

Hydro Electr2

REPORT ON THE MEETING OF
PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS
TO CONSIDER THEIR PARTICIPATION
IN THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON ELECTRIC POWER PLANNING

3253

OCTOBER 3RD AND 4TH, 1975
AT THE SEAWAY HOTEL, TORONTO

CELA PUBLICATIONS:
Canadian Environmental Law Association
CELA PUBLICATION [no number]; Report on the
meeting of public interest groups to consider their
RN 3122

FUNDED BY: THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON ELECTRIC POWER PLANNING
SUBMITTED BY: THE CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL LAW ASSOCIATION

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
WHAT IS A PUBLIC INTEREST INTERVENOR -- WHO PARTICIPATED	1
GOALS OF CONFERENCE	2
REPORT ON DISCUSSION WITH STEVEN GOUGE, ASSISTANT COUNSEL McKENZIE VALLEY PIPELINE COMMISSION OF INQUIRY	3
RESULTS OF THE WORK GROUPS	5
REPORT ON PROCEDURE AND FUNDING	10
CONFERENCE FOLLOW UP AND SUMMARY	20
LIST OF DELEGATES	21
CONFERENCE AGENDA	24

INTRODUCTION

In March of 1975, the Honourable Allan Grossman, Provincial Secretary for Resources Development, announced that the government would establish a Royal Commission on the Long Range Planning of Ontario's Electrical Power System, to be chaired by Dr. Arthur Porter. In July the formal terms of reference were announced. During late August, the Commissioners held informal meetings with a number of groups who had expressed an interest in the issues to be considered by the Commission. Three such groups were Energy Probe, Pollution Probe Toronto and the Canadian Environmental Law Association (CELA) which met with the Commissioners on August 22. It became clear that a meeting of the public interest groups was necessary in order to exchange information and to co-ordinate input to the Commission. Communications links needed to be established as well as expertise defined in terms of research capability and leadership roles. Necessary research tasks had to be identified and assigned. The meeting would provide valuable feedback to the Commission about expectations and ideas for public participation, procedure, research and the funding of intervenor groups. The Commissioners were supportive of the concept and asked Energy Probe, Pollution Probe and CELA to submit a proposal and a budget. The proposal was submitted in early September, the conference date was set for the third and fourth of October in Toronto. Funding approval was received from the Commission shortly thereafter.

WHAT IS A PUBLIC INTEREST INTERVENOR GROUP

WHO PARTICIPATED

Thirty-five groups were invited. Many of them were unaware of the work of the others prior to the conference. Some groups were concerned with a specific local issue such as the proposed siting of a transmission line or generating station. Generally, these groups were staffed by volunteers who spent evenings and weekends working with the group. Some of those invited were farmers who were not only concerned as small businesspeople, but also as people whose life-style was threatened, partly by vanishing food producing lands. Some groups were province-wide organizations with salaried staff who's mandate included the protection of the public interest,

be it with reference to environmental issues, consumer issues or public education. In spite of the diversity and widely varied resources, a number of mutual concerns exist. Each group had serious reservations concerning the implications of Ontario Hydro's growth forecasts. Each was concerned that the RCEPP hear all facts about proposed expansion without favour to Hydro. Each is a non-profit group and represents a volunteer constituency. Each evolved because concerned citizens identified a problem and continued to organize toward its solution.

CONFERENCE GOALS OF DELEGATES

The goal of the delegates appeared to be one of information exchange. Who is Dr. Porter? How does the Commission view public participation? What is being done to ensure fair hearings, to even the sides? What issues are of concern to the other public interest groups? How can efforts be combined? What tasks must be done? What kind of resources will be needed to do the necessary work? Will the Commission allow sufficient time to prepare research? How much will research cost? Where should the money come from? How will contacts be maintained? Who will co-ordinate efforts? Since Hydro has lawyers, will the intervenors have funding for legal help? Where are the experts needed to do research to present their findings?

Bob Rosehart, Scientific Counsel to RCEPP, was able to answer many of the questions with regard to the role and attitude of the Commission. During the plenary sessions on funding and procedure, a number of recommendations were made. (A report of these is included.) The delegates also identified a need for an on-going information facilitator. Based on the feedback during and after the conference, the expectations of the delegates concerning information exchange were met.

