

Name: Zoe Meletis

Date: October 11, 2017

Dear all,

I am an academic with a curiosity about the world around me, and I am an active citizen trying to leave behind a better world for my daughter and others who will inherit the consequences of our decisions.

With respect to the questions before the BCUC, I ask the following related questions:

a. regarding timing and budget—

Why are we undertaking an antiquated form of extractive mega-"development" in BC (a dam, without proven necessitating energy demand, and based on powering an LNG industry that seems now to be out of the picture), and one that banks on a "budget" that allows for gross externalities including extensive cultural and landscape losses, loss of prime regional agricultural land, and environmental damages?

Why are we investing in a mega dam from yesteryear when sustainability, energy, and investment leaders around the world are calling for greater energy portfolio diversification, emphasizing forms of green energy that are lighter on the land and its peoples?

b. regarding costs of suspending the project--

Why are we emphasizing this as a problematic aspect of the possible cancellation of this project, when we should rather be considering more holistic, longer term costs?

Suspension and associated costs are the moral and ethical burdens we must bear for reconsidering the impacts and implications of short-term "development" planning in our province, and our out-dated emphasis on extractive industries and energy production.

Why aren't we instead focusing on the more important question—can we afford to carry it through—politically, socially, economically, culturally, environmentally, and with an eye to the future of our province and places "downstream" from this proposed project?

Can we fully understand the costs associated with carrying on investing in this project, without proven demand for it, and with indeterminate risks and costs, including vocal First Nation opposition to the project in an era of Reconciliation?

c. regarding the cost of terminating the project

What is the cost of peace, and improved relations with First Nations and allies who oppose the project?

What is the cost (and benefit) of building a better, more balanced economy in BC, with less reliance on accumulation by dispossession, and raiding rural resources primarily for urban and elite benefit?

What are the costs (and benefits) of honouring an honest re-evaluation of an inadequate project with limited proven benefits for most residents of BC (current and future)?

e. regarding "what are expected peak capacity demand and energy demand"?

Great question.

Why are we still asking this and other questions like this?

Why is a large-scale project underway when significant related data gaps persist?

What does it say about the future of BC and the energy sector within it if we continue along with a

culture of starting projects without greater certainty of information? What does this practice suggest about the soundness of our decisions, and the associated risks in our future as a result?

I hope that the limited framework of questions currently before you for consideration is revealing many other questions that remain... about the need for the project, the quality of its design, its location and related considerations, its degree of popularity (public opinion; community support/opposition; political will) among ALL of BC's citizens, particularly those most affected by it, such as First Nations (e.g. Treaty 8), and planning for future generations.

If you consider questions nested within the 5 (a-e) themes provided, and contemplate issues beyond "business as usual" emphasis on costs, rates, budgets, and impacts, as we so inadequately calculate them, I do not see how you can recommend that this project continue in its current form.

I trust that you will make the correct decision for the future of BC.

Thank you,

Zoë Meletis (PhD)