

**Suggested questions for the BCUC Community Input Sessions on Site C Dam  
September 2017  
Peace Valley Environment Association and Allied Groups**

We are fortunate to have received comments, advice and suggested questions related to the BCUC's Preliminary Report from a number of very credible experts. Following are some of the key messages that they suggest we bring to the BCUC Commissioners' attention:

1. Thanks to the BCUC for undertaking this review of Site C.
2. Thanks to the BCUC for asking BC Hydro to provide significantly more information in order to ensure a truly comprehensive review of Site C is undertaken.
3. Can you please do your best to ensure that BC Hydro provides the required information in a timely fashion?
4. Ask BCUC to devote their energy to findings on alternative portfolios.
5. Even if Site C is on time and on budget, and even if BC Hydro forecasts were true, alternatives will save ratepayers money.
6. Please let me know how I can support your (BCUC's) efforts to conduct a thorough assessment of Site C.
7. Can you tell me what my hydro rates will be if we:
  - a. Proceed with Site C
  - b. Bring Hydro's debt down to a reasonable amount
  - c. Bring the regulatory accounts from \$6 billion to zero
8. Can you tell me why Site C is even being considered, given that demand has been flat for the last 10 years and is expected to continue to be so?
9. Can you tell me how many jobs Site C is really providing? How many are for British Columbians? How many are truly 'local' workers? How many are actually working full-time on Site C versus providing part-time services to the Site C project? How many are for Canadians from other provinces? How many are foreign workers?
10. Given that we have several dams in this province as well as the potential for the Canadian Entitlement to the Columbia River Treaty, Burrard Thermal and the Northwest Electrical Grid, why does BC Hydro keep telling us that we need Site C for back-up power? It is essentially a run-of-river project, isn't it?
11. Retired KPMG partner, Eoin Finn says that we are currently exporting 90% of the amount of power that Site C is expected to produce. Given this, why wouldn't we use more of this power ourselves instead of building Site C, the power from which will cost three times more?

12. One alternative to proceeding with Site C is to adopt more power conservation measures. I ask the Commission to explain in its final report, the cost differences between conservation measures and building Site C.