CONFERENCE CONVENORS' GOALS

The goal of the convenors was mainly to identify, assign and cost necessary research. This goal was predicted on the assumption that those attending would have enough information to make these decisions. This turned out not to be the case inasmuch as many delegates had not yet begun to plan for

involvement with the RCEPP. Very little information had reached them, probably because the Commission was staying in the background until after the election. However, the research areas which will require investigation were defined. Sufficient links among groups with similar interests were established to make further meetings to prepare comprehensive research proposals profitable.

COMMISSION GOALS

It is difficult to state the goals of the Commission, but it would appear that RCEPP goals concerned preventing duplication of research efforts which might be costly and gathering feedback concerning the public interest group's perception of the Commission's role and credibility.

THE CONFERENCE - SATURDAY

Heather Mitchell, counsel to CELA, opened the conference with a statement of purpose and introduced the first of two speakers, Bob Rosehart, Scientific Counsel to the Commission. With the use of slides and pamphlets, Mr. Rosehart discussed the terms of reference, the attitude of the Commission on public participation and intervenor groups, the available timetables and roles of the preliminary meetings and main hearings, and Commission resources available to intervenor groups. He also discussed the priority projects briefly. A major portion of this session was spent in a question and answer exchange primarily to clarify the role of the Commission and how funding of intervenors would be handled. Throughout the conference, Mr. Rosehart in his role of Commission spokesperson, answered questions of concern and proved an open and valuable source of information.

Steve Gouge, Assistant Counsel to the McKenzie Valley Pipeline Commission of Inquiry, next reported on the Berger experience with respect to public participation, procedures and funding of public interest intervenors. The following is a report of his remarks.

Firstly, Mr. Justice Berger held a series of preliminary meetings at which

everybody could come forward and discuss with Berger what they perceived his mandate to be. The meetings were to define issues, to discuss funding and to create liaisons among groups which had similar interests.

1. Berger used a preliminary list of groups and asked for input from these groups as well as from all the northern communities. He then wrote a decision on what he wanted to hear and what the Order in Council appointing his commissions said that he really could not do.
2. Funding. Mr. Gouge said that the Government will listen to the Commission on the subject of funding and direct proportion to the amount of public participation that has occurred. It is therefore:
 - (a) Necessary to develop a high profile. The media is extremely interested in the Berger Commission, so they found it necessary to have a full time media person.
 - (b) The Commission must develop an independence from the Government, notwithstanding the fact that it is an Order in Council appointment because they will be:
 - (i) Subpoenaing documents, and
 - (ii) Engaging in arguments on Crown privilege with respect to what documents can be brought forward
 - (c) Funding should be sufficient to allow participation to the limits that the public interest groups want, for it is the public interest groups which act in the political forum which ignores or implements the findings of the Commission.
3. Berger attempted to combine, under umbrellas, groups which had similar interests. There were two such umbrellas, environmental groups and three native groups. The fewer groups which apply to the Government for funding, the more chance of success, Mr. Gouge said. Berger funding has been cyclical on a fiscal year basis and the funding has been pretty well without strings which greatly helped the credibility of the Commis-

sion and led to widespread feelings that the Berger Commission would hold fair hearings.

After all of these things were done, Berger held a second preliminary hearing to do with procedure. At these preliminary hearings, lawyers and expert witnesses participated. He then wrote a second decision with respect to procedure and then waited for the interest groups to prepare their positions so that they had enough time to make it a fair hearing. Mr. Justice Berger waited 12 months before starting the formal hearings.

The formal hearings were set up so that anybody who wanted to ask questions of a witness did so and Mr. Justice Berger ruled that everybody who came forward to testify must be subject to questions from all the interest groups. Sometimes a witness would be cross-examined by nine or ten people representing nine or ten groups. While this took a lot of time, it was very important in terms of emphasizing the independence of the Commission and the credibility of the hearing process.

At the local meetings north of 60, the same rules applied. There was a right of cross-examination, but it was rarely used because it was obvious that a questioner would lose face by cross-questioning one of the native leaders.

Public participation is the essential and crucial element in getting the Government to listen to the results of the Commission.

