

From: [Site C Inquiry - Make a Submission](#)
To: [Site C Comments BCUC:EX](#)
Subject: SiteC Inquiry - Make a Submission
Date: Saturday, September 23, 2017 10:08:43 PM

First Name: Nicole

Last Name: Boon

Phone:

Organization:

Comment: I would like to thank BCUC for undertaking this review of Site C and for asking BC Hydro to provide significantly more information. I ask that you please do your best to ensure that BC Hydro provides the required information in a timely fashion and focus your findings on alternative portfolios.

I believe that if Site C is on time and on budget, and if BC Hydro forecasts are true, that still alternatives will save ratepayers money. Please tell me what my hydro rates will be if we:

- a) proceed with Site C;
- b) bring BC Hydro's debt down to a reasonable amount; and
- c) bring the regulatory accounts from \$6 billion to zero?

Why is Site C being considered given that demand has been flat for the last 10 years and is expected to continue to be so and how many jobs is Site C providing? And, how many of these jobs are for British Columbians, for Canadians from other provinces, and for foreign workers?

In conclusion, given that we have several dams in this province as well as the potential for the Canadian Entitlement to the Columbia River Treaty, Burrard Thermal, and the Northwest Electrical Grid, why does BC Hydro keep telling us that we need Site C for back up power? Is it not essentially a large run-of-river project? If we are currently exporting 90% of the amount of power that Site C is expected to produce, then why wouldn't we use more of this power ourselves. Shouldn't we not build Site C power, which is about three times as expensive? Thank you for your time and consideration.

This e-mail was sent from a comment form from the Site C Inquiry (<http://www.sitecinquiry.com>).