

**Name:** Dave Cuddy

**Date:** October 11, 2017

**Subject:** Submission for Site C Inquiry

Dear British Columbia Utilities Commission,

After reading through the Site C Preliminary Report executive summary, I was surprised that you did not include whether the Site C dam will be economically viable when it is in operation. It is very important to understand if building the damn will actually pay off in the future, and if the damn is in the correct geographical location where such energy can be harnessed to create suitable profits from the required amount of users. If you are not researching this question I feel you are wasting valuable resources while the project is being suspended. Moreover, as Justin Trudeau exclaimed, the economy and the environment go hand in hand like a canoe and a paddle. Therefore, it must be understood that future users of the Site C damn are harnessing the power in an ecological and intelligent manner which raises much skepticism when major customers (users) of the damn would be from the controversial LNG fracking industry. Consequently, a proper analysis of economic viability must also include a thorough ecological component which recognizes ecological resources as equivalent to or greater value than money (My opinion is greater value). It should also be understood that LNG does not have a good long term economical viability anyway, which threatens an adequate return on investment, not even considering the ecological component.

In conclusion, I ask that the British Columbia Utilities Commission to ask more relevant questions and goes more in depth to understand important issues with regards to the long term economic and ecological viability of the Site C project. We all know that a delay in the project will cost extra money but the very reason of suspending the project is to determine if this is the right project at all. Please ask the right questions.

Thank you,

Dave Cuddy

██████████

██████████