or not? & \\
\hline 5 & MS. C. JOHNSON: I have asked them & \\
\hline 6 & whether they want to record that as a written & \\
\hline 7 & submission. & \\
\hline 8 & THE CHAIRMAN: And? & \\
\hline 9 & MS. C. JOHNSON: I'm waiting for their & \\
\hline 10 & reply. & \\
\hline 11 & THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. For now it's in & \\
\hline 12 & abeyance. We'll let you know on Monday morning & \\
\hline 13 & whether or not they wish to submit that as on the & \\
\hline 14 & record. & \\
\hline 15 & MR. WILLIAMS: Okay, because certainly & \\
\hline 16 & I think our client had intended to rely on some of & \\
\hline 17 & that information for their closing submissions. & \\
\hline 18 & So that would be helpful to have that clarified, & \\
\hline 19 & sir. & \\
\hline 20 & THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you & \\
\hline 21 & Mr. Williams. Mr. Tymofichuk? & \\
\hline 22 & MR. TYMOFICHUK: Yes. With your & \\
\hline 23 & indulgence and the indulgence of everybody in the & \\
\hline 24 & room, I'd like to share something here that speaks & \\
\hline & to the passion that you have felt from some of us & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
during the hearings, and the cure that we all have for planning to keep the lights on in the Province, and even more so when the lights do go out.

THE CHAIRMAN: Were you here earlier in the week when the lights went out here?

MR. TYMOFICHUK: Yes, I was. I really don't know what the cause of it was. So bear with me. This is by an anonymous author. It's called the Man on the Pole.
"The black blowing night and the driving snow, makes it feel much colder than ten below. The wind rasps the snow like sharp cutting sand, strokes bare frozen trees with harsh icy hand. Stiff branches creak with the weight of the wind, which has sung its chill dirge for hours on end. No pin-point of light pricks the gloom of the street,
the dark is forever, frozen, complete. By the curb stands a truck, its tail to the storm, around it gray drifts have started to form. Dimly discerned are the lines of its back, the tools on its side, the high ladder rack. Like a pack-horse it stands, hock deep in the snow,
as patiently waiting, with head hanging low. Alone in the wind and the swirling dark, dim flashers repeating their faint red spark. Above, on a pole, in the wintry night sky, a snow-blurred figure works on high. Clings to his perch with sharp pointed steel, arches his back to the safety trap feel. Desperately he twists the stiff, stubborn wires, his mind running home to warm glowing fires. He pulls with numbed hands, his face a chill mask, with fast-ebbing strength, completes his lone task.

Now LIGHT sprays from windows all down the street, a radio blares loudly, then becomes more discreet. Somewhere a dog barks his plea at the door, light and LIFE have come back to the street once more.

The man on the pole draws a long, tired sigh, then picks his way slowly down out of the sky. The cold hours of labour have taken their toll, he leans for a moment against the hard pole. To the truck he ploddingly makes his way, stows his tool in the back and drives away. Not a soul in those houses, now bright and warm, knows that he's been there, out of the storm.
Silently working to bring them light, as silently fading into the night.
When work-a-day heroes are inscribed on the roll, we too often forget The Man on the Pole."
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,
Mr. Tymofichuk. ice storm and the power outage in Southeastern Manitoba, and watching the news, and I greatly admired those men on the pole. And I was glad that it was somebody else and not me, that I have a different job. So thank you for that.
Mr. Mills?
MR. MILLS: Just a few points.
In our cross of Hydro, I believe we received one undertaking and one commitment that I will, and if we could encourage Hydro to get those to us sometime before our closing, we would appreciate it.
For your information, Mr. Chairman, our closing is available, and if you want to use that time to move your schedule up, we can offer that after Monday morning.
```

I recall last fall when there was the
I recall last fall when there was the

```
    ice storm and the power outage in Southeastern
    Manitoba, and watching the news, and I greatly
    admired those men on the pole. And I was glad
    that it was somebody else and not me, that I have
    a different job. So thank you for that.
    Mr. Mills?
    MR. MILLS: Just a few points.
    In our cross of Hydro, I believe we
    received one undertaking and one commitment that I
    will, and if we could encourage Hydro to get those
    to us sometime before our closing, we would
    appreciate it.

And we just wanted to, John and I were
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & concerned to hear Mr. Bedford's reference to his & Page 6474 \\
\hline 2 & potential future employment. In the spirit of & \\
\hline 3 & sharing that we have strived to achieve, we wanted & \\
\hline 4 & to let him know that we can confirm that, yes, in & \\
\hline 5 & fact, Ikea is hiring. & \\
\hline 6 & So that would be all, Mr. Chairman, & \\
\hline 7 & thank you. & \\
\hline 8 & THE CHAIRMAN: I think you made that & \\
\hline 9 & reference to me as well yesterday, so I'm not & \\
\hline 10 & quite sure what you're getting at. & \\
\hline 11 & MR. MILLS: We'll have cards on Monday & \\
\hline 12 & for your file. & \\
\hline 13 & THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. No more final & \\
\hline 14 & comments? Well, then thank you all. We'll stand & \\
\hline 15 & adjourned now until Monday morning at 9:00 a.m. & \\
\hline 16 & (Adjourned at 11:30 a.m.) & \\
\hline 17 & & \\
\hline 18 & & \\
\hline 19 & & \\
\hline 20 & & \\
\hline 21 & & \\
\hline 22 & & \\
\hline 23 & & \\
\hline 24 & & \\
\hline 25 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\hline 6454:20 & 6413:6,7 & 6414:10 & 6432:22,25 & 6426:22 6441:13 \\
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\hline 6468:21 & 6450:7 & 6404:6,21 & 6389:18 6391:12 & draws 6472:18 \\
\hline cross 6455:23 & decided 6388:13 & 6419:21,22 & 6448:17 & drifts 6471:21 \\
\hline 6456:18 6473:16 & decides 6388:23 & 6420:16 6463:18 & documents 6468:16 & drives 6472:23 \\
\hline crossing 6457:19 & decision 6416:5 & 6469:3 & dog 6472:15 & driving 6471:11 \\
\hline crossover 6456:20 & 6418:9 6441:20 & devoted 6468:1 & doing 6417:16 & drought 6415:6 \\
\hline cross-examination & 6441:21 6442:18 & dictate 6435:19 & 6418:14 6425:16 & dry 6382:1 \\
\hline 6380:3,3 6381:15 & 6442:22 6448:25 & difference 6449:20 & 6443:1 & Duck 6379:6 \\
\hline crowded 6393:20 & 6454:4,6 6456:21 & 6455:4 6457:11 & dollars 6449:7 & 6468:24 6469:7 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{Page 6480} \\
\hline due 6394:12 & 6471:16 & eventually 6455:21 & 6395:23 6396:22 & figure 6424:5 \\
