

From: [Site C Inquiry - Make a Submission](#)
To: [Site C Comments BCUC:EX](#)
Subject: SiteC Inquiry - Make a Submission
Date: Sunday, September 24, 2017 10:57:53 AM

First Name: Lorne

Last Name: Seitz

Organization:

Comment: Submission to the British Columbia Utilities Commission

Re: Site C Power Project

I urge the BCUC to support the completion of the Site C dam at the earliest possible date. My views are based on the following:

1. With the drive to replace carbon-based energy, electricity needs will increase significantly in the short-, medium- and long-terms.

2. Hydro power is the perfect complement to the interruptible power of virtually all current, proven "green" power technology. The water storage capability of hydro power is a "battery" storing power to be used when interruptible power sources are low. I am not convinced of the storage capacity of other forms of power.

3. The true cost, at this point, is the total estimated cost minus the amount already spent and the additional costs of suspension or termination of the project. On that basis, the project must be considered economical, particularly when one considers the long lifespan of a hydro electric generating facility such as Site C.

4. I have little confidence in both the pace of development of alternative sources of "green" power or their net green benefits over hydro power. Nor do I believe the total environmental impact of Site C is greater than the total environmental impact of other forms of renewable energy, such as wind or solar power when one includes all the environmental impact of production of the equipment, sourcing of the materials required, construction and operation. Recognize also, that the lifespan of these alternatives is significantly shorter than that of Site C, resulting in environmental impacts each time one of these alternative sources is replaced.

5. From my own knowledge and that of acquaintances, there is not a significant impact of Site C on agriculture in British Columbia. First, the land lost to agriculture is, for the most part, not the best food-producing land. Second, we do not have a shortage of agriculture land for food production. The Peace River area itself has a significant high-quality land base capable of producing food. Third, a source of water for irrigation is the foundation of significantly greater food production. The storage capacity of the reservoir can serve as that source of water.

I believe the opposition to Site C is driven by ideological and political considerations. I trust your review will reflect sound, unbiased analysis.

There will be some uncertainty, at this point, regarding the total cost and expected completion date. However, that does not change my view that the project should proceed without any further delay.

Lorne Seitz

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