

From: [Derril Gudlaugson](#)
To: [Site C Submissions BCUC:EX](#)
Subject: Site C submission August 30, 2017
Date: Wednesday, August 30, 2017 8:27:19 PM
Attachments: [Site C letter to premier.doc](#)
[ATT00001.htm](#)

From: Derril Gudlaugson [REDACTED]
Subject: Site C submission August 30, 2017
Date: August 30, 2017 at 8:14:43 PM PDT
To: <SiteCSubmissions@bcuc.com>

Site C Submissions
B.C. Utilities Commission
August, 2017.

As a longtime BC resident and taxpayer, I have for many years expressed grave concern over the decades-long proposal to build a Site C dam, as expressed in my Site-C letter to Premier Clark /cMLA John Yap July 26, 2015 (PDF attached to this submission). Please peruse this letter for an overview of my concerns, and for reference in my comments here.

In reference to the BCUC Enquiry Respecting Site C, I wish to address Section 3 a iii), b iii), and b iv).

Section 3 a iii) Terminating construction and remediating the site:

As I make very clear in Paragraph 6 of my 2015 letter, cancelling this project is the only viable solution due to the great harm inflicted on the environment, agriculture, the farming community, and First Nations in the connected and extensive watershed of the Peace. As a taxpayer, I am prepared to shoulder some responsibility for the cost of termination and remediation. This is not a terrible thing, but a common occurrence. In our democratic society, governments frequently make errors which have to be corrected, and the taxpayer foots the bill.

Section 3 b iii) What are the costs to ratepayers of terminating the Site C project and what are the potential mechanisms to recover those costs?

This question is asking directly: “should ratepayers of BC Hydro bear the cost?”. My response is in the negative. It would be unfair to saddle the individuals, businesses, and corporations who consume electricity with the full cost of this mistake; this mega project was initiated by the province of BC supposedly for the

good (jobs, economic growth) of residents of BC. The cost should be born by taxes, not rate hikes. The fairest way to pay the cost would be out of the general revenue as, essentially, bad debt.

Section 3 b iv) Given the energy objectives set out in the Clean Energy Act, what, if any, other portfolio of commercially feasible energy projects . . . could provide similar benefits ...

This question suggest that the province or BC Hydro have a portfolio of projects to consider. I sincerely doubt that this is the case, as both entities have with a determined tunnel vision pursued Site C and private hydro, and ignored funding alternate energy sources. Again in Paragraph 6 of my letter, I urged the government to “devote funding to develop solar, tidal, and especially geothermal sources of electric generation.” Neither entity has done so, and both have managed to encourage green energy projects to go elsewhere. I still stress that solar, tidal, and geothermal can provide that portfolio, but funding and volition are required from the government and BC Hydro.

I wish to briefly address the experience of the geothermal industry in this province. BC Hydro, I believe, had a tiny geothermal project near Pemberton for a decade or more but its funding was not renewed and the project abruptly cancelled in 2002 or thereabout. More recently, the geothermal industry in BC approached the provincial government for some small funding (a few thousand dollars) to enable more interested technical people to attend an international geothermal conference in Europe. Our provincial government at that time did not even reply to the request in spite of repeated contact.

Now, I have been to Iceland, where geothermal technology of the highest order is in place, functioning to provide heat, hot and cold water, and electricity for everything from the smallest farm to the largest city, all from boreholes that are drilled a few hundred metres into the earth. There is no pollution, and the end product is a neutral wastewater that is returned down the borehole. Large pipelines carry water to heat and provide domestic water to the city of Reykjavik, but if a pipeline were to break (the Icelanders are very thorough and careful so I have never heard of a pipeline break), the only thing that is spilled is - water. Now, the point of mentioning this is that we have large geothermal areas in BC, and we have not even enquired or shown any interest in this alternate energy source, at the provincial level. It is high time we do so. I urge the Commission to recommend to the provincial government to immediately establish a funded portfolio for geothermal energy.

Thank you for your attention to the concerns expressed here. I very strongly believe the only viable answer to the main question is “terminating construction and remediating the site”.

Further, in reading the current submissions, I strongly support the views expressed in submissions F13 (Marc Elieson), F23 (Sierra Club), F28 (Treaty 8), F35 (PVLA), F36(H. Swain), F40 (Ken Boon).

Yours Sincerely,

Derril Gudlaugson,



[REDACTED]
July 26, 2015

Premier Clark,
Office of the Premier
Legislative Building,
Victoria, B.C. V8W 9E1

Dear Premier Clark,

I am very concerned about the destruction that the proposed Site-C power dam will cause to the environment, to agriculture, to the farming community in the Peace valley, and to the traditional and legal territory of the First Nations, specifically the West Moberly, Prophet River, Macleod Lake, and others in the connected watershed of the Peace.

Further, I am concerned about the environmental degradation for hundreds of kilometers downstream of the proposed dam, in the Peace and Athabasca watersheds. The construction of the Bennett dam some sixty years ago caused immense environmental degradation in these watersheds, degradation which continues today. It also negatively affected the territory of the Athapaskan First Nations. I do not want to see that disaster repeated.

I find it reprehensible that, in promoting this project, your government and B.C. Hydro present slanted, incomplete, or misleading information. As an example, I would cite the letter of Dave Conway, B.C. Hydro Community Relations Manager for Site C, to the Richmond Review April 29, 2015 "Site C Would Benefit Agricultural Production", best described as disingenuous use of unrelated facts, at worst pernicious propaganda.

Your administration touts Site-C as "clean energy" which is far from the truth. That was the view in the 1960's; today hydro dams are considered outdated technology because of the damaging environmental footprint, which over time becomes as dirty as old technology coal or petroleum production. Consider just one fact among many: the Bennet Dam (Williston Lake) has apparently for decades been dissolving mercury deposits from the flooded valleys into the water, contaminating the fish, and human consumption can lead to mercury poisoning.

Finally, there is the financial cost to the B.C. taxpayer, of whom I am one. As a taxpayer I am distressed by the lack of clear financial planning for this \$8.8 billion project. My concern is heightened by your refusal to implement the financial recommendations of the Federal-Provincial Review Panel and your continued disallowal of the recommended transparent financial evaluation by the B.C. Utilities Commission.

Therefore, I urge your government to cancel this harmful and expensive project, and devote funding to develop solar, tidal, and especially geothermal sources of electrical generation. These can lead to a robust, remarkably cleaner energy future.

In closing, I draw your attention to the recent public letters (attached) which you and your Minister have received from the Peace Valley Land Owners, regarding Site C. They are cogent, thoughtful, knowledgeable, respectfully addressed to you as our elected government. I support their petition, as do a growing number of British Columbians. It is of the utmost importance that it receive careful and significant consideration.

Yours truly,

cc John Yap, [REDACTED]

Derril Gudlaugson