\hline 6443:11 & endeavour 6468:8 & 6460:15 & express 6446:23 & 6427:16 6428:24 \\
\hline duly 6475:5 & engineer 6433:13 & ever 6451:2 & extend 6456:9 & 6429:2 6472:5 \\
\hline during 6471:1 & 6433:16,17 & 6464:21 & extended 6451:4 & file 6468:17 6474:12 \\
\hline & engineered 6388:15 & every 6420:3 & extending 6428:21 & filed 6383:9 \\
\hline E & engineering 6403:1 & everybody 6402:21 & extent 6418:3 & 6391:15,17 \\
\hline each 6461:19 & 6418:19 6433:21 & 6470:23 & external 6438:13 & 6405:9 6412:7 \\
\hline EAPF 6382:15 & 6434:2 6451:14 & everything 6402:10 & & 6441:18 6443:9 \\
\hline earlier 6400:20 & 6465:17 6467:15 & 6408:2 6461:9 & F & 6443:17 6463:19 \\
\hline 6448:1 6464:23 & engineers 6459:25 & evidence 6382:3 & face 6472:10 & 6464:9,23 6465:5 \\
\hline 6466:9 6467:12 & 6460:1 & 6443:6,8 & facetious 6463:16 & 6467:12 6469:20 \\
\hline 6471:5 & engineer's 6433:14 & exactly 6407:1 & facetiously 6466:3 & filing 6443:16 \\
\hline earliest 6408:25 & enhanced 6395:20 & 6451:14 & facilities 6414:5 & 6467:19 \\
\hline 6409:7 & 6400:12 6410:7 & Examiner 6475:16 & 6425:10 & final 6383:7 \\
\hline early 6437:20 & 6412:18 & 6475:20 & fact 6391:9 6395:21 & 6384:10 6386:20 \\
\hline 6438:1 & enhancement & Examiners 6475:6 & 6406:12 6417:13 & 6387:4,5,8 \\
\hline ease 6462:8,14 & 6400:14 & EXAMINER'S & 6419:1 6424:22 & 6416:24 6430:24 \\
\hline easier 6424:5 & enhancements & 6475:1 & 6428:14 6440:7 & 6441:21 6445:4 \\
\hline 6462:19 & 6418:14 & example 6423:5 & 6453:14 6474:5 & 6468:3,14 \\
\hline east 6393:6,11,14 & Enns 6377:17 & 6446:18 6448:22 & factor 6385:1 & 6474:13 \\
\hline 6393:17 6394:1 & enough 6438:15 & 6452:1,2 & 6419:5 & financial 6415:4 \\
\hline 6402:6 6438:10 & 6442:25 & except 6405:17 & factored 6411:21,25 & find 6409:22 \\
\hline 6452:22 6453:2 & entails 6387:18 & Excuse 6412:24 & factors 6391:23 & finding 6394:6 \\
\hline 6456:16 6458:6 & entitled 6383:10 & executive 6396:17 & Factory 6444:15 & 6395:6 \\
\hline 6459:12 6466:21 & Environment & 6433:6,9 & 6469:14,18,20 & findings 6385:20 \\
\hline east/west 6466:15 & 6376:1 6377:2 & executives 6384:5 & fading 6473:2 & 6391:18 \\
\hline economic 6448:25 & 6399:10 6458:17 & EXHIBIT 6379:2 & failed 6402:25,25 & finished 6431:10 \\
\hline economical 6416:6 & 6464:2,16,19 & 6469:2,4,6,8 & 6459:19 6463:1 & 6444:18 \\
\hline economics 6439:15 & environmental & exhibits 6379:1 & failure 6443:2 & fires 6472:9 \\
\hline 6440:4,10,17 & 6382:14 6389:1 & 6465:6 & faint 6472:3 & first 6377:20 6378:2 \\
\hline effect 6419:7 & 6423:25 & existing 6400:5 & fair 6384:25 & 6385:21 6387:24 \\
\hline 6428:11 6439:14 & envision 6424:12 & 6405:5 6407:14 & 6404:16 6406:23 & 6388:1 6399:8 \\
\hline 6440:3,17 & envisioning 6458:18 & 6410:5 6425:5,12 & 6407:19 6417:6,7 & 6405:23 6413:14 \\
\hline 6469:15 & equipment 6422:5,8 & 6427:16,18,22,25 & 6438:15 6442:25 & 6415:13 6424:14 \\
\hline effectiveness & 6448:5 6449:9 & 6445:6 6446:25 & 6447:18 6449:25 & 6435:17,21 \\
\hline 6408:13 & 6453:16,19 & 6447:4 & fairly 6394:1 & 6439:24 6442:5 \\
\hline effects 6431:8 & 6461:9,10 & expectation 6421:9 & fall 6473:8 & 6444:15 6449:16 \\
\hline 6440:16 & equivalent 6415:5 & expected 6409:6 & familiar 6383:12 & 6454:16 6456:4 \\
\hline efficient 6452:11 & 6423:20 6450:21 & 6413:16 6423:7 & 6436:23 & five 6403:24 \\
\hline eight 6426:18 & essence 6452:10 & expecting 6469:17 & far 6391:3,7 6398:5 & 6414:16 6415:24 \\
\hline EIS 6382:14 & essentially 6385:6 & expenditures & 6410:17 6458:20 & 6449:5 \\
\hline 6386:14,18,20 & 6386:6 6458:12 & 6423:7 6448:18 & farther 6456:16 & fix 6441:9,10 6442:8 \\
\hline 6387:3 6390:14 & established 6392:21 & expensive 6401:12 & 6457:18 6458:6 & 6442:10,19 \\
\hline 6390:20 6391:12 & 6406:13 6438:9 & 6405:18 6412:10 & fast 6417:5 & flashers 6472:3 \\
\hline 6404:23 6405:10 & 6438:24 6439:2 & 6452:10 6456:8 & fast-ebbing 6472:11 & flexibility 6418:13 \\
\hline 6405:14,18 & estimate 6424:21 & expert 6469:1 & fault 6404:13 & 6462:9 \\
\hline 6410:11 6419:2 & 6426:25 6461:14 & experts 6468:9 & 6466:12 & flexible 6462:11 \\
\hline 6420:18 6427:15 & estimated 6422:24 & explain 6448:12 & faults 6391:22 & flowing 6452:20 \\
\hline 6443:15 & et 6410:18 6462:15 & 6452:14 & favoured 6417:24 & focus 6385:15 \\
\hline either 6430:7 & ethics 6433:20 & explanation & feasible 6416:17 & 6403:12 6409:18 \\
\hline 6459:19 & evaluation 6454:7 & 6452:18 6465:23 & 6422:18,23 & 6410:20 6455:1 \\
\hline electrons 6389:22 & evaluations 6417:16 & explore 6465:1 & Federation 6377:15 & focusing 6432:17 \\
\hline Elise 6377:7 & even 6387:16 & explored 6449:24 & 6468:1 & 6441:3 \\
\hline eminent 6391:5 & 6408:16,20 & export 6420:10 & feel 6471:12 6472:7 & follow 6420:1 \\
\hline emphasizes 6414:21 & 6413:4 6427:23 & 6429:16,23 & felt 6442:20 6467:7 & 6428:6 6429:17 \\
\hline employment 6474:2 & 6448:19 6456:2 & 6430:18 6431:22 & 6470:25 & 6431:7 6452:13 \\
\hline encourage 6466:2 & 6459:20 6471:3 & 6438:6 & few 6432:18 6443:2 & 6453:7 \\
\hline 6473:18 & event 6427:11 & export-import & 6444:21 6454:6 & followed 6438:11 \\
\hline end 6401:16 & 6428:4 6429:11 & 6388:13 & 6473:15 & following 6417:25 \\
\hline 6418:24 6431:13 & events 6394:13 & exposure 6395:22 & fifth 6445:10 & 6424:4 6428:21 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{Page 6} \\
\hline 6417:12,13 & 6454:12,15,19,25 & implemented & inquiry 6399:13 & J \\
\hline 6421:10,14,17 & 6455:6,9,12 & 6409:9 & inscribed 6473:3 & James 6377:19 \\
\hline 6430:14 6432:15 & 6456:21 6457:12 & imply 6418:16 & insight 6442:9 & Janet 6377:9 \\
\hline 6432:24 6433:2 & 6458:2,6,25 & 6427:19 & install 6463:1 & January 6466:8 \\
\hline 6436:13 6438:3 & 6460:13,18 & import 6405:7 & instead 6452:5 & 6467:7 \\
\hline 6439:6 6441:16 & 6461:19 6462:2 & 6412:8 6420:8 & insurance 6448:7 & Jason 6377:16 \\
\hline 6442:18,23 & 6464:1 & important 6452:3 & intended 6429:14 & job 6473:13 \\
\hline 6443:9 6454:16 & III 6376:6 6377:10 & 6465:15 & 6470:16 & John 6378:3 \\
\hline 6454:18 6460:22 & 6381:8 6384:23 & importation & intent 6388:18 & 6473:25 \\
\hline 6462:18 6465:19 & 6385:7,13 6386:4 & 6390:12 & 6440:19 & Johnson 6377:5,9 \\
\hline 6466:1 6468:7,8 & 6386:7,9,13,20 & imported 6412:2 & intention 6381:23 & 6468:18 6470:1,5 \\
\hline 6468:20 6473:16 & 6387:4,12 & improve 6411:11 & 6420:25 6428:20 & 6470:9 \\
\hline 6473:18 & 6388:24 6389:16 & improved 6439:13 & interested 6414:1 & joint 6390:16 \\
\hline Hydro's 6407:6 & 6390:13,23 & 6440:8,15 & 6417:24 & July 6463:23 6464:2 \\
\hline 6445:13 6468:12 & 6392:2 6393:3,14 & improvement & interesting 6443:24 & jump 6381:14 \\
\hline hypothetical & 6393:15,21 & 6399:23 & 6467:13,18 & jumped 6466:13,19 \\
\hline 6453:25 & 6395:2,10 6396:8 & improvements & Interlake 6458:23 & juncture 6425:5 \\
\hline I & 6396:19 6397:7 & 6404:2 & interpreted 6466:25 & June 6382:21 \\
