

Paul McGrady: Thanks, Keith. Paul McGrady here for the record. First of all a big thank you to the EPDP team, I know that's been an enormous amount of work in a very short timeframe. I also wanted to thank my fellow councilors for the extra time that we got, the 10 days were put to good use. Going into the call last time it was not clear to me that there was no way that we could not come up with something that would have allowed the IPC to vote yes so the time was well spent.

We spent many hours together both the IPC by itself and also with the BC attempting to find way to get to a place where we could support the motion but after lots of hours on calls and many, many emails, we just couldn't get there.

The bottom line from our point of view is that we believe that the consensus call in this particular case was broken. We believe that the chart showing consensus reflects a consensus where there really wasn't any and that the IPC had withheld its consensus on the entire report and that wasn't - that wasn't reflected.

And so the itemized list of things that we thought still needed a lot of work was a way to try to get the final report into shape so that the IPC could provide its consensus. It wasn't to be read as an indication that, you know, everything else was great because these recommendations are, you know, sure, they can be itemized out but that's not how the vote was, right, the report was, you know, the whole thing up or down.

So as a result we think that the recommendations that are now going to the Board reflect, you know, I'm sorry, the report reflects a cheerier picture than what is in fact the reality. And so we think that the Section 10 of the whereas clause simply doesn't reflect what actually is the case on the ground, although the whereas clauses weren't read into the record, they're part of the back and forth.

And again, and although some have said that this motion was about whether or not the working group followed its procedures, you know, in the motion's own language, Section 7 of the whereas clause indicates approval of the recommendations, not just an indication that all the procedures were followed, which we don't believe they were, you know, I've already mentioned that, in relationship to the consensus call and how that essentially broke down there at the end.

And then lastly, the whereas say that we reviewed and discussed the recommendations but we were in fact told that there was no possibility of opening up the recommendations at the Council level and that this was an up or down on procedural issues only. Additionally I'm just befuddled that the Council discussion was restricted to amendments of the motion only. I've never seen that in all the time on Council. I still don't understand why the Council didn't dig in here and really look at these recommendations so that Section 11 of the whereas clause of this motion could have been accurate. I don't think that it is.

So anyways, those are some of the reasons. I try to boil them down to the most relevant ones. Hopefully I've not left anybody's pet reason off the list and I get an email from an IPC member after the call, but those are some of the reasons why we just couldn't get to yes. It's somewhat moot now of course because the motion passed but I did want to pass along the reasons and pass along my thanks to fellow councilors for giving me the extra time to try to go back and get to a yes, it just - we just couldn't there.

And I know that this cost everybody an extra phone call meeting and so it wasn't just a hypothetical thank you, this is a real thank you to the other councilors on this call and I guess we move forward from here. Thank you.