1. Everything that the Berger Commission has heard, has been heard in public and this has resulted in some problems, particularly with respect to public employees giving evidence.
2. Berger said he would go everywhere he was invited and this was excellent for the credibility of the Commission. It was essential to have people know that they were being heard.
3. The Commission must be independent. Counsel for the Commission declined

to act for Government witnesses and the Commission insisted that everything the Government possessed touching the matter must be available. Berger ordered that a list of documents be prepared. This was resisted by the Federal Government, but eventually done. The Government may not have given a complete list, but the staff of the Commission thinks that it is fairly complete.

Lawyers were used only at the formal hearings and not at the local ones, although some attended. At the formal hearings, the lawyers skills in examining the witnesses and cross-examining were very useful. A great number of difficulties would have been created in having experts cross-question each other.

A lot of legal research had to be done by the groups, and this was of course part of their budget. Some of the legal research budget was used for presentation of the results to the Commission.

Daily transcripts of the formal hearings are an essential part of making sure the Commission runs fairly. Such transcripts are an on-going expense, but once the decision is made to have a transcript, it is much more valuable to have a daily transcript than to wait two months before the information is typed.

WORK SESSIONS ON RESEARCH TASKS

Following the discussions with Mr. Rosehart and Mr. Gouge, delegates divided themselves into four working groups which were:

WORK GROUP	FACILITATOR
Agriculture and Land Use	Elbert van Donkersgoed, Christian Farmers Union
Systems Concepts	Bill Peden, Energy Probe
Economics	Sean Casey, Energy Probe
Environment	Joanne Opperman, Garbage Coalition

REPORT BACK

During the plenary session, a number of similar concerns were voiced by the working groups. Each group identified the need for public education surrounding the issues to be considered by the Commission, thus a fifth group emerged spear-headed by Pollution Probe Ottawa and Energy Probe who undertook to outline a public education program and to submit a proposal to Dr. Porter.

Identified tasks fell roughly into three areas: Analysis of Hydro's current expansion forecasts, socio economic and environmental impacts of Hydro's current growth plans and alternative ways of planning for electrical power supplies. The following are the areas which demand attention.

ANALYSIS OF CURRENT EXPANSION FORECAST

- . Cost of capital and debt/equity relationships
- . Rate structures
- . Siting of transmission lines and generating stations
- . Energetics
- . Location of generating stations to exports, i.e. Ontario, Michigan, New York, grid
- . Industrial growth patterns - direct per capita use
- . Fuel prices
- . Incremental growth rate
- . Reliability factors
- . Historical perspective
- . Public education
- . Implications for an overall Ontario land use plan

SOCIO ECONOMIC IMPACT OF EXPANDING ELECTRICAL POWER SUPPLIES

- . Relationship to provincial/national economy
- . Implications of current and increased growth rates
- . Impact on food producing lands
- . Impact on rural communities
- . Population migration to primary energy installation

- . Commercial and industrial growth
- . Decentralized small scale vs. centralized large scale "parks"
- . Effects of generation away from load - food supply - community employment
- . Effects on North of generation for remote load

RATE STRUCTURES AND ENERGY CONSERVATION

- . Demand and rate structure
- . Peak load pricing
- . Inverted rate structure
- . Lifeline rate structure

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

- . Climatic impacts
- . Pollution impacts including: ozone, thermal, radiation and health hazards
- . Reliability capacity including accidents and sabotage
- . Decreased reliability with increased transmission voltage
- . Impacts on recreational lands
- . Impacts on food producing lands
- . Health hazards to workers such as uranium miners
- . Impact comparison of generating site in Southern Ontario and Northern Ontario
- . Effects of pollution on food stuffs.

ALTERNATIVES TO NON-RENEWABLE RESOURCES

Alternate demand forecast under these assumptions:

1. Change in use
2. Alternate sources
3. Alternate rate structures
4. Growth vs. zero energy growth (ZEG)

....

Alternate Sources:

1. Waste heat
2. Wind

3. Hydrogen
4. Sun or solar power
5. Fuel cell

....

Potential of ZEG or growth via renewable resources - effects on:

- . Capital requirements
- . Rate structures
- . Energetics ratios as relates to environmental impacts of current rate of growth

In addition to the tasks, the participants felt it necessary to study Ontario Hydro as a corporate entity under the following headings.