\hline \(\frac{1}{\text { I }}\) & 6397:20,22 & 6 & interpreting 6441:7 & jurisdiction \\
\hline Ian 6377:22 & 6398:1,25 & inclined 6464:25 & interrogate 6462:21 & 6446:15 \\
\hline ice 6473:9 & 6399:15 6400:5 & include 6414:16 & intuitive 6403:2 & just 6382:5,8 \\
\hline icy 6471:14 & 6400:21 6401:6,8 & 6429:15 & inverter 6387:18 & Ju389:14 6397:20 \\
\hline idea 6404:25 & 6403:9,15 & included 6386:9 & 6395:19 6396:1 & 6398:7 6400:11 \\
\hline 6437:20 6455:6 & 6405:14 6407:8 & includes 6429:7 & 6399:9 6400:6 & 6400:23,24 \\
\hline identified 6383:7 & 6408:4,6 6410:5 & 6461:24 & 6401:24 6403:10 & 6401:8 6402:23 \\
\hline 6386:23 6389:4 & 6411:4 6412:8,10 & including 6398:2 & 6404:5 6410:6 & 6404:8 6409:4,20 \\
\hline 6391:10 6422:20 & 6417:3,8,17 & 6433:9 6464:4 & 6414:12 6435:7 & 6410:13 6412:14 \\
\hline 6423:23 6424:19 & 6419:3,6 6434:8 & increase 6423:10 & 6441:11 6442:12 & 6416:14,15 \\
\hline 6448:4,15 & 6435:12 6437:17 & increased 6410:8 & inverters 6394:9 & 6418:25 6423:18 \\
\hline 6450:10 & 6437:21,21,23 & incremental 6423:2 & 6398:21 6403:3 & 6428:10,13,14 \\
\hline identifies 6413:23 & 6438:17,19,22 & 6440:1,20 6445:4 & 6403:25 6413:9 & 6431:6,16 \\
\hline identify 6420:12 & 6439:11,12 & indeed 6434:7 & 6447:24 6448:8 & 6432:20 6433:3 \\
\hline ignoring 6403:6 & 6440:1,2,12,15 & 6435:5 6436:24 & invite 6463:5 & 6433:13 6434:21 \\
\hline II 6386:25 6387:14 & 6441:25 6444:22 & independent & involve 6388:12 & 6434:23 6435:1,1 \\
\hline 6387:18 6394:9 & 6444:23 6445:2 & 6416:21 & involved 6461:12 & 6435:2 6439:18 \\
\hline 6394:18,22 & 6447:8 6448:7 & INDEX 6379:1 & in-service 6408:25 & 6441:20 6442:4 \\
\hline 6395:7,18 6396:8 & 6449:17 6451:24 & 6380:1 & 6409:7 & 6443:22 6444:14 \\
\hline 6396:23 6397:10 & 6452:2,4,7 & indicate 6388:1 & IR 6388:4 6465:9 & 6447:11 6451:4 \\
\hline 6397:23 6398:21 & 6453:20,25 & 6425:11 6446:7 & IRs 6426:24 & 6451:20,22 \\
\hline 6399:8,16 6401:7 & 6454:13,19,22,24 & indicated 6425:21 & 6463:24,25 & 6452:11,25 \\
\hline 6401:9 6403:9 & 6455:5,17,22 & indicates 6401:18 & Island 6445:11 & 6460:3 6462:2,4 \\
\hline 6404:5 6405:6 & 6456:3,10 & 6413:25 & 6446:3 & 6463:14 6465:25 \\
\hline 6408:24 6409:12 & 6460:19 6461:5 & indication 6393:16 & issue 6384:19,22 & 6469:22 6473:15 \\
\hline 6409:17 6410:25 & 6465:2 & indulgence 6470:23 & 6394:20 6400:24 & 6473:25 \\
\hline 6413:9,17,24 & II's 6453:11 & 6470:23 & 6403:7 6410:14 & \\
\hline 6414:6,10,12,14 & Ikea 6474:5 & inertia 6404:12 & 6413:5 6416:16 & K \\
\hline 6416:6 6418:6 & imagine 6451:7 & inevitable 6447:20 & 6420:19 6433:25 & K 6429:25 \\
\hline 6419:25 6422:5,7 & 6458:18 & inflation 6416:9 & 6455:3,9 6456:2,7 & Kaplan 6377:3 \\
\hline 6422:13 6423:7 & immediately & information 6437:4 & 6463:8 & 6459:17,18 \\
\hline 6423:21 6425:6 & 6430:20 & 6437:10 6470:17 & issued 6388:4 & 6461:11,16,21 \\
\hline 6425:14,24 & impact 6385:6 & 6473:21 & issues 6384:14 & 6462:3,16 6463:3 \\
\hline 6429:8,11 6434:1 & 6396:9 6423:25 & informed 6444:14 & 6386:24 6389:19 & Karen 6377:11 \\
\hline 6434:17 6435:7 & 6440:9 & initially 6438:10 & 6390:12 6405:22 & Keating 6377:22 \\
\hline 6441:11 6442:11 & impacts 6440:20 & 6466:14 & 6406:17 6407:7 & keep 6426:8 6448:5 \\
\hline 6446:25 6447:1 & impediment & initiated 6383:4 & 6407:12 6410:21 & 6448:23 6449:13 \\
\hline 6447:21,23,24 & 6409:11,16 & initiative 6425:9 & 6414:20,25 & 6471:2 \\
\hline 6448:8,21 6449:6 & 6415:5 & inject 6399:15 & 6416:9 6417:18 & keeping 6382:1 \\
\hline 6449:19 6450:6 & impenetrable & 6452:7,8 6453:3 & 6422:2 6467:2 & Keewatinoow \\
\hline 6450:20 6451:2,3 & 6388:25 6407:11 & injection 6452:24 & item 6397:5 & 6387:9 \\
\hline 6451:24 6454:1 & implement 6429:3 & inquired 6450:6 & & Keeyask 6445:2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & & & Page 6484 \\
\hline market 6445:16 & 6420:7,20,23 & 6384:13,18,25 & 6469:2 & 6389:16 6396:10 \\
\hline marketers 6437:12 & 6421:3,6,13,20,22 & 6385:9,18 6386:3 & Michael 6377:4 & 6399:12 6400:6 \\
\hline mask 6472:10 & 6421:23 6422:1,7 & 6386:11,17 & middle 6384:10 & 6405:12,18 \\
\hline material 6469:20 & 6422:15,21 & 6387:2,10,21,25 & 6467:14 & 6407:6 6412:9 \\
\hline mathematically & 6423:1,4,12,15,18 & 6388:6,14,22 & might 6385:16 & 6413:4 6414:15 \\
\hline 6403:2 & 6424:2,11,16,21 & 6389:7,12,25 & 6388:12 6389:20 & 6416:6 6424:25 \\
\hline matter 6381:24 & 6425:1,7,15 & 6390:6,11,18 & 6391:2 6399:9 & 6426:19 6436:5 \\
\hline 6391:10 6419:1 & 6426:2,10,16,23 & 6391:6,18 6392:5 & 6414:22 6418:22 & 6440:22 6442:20 \\
\hline 6444:19 6466:8 & 6427:5,12,22 & 6392:8,14,19,23 & 6420:8 6428:17 & 6443:2 6444:9 \\
\hline matters 6382:8 & 6428:6,12 6429:2 & 6393:5,10,13,18 & 6429:17 6430:7 & 6446:5,8 6447:5 \\
\hline 6468:2 & 6429:6 6430:2 & 6394:5,20 6395:4 & 6446:20 6453:9 & 6448:13 6450:21 \\
\hline maxed 6447:3 & 6431:20 6432:8 & 6395:12,16,25 & 6454:17 6463:6 & 6451:22 6452:10 \\
\hline maximum 6406:14 & 6432:16 6433:10 & 6396:5,14 6397:1 & million 6422:25 & 6452:11 6455:12 \\
\hline may 6418:20 & 6433:22,24 & 6397:19 6398:6 & 6423:11,14 & 6455:16 6456:5,8 \\
\hline 6430:23 6439:5 & 6434:5,10,14,19 & 6398:12,19 & 6426:1 6448:16 & 6456:13 6457:2,8 \\
\hline 6444:13,19 & 6435:3,4,9,14,22 & 6399:1,6,17,20 & 6448:17 6449:21 & 6457:9,18 6458:4 \\
\hline 6453:25 6457:23 & 6436:2,7,12,22 & 6400:1,4,10,23 & 6460:25 6461:1 & 6461:22 6462:10 \\
\hline 6462:25 & 6437:3,9,18,23 & 6401:4,14,23 & 6461:22,22 & 6465:22 6469:12 \\
\hline maybe 6445:22 & 6438:5,22 6439:4 & 6402:3,10,16,21 & Mills 6378:3 & 6471:3 6472:14 \\
\hline 6457:3 & 6439:10,21 & 6403:8,16,20,24 & 6473:14,15 & 6472:17 6474:13 \\
\hline Mayor 6377:9 & 6440:5,11,18 & 6404:4,15,22 & 6474:11 & morning 6381:3,5 \\
\hline Mazur 6380:2 & 6441:3,5,6,15 & 6405:8,11,21 & mind 6406:20 & 6381:18,20,21,22 \\
\hline 6381:21 6383:17 & 6442:4,13,22 & 6406:8,16,19 & 6418:18,19 & 6381:24 6432:14 \\
\hline 6383:20,21 & 6443:4,5,13 & 6407:1,5,10,16,22 & 6449:13 6454:3 & 6432:16 6447:19 \\
\hline 6384:17,21 & 6448:1,12 & 6408:6,11,18,23 & 6459:3 6472:9 & 6467:21,22 \\
\hline 6385:5,10,12 & 6449:12,22 & 6409:4,11,20 & mindset 6395:6 & 6468:5 6469:15 \\
\hline 6386:2,6,12,15,22 & 6450:3,9 6451:7 & 6410:1,3,13,19,23 & Minister 6464:11 & 6470:12 6473:24 \\
\hline 6387:7,20,23 & 6452:6,16 & 6411:7,19,24 & 6464:24 & 6474:15 \\
\hline 6388:3,9,17 & 6453:18 6454:4 & 6412:2,9,12,16 & Minister's 6465:11 & most 6465:12 \\
\hline 6389:3,11,14 & 6456:6,19 & 6413:1,3,14,22 & 6467:1 & mostly 6445:6 \\
\hline 6390:15,22 & 6457:10,15,20 & 6414:9,20 6415:1 & Minnesota 6436:19 & motion 6464:9,9 \\
\hline 6391:14 6392:4,7 & 6458:9,24 6459:2 & 6415:9,11,23 & 6437:5 & 6466:8 6467:7 \\
\hline 6392:11,17 & 6459:6 6460:23 & 6416:8,19,23 & minor 6460:11 & Mountain 6379:4 \\
\hline 6393:1,15 & 6461:3,14,18,24 & 6417:9,19 & minuses 6422:24 & 6468:22 6469:5 \\
\hline 6394:15,24 & 6462:6 & 6418:15,25 & minute 6431:4 & move 6399:16 \\
