

Karen Goodings

[REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]

October 11, 2017

David Morton, Chair, BCUC  
Suite 410, 900 Howe Street  
Vancouver B.C.

Email: [sitecinquiry@bcuc.com](mailto:sitecinquiry@bcuc.com)

Dear Mr. Morton and Commissioners

A few closing comments on the Site C inquiry.

BC Hydro has now admitted they cannot meet their proposed budget and that the tension cracks are among the causes for the delay and therefore an increase in costs of over 6 million dollars. Those tension cracks should act as a warning of the possible future failing of the dam site. The veil of secrecy on this project and the costs associated with it remain as a warning of manipulation of the final outcome on the costs. With less than 25% of the uncommitted contingency remaining, while 75% of the contract is outstanding, should raise alarm bells as to what the future cost overruns will be to complete the project.

The determination by the previous government to proceed with this project and to push it past the point of no return is now costing us uncertainty and economic losses. Their refusal to follow the recommendations from the Joint Review Panel (JRP) that clearly said this project needs further examination as to need and cost and should be sent to the BCUC before the shovels hit the ground should have been acted on. In the report from the JRP there are several reference points. Lack of cost analysis (page 280), Demand Forecast (page 287), Lack of research into geothermal resources (page 299) and last, but not least, there has not been a fully demonstrated need for this project on the timetable that is being proposed (page 306). Previous Premiers of this Province recognized that and after the review determined it was **NOT** in the best interests of the Province to proceed with Site C.

The narrow focus of the inquiry does not allow for consideration of the loss of our valuable class 1 & 2 soils. Climate change is happening and with that comes more dramatic swings in weather which will affect the ability of food to be grown to feed the increased populations world wide. **We are not making any more land** but we are capable of producing power without permanently destroying the land. Not enough has been done to investigate those alternatives. Why would anyone destroy our food growing lands without doing those investigations? How do we determine the economic loss of those same class 1 & 2 lands x 100 years.

While I acknowledge the sunk costs as a mistake I liken those sunk costs to having thrown \$20 down the well and knowing that I can't recover the first \$20 continuing to throw more down the well. It is time to terminate this project and return the lands to the production of food now and in the future.

I wish you well in your deliberations and appreciate the task in front of you. The uncertainty for the landowners has been the story of their lives for the past thirty plus years. More concern is expressed about people who might have to look for other work than about those whose livelihood is on the line. It is time for a decision to be made and I certainly hope it is a decision that allows this river valley to remain a valley and not a reservoir.

Sincerely

Karen Goodings