



## Fact Sheet: Economic Impacts of Site C Dam

- Site C will create at least \$5000 of debt for every [household in BC](#).
- Site C will saddle BC taxpayers with [70 years of debt](#) from Site C. The dam will not be paid off by BC residents until 2094 at the earliest.
- BC Hydro is borrowing \$9 billion, on top of its current [debt of \\$22 billion](#) and long term commitments of [\\$53.8 billion](#) to pay for Site C dam.
- \$9 billion could be better spent in BC: It could fund 54 secondary schools or 321 middle schools or many new hospitals.
- Homeowners face a [28% increase](#) in BC Hydro rates by 2018. This is in addition to increases in ICBC rates, housing costs and the cost of imported food.
- Energy demand in BC has been [flat](#) for a decade; as rates increase, demand will fall.
- British Columbia has many cheaper and greener [alternatives](#); geothermal, solar and wind are available at lower cost. Taking back the power available under the Columbia River Treaty is also an option.
- Site C is [another boondoggle](#), like the Muskrat Falls Dam in Newfoundland and Labrador where homeowners will be paying \$150 more per month by 2022. The cost of the dam has almost doubled since construction began; the case for the project has evaporated since its sanctioning in 2012. The current head of the Newfoundland utility [calls](#) Muskrat Falls a “boondoggle”.
- Site C was not sent to the regulator, the BC Utilities Commission (BCUC) even though the former chair of the Joint Review Panel, Dr. Harry Swain strongly and repeatedly [advised](#) that it should.
- Average price for Site C electricity = [\\$88/MWh](#) yet promised average price to industry = [\\$55/MWh](#)
- Why are LNG companies in BC getting [reduced hydro rates](#) on the backs of BC citizens?
- Why is BC spending \$9 billion and further, why is the federal government [open to spending](#) billions more to send Site C power to Alberta to support their oil sands industry?
- Site C construction is [supporting companies](#) such as [SNC Lavalin](#) and [Samsung](#), which have worldwide reputations for corruption.

Harry Swain, chairperson of the joint federal-provincial panel that examined the case for Site C, [said](#): **“You don’t even have to think very much about the environmental and aboriginal cost of Site C because the economics are so awful”.**

As former BC Hydro CEO Marc Eliesen [said](#) in an interview with DeSmog, **“With Site C, BC Hydro ratepayers will be facing a devastating increase. This is scheduled to become a big white elephant.”**

**Note:** Sources are hyperlinked in this document. If you are viewing a paper version, please access the digital version with hyperlinks at: <https://keepingthepeace.wordpress.com/resources/>