\hline 6395:13,21 & Mazur's 6443:23 & 6419:12,16 & minutes 6432:18 & 6421:16 6458:5 \\
\hline 6396:3,12,16 & mean 6389:8 6414:6 & 6420:6,14,21,25 & 6444:8 & 6473:23 \\
\hline 6397:2,13 & 6418:5 6458:22 & 6421:5,8,16,21,24 & missing 6430:10 & moving 6387:17 \\
\hline 6398:18,24 & 6462:11 & 6422:3,9,17,22 & mistaken 6445:22 & 6388:11 6396:23 \\
\hline 6399:3,24 6400:3 & meaningful 6407:2 & 6423:2,9,14,17,22 & mistakes 6425:17 & 6422:5,8 6438:13 \\
\hline 6400:9,16 & means 6418:8 & 6424:3,13,18,24 & mitigable 6407:13 & 6455:10 6456:16 \\
\hline 6401:11,22 & 6455:22 & 6425:4,13,20 & \(\boldsymbol{m i x} 6398: 3,10\) & 6458:15,25 \\
\hline 6402:2,7,14,17 & megawatts 6420:2 & 6426:6,13,21 & 6461:8 & much 6382:5 \\
\hline 6403:6,11,18,21 & 6436:13,16 & 6427:2,8,15 & modification & 6395:6 6405:12 \\
\hline 6404:3,10,19 & 6437:4,8 6447:12 & 6428:3,8,23 & 6462:15 & 6405:18 6416:5 \\
\hline 6405:2,9,15 & 6447:14 & 6429:5,23 6430:4 & modify 6462:14 & 6418:19 6423:12 \\
\hline 6406:7,11,18,24 & Member 6377:3,3,4 & 6430:8,13 6431:3 & moment 6397:20 & 6444:13 6449:10 \\
\hline 6407:4,9,12,20 & members 6422:2 & 6431:6,10,13,16 & 6436:12 6455:1 & 6451:21 6455:4 \\
\hline 6408:17,22 & 6432:14,15 & 6432:6,10,12 & 6472:21 & 6457:4,11 \\
\hline 6409:2,10,16,24 & 6444:21 6463:6 & 6433:12 6434:6 & moments 6437:14 & 6459:22 6462:10 \\
\hline 6410:2,10,16,20 & memory 6469:19 & 6434:25 6441:2 & 6437:16 & 6462:24 6471:12 \\
\hline 6411:2,18,22 & men 6473:11 & 6449:24 6464:8 & Monday 6467:21,22 & multi-year 6415:5 \\
\hline 6412:1,6,11,15,24 & mentioned 6456:6 & 6466:6 & 6470:12 6473:24 & must 6435:20 \\
\hline 6413:2,11,20 & mentions 6445:9 & Meronek's 6379:8 & 6474:11,15 & 6460:15 6467:14 \\
\hline 6414:8,19,24 & Meronek 6377:11 & 6463:23 6465:15 & money 6416:10 & \\
\hline 6415:7,10,22 & 6380:3 6381:16 & 6466:17 6467:7 & month 6461:13 & N \\
\hline 6416:3,14,20 & 6381:17,23 & 6468:24 6469:8 & months 6426:15 & narrative 6409:22 \\
\hline 6417:7,15 6418:8 & 6382:13,19,23 & Metis 6377:15 & 6430:25,25 & 6413:4 \\
\hline 6418:21 6419:6 & 6383:3,8,15,19,22 & 6468:1 & 6466:11 & Nation 6377:20,21 \\
\hline 6419:15,19 & 6383:25 6384:3,7 & MH 6379:2 6468:20 & more 6384:21 & 6378:2 6444:15 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{Page 6485} \\
\hline nature 6426:19 & NFAT 6466:19 & 6454:1,12,19,20 & Ontario 6437:25 & orient 6439:17 \\
\hline 6435:11 & 6467:1 & 6454:25 6459:23 & 6439:6 6446:19 & original 6455:6 \\
\hline near 6391:5 & night 6471:11 & 6463:5 6466:7 & 6446:20 & other 6381:8 6389:2 \\
\hline 6401:24 6418:24 & 6472:4 6473:2 & offer 6473:23 & open 6426:6 & 6390:23 6391:22 \\
\hline 6447:23 6451:3,6 & none 6390:18,23 & offered 6442:9,11 & opening 6455:13 & 6396:4,6 6409:16 \\
\hline 6455:15 & 6404:22 6416:20 & Official 6475:1,6,16 & opens 6454:24 & 6411:12 6412:22 \\
\hline necessarily 6404:20 & non-domestic & 6475:20 & operating 6418:13 & 6416:9 6418:14 \\
\hline 6430:6 & 6445:17 & officially 6470:1,2 & 6462:9 & 6422:1 6430:12 \\
\hline need 6385:23 & non-starter 6422:6 & officials 6381:6 & operation 6427:14 & 6431:21 6432:23 \\
\hline 6396:24 6411:13 & 6422:8 & 6468:7 & opinion 6441:22 & 6444:17 6445:10 \\
\hline 6419:8 6423:25 & normal 6433:1 & often 6473:4 & opportunity & 6449:10 6452:5 \\
\hline 6426:18 6427:3 & north 6384:23 & Oh 6447:15 & 6447:22 6448:11 & 6454:14 6455:16 \\
\hline 6441:25 6445:3,9 & 6392:16 6446:5 & okay 6381:14 & 6448:25 6449:4 & 6461:7 6463:5 \\
\hline 6446:3,5,6 6447:5 & 6459:7 & 6393:13 6403:20 & 6453:15,23 & others 6398:11 \\
\hline 6447:7,9,25 & northern 6400:18 & 6404:15 6410:1 & 6454:25 & otherwise 6394:19 \\
\hline 6448:6 6453:12 & 6403:22 6404:6 & 6415:23 6424:13 & opposed 6403:3 & 6453:22 \\
\hline 6454:2 6456:9,20 & 6419:22 6420:7,9 & 6425:20 6431:9 & 6455:6 6458:6 & out 6394:18 \\
\hline 6465:1 & 6421:15 6445:7 & 6431:15 6432:6 & optimum 6438:24 & 6396:17 6402:17 \\
\hline needed 6450:2,8 & 6447:4 & 6435:3 6439:21 & 6439:2 & 6405:1,3 6410:11 \\
\hline needs 6439:8 & northwest 6453:2 & 6440:25 6452:13 & option 6390:7,24 & 6419:5,8 6420:11 \\
\hline 6456:3 & north/south 6392:1 & 6454:9 6458:11 & 6397:24 6398:5,5 & 6422:2 6423:19 \\
\hline negative 6439:14 & 6396:25 6400:16 & 6459:5,8 6470:11 & 6398:7 6399:8 & 6425:2 6430:12 \\
\hline 6440:3 & 6403:13 6405:4 & 6470:15,20 & 6400:4,5,10,12,22 & 6430:20 6431:25 \\
\hline Nelson 6445:25 & 6409:8 6411:5 & 6474:13 & 6400:25 6401:1,4 & 6432:3 6438:6 \\
\hline net 6423:4 & 6419:24 6421:11 & old 6460:14 6461:8 & 6401:13,17,20,20 & 6447:3 6448:19 \\
\hline network 6452:19 & 6441:13 6445:5 & 6461:8 6462:23 & 6402:18,19 & 6459:12 6462:25 \\
\hline Neufeld 6380:2 & note 6405:20 & once 6395:1 & 6403:8,19,24,24 & 6466:22 6471:4,6 \\
\hline 6381:22 6383:23 & 6439:11 & 6420:24 6444:18 & 6404:4,7,11,17 & 6472:19,25 \\
\hline 6383:24 6384:5,9 & notes 6442:6 6475:8 & 6472:16 & 6405:17 6408:23 & outage 6387:16 \\
\hline 6384:12,16 & nothing 6388:13 & one 6384:18 6389:5 & 6408:25 6409:6 & 6390:25 6391:1 \\
\hline 6385:14 6388:20 & 6394:19 6402:5 & 6389:25 6391:15 & 6409:13,22,25 & 6395:8 6396:22 \\
\hline 6389:20 6390:2,9 & 6428:12 & 6396:3,5,7 6401:1 & 6410:4,7,14 & 6403:4 6410:25 \\
\hline 6391:2 6392:20 & nothing's 6388:21 & 6403:4,12 & 6411:8,10,11 & 6426:14 6442:9 \\
\hline 6393:7,12,23 & notwithstanding & 6408:24 6414:14 & 6412:12,17 & 6453:22 6462:17 \\
\hline 6395:1,4,10 & 6440:6,15 & 6414:20,24 & 6414:15,16,16 & 6473:9 \\
\hline 6399:4,14,19 & 6465:11 & 6416:22 6417:2 & 6417:2,5,11,19,23 & outages 6454:21 \\
\hline 6400:19 6401:3 & November 6384:9 & 6418:10 6420:2 & 6418:11,16 & outcome 6418:2 \\
\hline 6401:12,15 & 6444:1 6452:17 & 6422:15 6423:17 & 6419:9 6420:2,12 & Outfitters 6467:25 \\
\hline 6408:1,9 6428:17 & numbed 6472:10 & 6423:22 6430:2 & 6432:2,7,9 6434:8 & outlet 6392:13,22 \\
\hline 6429:13 6430:6 & number 6381:5 & 6431:17,24 & 6434:17 6435:11 & outside 6464:5 \\
\hline 6430:11 6442:14 & 6397:5 6430:20 & 6432:23 6437:2 & 6440:1,2 6441:3,9 & 6467:2 \\
\hline 6444:1 6452:17 & 6456:7 6460:6,16 & 6441:4,7,8,19 & 6451:25 6453:3 & over 6381:24 \\
\hline never 6403:1 & 6463:24 6466:11 & 6442:7,20 & 6454:11 6455:3 & 6395:20 6397:4 \\
\hline 6438:7,12 6444:4 & 6468:22,23 & 6443:15 6444:5,6 & options 6385:2,3,8 & 6399:23 6400:10 \\
\hline new 6391:20 & numbers 6448:16 & 6450:10,25 & 6389:2,4 6390:18 & 6400:14 6405:21 \\
\hline 6400:13 6401:7 & 6460:7 & 6451:15,20,22 & 6390:23 6398:2 & 6411:7 6412:17 \\
\hline 6405:6 6406:1,9 & & 6453:7,8 6454:12 & 6398:13,17 & 6413:3 6415:12 \\
\hline 6409:8 6420:15 & 0 & 6455:4,20 6456:7 & 6400:14,20 & 6416:25 6417:20 \\
\hline 6421:1,3,10 & observation 6431:7 & 6457:2 6458:4 & 6402:12 6403:12 & 6423:24 6435:12 \\
\hline 6422:13 6429:16 & obtain 6428:16 & 6466:4 6469:17 & 6404:23,25 & 6451:5,10,14 \\
\hline 6431:22 6435:20 & 6429:6 & 6473:17,17 & 6405:3,4,13 & 6455:23,23 \\
\hline 6441:13 6446:7 & obviously 6406:21 & ones 6464:4 & 6406:25 6407:24 & 6456:18 6457:7 \\
