A Symbiotic System Model for the Development of Canadian Oil Sands

And The Potential For Positive Impact On The Decision To Build The Keystone Pipeline

Prof. Alexander H. Slocum[[1]](#footnote-1) (slocum@mit.edu)

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

David James Taylor (dtaylor@mit.edu)

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Kevin Patrick Simon (kevinpsi@mit.edu)

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Santiago Paiva (santiago.paiva@mail.mcgill.ca)

McGill University

Mark Bartlett (mbartlett@uni444.ca)

Unifor Windsor Regional Environment Council

**Abstract**

We propose a symbiotic system model for the development of Canadian Oil Sands: for example, if 10 % of Canadian Oil Sands income (priced at US$75 per barrel of oil) were to be invested in renewable-energy machines as part of reclamation efforts for the land that is mined, then three significant results can follow. First, we estimate that in 36 years as much CO2 will have been kept from the air from burning coal to make electricity as was released into the air from mining the oil sands and consuming the oil. Second, the investment is a better and more productive alternative to the Carbon Tax because the money is put directly to use to benefit oil sands development in the short term and renewable power generation in the long term, and the resources remain on the development companies’ balance sheets. Finally, during periods of peak electrical power generation, the power can be sold back to the grid, power electric underground heaters for liquefying bitumen for extraction without mining operations, or to power operations for cleaning contaminated water of Poly-Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH), which can be hydrocracked into useful compounds.

Contents

[1 Introduction 3](#_Toc426483947)

[*1.1 Motivation* 3](#_Toc426483948)

[*1.2 Problem Observation* 3](#_Toc426483949)

[*1.3 Renewables as a Potential Solution for Oil Sands Development* 5](#_Toc426483950)

[2 Alberta's Oil Sands Overview 6](#_Toc426483951)

[*2.1 CO2 Emissions Overview* 6](#_Toc426483952)

[*2.2 The Keystone XL Pipeline* 7](#_Toc426483953)

[3 Alberta’s Oil Sands EROI Analysis 8](#_Toc426483954)

[*3.1 Oil Sands EROI Overview* 8](#_Toc426483955)

[*3.2 Economic Model Specifications* 8](#_Toc426483956)

[*3.3 CO2 Offset by Investing in Wind Energy Systems* 9](#_Toc426483957)

[*3.3 CO2 Saved from Investing in Solar Energy Systems* 14](#_Toc426483958)

[4 Possible Uses of Excess Power Generated 16](#_Toc426483959)

[*4.1 Selling Electricity Back to the Grid* 17](#_Toc426483960)

[*4.2 Cleaning Contaminated Water* 17](#_Toc426483961)

[*4.3 Powering Underground Electric Heaters as an Alternative to Pumping Steam Underground for Bitumen Extraction* 17](#_Toc426483962)

[*4.4 Exploring the Possibility Using Pumped-Storage Hydroelectricity* 17](#_Toc426483963)

[*4.5 Implementing UPM’s Advanced Biofuels* 18](#_Toc426483964)

[5 Carbon Reinvestment Tax 19](#_Toc426483965)

[*5.1 A Better Alternative to a Carbon Tax* 19](#_Toc426483966)

[*5.2 CO2 Footprint as a Function of a Carbon Reinvestment Tax* 19](#_Toc426483967)

[Section 6 - Symbiotic Approach with Labour Unions 21](#_Toc426483968)

[*6.1 Labour’s Role in Harvesting Natural Resource Wealth* 21](#_Toc426483969)

[*6.2 Mitigations, Transitions, and Adjustments* 22](#_Toc426483970)

[*6.3 Stronger Environmental Standards Could Lead To More Jobs* 22](#_Toc426483971)

[7 Conclusion 23](#_Toc426483972)

[Acknowledgments 23](#_Toc426483973)

[Appendix 24](#_Toc426483974)

[References 24](#_Toc426483975)

# 1 Introduction

## *1.1 Motivation*

Beneath the boreal forest in Northern Canada lies the world's 2nd largest oil reserve, known as the *oil sands*. The oil sands are a mixture of sand and a heavy crude oil called bitumen. Natural bitumen is reported in 598 deposits in 23 countries, with the largest deposits in Canada, Kazakhstan, and Russia. Bitumen reserves are estimated at 249.67 billion barrels out of which 178 billion barrels (70.8%) are in Canada (Alberta) [1]. There are 170.4 billion barrels of recoverable oil in the oil sands deposits of Northern Alberta, and 315 billion barrels of potentially recoverable oil in the oil sands. Approximately 80% of oil sands are recoverable through in-situ production, with only 20% recoverable by mining [29].

