

Name: Darcy Houston

Date: October 07, 2017

Assuming the Site C project is actually on time and on budget (doubtful), this represents a cost of over \$2,000 per BC resident. I would far prefer the Province simply gave me my \$2,000 as a subsidy for the installation of solar power. As opposed to Site C, solar power would be a year-round clean power source - Site C is unlikely to generate power when the water in the rivers and snow on the mountains that feed them are frozen for a good portion of the year. Solar is also more environmentally friendly - no need to divert rivers, flood farmland, or interfere with spawning grounds. In addition, solar power does not trample on the rights of Indigenous groups, who have stood against the Site C project. Finally, my understanding is that the Site C project was largely intended to power the LNG industry, with excess power going to US markets. Given the LNG industry has pretty much died in BC, due to the worldwide glut, and given my fervent desire not to subsidize corporate interests if LNG does ramp up here, I think Site C should be stopped. The budgeted funds should be redirected into truly green energy alternatives such as solar, wind, tidal and geothermal power. Site C must be stopped before Hydro ratepayers bear the cost of Christy Clark's inexcusable vanity project.