\hline 6447:4 6449:20 & occur 6458:16 & ongoing 6448:18 & 6408:13,13 & 6457:19 6461:5 \\
\hline 6461:9 6463:1 & occurring 6458:23 & only 6397:13 6398:4 & 6414:11,14 & 6461:12 6465:9 \\
\hline news 6473:10 & October 6383:11 & 6416:16 6419:4 & 6418:10 6420:8 & 6467:16 \\
\hline next 6382:3 6391:25 & 6384:8 6432:18 & 6437:8 6447:11 & 6420:11 6431:23 & overall 6416:2 \\
\hline 6396:20 6400:11 & 6436:6 & 6455:1,10 & 6444:3 6450:25 & 6417:17 6460:11 \\
\hline 6406:16 6414:1 & off 6382:6 6383:22 & 6456:14,20 & 6454:7 & overconcentration \\
\hline 6415:12 6417:24 & 6384:3 6408:15 & 6458:13 6468:4 & order 6407:16 & 6414:4 \\
\hline 6418:9 6454:4 & 6444:22 6450:14 & 6469:13 & 6454:20 6458:2 & overhead 6450:14 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{Page 6486} \\
\hline overly 6411:14 & 6398:15 6400:12 & 6420:24 6421:14 & 6418:4 & 6407:17 6462:24 \\
\hline oversight 6443:11 & 6402:8 6407:23 & 6423:8 6438:9,11 & potential 6400:18 & prevent 6402:5 \\
\hline own 6427:23 & 6409:13,14 & 6448:13 6460:22 & 6411:16 6418:6 & previous 6397:1 \\
\hline 6463:21 & 6464:3,9 6465:7 & planned 6390:24 & 6440:9 6454:21 & pricks 6471:17 \\
\hline ownership 6379:6 & particularly 6467:2 & planning 6386:8 & 6474:2 & prime 6430:5,10 \\
\hline 6468:23 6469:6 & parties 6404:24 & 6390:16 6415:15 & powder 6382: & 6455:19 \\
\hline & 68:13 & 6418:5 6438:19 & power 6394:12 & printed 6462:12 \\
\hline P & partly 646 & 6438:20,22 & 6415:17 6420:10 & prior 6454:6 \\
\hline pack-horse 6471:24 & parts 6467:14 & 6448:3 6458:14 & 6436:19,20,25 & priority 6435:12 \\
\hline page 6379:2 & PARTY 6377:18 & 6467:17 6471:2 & 6437:1,6 6438:6 & probably 6391:8 \\
\hline 6385:21 6391:19 & pass 6421:1,12 & plans 6388:19 & 6441:25 6444:25 & 6424:5,24 \\
\hline 6396:18 6397:4 & 446:19 & 6391:4 6408:5 & 6446:24 6452:7,9 & 6429:19 6434:13 \\
\hline 6398:15 6400:11 & passion 6470:25 & 6428:11,13 & 6452:15,18,20 & 6436:3 6446:10 \\
\hline 6405:21,24 & past 6425:18 6444:2 & 6429:15,21 & 6453:4,23 & 6459:12 6468:8 \\
\hline 6408:11 6411:8 & Pat 6377:3 & 6437:17 6438:3,5 & 6462:17 6473:9 & problem 6394:21,25 \\
\hline 6412:17,24 & patiently 6472: & 6438:6 6445:13 & practice 6406:5,9 & 6395:3 6413:8 \\
\hline 6413:1,3,6 & pay 6428:4 & plea 6472:15 & 6406:12 & 6416:16 6425:12 \\
\hline 6415:12 6416:25 & PCFN 6379:4,6 & please 6439:23 & precisely 6424:19 & 6442:15 6449:15 \\
\hline 6417:20 6423:14 & 6468:21,22 & pleasures 6466:4 & predecessors & 6458:3 \\
\hline 6423:24 6424:6 & 6469:4,6 & plebeian 6406:20 & 6465:18 & problems 6413:23 \\
\hline 6432:21 6433:14 & PEGUIS 6377:20 & ploddingly 6472:22 & predetermined & 6448:20 \\
\hline 6434:22 6437:15 & people 6462:24 & plus 6400:5 6410:5 & 6393:8 & proceeded 6438:8 \\
\hline 6439:11 6440:25 & per 6461:15,17,18 & 6419:9 6436:14 & predict 6464:20 & Proceedings \\
\hline 6460:6,7,16 & percent 6400:2 & 6437:5 & prefer 6454:15 & 6376:18 6380:1 \\
\hline pages 6406:17 & 6441:24 6442:2 & pluses 6422:2 & preferred 6382:25 & process 6384:10 \\
\hline 65:4 6475: & 6452:19 6457:2,4 & point 6387:13 & 6383:7 6384:11 & 6458:14 6466:14 \\
\hline painting 6456:23 & perch 6472:6 & 6392:11 6393:2 & 6386:20 6387:5,6 & production 6463:23 \\
\hline panel 6380:2,4 & perhaps 6426:14 & 6396:16 6397:9 & 6387:8 6388:10 & 6464:4 \\
\hline 6382:7 6422:2 & 6428:18 6429:16 & 6399:22 6402:15 & 6398:5 6402:18 & programmable \\
\hline 6432:10,15,15 & 6439:8 6444:5 & 6403:21 6404:7 & 6413:6 6417:4 & 6462:8 \\
\hline 6444:21 6463:5 & 6447:20 6457:2 & 6416:17 6419: & 6421:14 & project 6376:6 \\
\hline 6468:7 6469:23 & 6467:6 & 6419:18,24 & preliminary & 6465:2 \\
\hline paper 6430:15,17 & permit 6431:11 & 6420:4 6423:1 & 6388:10 & promote 6385:3 \\
\hline 6430:18 6431:24 & perspective 6382:8 & 6424:8 6425:2 & premise 6425 & promoting 6386:13 \\
\hline 6465:4 & 6385:24 6397:16 & 6427:24 6436:1 & preparation & 6386:19 6387:4 \\
\hline paragraph 6405:23 & 6401:19 6402:24 & 6438:7,18 & 6415:15 & proper 6433:21 \\
\hline 6413:15 6414:1 & 6407:6 6417:21 & 6439:25 6440:1 & prepared 6383:20 & property 6379:6 \\
\hline 6415:14 6434:24 & 6419:3 6420:17 & 6440:23 6443:6 & 6384:8 6389:10 & 6468:23 6469:6 \\
\hline 6434:25 6435:1,3 & 6431:8 6455:8,25 & 6445:15 6448:4 & 6421:23 & proposal 6382:9,15 \\
\hline 6435:6,16,17 & 6456:1,12 & 6452:24 6454:5 & present 6400:7 & 6399:15 6400:7 \\
\hline 6439:17,19,20,25 & physical 6457:8 & 6456:2 6459:11 & 6404:7 6414:4 & 6401:6 6417:12 \\
\hline 6440:14 6441:1,7 & physics 6402:25 & 6466:21 & 6416:8 6433:8 & 6454:10 \\
\hline parallel 6417:16 & 6457:1,3 6459:19 & pointed 6448:19 & 6436:12 6460:22 & propose 6405:11 \\
\hline 6426:3 6427:6 & 6459:20,21 & 6466:22 6472:6 & presentation & proposed 6393:22 \\
\hline 6429:12 6450:15 & picking 6422:5, & points 6410:11 & 6381:11 6444:16 & 6396:11 6417:3 \\
\hline 6450:20 & picks 6472:19 & 6441:8 6473:15 & 6448:20 6460:5,7 & 6424:10,17 \\
\hline paralleling 6423:6 & pin 6426:22 & pole 6471:10 6472:4 & 6460:9 6467:23 & 6438:6 \\
\hline 6423:20 6427:13 & Pine 6378:2 & 6472:18,21 & 6467:24 6468:2 & proposing 6395:20 \\
\hline 6428:20 6429:7 & 6468:21 & 6473:4,11 & 6469:18 & 6408:8 6411:9 \\
\hline 6429:22 6431:22 & pin-point 6471:17 & portion 6426 & presently 6382:9 & proposition 6387:22 \\
\hline paraphrasing & place 6395:2 6452:6 & 6450:19 & 6388:24 6393:21 & 6397:12 \\
\hline 6412:20 6417:20 & 6454:20,22 & pose 6453:24 & 6397:22 & prospect 6418:6 \\
\hline Pardon 6434:10 & 6475:9 & posed 6443:25 & president 6433: & protected 6418:3 \\
\hline 6450:3 & placed 6390:20 & posit 6388:23 & 6457:1 & protection 6461:6 \\
\hline part 6383:20 & placement 6406:1 & possibility 6381:7 & pressing 6385:2 & provide 6392:13 \\
\hline 6399:17,19 & places 6381:8 & 6389:9 6410:8 & presumably & 6400:17 6423:19 \\
\hline 6443:10 6456:22 & plan 6386:10 & 6414:17 6431:19 & 6458:20,21 & 6425:9 \\
\hline 6456:23 6464:10 & 6388:5,10 & 6445:19 6446:14 & presume 6393:2 & provided 6464:6 \\
\hline participants 6463:6 & 6390:24 6395:15 & 6455:14 & presuming 6469:21 & 6469:25 \\
\hline particular 6386:13 & 6408:7 6418:5 & possible 6411:5 & pretty 6393:20 & provides 6400:12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{Page 6487} \\
\hline 6400:13 6404:11 & quick 6441:8 & reconsider 6398:2 & relationship & 6428:7 \\
\hline 6404:13 6418:11 & 6442:20 & reconsidered & 6393:21 & repeatedly 6426:17 \\
\hline 6450:12 & quickest 6441:10 & 6387:15 & relative 6384:22 & repeating 6425:17 \\
\hline providing 6404:1 & 6442:8,10 & reconstruction & 6394:3 & 6472:3 \\
\hline 6423:6 & quickly 6464:7,21 & 6415:3 & relays 6461:8 & repetition 6451:21 \\
\hline Province 6471:3 & quite 6438:3 6439:2 & reconvene 6381:4 & relevance 6431:2 & replace 6388:15 \\
\hline 6475:6 & 6449:24 6451:10 & 6444:12 & relevant 6431:7 & 6448:13,22 \\
\hline proximity 6458:8 & 6467:18 6474:10 & reconvened 6444:11 & 6465:14 & replaced 6460:15 \\
\hline prudent 6415:16 & quo 6398:17,20 & record 6413:25 & reliability 6384:20 & replacement \\