The Northern Alberta region contains 98% of the Canadian oil sands and they are divided into three regions:

* The Athabasca-Wabiskaw deposits region
* The Cold Lake deposits regions
* The Peace River deposits region

Together, they cover about 140,200 square kilometers [2]. It is also estimated that these regions hold proven reserves up to 1.75 trillion barrels of bitumen [3]. In addition, 173 billon barrels (10%) are estimated to be recoverable at current prices using existing mining technology. About two tonnes of oil sands must be dug up, moved, and processed to produce 1 barrel of synthetic oil [29].

Detractors hypothesize that mining, processing, and using the oil from the oil sands will greatly exacerbate global CO2 problems, and extend this argument as a reason for the US to deny permission to grant approval for the Keystone XL pipeline. Proponents say that global CO2 impact will be no different than from other sources of oil, and the pipeline is safer than rail shipments.

In this paper, we demonstrate how reclamation efforts for mined oil sands land that focus on investment in Wind Turbines and/or Photovoltaic (PV) installations not only could result in significant long term reduction of CO2 emissions by providing power for cleaner extraction methods and enabling coal fired power generation stations to be phased out, but also prove to be a *profitable* green option for the future of Alberta and the country.

## *1.2 Problem Observation*

The Province of Alberta is currently operating a modest at best energy return per area invested: Oil sands are being mined over a vast area which destroy large swaths of forests releasing even more carbon into the atmosphere while also generating large lagoons of heavily polluted water. Poisson *et al* [4] recently demonstrated that since the 1990s, the total energy used (invested) in the Canadian oil and gas sector increased approximately 63%, while energy production (return) increased only 18% resulting in a decreased total energy return on investment (EROI) from 16:1 to 11:1. In the spirit of increasing the EROI from this vast resource, we present a possible better EROI for the area and the country.

Hypothesis:

*The effect of oil sands utilization on climate change does not have to be negative if, as part of land reclamation of the mined oil sands area, developers of the oil sands resource planned and invested for when the oil sands are depleted. One scenario could include for every square kilometer of land to be reclaimed, a modest 5 MW wind turbine is installed. The power from the turbine can be used for oil sands production, and excess power can also be sold to the grid or be used to clean contaminated water. Another possible scenario could include significant coverage of the land to be reclaimed by PV solar panels*

*.*

Figure 1 below shows an example of the cumulative effect on CO2 emissions over the years with this land reclamation plan, where 50% of the total oil sands land area being reclaimed include wind turbine installations, one wind turbine per square kilometer, funded by oil revenues and a $0.05/kWh reinvestment from the wind power generated. A more modest, but still significant results are obtained with 30% of the land area reclaimed using arrays of PV cells as shown in Figure 2.

**Figure 1.** Amount of CO2 offset by $7.5/bbl investment in wind turbines based on $2/Watt installed, and a $0.05/kWh reinvestment from the wind power generated. This graph assumes ultimately 50% of the total oil sands land area being reclaimed with wind turbine installations, placing one wind turbine per square kilometer. We could achieve carbon neutrality in approximately 36 years with this model. More in depth analysis is provided in section 3 of this paper.

**Figure 2.** Amount of CO2 offset by $7.5/bbl investment in PV solar panels based on $2/Watt installed, 15% net system efficiency, and a $0.05/kWh reinvestment from the solar power generated. This graph assumes 30% of land area being reclaimed with PV solar cell installations.

## *1.3 Renewables as a Potential Solution for Oil Sands Development*

It was believed that the primary factor for the research and development of renewables were the fact that conventional fuels were too high and that the price was to rise over time. With the dramatic decline of oil in the past year, many thought that it was no longer viable and profitable to look at renewable energy. This belief is incorrect. Oil companies were making more profit when oil prices were lower [35]. The price for a barrel was above US$100 in 2013 [36], however companies were making their highest profits back in 2007 when the price of a barrel of oil was US$54 [37]. Many corporations were making four times as much profit was they were making it today. As the price of a barrel of oil went up, so did all the supplier costs and third party services. Currently, the price is significantly down compared to 2013, however the cost of suppliers and other vendors is not down, they have remained the same. The increase in oil prices were never the principal motivator for exploring alternative energy.