- . Process of public accountability
- . Financing and accounting procedures
- . Mandate to growth and decision making process
- . Access to information
- . Legal corporate parameters

THE CONFERENCE - SUNDAY

This second day of meetings was devoted to discussions which dealt with the questions of funding and procedure. The following is a report of those discussions which was previously submitted to the Commission on October 10, 1975 by Heather Mitchell of CELA.

REPORT ON PROCEDURE AND FUNDING

FUNDING

Funding was discussed under headings as follows:

- (a) What is an intervenor group?
- (b) What should be the criteria for funding?
- (c) What should be funded?
- (d) Where should the money come from?
- (e) Ways of getting the money?
- (f) Administration.

It was agreed by the group that there ought to be two standards applied for funding intervenor groups. One should apply to large scale organized groups which might want to be present for a good part of the hearing. Such groups ought to demonstrate their credibility, their interest and their ability to carry on with the task.

The second group should be that of individuals and new groups which may have formed simply in response to a local concern. These groups would not be considered "primary groups" as the others had been. Such groups should be asked to present a proposal for funding with very specific information as to what the money would be spent on, how often or how long the groups would wish to appear at the main hearings.

It was also agreed that anybody who had something to say to the Commission ought to be able to come forward and say it. To this end, reasonable travel expenses for a person who lived more than 25 miles from the place where the Commission was meeting ought to be paid. Again, a written letter

stating a person's intention to come forward would act as a trigger mechanism for getting funding.

It was suggested that a subject-group orientation be adopted and a steering committee be set up to co-ordinate ideas on funding.

It was agreed to recommend to the Porter Commission that some funding be made available for attendances at the preliminary meetings where procedure will be discussed. This preliminary funding might be only travel costs or the costs of duplication of reports, if the Commission were unable to duplicate things submitted to it.

CRITERIA FOR FUNDING

The five criteria used for Mr. Justice Berger's inquiry were explained. It was agreed by the group that the item which insisted that to apply for funding, the group have inadequate financial resources ought to be qualified in view of the priority decisions made by those groups with respect to their long-range planning. For example, groups such as the Consumer's Association of Canada have an ongoing function to maintain to be responsive to their members and to advance the cause of consumerism. They cannot devote their entire resources to appearing at the Commission. It was agreed that a distinction must be drawn between public interest groups and interest groups as it was felt by the delegates that a group such as the Association of Major Power Consumers which could assess its members (all of whom could deduct the money that they contributed) should not be funded whereas a group such as the Canadian Environmental Law Association which could not get any more money from its members ought to be treated on a different footing.

It was also agreed that funding should be made available outside the criteria that Mr. Justice Berger used to fund specific projects such as the organization of a community or the organization of information to a community. It was pointed out by some of the delegates who were at the meeting to express local and regional concerns, that the individuals in their areas had not yet

been organized and some seed money would be helpful in making an adequate presentation and in making sure that goals of public participation were achieved. The delegates from the concerned farmers stated that they had adopted a steering committee approach after their initial meetings and that it was necessary before getting funding to show that there was at least a commitment of time donated to the project if people were not able to put in any of their own money.

It was also suggested that some creative use of funding be made. For example, when the preliminary meetings are held in the northwest of the Province, a bus might travel along the north shore picking up people at various stops to attend the hearing.

WHAT SHOULD BE FUNDED?

The group agreed that there were at least four appropriate areas for funding. One was research (another part of the conference dealt with research tasks and a separate report will be submitted). The second was public education with a view to increasing participation of as many people as possible in Ontario's long-range planning. The third was ongoing representation at the hearings. The fourth was effective presentation at the hearings and the fifth was liason person for intervenor groups which might combine so that an orderly way of presenting themselves at the hearings could be arranged.

With respect to ongoing representation at the hearings, it was agreed that some groups would want to be at the hearings every day, others would want to be at the hearings only occasionally, and still others would be satisfied to read daily transcripts and then suggest further questions of that day's witnesses if necessary. It was agreed that representation at the hearings might be either by experts or by legal counsels. The Consumer's Association of Canada suggested strongly that it was their opinion that the main hearings would wind up as adversary hearings notwithstanding the CAC preference (shared by all the groups at the meeting) to have subject-orientated hearings. Witness fees would be an appropriate subject for funding under this category as well.

