

PRESS RELEASE

New Report Indicates that BC's Site C Dam is not cleaner or greener than other renewables

New report finds that an alternative portfolio (which includes wind energy) would produce no more greenhouse gas emissions than the Site C project while having significantly lower environmental impacts.

July 15, 2016 (Ottawa)—The key finding in a new report from the University of British Columbia: the \$8.8 billion Site C Dam would not deliver energy and capacity at lower greenhouse gas emissions than other renewable sources of energy. The Site C Project is not “cleaner” or “greener” in terms of GHG emissions.

“Our analysis indicates that these other renewables (such as solar and wind) would likely be a better alternative, helping Canada achieve its climate change goals more quickly and affordably, and with a much lower overall environment impact than Site C,” said report author Rick Hendriks, an energy consultant with 20 years experience assessing and analyzing large-scale hydropower projects.

An earlier report found that Site C has more significant adverse environmental effects than any project ever reviewed under the history of the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, including impacts on dozens of species, aquatics, vegetation, wildlife, Aboriginal use of lands and resources, and cultural heritage.¹

“The government stated that the unprecedented number of significant adverse environmental effects from Site C is justifiable, in part, because the project delivers energy and capacity at lower GHG emissions than the available alternatives,” says Hendriks. “Our analysis indicates this is not the case.”

The analysis uses data prepared by BC Hydro and compares the difference in greenhouse gas emissions between the Site C Project and an optimization of an Alternative Portfolio initially put forward by BC Hydro (which includes wind energy). The difference in lifecycle greenhouse emissions is estimated to be significantly less than 1% of BC's current emissions.

The Joint Review Panel commissioned by the federal and provincial governments to conduct an environmental assessment of the Site C Project was not able to conduct a comparative analysis of greenhouse gas emissions because of limited time and resources. The new report from the University of British Columbia thus fills an important information gap.

The report also questions the potential for exporting Site C energy to Alberta. The relatively high cost of Site C energy (compared to other renewables such as wind and solar) may dampen export opportunities, particularly given the rapidly declining cost of other renewables.

The report was overseen by Dr. Karen Bakker (UBC) and independently reviewed by Dr. Arthur Fredeen (UNBC), Dr. Norman Mousseau (Université de Montreal) and Philip Raphals (Helios Centre, Montreal).

For a copy of the report visit www.sitecstatement.org, which also contains a Statement of Concern on Site C (signed by 360 Canadian scholars) and three additional reports on legal/regulatory, First Nations, and environmental issues.

Media contact:

Dr. Karen Bakker (Vancouver; French and English): (778) 847 2663; karen.bakker@ubc.ca

¹ Briefing Note #2: Assessing Alternatives to Site C: Environmental Effects Comparison. www.sitecstatement.org.