The oil sands industry has experienced two challenging events in the past months. First, the continuous drop of oil price, and, second, the rejection of Keystone XL by the Obama administration in 2015. As a consequence, some oil companies started to pull the plug on Alberta expansions and cutting down the expenses under a break-even threshold analyst say is needed to justify a brand new oil sand expansion [38]. However, a recent study conduction by *THEnergy*, a Munich, Germany-based energy consultancy finds that while lower oil prices might slow down the momentum of mining companies switching to renewables, projects planned already will still go ahead [34]. As a consequence, oil companies must prepare themselves to transition to a low-carbon economy and energy systems. This transition to low carbon energy is needed as soon as possible and should exclude new coal burning plants. This paper addresses this transition by implementing a symbiotic economic model to the oil sands development.

John Gingrich, chairman and president of Advanced Explorations, believes that the impact of lower oil prices will be felt in the short term, but not over the long term. It is unlikely that oil is going to be at US$40 or US$50 per barrel in the long term as many analysts believe that the price will be close to US$75 down the road [34].

Renewables are a potential solution. They represent an appealing solution for off-grid mines that ship diesel long distances in order to run generators. Furthermore, mining emits CO2, hence renewables are part of the necessary solution of energy development and consumption to lower emissions.

Companies can only invest in renewables if they are given a tax incentive and are economically robust enough to invest outside their core businesses. The cost of wind and solar energy is continuously decreasing making these new sources of energy attractive. Moreover, this improves the competitiveness for the industries to self-investing in research and application of renewables as a long-term strategy for development.

In addition to improving EROI, this proposed investment discussed in section 1.2 represents a better alternative to Alberta’s Carbon Tax because companies are investing in their own future and they benefit from the power generated. It benefits the oil sands companies directly and immediately because they can use the electric power for production of the oil sands instead of having to build more transmission lines, or install small nuclear reactors [5] to bring power in for which they then have to pay to use. Furthermore, once the number of turbines increases to a point, they can start sending power out on the same power lines they initially had installed to bring power in to develop the oil sands.

# 2 Alberta's Oil Sands Overview

## *2.1 CO2 Emissions Overview*

Each day, oil sands mining operations release as much CO2 as all the cars in Canada [6]. In 2011, production of oil sands released an estimated of 47.1 million metric tonnes of CO2 into the air [7]. Considering that in 2011, 1.8 million barrels a day were produced, Table 1 estimates the CO2 emissions from oil sands production and oil use as of 2011:

**CO2 from Oil Sands Production and Oil Use**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Production | Use |
| Oil produced (Million barrels per year) | 693.5 |
| CO2 to produce the oil (Mega-tonnes/Year) | 50 |
| CO2 attributed to the mining | 0.07 |
| CO2 attributed to consumption of oil sands oil | 0.43 |
| CO2 from oil use (Mega-tonnes/Year) | 298.2 |
| Total CO2 from Oil sands (Mega-tonnes/Year) | 348 |

**Table 1.** Estimated total amount of CO2 from Oil Sands Production and Oil Use as of 2011. Calculations are provided in the Appendix section of this paper.

## *2.2 The Keystone XL Pipeline*

One of the biggest challenges in Alberta’s Oil Sand industry is sufficient pipeline access to transport the oil to Western Canada and Southern U.S. refiners. Consequently, much of the oil is finding its way out of Alberta on trains and trucks, which can be [two or three times more expensive](http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-06-13/amid-u-dot-s-dot-oil-boom-railroads-are-beating-pipelines-in-crude-transport) than pipeline costs [8]. The Keystone XL environmental review included a wide variety of cost estimates that with rail shipments to the Gulf Coast it costs between US$15 to US$20 a barrel [9]. This further justifies the investment in renewable energy systems as part of land reclamation if it helps overcome objections to the Keystone XL pipeline.