To maintain an effective presentation at the hearings, the group agreed that a lead expert could call his own researchers to testify on say working papers they had prepared which the lead expert had combined with his own knowledge to make a final report or it could be a knowledgeable person asking questions at the hearings of other witnesses (such as a farmer questioning an agronomist who knew very little about the farmer's locality).

It was agreed by the group that some kind of liaison person would have to be designated to make sure presentations were orderly and timely and that daily transcripts were sent to those people who were interested in the subject of that day's hearing. It was suggested that the Commission be asked to fund such a person to be located either in the Energy Probe office or the CELA office or the CAC office. No conclusion was reached as to which alternative was preferable.

WHERE SHOULD THE MONEY COME FROM

It was strongly agreed that the money should not come through the Government. Two other alternatives were explored. One was a separate tribunal to whom groups would apply. This was rejected after much discussion by the delegates for the reason that such a tribunal independent of both Government and the Commission could control the hearing process which might subvert the purposes of the Commissioners.

It was by default agreed that the most appropriate way of funding should be through the Commission itself. It was strongly suggested that an advisory committee with grass roots participation be set up to help the Commission in assessing both the applications and the viability of groups such as the advisory committees which participate in recommending recipients for OFY and LIP grants. It was stated that the funding should come through the Commission because it was the Commission's responsibility to make the final recommendations and to ensure that a proper procedure was followed so that all the information which might have an input into the final recommendations was heard. Furthermore, it was stated that funding through the Commission and ensuring fair hearings was the source of the Commission's

credibility.

WAYS OF GETTING THE MONEY

Five alternatives were discussed. One, grouping interests. Two, using free experts. Three, raising money and having it matched dollar for dollar. Four, funding to a percentage of hydro's budget for the projects. Five, a flat sum plus a percentage of what hydro spent preparing for the hearing. A sixth suggestion that funding be based on the cost of electricity to an area was rejected because it would mean that urban groups were in a much more favored position than farmers who had an equally legitimate interest in the outcome of the Report.

It was agreed that some grouping of interests would go on but that it was premature to do this before research tasks were fully formulated and assigned.

It was agreed that it would not be fair to ask experts to donate their time free to intervenor groups when the hydro experts and staff were getting paid.

It was agreed that it would be extremely difficult for small groups to participate in a situation where they had to raise money and then the funders would match that amount dollar for dollar. The CAC stated that this was an extremely bad principle for funding although the CAC would be one of the major beneficiaries of such a principle of funding. It was pointed out by CELA, a law group, that it would be impossible for them to raise money for appearances at the hearing which would be considered litigation and which would therefore not be able to attract donations through a charitable foundation (the foundation is by law forbidden to fund litigation).

There was strong support for a sum as a percentage of the hydro's budget for this project. The suggestion was .1% which would equal \$1,000,000.00.

There was some support for the idea of having a flat fee plus a percentage of what hydro spent on the hearings but it was agreed that this would be extremely difficult to figure out because hydro probably did not do their cost accounting in this way.

Energy Probe stated that a decision had to be made between whether it would be "supply" funding or whether it would be "demand" funding. Energy Probe stated that demand, that is funding to the extent that funding is needed for effective participation was the better principle but that it would ultimately be a supply situation.

In sum, then, the group agreed that the principle to be followed no matter what funding mechanism was used would be that of placing everyone, hydro, public interest groups, interest groups and individuals on an equal footing with respect to quality of research and quality of participation including representation at the hearing.

It was suggested that the Commission take a look at the idea of having a system where there would be sustaining money to carry on research and participation over the life of the Commission as well as a special projects budget for new ideas which came up during that time.

ADMINISTRATION

This topic was not much discussed although it was mentioned that since the money would probably be on a yearly basis, some independence of funding had to be assured so that grants were not cut off at the end of one year while a research project was in progress.

PROCEDURE

Before discussing procedure in detail, the group discussed their expectations coming out of the Commission's inquiry. No expectations were formulated with respect to the results the Commission might reach. The group's expectations with respect to procedure were simply that everybody that wanted to be heard would have an opportunity to be heard.