\hline 6428:13 & 6399:2,23 6401:2 & 6447:11 6466:7 & 6384:22 6385:1,6 & 6461:10 \\
\hline public 6376:7 & 6404:17 6408:15 & 6469:22 6470:4,6 & 6385:10,24 & replacing 6448:8 \\
\hline 6437:4 6463:6 & 6408:20 6417:1 & 6470:14 & 6386:12,19,23,24 & reply 6470:10 \\
\hline pulls 6472:10 & 6419:11 & red 6472:3 & 6386:24 6388:12 & report 6383:9,13,19 \\
\hline purchases 6448:22 & quotations 6460:9 & reduce 6394:11 & 6390:12 6391:11 & 6384:7,14,19 \\
\hline purpose 6411:3 & quote 6460:8,12,16 & 6442:1 & 6391:23 6394:4,7 & 6385:2,5,11,15,19 \\
\hline 6449:9 & Q.B 6475:16,20 & reduced 6395:22 & 6395:19 6397:16 & 6385:21 6386:6 \\
\hline purposes 6390:21 & & Reduces 6400:1 & 6399:22 6400:12 & 6386:15,18 \\
\hline 6404:24 6405:2 & R & reducing 6396:9 & 6400:25 6401:17 & 6388:7,15,15,16 \\
\hline 6448:4 6460:4 & rack 6471:23 & reduction 6404:14 & 6401:19 6402:24 & 6389:5,10,13,14 \\
\hline pursue 6402:19 & radio 6472:14 & 6427:6 & 6403:3 6404:2,7 & 6389:18,21 \\
\hline put 6382:8 6389:16 & range 6437:6 & redundant 6425:9 & 6404:16 6405:23 & 6390:4,7,20 \\
\hline 6390:24 6392:14 & rasps 6471:13 & refer 6445:9 6460:6 & 6405:25 6408:14 & 6391:10,11,19 \\
\hline 6404:23 6405:10 & rather 6407:7 & reference 6405:22 & 6408:19 6410:7 & 6394:16 6395:5 \\
\hline 6405:13 6418:17 & 6445:23 6455:12 & 6406:12 6408:10 & 6412:19 6415:19 & 6396:17 6397:5 \\
\hline 6420:2 6421:14 & 6456:17 6457:19 & 6408:20 6410:14 & 6417:21 6418:10 & 6398:14,16 \\
\hline 6425:23 6427:15 & read 6385:19 & 6410:16,24 & 6419:2,5,7,13 & 6399:21 6400:24 \\
\hline 6438:10 6449:16 & 6402:22 6423:11 & 6411:2,8 6454:17 & 6420:5,15,16 & 6401:18 6402:22 \\
\hline 6450:11,17 & 6445:11 & 6464:6 6465:8 & 6423:20 6425:9 & 6404:11,23 \\
\hline 6456:1,10 & reading 6401:20 & 6474:1,9 & 6427:6 6429:7 & 6405:3 6407:23 \\
\hline putting 6458:6,7 & 6409:4 & referenced 6444:5 & 6439:13 6440:8 & 6407:24 6408:3 \\
\hline & really 6392:12 & 6446:13 & 6440:16,20 & 6409:5,14,19 \\
\hline Q & 6403:12 6404:20 & references 6443:14 & 6441:17 6450:22 & 6410:2 6411:1,3 \\
\hline quantity 6437:1 & 6411:22 6418:22 & referred 6444:1,4 & 6454:8 6455:11 & 6411:22 6412:7 \\
\hline quarter 6449:7 & 6444:17 6452:21 & 6445:11 6448:1 & 6456:11,15 & 6413:7,22 \\
\hline question 6385:9 & 6452:25 6455:4 & 6466:9 & 6457:23 & 6414:21 6415:12 \\
\hline 6386:11,18 & 6471:7 & referring 6412:25 & relocate 6449:2 & 6416:21 6417:14 \\
\hline 6392:18 6410:24 & reason 6387:13 & 6413:12 6436:11 & 6456:21 & 6419:1 6422:4,12 \\
\hline 6428:7,18,19 & 6388:22,23 & 6458:24 6468:6 & relocated 6399:9 & 6432:19,22 \\
\hline 6431:2 6432:21 & 6390:3,10 & refurbish 6416:6 & 6409:12 6418:7 & 6433:5,18,25 \\
\hline 6433:4 6439:22 & 6405:12 6408:2 & 6449:5 & relocating 6387:14 & 6434:23 6436:5 \\
\hline 6439:25 6442:5,7 & 6425:5 6436:18 & refurbished & 6397:9 6404:5 & 6438:18 6439:11 \\
\hline 6443:23,25 & 6464:22 & 6447:25 & 6410:17 6414:14 & 6442:10 6443:8 \\
\hline 6445:23 6449:15 & reasonable 6457:9 & refurbishing & 6422:13 6434:1,8 & 6445:8,12 \\
\hline 6451:18,20 & reasons 6389:19 & 6449:19 & 6434:17 6442:11 & 6446:13 6450:25 \\
\hline 6453:8 6458:13 & 6446:9 6455:11 & refurbishment & relocation 6397:23 & 6457:25 6463:18 \\
\hline 6459:24 6460:2 & rebuild 6414:23 & 6413:8,13,19 & 6399:11 6407:7 & 6463:24 6464:5 \\
\hline 6460:12,24 & 6416:7 & 6453:12 & 6408:24 6416:15 & 6464:23 6465:20 \\
\hline 6469:24 6470:3 & rebuttal 6382:2 & regard 6438:13 & 6435:7 6441:11 & 6467:12,13 \\
\hline questioning 6444:9 & 6468:12 & regarding 6453:11 & reluctant 6449:8 & reports 6386:8 \\
\hline 6444:19 6466:10 & recall 6437:3 & regards 6453:7 & 6454:18,19 & 6391:16 6433:2 \\
\hline 6466:18 6468:19 & 6459:21 6473:8 & regret 6465:16 & rely 6460:8 6470:16 & 6441:18,18 \\
\hline 6469:12 & recalling 6465:7 & Reid 6475:5,15 & relying 6435:25 & 6469:1 \\
\hline questions 6380:4 & received 6443:14 & relate 6460:21 & remain 6469:21 & require 6403:14 \\
\hline 6381:7 6382:6 & 6473:17 & related 6404:1 & remains 6394:21 & 6409:8 6429:3 \\
\hline 6422:16 6443:19 & recessed 6444:10 & 6418:22 6420:9 & 6403:18 & 6462:12 \\
\hline 6444:21 6451:17 & recognition 6440:7 & 6461:23 & remember 6464:7 & required 6394:3 \\
\hline 6460:11,21 & recollection & relates 6386:18 & reminded 6463:22 & 6410:17 6421:3 \\
\hline 6463:7 6464:3 & 6443:13 & 6402:24 6409:13 & remote 6462:22 & 6429:10 \\
\hline 6468:6,10 & recommend & relation 6402:12 & renewed 6413:18 & requirement \\
\hline 6469:16 & 6435:11 & 6405:14 & repeat 6408:17 & 6392:21 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{Page 648} \\
\hline requirements & 6455:12,22 & round 6383:3 & screen 6405:3 & serve 6421:4 \\
\hline 6411:16 & 6456:10,12,17 & rounds 6382:24 & seal 6434:3 & served 6449:9 \\
\hline reroute 6429:8 & 6458:8,25 & 6383:2 & seasonal 6436:15 & serves 6469:19 \\
\hline rerouting 6381:8 & right 6381:15 & route 6382:25 & second 6394:5 & service 6445:2,3 \\
\hline 6468:2 & 6383:5,21 6384:7 & 6383:7 6384:11 & 6400:4 6432:2 & 6453:21 \\
\hline reserved 6427:14 & 6384:9 6387:10 & 6386:20 6387:5,6 & 6434:14 6435:1,2 & settings 6462:8 \\
\hline reset 6462:23 & 6389:7,12 & 6387:8 6428:21 & 6435:16 6439:19 & seven 6398:16 \\
\hline reside 6429:19 & 6390:11 6391:6 & 6429:18 6430:14 & 6460:16 & several 6406:16 \\
\hline resolution 6412:4 & 6392:4,8,19,23 & routes 6430:12 & secondly 6456:7 & 6417:16 6426:24 \\
\hline resource 6388:5,19 & 6394:5,20 & routing 6424:17 & 6469:18 & 6437:24 6443:14 \\
\hline 6390:16 6420:24 & 6399:17 6400:1 & 6425:3 6430:24 & secretary 6377:5 & severe 6415:5 \\
\hline 6445:14 & 6402:16 6403:16 & ruled 6402:17 & 6468:16 & Shannon 6377:9 \\
\hline respect 6381:7 & 6408:15 6410:3 & run 6446:20 6450:1 & section 6390:16 & share 6470:24 \\
\hline 6382:1,25 6395:8 & 6412:9,12 6415:9 & 6452:11 & 6435:2 6439:19 & sharing 6474:3 \\
\hline 6407:23 6409:12 & 6415:11 6416:5 & running 6451:2 & secure 6428:13 & sharp 6471:13 \\
\hline 6410:4 6413:24 & 6416:19 6417:19 & 6472:9 & 6466:2 & 6472:6 \\
\hline 6419:11 6420:19 & 6418:15,21 & & see 6386:1 6387:19 & Shaun 6377:22 \\
\hline 6423:20 6425:20 & 6420:6 6421:5 & S & 6387:20 6390:3,6 & sheet 6436:25 \\
\hline 6431:17 6463:13 & 6422:17 6423:9 & safety 6472:7 & 6394:14 6398:15 & sheets 6436:21 \\
\hline 6465:20 & 6424:13,24 & sale 6437:5,6,25 & 6406:6 6409:10 & short 6467:24 \\
\hline respects 6455:7 & 6425:4,14 6428:3 & 6439:6 6446:19 & 6413:10 6414:18 & shorter 6436:14 \\
\hline responded 6426:23 & 6429:5 6430:4 & sales 6420:10,15 & 6414:19 6415:21 & 6454:3 6455:18 \\
\hline responding 6381:6 & 6435:9,14,22 & 6435:19 6436:10 & 6431:12 6432:21 & shortly 6460:24 \\
\hline 6422:16 & 6442:13 6444:7 & 6436:10,14,15,20 & 6432:23 6433:14 & show 6388:7 \\
\hline response 6381:19 & 6445:20 6449:16 & 6437:1,11 6438:7 & 6433:16 6435:4 & shown 6431:24 \\
\hline 6391:21 6421:22 & 6451:9 6461:7 & 6453:23 & 6439:21 6453:17 & shows 6459:15 \\