The Keystone XL pipeline is a major milestone in the next phase of extracting oil sands under Canada's Boreal Forest to reach higher prices of overseas markets. However, the US has recently refused the pipeline to be built as there is significant public opposition. The projected impact of Keystone XL by the U.S Department of State in the *“Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)*” [10] is stated as:

* Projected 830,000 barrels/day flow
* An additional 147 to 168 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions would be annually released by the oil sands

The Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP) 2015 Crude Oil Forecast, Markets and Transportation forecasts Canadian crude oil production will almost double to 5.3 million barrels per day by 2030 from 3.7 million barrels per day in 2014 [11]. Meanwhile in the US, two senators called on the Secretary of State John Kerry and the Obama Administration to conduct “an immediate and comprehensive study" of the public health risks to communities from the proposed Keystone XL pipeline would carry diluted bitumen from Alberta across the US-Canada border to refineries on the Texas Gulf Coast [12].

*These opposing points of view may be resolved, we hypothesize, with the renewable electric power and long term CO2 reduction that would result from the reclamation methods proposed in this paper.*

Another benefit of generating significant electric power in-situ from renewable resources is reduced pipeline pumping costs. It has been estimated current transport costs including extra lubricants needed to pump the thick oil through thousands of miles of pipeline add about $18 a barrel to get oil sands crude from Western Canada down to the US Gulf Coast on the Keystone XL [8]. If plentiful electric power were available, the case could be made for at least partially refining the oil on site so lighter crude could be more easily pumped through the pipeline.

Furthermore, if we extend our way of thinking to include lessons from history in other related industry areas, considering the lessons of tanker ships could mitigate concerns about environmental damage from a spill. For many years, industry insisted single hull tankers were sufficient and double hull tankers too expensive, but after repeated accidents, double hull tankers have become the norm. For a pipeline, we could borrow from landfill technology and line the trench with an impermeable membrane, and then the oil-carrying pipe would rest in a bed of sand and very course rock with drain lines alongside it. In the event of a spill the oil could be contained and rapidly pumped out. Large tanks periodically placed along the pipeline could hold water for irrigation, or in the event of a spill, they could be rapidly emptied and used as receptacles. Once again more symbiotic thinking could help provide solutions to our more difficult problems.

# 3 Alberta’s Oil Sands EROI Analysis

## *3.1 Oil Sands EROI Overview*

Higher oil prices have boosted oil sands revenues, but operating costs have also increased significantly with the rise in energy prices.

Natural gas requirements for the oil sands industry are projected to increase to 2.1 billion cubic feet per day in 2015 [14]. Natural gas is combusted on site to fuel steam generation units to provide steam which is pumped underground to reduce the viscosity of the bitumen so it can then be more easily extracted, and the process bitumen that is mined. However, the use of natural gas exposes production to economic risk through the highly variable nature of natural gas cost. Furthermore, natural gas combustion for steam production is the primary source of greenhouse gas emissions for an in-situ project [15]. If natural gas prices increased to $8/GJ, oil sands production cost would increase by $6.30 per barrel [16].

Higher natural gas prices have encouraged companies to use natural gas more efficiently and to look for alternative fuels. Many attempts have been made in the past to show how nuclear power may be used to supply the energy demand created by the growth of development in the oil sands regions, including installation of newly proposed Molten Salt Nuclear Reactors [15]. In 2013, there was discussion about including small nuclear reactors from Toshiba to mine oil sands with initial deployment projected by 2020 [5].

Every dollar invested in the oil sand’s industry creates about $8 dollars’ worth of economic activity [30]. Oil sands related investments is expected to generate 79.4 billion dollars in federal and provincial government revenues between 2012 and 2035 [30], and the investment will total hundreds of billions over the next 25 years (2012-2035) with 162.3 billion dollars to be invested just in maintenance infrastructure [30].

We hypothesize that a better EROI would be obtained by investing in renewable energy systems emplaced on land to be reclaimed from mining activities. In the short term, companies would be able to insert electric heaters in the ground to make the oil flow instead of having to inject steam, and refining of the heavy oil could be done to be sent through the pipeline in lighter more valuable form. In the long term, it would be possible to send power generated out along the power lines that recently have been built to provide power to the oil sands region, thus enabling coal-fired power plants in the other regions to be phased out.

## *3.2 Economic Model Specifications*

In this paper, we propose a hypothetical economic model which implements renewable energy systems deployed in reclamation lands which offsets CO2 in the long-term. We specify this offset as follows:

The Cumulative Ratio Carbon Saved primarily depends on the renewable system we select (either wind energy systems or solar energy systems), the percent area where we would deploy the system, and the decommission rate (for either a wind turbine or a solar panel) as time goes on. For information on how this is calculated is found in the Appendix.

