

Dear Editor:

The Dam News brief in the spring magazine came up a bit short.

Some things were correct: the delay in the opening, some features need more work, and that everyone involved learned a huge amount.

Some things were incorrect; the delay is not due to recirculations, but due to a missing generator (damaged falling off a trailer). Once it is installed, testing has to be completed and only then will the developer, the engineers, and the WKABC be able to sign off on the course as available to paddle. Sure some things have to be changed – the real achievement is that so few things need work.

I also understand undocumented sources provided information about how difficult the course is. To date, only a couple of paddlers have ever seen water run through the course, for two brief periods of time. There are two kinds of inputs here – those that are informed, and part of the solution, and those that are not informed, and part of the problem. Then there was the blood-red title...

Negative press regarding artificial courses is a problem; a problem for the Pumphouse in Ottawa, for feature enhancements in North Vancouver, and for a wave in Saskatoon.

If people looking in from outside the paddling community think that even paddlers feel artificial courses are dangerous, then why would any developer, city planning department, or regulatory agency even want to consider allowing them?

How about a more positive approach; a follow up article that focuses on the truly unique and really exciting aspects of the Rutherford Course? As the only course in Canada where users will be able to vary the flows at will, rearrange obstacles easily to change the course, and the only course the paddling community will own outright, there are clearly some positive aspects to focus upon.

Stuart Smith