With respect to participation, the group agreed that making people aware of the public responsibility for helping in the decision-making for an essential issue for the Province was a priority; convincing people that this was a responsibility which would last in terms of participation beyond the Commission's hearings was also necessary, and the group agreed that they themselves as organized individuals had a responsibility to get lots of other people involved.

With respect to the educational aspect, the group agreed that public debates on the issues were essential and that much should be done to get press and the electronic media involved both in writing stories and dramatizing the hearings by perhaps interviewing the expert witnesses.

The group also agreed that the Commission had a responsibility to search out alternative experts to talk about hydro's plans if it appeared that intervenors had not covered that field or that they could not be reason of some monetary impediment.

Procedure was discussed with respect to similarities and differences that might be applicable to the preliminary meetings and to the main hearings.

With respect to the preliminary meetings, it was agreed that they should be as informal as possible and that a list of groups who came forward and their addresses and a brief summary of what they said ought to be distributed within a week of the meeting. It would therefore be necessary to establish some kind of registry system whereby people who wanted to receive this kind of information would get it from the Commission.

For preliminary meetings, there was a very strong preference for evening meetings because about 90 percent of the delegates to the weekend meeting had other jobs which would mean they could not take off part of the day.

The group agreed that there should not be cross-questioning of the people at the preliminary meeting although questions might be put to them through the Commission.

No agreement was reached with respect to whether the Commission should go every where it was invited or whether people might be brought to Toronto after reading the summaries of information presented. It was agreed that it should be left to the discretion of the Commission as long as everybody who wanted to say something had an opportunity to say it.

It was agreed that there should be no age limits to people who wished to appear at the preliminary meetings although it might be important to have a time limit on presentation or on questioning. A system of poker chips was suggested whereby each person at the meeting got an equal number of poker chips and each time someone opened his or her mouth he or she had to forfeit one chip.

It was suggested that travel costs to preliminary meetings be paid if a person lived more than 25 miles from the meeting place and there was no public transportation. If there was public transportation, it was suggested that travel costs be paid for people who lived more than 50 miles away.

It was suggested that during the preliminary meetings, the Commission take written questions from the audience and ask those people appearing those questions and provide microphones. This would give people who are less articulate a chance to have their say by writing their questions to the Commission. It was agreed that at the preliminary meetings everybody should be considered an equal and that the order of asking questions should not go according to whether one was an expert, a lawyer, a citizen, a group or what have you.

It was agreed that the Commission should ask hydro for a list of all reports, documents, letters, drafts, charts and other material hydro had on the subject and such a list should be made freely available. Such a list should be unedited and there should be no deletion of anything in what hydro presented. It was agreed that such a list should be made available as soon as possible, preferably before the first of the preliminary meetings began. It was recognized that this might not be possible and so it was agreed that in no event should the main hearings begin before such a list had been prepared together with a way of getting access to that information.

MAIN HEARINGS

With respect to the main hearings, it was agreed that they should be fully public and they should be advertised. However, no agreement was expressed on how much notice would be adequate. Also, all the delegates were concerned that enough lead time be available for proper preparation.

It was agreed that the main hearings would probably have to be held during the day although this would inconvenience some people who wanted to come to them. It was agreed that transcripts of what went on at the hearings ought to be made available every day for the previous day's evidence and ought to be made available free of charge to public interest groups and to individuals.

It was agreed that there ought to be cross-questioning at the main hearings although this should not be restricted to lawyers representing groups but should be allowed to experts or to the Commissioners themselves.

Again, for the main hearings it was agreed that reasonable travel expenses should be paid although this might form part of a budget which included a request for funding for effective presentation.

With respect to documents, no agreement was reached as to how much time was necessary between getting access to a document and having to comment on it in some way at the main hearing.

It was agreed that the Commissioners should have or should develop the expertise to cross-question other experts who appear before them. It was agreed that even if it takes a long time everyone should have a chance to cross-question experts. It was agreed that it would be appropriate to give a different status to representatives who were at the hearing all the time and required some continuity to their ongoing questioning. It was suggested that a time limit on questions from the general audience be put. It was agreed that public interest representatives should also have access to questioning the witnesses and that the order of questioning be managed so that it was fair. This would mean that the same person did not always get to speak first.