\hline 6422:20 6443:23 & 6462:3 6469:19 & same 6390:9 6393:3 & 6454:15 6458:22 & side 6392:25 6393:6 \\
\hline 6443:24 6444:3 & right-of-way & 6393:19 6394:18 & 6462:22 6468:9 & 6393:11,14,17,19 \\
\hline 6459:15 6467:1 & 6427:17,18,23,24 & 6394:22,22 & seeking 6466:14 & 6411:20 6437:10 \\
\hline responsibility & 6427:25 6428:16 & 6396:17 6401:9 & 6469:22 & 6438:10 6452:5 \\
\hline 6433:18 & right-of-ways & 6425:17 6429:6 & seem 6415:16 & 6452:22,25 \\
\hline rest 6422:11 & 6428:14 & 6460:16 6467:21 & 6452:3 & 6458:7 6466:21 \\
\hline resume 6467:21 & ring 6427:20 & sand 6471:13 & seems 6403:1 & 6471:23 \\
\hline retired 6458:16 & 6431:17 & Sargeant 6377:2 & 6418:15 6454:11 & sigh 6472:18 \\
\hline reverse 6455:7 & ringing 6429:1 & 6463:14 & 6455:8 & sign 6384:3 \\
\hline 6456:14 & 6431:18,20 & Sargeant's 6453:8 & select 6411:4,4 & signed 6383:22 \\
\hline reversed 6401:8 & 6432:4 & save 6425:25 & sense 6402:11 & 6384:8 6437:2 \\
\hline reviewed 6400:20 & rings 6406:3,10 & saw 6445:12 & 6455:12 6456:5 & significance \\
\hline revisions 6462:12 & risk 6387:15 & saying 6398:7 & 6456:13 6457:18 & 6433:13 \\
\hline revisit 6398:9 & 6394:23 6395:11 & 6419:17,19 & sent 6464:1 & significant 6385:10 \\
\hline re-establish & 6400:2 6403:4 & 6428:8,10 6444:1 & sentence 6397:6 & 6385:15 6394:25 \\
\hline 6414:12 & 6407:13 6410:24 & 6457:4 & 6405:24 6411:9 & 6395:23 6415:4 \\
\hline Riel 6387:9 6399:9 & 6425:10 6441:9 & says 6385:22 & 6415:13 6417:25 & 6445:24 6451:16 \\
\hline 6399:11,16 & 6441:17 6442:8 & 6391:19 6396:18 & 6435:17 6440:19 & significantly \\
\hline 6400:6 6401:7,9 & 6442:19 6443:1 & 6409:5 6411:10 & sentences 6397:14 & 6395:11 6397:8 \\
\hline 6403:9 6404:5 & 6450:16,19 & 6413:15 6414:2 & separate 6394:9 & 6412:23 6436:25 \\
\hline 6408:25 6409:12 & risks 6387:17 & 6419:2 & 6397:17 6403:25 & 6439:12,14 \\
\hline 6410:6,18 & 6396:22 6407:18 & scenario 6422:12 & 6416:17 6455:2 & 6440:3 \\
\hline 6414:15 6422:6 & 6407:21 & 6423:9 6454:23 & separated 6425:10 & signifies 6433:17,19 \\
\hline 6422:13 6427:10 & risky 6399:5 & 6455:17 6456:23 & separation 6418:23 & silently 6473:1,2 \\
\hline 6427:17 6428:2,9 & River 6445:25 & 6456:24 6458:5 & 6424:23 6425:8 & similar 6401:5 \\
\hline 6428:22 6429:9 & Riverton 6458:22 & schedule 6473:23 & 6425:14 6456:16 & simple 6385:9 \\
\hline 6429:10 6432:1,1 & RM 6379:4 6468:22 & scheduled 6437:25 & 6457:8 6458:2,5 & simply 6436:21 \\
\hline 6434:1,9,17 & 6469:4 & scheme 6422:14 & 6458:10,15,19 & 6460:10 \\
\hline 6438:24 6439:1 & road 6415:24,25 & 6424:11 6427:7 & September 6382:11 & since 6409:7 \\
\hline 6441:11 6442:12 & Robert 6377:20 & 6429:4 & sequence 6397:15 & 6463:20 \\
\hline 6450:1,5,12,14,20 & roll 6473:3 & school 6457:1 & 6404:9 & single 6441:24 \\
\hline 6451:25 6452:4,7 & room 6470:24 & scope 6464:5 6467:9 & serious 6407:2 & 6442:1 \\
\hline 6452:10,12,15 & roughly 6382:11,16 & scoping 6382:19 & seriously 6416:1,4,4 & Sipihk 6467:22 \\
\hline 6454:13 6455:6 & 6399:10 6422:25 & score 6418:25 & 6417:5 & sir 6396:1,15 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|r|}{Page 6490} \\
\hline 6418:14 6445:6 & tells 6464:3 & 6405:19 6407:12 & 6465:13 & 6472:22 \\
\hline 6446:8 6447:3,12 & temptation 6414:22 & 6414:24 6416:3 & timing 6382:6 & true 6395:9 6404:20 \\
\hline 6448:14 6460:24 & 6415:2 & 6419:16 6422:9 & 6437:17 6454:15 & 6408:1 6415:10 \\
\hline 6462:18,23 & tempting 6414:3 & 6424:4,7 6426:17 & 6456:2,3,7 & 6434:5 6475:7 \\
\hline systems 6461:7,8 & ten 6471:12 & 6428:14 6433:22 & tired 6472:18 & truncated 6466:10 \\
\hline & term 6391:5 & 6434:5,13,24 & today 6381:23 & 6466:17 \\
\hline T & 6436:14,21,25 & 6437:5 6440:18 & 6382:5 6387:23 & try 6414:23 \\
\hline table 6408:15 & 6451:9,14 6455:8 & 6444:19 6445:9 & 6390:19 6392:6 & trying 6400:24 \\
\hline 6466:16 & terminate 6431:25 & 6446:12 6448:2 & 6420:12 6430:24 & 6402:23 6404:8 \\
\hline tail 6471:20 & termination & 6448:18 6449:3 & 6440:22 6444:14 & 6428:24 6458:14 \\
\hline take 6421:21 & 6438:23 & 6450:24 6451:16 & 6444:18 6447:11 & Tuesday 6382:3 \\
\hline 6435:24 6444:7 & terminus 6455:14 & 6451:19 6452:16 & 6448:1,5 6450:22 & 6465:19 6468:5 \\
\hline 6451:8 6459:11 & 6455:16 & 6453:9,12 & 6457:1 6458:1 & turbines 6390:7,12 \\
\hline 6461:1 6467:11 & terms 6385:2 & 6454:16 6457:10 & 6459:19 6460:13 & twinning 6440:14 \\
\hline 6469:17 & 6401:17 6404:12 & 6459:6 6460:3,23 & 6461:9 6465:17 & twists 6472:8 \\
\hline taken 6411:13 & 6404:13,16,18 & 6465:3,9 6469:14 & 6467:4 6468:19 & two 6382:4 6385:20 \\
\hline 6472:20 6475:8 & 6408:12,18 & 6470:16 6474:8 & told 6449:10 & 6386:23 6394:9 \\
\hline takes 6433:17 & 6412:21 6416:2 & thinking 6388:8 & toll 6472:20 & 6400:5,22,25 \\
\hline 6455:5 & 6419:12 6420:14 & third 6385:24 & tomorrow 6415:24 & 6401:20 6402:19 \\
\hline taking 6452:1 & 6426:13 6433:5 & 6395:12 6396:9 & 6460:18 6468:9 & 6403:3,4 6410:4 \\
\hline 6459:21 & 6433:13,24 & 6397:17 6400:10 & tool 6472:23 & 6410:14 6411:10 \\
\hline talk 6390:19 6391:3 & 6434:19 6435:23 & 6403:10 & tools 6471:23 & 6417:11 6418:11 \\
\hline 6396:3 6437:11 & 6436:9 6437:16 & though 6457:5 & top 6385:21 & 6435:17,21 \\
\hline 6437:16 & 6441:9 6443:8 & thought 6391:15 & 6458:23 & 6447:3,21 \\
\hline talked 6430:14 & 6458:5,9 6462:8 & 6412:5 6443:9 & totally 6436:23 & 6450:10 6454:11 \\
\hline 6451:1 & 6464:6 6469:14 & 6453:11 & toward 6453:1,2 & 6456:12,16 \\
\hline talking 6391:3,4 & Terry 6377:2 & thousands 6465:4 & towards 6452:21 & 6457:22 6460:8 \\
\hline 6393:25 6395:14 & Teshmont 6441:18 & three 6383:2 & transcript 6376:18 & 6469:16 \\
\hline 6395:14,25 & Teulon 6458:21 & 6395:19 6401:4 & 6466:16 6475:8 & Tymofichuk 6380:2 \\
\hline 6396:1,5 6399:18 & thank 6381:17 & 6403:2 6412:18 & transformers & 6381:13,20 \\
\hline 6426:14,16 & 6413:20 6432:10 & 6414:15 6417:20 & 6448:21,23 & 6382:12,17,22 \\
\hline 6429:24 6437:14 & 6432:10,12 & 6419:10 6422:14 & transmission & 6383:1,5,14,18 \\
\hline 6456:24 6457:13 & 6434:15 6442:3 & 6439:20 6441:17 & 6376:6 6384:15 & 6384:1,2 6397:25 \\
\hline 6461:2,13 & 6443:18,20 & 6446:8 6447:11 & 6384:23 6389:21 & 6398:10,23 \\
\hline talks 6408:24 & 6449:23 6454:9 & 6447:13 6454:11 & 6390:14 6391:24 & 6430:16 6432:20 \\
\hline 6456:5 & 6459:8 6463:3,4 & 6455:3 6456:12 & 6392:1,24 & 6433:1,8 6439:5,9 \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{\operatorname { t a p }}\) 6389:8 6450:14 & 6465:24 6467:10 & 6460:11 & 6393:24 6394:2 & 6439:16 6445:1 \\
\hline 6450:20 & 6467:18 6470:20 & through 6402:23 & 6396:25 6397:8 & 6445:14,20 \\
\hline tapping 6458:25 & 6473:5,6,13 & 6404:10 6415:18 & 6400:13,17 & 6446:1,6,16,22 \\
\hline task 6428:16 & 6474:7,14 & 6429:17 6430:5 & 6402:1,6 6403:13 & 6447:2,10,14,16 \\
\hline 6472:12 & their 6399:15 & 6451:22 6463:24 & 6403:15 6405:5 & 6448:3 6459:9 \\
\hline TATASKWEYAK & 6430:14 6459:20 & 6464:8,10 6466:5 & 6406:2,10 6409:9 & 6462:20 6470:21 \\