The Amount of Carbon Burned is the yearly amount of CO2 released in the atmosphere from oil production and oil use. In our economic model, we treat this yearly amount of CO2 variable as a constant. From Table 1, we estimated total amount of CO2 from oil sands production and oil end use to be approximatively 348 Mega-tonnes/Year (as of 2011), with all calculations in the Appendix section, but with the possibility of Keystone XL pipeline expansion this quantity of CO2 will increase as there will be more oil sands production.

In this model, the Cumulative Ratio Carbon Saved changes according a set of parameters:

* The choice of renewable system to offset the CO2: wind energy system or solar energy system
* Deployment of the systems to be located in a percentage area of the oil sands region to be reclaimed
* Peak Power for a wind turbine or a solar panel
* The cost per watt ($/Watt) of the renewable system with the installation included
* The Reinvestment Policy amount to be either $0.05/kWh or $0.07/kWh per year into purchasing more equipment for the deployed energy system
* The approximate decommission rate of a wind turbine or solar panel
* Different amounts of yearly investments in the renewable energy system based on:
  + Case 1: a portion of the oil sands income (a percentage of a barrel of oil) to be invested in the model instead implementing a Carbon Tax (described in Section 3 of this paper)
  + Case 2: a portion of the Carbon Tax as a Carbon Reinvestment Tax (described in Section 5 of this paper)

Further specifications for the Economic Model:

* Variables and parameters are we taking into account:
  + Assumption that the price of oil will stabilize around US$75 per barrel [34]
  + Oil sand production and oil end use as of 2011
  + The Amount of Carbon Burned is constant and set to be 348 Mega-tonnes per year from our estimations (see Appendix)
  + The amount of Carbon Tax introduced by the Government of Alberta as two separate constants. One constant for 2016 set to be $20/tonne, and another constant for 2017 to be $30/tonne as specified in [41]
* Variables and parameters that are we **not** taking into account for simplicity issues:
  + The price of a barrel of oil changes daily
  + The Amount of Carbon Burned changes over time and oil sands development fluctuates over time, possibly higher than 348 Mega-tonnes per year
  + The Carbon Tax will most likely increase over time and be set over $30/tonne
  + The cost of deploying a wind turbine or a solar panel will decrease over time while performance (peak power and capacity factors) of these systems will increase over time
  + We have not conducted a complete study to conclusively prove that the land area where these systems would be hypothetically deployed are actually suitable for either a wind farm or a solar farm solution.
  + We do not consider the short-term CO2 generation from installing and deploying the renewable energy system studied

## *3.3 CO2 Offset by Investing in Wind Energy Systems*

Our first economic model is the study of CO2 offset by investing in wind energy only. The installation of one 5 MW wind turbine per square kilometer of reclaimed land up to a total of 70,100 square kilometers (50 % of the Alberta oil sands area), would require an annual investment of about $7.5/bbl with $0.05/kWh reinvestment policy into purchasing more wind turbines. The number of wind turbines installed would grow rapidly over the years, which would offset the CO2 created by mining and using the oil sands oil in approximately 36 years.

Furthermore, it is common for the return on investment (ROI) period for a wind turbine to be about 10 years [17], which means the $7.5/bbl invested is actually fully recouped in 10 years and then onward the wind turbine becomes a net income producer [17] and a profitable source of income for the company operating the wind turbine. The turbines have a 20-year expected life, and the eventual replacement cycle would help ensure a robust wind energy business which is a source of high quality jobs.

Installing wind turbines in this region also need not reduce the amount of forest being replanted because the surface footprint of a large wind turbine is relatively small and tall towers enable the turbine to be placed high above the treeline Comparing the net carbon captured by the forest area of a turbine’s footprint compared to the carbon offset of a turbine, we find that the CO2 captured from the boreal forest is about 26.2 tonnes/km2 [18] compared to a CO2 offset by having a large wind turbine, which saves 8500 tonnes/year/MW by not burning coal to produce energy generated by wind. Therefore, there is a strong motivation for oil sands land mining reclamation to not to just replant the forest, but to plant forest *and* a large high hub height wind turbine every square kilometer.

There is the issue of migrating birds and local birds of prey which needs to be studied and considered; however, given the northern location, other options can be considered such as brightly coloured blades and poles to visually warn birds. During periods of large migration, radar can be used to identify flock positions and selected turbines can be turned off.