It was suggested that priority be given to those who did not appear at the main hearings all the time and that those who were appearing on a regular basis be the ones who waited their turn to question or cross-question witnesses. The group noted that the Fisher Harbour Hearings had the appearance of unfairness because interested residents were allowed only one opportunity to ask questions and they always had to wait until the lawyers got finished.

This discussion concluded the morning session. However, the group asked that CELA, the organizer of this conference, send out within a week a list of all the people who attended the conference, a list of all the work groups and their leaders, a report on funding and procedure, a report on Saturday's work groups, a list of the preliminary meetings the Porter Commission will be having and that CELA ask the Porter Commission for a list of research reports or information that the Commission has at present. In addition, a copy of the Order in Council stating the terms of reference was to be sent out.

Ottawa Probe made a strong statement that the Bradley-Georgetown line should be included among the priority projects. Ottawa Probe agreed to send more information to the participants so they could make some decision as to whether they agreed with Ottawa Probe on this issue or not.

CONFERENCE FOLLOW-UP

An invaluable by-product of the conference has been the expanded communication links which the meetings made possible. Delegates now have a much clearer sense of the goals of the participating groups, the kinds of research each is likely to undertake and the kinds of supportive resources each might offer.

Due to the mail strike, communications have become expensive and time consuming for those outside Toronto. For example, members of the agricultural group formed a coalition, The Food Land Steering Committee. In order to report back to the conference convenors, it was necessary to deliver the report by car from Guelph. The joint planning by Energy Probe and Pollution Probe Ottawa for public education has been via long distance telephone. In order for CELA to complete this report, it was necessary to contact out-of-town delegates by telephone, often during evening hours.

In Toronto, a number of meetings have been held with Energy Probe, The Consumer's Association of Canada, The Federation of Ontario Naturalists Sierra Club and CELA, which have provided valuable input to this report. These meetings have also served to clarify research topics and distribution of responsibility. Presumably these meetings will continue and expand to include others as soon as resources permit.

In summary, the conference catalyzed an enormous amount of energy. It served as a focal point in beginning to define what work will be needed. It provided a forum for the exchange of information and ideas. It fostered a sense of co-operation and co-ordination of the public interest efforts.

It would not have been possible without the support of the Royal Commission on Electric Power Planning.

PARTICIPANTS IN ATTENDANCE

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>TELEPHONE NO.</u>
Heather Mitchell	CELA	1 Spadina Crescent Suite 303 Toronto, Ontario	(416) 928-7156
Willie R. Turner	✓ VIS 5 FOUNDATION ✓	2220 Queen Street East Suite 16 Toronto, Ontario	690-7837
E. C. Nokes	✓ OMEA ✓	2323 Yonge Street Toronto, Ontario M4G 2C9	
Ken Tilson	✓ HOPE ✓	137 Egan Place Thunder Bay, Ontario	344-2844
Mel Redfern	HOPE	718 Holly Crescent Thunder Bay F, Ontario	622-6792
Joann Opperman	✓ GARBAGE COALITION PROBE ✓	43 Queen's Park Cres. E. Toronto, Ontario	928-7016
Joanna Watts	POLLUTION PROBE (GARBAGE TEAM)	43 Queen's Park Cres. E. Toronto, Ontario	928-5432
Greg Moore	✓ CURE ✓	122 Manor Drive Brockville, Ontario	(614) 345-0248
William Peden	✓ ENERGY PROBE	43 Queen's Park Cres. E. Toronto, Ontario	928-7014
Gordon Kidd	✓ INT. CIT. BRADLEY TO MITTON ✓	R. R. # 3 Georgetown, Ontario	(416) 877-6861
K. J. Hazlitt	✓ BEAN PRODUCERS ✓	R. R. # 4 Goderich, Ontario	524-7474
Sean Casey	ENERGY PROBE	43 Queen's Park Cres. E. Toronto, Ontario	928-7014
Dan Bingaman	✓ MANITOULIN SAFE POWER	R. R. # 1 Little Current, Ontario POP 1K0	(705) 368-3326
Bill Loree	POLLUTION PROBE	Box 502 Kincardine, Ontario	(519) 396-3282
Dennis Eaton	✓ FACULTY OF ENVIRON- MENTAL STUDIES ✓	York University Toronto, Ontario	
Rob MacDonald	FACULTY OF ENVIRON- MENTAL STUDIES	York University Toronto, Ontario	
Steve Garrod	FACULTY OF ENVIRON- MENTAL STUDIES	8 Assiniboine Road Apartment 806 Downsview, Ontario	