\hline 6377:21 & 6465:18 6468:3 & Thursday 6376:19 & 6409:15 6410:8 & 6470:22 6471:7 \\
\hline team 6421:23 & 6468:13 6470:9 & 6381:1 6468:13 & 6411:6,20 & 6473:7 \\
\hline technical 6389:18 & 6470:17 6472:3 & 6468:15 & 6418:24 6421:11 & type 6429:20 \\
\hline 6391:11,22 & 6472:20 & tied 6439:7 & 6429:3,21 & types 6433:2 \\
\hline 6405:22 6406:17 & thereabouts & till 6420:22 & 6435:20 6437:10 & \\
\hline 6406:21,24 & 6456:13 & tilt 6466:19 & 6441:13 6445:5 & U \\
\hline 6410:21 6412:21 & thing 6416:12 & time 6389:10 & 6446:5 6447:5 & ultimate 6379:2 \\
\hline 6417:22 6422:19 & 6431:17 6445:10 & 6418:9 6419:24 & 6452:9,23 6453:1 & 6383:10 6390:4,4 \\
\hline 6446:9 & 6449:16 6463:2 & 6436:2,11 & 6456:9 & 6391:3 6408:12 \\
\hline technically 6418:3 & things 6435:18,21 & 6437:19 6438:1,3 & transmit 6444:24 & 6408:19 6415:15 \\
\hline 6422:18,22 & 6453:7 6462:10 & 6438:16,18,24 & transportation & 6418:2 6432:18 \\
\hline technologies & 6462:13 & 6439:2 6440:23 & 6389:22 6392:9 & 6445:8 6446:13 \\
\hline 6385:16 & think 6384:21 & 6444:2 6448:4 & \(\boldsymbol{t r a p} 6472: 7\) & 6450:25 6463:18 \\
\hline technology 6385:16 & 6388:3,11 6389:4 & 6451:23 6454:3 & traverse 6430:21 & 6464:22 6469:2 \\
\hline 6391:21 6411:4,5 & 6392:17 6393:1 & 6461:12 6468:5 & trees 6471:14 & ultimately 6418:20 \\
\hline 6460:14 & 6395:13 6398:19 & 6468:14 6473:23 & trespass 6430:21 & 6458:1 6465:16 \\
\hline tell 6404:22 6425:1 & 6399:6 6404:10 & 6475:9 & trial 6464:15,17,21 & umbrella 6390:1 \\
\hline 6443:16 & 6404:19 6405:2 & times 6437:24 & truck 6471:20 & under 6389:25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 6405:22 6411:10 & 6443:22 6447:23 & weigh 6407:18 & 6461:2 6469:17 & 6406:11 \\
\hline 6412:17 6413:8 & 6458:23 6467:13 & weight 6471:15 & we've 6385:19 & worried 6455:21 \\
\hline 6417:11 6430:18 & vice-presidents & weighting 6414:11 & 6428:15 6452:22 & worst 6404:18 \\
\hline 6430:19 6434:2 & 6432:24 & welcomed 6467:5 & Whelan 6377:17 & worthy 6434:3 \\
\hline underlying 6417:9 & view 6399:22 & well 6393:7,23 & whichever 6387:6 & wouldn't 6387:24 \\
\hline 6452:23 & 6402:15 6404:8 & 6396:14 6402:14 & while 6417:21 & 6390:3 6392:14 \\
\hline underneath 6427:4 & 6420:4 6445:15 & 6408:1,6,9 6409:4 & whole 6425:8 & 6393:3,5,10,19 \\
\hline understand 6384:13 & visualize 6429:25 & 6409:20 6411:24 & widening 6455:10 & 6398:25 6406:15 \\
\hline 6385:18 6406:20 & 6458:14 6459:10 & 6413:25 6418:20 & WILDLANDS & 6420:12 6423:19 \\
\hline 6413:7 6416:23 & Vital 6428:2 & 6418:22 6425:7 & 6377:17 & 6426:3,8,25 \\
\hline 6422:4,11,18 & 6429:15,16 & 6426:10 6428:8 & Williams 6377:13 & 6427:3 6432:4 \\
\hline 6428:24 6451:13 & vitally 6465:15 & 6430:8,11 & 6380:3 6432:13 & 6436:4 6450:20 \\
\hline 6451:15 6457:24 & voltage 6391:24 & 6431:13 6436:19 & 6432:14,17 & 6455:11 6456:4,9 \\
\hline understanding & 6392:9 6406:3 & 6439:9 6446:13 & 6433:3,10,24 & 6457:17 \\
\hline 6381:10 6465:10 & 6430:19 & 6452:6,16 6453:2 & 6434:7,12,16,21 & writing 6466:2 \\
\hline understood 6428:18 & VOLUME 6376:16 & 6454:4 6456:6,19 & 6435:5,10,15,23 & written 6389:21 \\
\hline 6440:22,23 & & 6457:24 6458:9 & 6436:4,9,17,24 & 6470:6 \\
\hline undertake 6453:20 & W & 6462:6 6467:1 & 6437:7,13 6438:2 & wrong 6427:8 \\
\hline undertaking & wait 6420:22 & 6474:9,14 & 6438:15 6439:1,9 & 6462:23 \\
\hline 6473:17 & waiting 6459:25 & went 6382:15 & 6439:18,24 & Wuskwi 6467:22 \\
\hline undeveloped & 6470:9 6472:1 & 6388:11 6393:18 & 6440:6,13,25 & \\
\hline 6427:16 & walk 6402:23 & 6433:5 6440:11 & 6441:6 6442:3,16 & Y \\
\hline unfold 6464:21 & want 6382:6 & 6454:24 6456:10 & 6442:25 6443:5 & yeah 6384:12 \\
\hline unfortunate & 6421:16 6431:16 & 6471:6 & 6443:18,21 & 6392:17 6400:16 \\
\hline 6462:16 & 6434:23 6437:13 & were 6390:12,20 & 6469:10,11,13 & 6401:22 6409:11 \\
\hline unit 6389:24 & 6437:15 6444:6 & 6399:18 6400:14 & 6470:15,21 & 6413:14 6414:19 \\
\hline United 6412:3 & 6448:11 6449:1 & 6404:23,25 & William's 6470:3 & 6415:1 6417:17 \\
\hline unknown 6416:15 & 6453:6 6464:25 & 6405:9,13 6417:6 & wind 6471:13,15 & 6418:10 6424:16 \\
\hline unless 6426:6,7 & 6470:6 6473:22 & 6417:15 6422:16 & 6472:2 & 6435:22 6447:10 \\
\hline 6452:24 & wanted 6424:22 & 6425:18 6434:13 & window 6447:22 & 6449:12 \\
\hline unlike 6456:25 & 6429:12 6464:17 & 6436:11,20 & 6448:11,18,24 & year 6420:2,3 \\
\hline until 6388:18 & 6466:22 6473:25 & 6438:18,20 & 6449:3 6453:15 & 6421:7,7 6437:2 \\
\hline 6419:7 6425:2 & 6474:3 & 6444:14 6446:2,9 & windows 6472:13 & 6453:10,13 \\
\hline 6445:12 6449:8 & warm 6472:9,24 & 6446:19 6449:10 & Winnipeg 6376:18 & 6460:14 6461:13 \\
\hline 6465:21 6474:15 & warning 6415:2 & 6450:5 6453:25 & 6376:19 6401:25 & 6465:9 \\
\hline unturned 6397:2 & warnings 6415:12 & 6454:22 6459:19 & 6430:9 6452:22 & yearly 6436:15 \\
\hline updated 6387:25 & Warren 6378:3 & 6464:5 6467:3,8 & wintry 6472:4 & years 6411:12 \\
\hline 6388:6 & wasn't 6389:8 & 6467:15 6471:5 & wires 6472:8 & 6413:17 6415:24 \\
\hline use 6390:7 6451:25 & 6393:14,16 & 6473:25 & Wisconsin 6436:19 & 6415:24 6425:19 \\
\hline 6467:5 6473:22 & 6409:18 6443:7 & weren't 6436:20 & 6436:25 6437:5,8 & 6443:3 6445:12 \\
\hline used 6453:13,14 & 6443:17 6467:12 & 6454:20 & wish 6470:13 & 6449:5,11 6454:6 \\
\hline utilized 6407:14 & watching 6473:10 & west 6392:25 & withdrawn 6444:16 & yesterday 6383:9 \\
\hline U.S 6430:18 6432:1 & WATER 6377:6 & 6393:19 6411:20 & 6469:16 & 6453:8 6459:23 \\
\hline 6432:3 & way 6407:3 6417:4 & 6438:14 6453:1 & witnesses 6453:9 & 6467:19 6468:21 \\
\hline & 6424:11 6425:11 & 6458:7 & wonder 6444:6 & 6474:9 \\
\hline V & 6425:22 6426:4 & western 6429:18 & wondering 6467:11 & York 6444:14 \\
\hline value 6416:9 & 6426:11 6428:1 & 6445:6 6459:11 & Woodford 6401:5 & 6469:14,18,20 \\
\hline valve 6461:3,15,18 & 6437:19,22 & we'll 6381:3,14 & 6448:19 & \\
\hline 6461:19,24 & 6452:4,16 & 6396:14 6397:2 & Woodford's 6460:6 & Z \\
\hline valves 6448:14 & 6456:18 6466:4 & 6401:14 6420:23 & word 6434:11,12,14 & zero 6419:25 \\
\hline varied 6420:11 & 6472:19,22 & 6431:12 6444:7,8 & 6467:5 & \\
\hline varies 6421:7 & ways \(6454: 11\) & 6444:12 6468:11 & words 6455:16 & \$ \\
\hline various 6406:3 & Webb 6377:6 & 6470:12 6474:11 & 6466:4 6469:15 & \$234 6448:16 \\
\hline 6468:13 & Wednesday & 6474:14 & work 6383:6 & \$4.188 6405:19 \\
\hline versus 6460:10 & 6468:12 & we're 6391:3,4 & 6388:10 6453:11 & \$55 6426:1 \\
\hline 6462:5 & week 6461:13 & 6393:25 6398:14 & worked 6440:21 & \$836 6422:25 \\
\hline very 6391:8 & 6463:19 6465:21 & 6419:19,22 & working 6473:1 & 6423:11,14 \\
\hline 6394:24 6395:6 & 6471:6 & 6425:15,16 & works 6472:5 & \\
\hline 6401:12 6418:19 & weeks 6426:18 & 6426:14,16 & work-a-day 6473:3 & 1 \\
\hline 6419:8 6430:17 & 6461:15,16 & 6430:25 6452:25 & worldwide 6406:5,8 & 1 6396:18 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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