

**From:** [REDACTED] on behalf of [David Ham](#)  
**To:** [Site C Submissions BCUC:EX](#)  
**Subject:** We do not need to sacrifice any more fertile valleys.  
**Date:** Monday, September 25, 2017 9:56:53 AM

---

Dear British Columbia Utilities Commission,

Please do the right thing. Reject Site C dam now

I urge you to carefully consider the impact any decisions or actions regarding this issue will have.

I am writing to urge you to recommend that the Site C Dam be rejected. The project has serious financial and environmental problems, and runs counter to the goal of seeking reconciliation with Indigenous peoples.

The financial costs of continuing with construction are just too high. According to a report prepared for your commission by Deloitte, there is a growing chance that the project will go significantly over-budget. Rather than spend so much money on a dam we don't need, the lowest cost option is to just cancel the dam.

There are better alternatives. BC can meet all its energy needs through building retrofits, energy efficiency, and investing in renewable energy. The BC NDP's own Power BC plan lays out how we can create more jobs and better value.

The environmental impacts are not justified. The project's environmental assessment concluded that the dam would "cause significant adverse effects on fish and fish habitat...birds and bats...rare plants, and sensitive ecosystems." Given that there are alternatives, these impacts can not be justified.

The project does not have the consent of the Treaty 8 First Nations. This project will have a devastating impact on the treaty and Aboriginal rights of Treaty 8 First Nations. The project will eliminate these First Nations' ability to continue their way of life and will severely curtail their treaty-protected constitutional rights to hunt, fish, trap, harvest and carry out their practices on their land.

The Site C Dam is clearly not in the public interest. Please recommend to the BC Government that this project be canceled.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,  
David Ham

[REDACTED]