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>TELEPHONE NO.</u>
Bob Paehlke	✓ ALTERNATIVES ✓	Trent University Peterborough, Ontario	748-1471
George Adams	✓ CONCERNED FARMERS ✓	R. R. # 2 Wroxeter, Ontario NOG 2X0	335-6216
Lloyd H. Moore	CONCERNED FARMERS OF THE UNITED TOWNSHIPS	Box 6 Listowell, Ontario	
Jim Bearden	✓ SOUTH EAST SPADINA STEERING COMMITTEE ✓	218 McCaul Street Toronto, Ontario	929-9495
Elbert vanDonker- sogoed	✓ CHRISTIAN FARMERS FEDERATION ✓	Box 135 Drayton, Ontario	638-3063
Adrian Vos	✓ HURON POWER PLANT COMMITTEE ✓	Box 106 Blyth, Ontario	523-4294
Ian Hornby	✓ ENERGY RESEARCH GROUP, POLLUTION PROBE OTTAWA ✓	52 Queen Street Suite 54 Ottawa, Ontario	231-5596
G. Ed Morden	✓ NATIONAL FARMERS UNION ✓	5 Douglas Street Guelph, Ontario	(519) 836-2482 (519) 836-2515
CANTDU	✓ CANTDU ✓	P. O. Box 342 Goderich, Ontario	
D. S. McKee	CANTDU	R. R. #4 Goderich, Ontario	524-9801
Paul Carrol	CANTDU	Wilson Street Goderich, Ontario	
Norm Sloane ✓	✓ CELA ✓	305 Pim Street Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	256-5222
Ralph L. Thomas	✓ BROKEN QUARTER ASSOC. (NORTH SHORE PROPERTY OWNERS) ✓	51 Idaho Drive Sault Ste. Marie, Ont.	254-7465
Elaine Marshall	✓ FRIENDS OF RAINBOW ✓	Box 370 Espanola, Ontario	869-1314
Joseph Marin on behalf of Mac Dunbar	✓ ASSOCIATED MUNICIPALITIES OF ONTARIO ✓	c/o Lang, Michener P. O. Box 10 First Canadian Place Toronto, Ontario	360-8600
Steve Marshall	F.O.R.	P. O. Box 370 Espanola, Ontario	869-2300
Veronika Bingham	MANITOULIN SAFE POWER	R. R. # 1 Little Current, Ontario	368-3326

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>TELEPHONE NO.</u>
✓ Andrew Kerekes	C.A.C. ✓	Kerekes, Collins Suite 1800 101 Richmond Street W. Toronto, Ontario	
Pauline Boote	CELA	1 Spadina Crescent Suite 303 Toronto, Ontario	928-7156
Bob Kerton	CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION OF CANADA	University of Waterloo Waterloo, Ontario	885-1211 Ex 2209
✓ Elaine Hall	VOICE OF WOMEN ✓	29 Edgewood Avenue Toronto, Ontario	694-6915
Tomy Hartment	FACULTY OF ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES	York University 9907 Keele Street Downsview, Ontario	832-1593
Jamie Benidickson	ALTERNATIVES	Trent University Peterborough, Ontario	(705) 748-1542
Nancy Pocock	VOICE OF WOMEN	52 Elgin Avenue Toronto, Ontario	922-4493
Walter Scott	INTERESTED CITIZENS	R. R. # 3 Georgetown, Ontario	Bus 367-3696 Res 878-7387
✓ Bob Rosehart	RCEPP ✓	7th Floor 14 Carlton Street Toronto, Ontario	965-2111
Delores Montgomery	CELA	1 Spadina Crescent Suite 303 Toronto, Ontario	928-7156