The initial reinvestment and reclamation hypothesis appears promising, and Figures 3 and 4 show different scenarios for different percentage of investments for US$75/bbl that will need to be considered by a more detailed investigation. Table 2 shows the modeling assumptions and Table 3 shows the years to achieve 100% cumulative CO2 offset by various investment percentage strategies.

Investments:

**Figure 3**.Amounts of CO2 offset with different investments in wind energy systems, assuming a wind turbine life expectancy of 20 years, one wind turbine per square kilometer of reclaimed land up to a total of 70,100 square kilometers (50% of oil sands region), $2/Watt cost including installation of the wind turbine, and a $0.05/kWh Reinvestment Policy into purchasing more wind turbines every year.

Investments:

**Figure 4.** Amounts of CO2 offset with different investments in wind energy systems, assuming a wind turbine life expectancy of 20 years, one wind turbine per square kilometer of reclaimed land up to a total of 70,100 square kilometers (50% of oil sands region), $2/Watt cost including installation of the wind turbine, and a $0.07/kWh Reinvestment Policy into purchasing more wind turbines every year.

**Wind Energy System Model Specifications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Description | Value |
| Turbine Peak Power (MW) | 5 |
| Capacity factor | 40% |
| Land area per turbine (km2) | 1 |
| Oil sands percent land area for wind turbines | 50 % |
| Area of wind farm (km2) | 70,100 |
| (Square Miles) | 27,383 |
| Square size (miles x miles) | 165 |
| Number of turbines to be built for land area | 70,100 |
| Average Power generated (GW) | 198 |
| Average annual energy produced (TWHr) | 1,734 |
| CO2 saved by not burning coal to produce energy generated by wind (Mega-tonnes/year) | 1,684 |

**Table 2.** Modelling assumptions for determiningamount of CO2 saved by wind turbines

**Approximate CO2 Offset Timelines Using the Wind Energy System Model**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Reinvestment Policy | |
| $0.05/kWh | $0.07/kWh |
| Percent Amount  (% out of US$75 bbl) | Investment Amount  ($X/bbl) | Estimated Time  (Years) | Estimated Time  (Years) |
| 5 | 3.75 | 48 | 36 |
| **10** | **7.5** | **36** | **29** |
| 15 | 11.25 | 30 | 25 |
| 20 | 15 | 26 | 22 |
| 25 | 18.75 | 23 | 20 |
| 30 | 22.5 | 20 | 18 |

**Table 3.** Estimated timeline for 100% CO2 offset for wind energy systems based on specific investment amounts ($X/bbl) and a $0.05/kWh or $0.07/kWh Reinvestment Policy into buying more wind turbines.

These scenarios are dependent on four parameters: the percentage of investment per barrel of oil sand ($X/bbl), the life expectancy of wind turbines, the cost per watt ($/Watt), the choice of wind turbine peak power, and the Reinvestment Policy amount for new equipment ($/kWh). If we invest the same amount each year eventually we hit a steady state for number of turbines vs. carbon emissions. The ability to achieve a 100% offset is sensitive to the $/kWh reinvestment from power generated. For example, with 20-year life expectancy and $0/kWh of reinvestment we need the percentage of investment per barrel to be bigger than $25/bbl to ultimately reach 100% ever.

Other model considerations include:

* Wind Turbine Peak Power
  + The choice of 5 MW/km2 is conservative as forthcoming are 7 MW turbines, although they will require larger spacing. Even 10 MW turbines are under consideration for production.
* Wind Turbine Capacity Factor
  + NREL’s median capacity factor is 40% for onshore wind turbines.
  + With higher hub heights, up to 140m, wind turbine net capacity factor could rise to 50%.
* Land area per turbine
  + Land area assumed to cover 1 km2 per turbine, many wind farms actually place up to two turbines in this area.
* Percent land area for wind turbines
  + Assumption to ultimately cover 50% of the total Alberta oil sands area (70,100 km2).
* Cost of installation of wind turbines
  + Estimated to be $2/W with the installation
* Reinvestment Policy
  + Assumption to reinvest $0.05/kWh or $0.07/kWh into wind turbine purchase and maintenance.

