Project context
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- Main research partner: Chaire de recherche en Géoscience côtière de l’Université du Québec à Rimouski (UQAR)
Project context

Three main tasks

1. Assessing the economic impacts of coastal erosion in Quebec in a climate change context
2. Analyzing the costs and benefits of various adaptation options to erosion and flooding hazards in coastal areas
3. Sharing lessons learned from the economic analyses completed in Quebec and the Atlantic provinces
Project context
Climate change in coastal areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Sea level rise</th>
<th>2. Reduced ice-cover</th>
<th>3. Increased freeze-thaw cycle</th>
<th>4. Changing extreme events patterns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Global mean sea level rise" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Reduced ice-cover" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Increased freeze-thaw cycle" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Changing extreme events patterns" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Quebec in the next 50 years:
- More than 5 000 buildings at risk
- More than 300 km of roads and railways at risk
- This translate into more than 1.5 billion $ of potential damages
Why using Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) for climate change adaptation?

- Bridge the gap between research and policy making
- Provide a decision-making tool (NPV, CBR, IRR) by allowing to compare the costs and benefits of various adaptation options (measures, strategies)
- Identify the most efficient adaptation measure (or option) from a society’s point of view
  - Including environmental, social and economic impact: lost of seaview, destruction of natural habitats, diminution of insecurity, etc.
CBA basics

Cost of climate change

Avoided costs = benefits

Estimate the cost of non-intervention

Identify adaptation measures

Identify, quantify and monetize the impacts of non-intervention and adaptation measures

Compare costs and benefits of adaptation measures and non-intervention
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CBA basics

Basic assumptions

• Study period: 50 years

• *Status quo* over the study period

• Discount rate over 50 years: 4%

\[
NPV = \sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{B_t}{(1 + i)^t} - \frac{C_t}{(1 + i)^t}
\]

\[
CBR = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} C_t}{(1 + i)^t} / \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} B_t}{(1 + i)^t}
\]

NPV: Net present value
CBR: Cost-benefit ratio
B: benefits
C: costs
i: discount rate
t: year
CBA and IA

Why combining CBA and IA?

– Allows to integrate in the analysis of adaptation options the environmental, social and economic costs and benefits

– Provides a thorough analysis of alternatives

– Helps to gain social acceptability by considering all project’s impacts into the economic analysis

– Points to the most important and most valued impacts for stakeholders
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type or source of costs and benefits</th>
<th>Costs originating from negative impacts</th>
<th>Benefits originating from positive impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Related to erosion</td>
<td>- Loss of land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of residential or commercial buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss or damage to public infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency evacuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related to flooding</td>
<td>- Damage to land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Damage to residential or commercial buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Damage to public infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emergency evacuation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic congestion or detour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Debris clean-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>- Reduced land value</td>
<td>Gain in tourism revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of goods and commercial revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of trade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of tourism revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of fishing revenues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>- Loss of natural habitats</td>
<td>Improvement in natural habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Loss of fish spawning grounds</td>
<td>Improvement in fish spawning grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>- Loss of sea view and access</td>
<td>Improvement in the coast’s recreational use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Decline in the coast’s recreational use</td>
<td>Improvement in quality of life (security)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reduced quality of life (anxiety, insecurity, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deterioration in the landscape</td>
<td>Improvement in the landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deterioration in historical and cultural heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percé case study
Percé Case Study

Major impacts considered in the CBA:

**Environment:**
Disruption of spawning areas
Destruction of lobster habitat and biodiversity

**Economic:**
Change in regional tourism traffic
Lost productivity of lobster fishing
Percé Case Study

Preliminary characterization of the seabed

- Changes in natural habitats
- Delimitation of good and poor lobster habitat
- Compensations calculated according to the sea encroachment area for each solution
- Construction cost of an artificial reef
### Percé Case Study

#### Variation in the number of nights spent in the Gaspesie region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Number of nights/year</th>
<th>Economic impact compared to present situation</th>
<th>Impact in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present situation</td>
<td>1 524 546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Intervention</td>
<td>1 205 020</td>
<td>(41 665 451) $</td>
<td>- 21 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubble mound revetment</td>
<td>1 370 168</td>
<td>(20 116 296) $</td>
<td>- 10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riprap</td>
<td>1 362 603</td>
<td>(21 017 495) $</td>
<td>- 11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawall</td>
<td>1 406 455</td>
<td>(15 195 273) $</td>
<td>- 8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach nourishment</td>
<td>1 559 294</td>
<td>4 274 289 $</td>
<td>+ 2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach nourishment with groynes</td>
<td>1 550 190</td>
<td>3 363 414 $</td>
<td>+ 2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Back to a natural coastline

Protection against storm surge and against erosion

Improvement of access and recreational use of the sea

Improvement of the landscape

Increase in tourism traffic in the Gaspesie region by 2% (35,000 nights/year)
Lessons learned

Consultative approach as in IA

- Ongoing dialogue over the 2-year study period
- Contribute to easing the data access
- Raise the results acceptance
- Increase endorsement

Combining CBA and IA can bring important benefits

- Documentation and quantification of most of the major impacts that will be studied in the IA
Lessons learned

Integrate climate change in the analysis

• Many projects don’t integrate climate change in their design or in the IA
• Overlooking climate in CBA or in IA can lead to poor investment and maladaptation

Quantify and document non financial impacts

• Highly important for projects financed with public funds
• Can lead to implementing another alternative than the most financially profitable
Lessons learned

Sustainable coastal communities

• Communities are tooled with a mass of information to make well-informed decision making
• Provides a framework to analyze and synthesize this information
• Raise awareness of climate change impacts in the future
• Engage and empower by the consultation and knowledge transfer process
Thank you for your attention!

Laurent Da Silva
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dasilva.laurent@ouranos.ca