**CHART SHOWING RECLAMATION LAND AND ELEVATION MAP TO CHECK WHETHER WE CAN MAKE THE CASE FOR A WIND FARM INSTALLATION**

## *3.3 CO2 Saved from Investing in Solar Energy Systems*

Our second model is the study of CO2 offset by investing on solar energy systems only. If one were to invest $7.5/bbl into PV panels to create solar electric generating stations on up to 15% of the total oil sand’s region, assuming 30% coverage by PV panels of the land allocated to the solar electric generating station, then this model would in fact never totally offset the CO2 created by mining and using the oil sands oil. This is due to the decommission period of the solar panels. Current panel technology and effective installation costs prevent being able to offset the CO2 attributed to oil sands. However, a significant amount of CO2 reduction could be accomplished and therefore the analysis of this scenario is presented here for completeness. Figure 5 and Figure 6 show different scenarios for different percentage of investments for US$75/bbl and Table 4 presents modelling assumptions.

Investments:

**Figure 5.** Amounts of CO2 offset with different investments in solar energy systems generating stations on up to 15% of the total oil sand’s region, assuming 30% coverage by PV panels of the land allocated to the solar electric generating station, assuming a solar panel life expectancy of 25 years, $2/Watt cost with the installation of the solar panel, and a $0.05/kWh Reinvestment Policy from the solar power generated for purchasing more solar panels.

Investments:

**Figure 6.** Amounts of CO2 offset with different investments in solar energy systems generating stations on up to 15% of the total oil sand’s region, assuming 30% coverage by PV panels of the land allocated to the solar electric generating station, assuming a solar panel life expectancy of 25 years, $2/Watt cost with the installation of the solar panel, and a $0.07/kWh Reinvestment Policy from the solar power generated for purchasing more solar panels.

**Solar Energy System Model Specifications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Description | Value |
| Oil sands percent land area covered by PV fields | 15% |
| Area of PV farm (km2) | 14,020 |
| (Square miles) | 5,477 |
| Square size (miles x miles) | 74 |
| Density of coverage on land designated for PV fields | 30% |
| Area of PV cells (m2) | 6,309,000,000 |
| PV cell efficiency | 15% |
| Average 24/7 solar insolation April (Wh/m2/day) |  |
| June | 6,250 |
| January | 1,389 |
| Average power (assumes 24/7 operation made possible with storage technology) (GW) |  |
| June | 164 |
| January | 37 |
| Average | 100.405 |
| CO2 saved by not burning coal to produce energy generated by solar (Mega-tonnes/year) | 854 |

**Table 4.** Amount of CO2 saved by not burning coal to produce energy by PV solar panels

Similarly, the behavior of these results are controlled by the amount investment ($X/bbl), the life expectancy of the solar cells, the peak power of the solar cells, and the ($/kWh) Reinvestment Policy into purchasing more solar cells.

Other model considerations include:

* Peak Power of PV cell
  + Assumption to be a 200W peak power solar photovoltaic panel.
* Percent land covered by PV fields
  + Assumption to cover 15% of land area (21,030 km2)
* Density of coverage on land designated for PV fields
  + Assumption to cover 30% of land area (6,309 km2)
* Efficiency of PV fields
  + For this analysis, OPV efficiency was estimated to be a conservative 15%.
  + PV cell efficiency is expected to reach 23% by 2015 [19]
* Cost of installation of PV fields
  + Estimated to be $2/W with the installation
* Reinvestment Policy
  + Assumption to reinvest $0.05/kWh or $0.07/kWh into solar equipment purchasing. This also includes the maintenance of solar panels

**Approximate CO2 Offset Timelines Using the Solar Energy System Model**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Reinvestment Policy | |
| $0.05/kWh | $0.07/kWh |
| Percent Amount  (% out of US$75 bbl) | Investment Amount  ($X/bbl) | Estimated Time  (Years) | Estimated Time  (Years) |
| 5 | 3.75 |  |  |
| 10 | 7.5 |  |  |
| 15 | 11.25 |  |  |
| 20 | 15 |  |  |
| 25 | 18.75 |  |  |
| 30 | 22.5 |  |  |

**Table 4.** Estimated timeline for 100% CO2 offset for solar energy systems based on specific investment amounts ($X/bbl) and a $0.05/kWh or $0.07/kWh Reinvestment Policy into buying more solar panels. Although this model would in fact never totally offset the CO2, this table is presented for model completion.

# 4 Possible Uses of Excess Power Generated

With the availability of large amounts of electric power as more and more wind turbines come on line, the potential for revenue generation from other applications of the power increase, thereby furthering the case for investment.

## *4.1 Selling Electricity Back to the Grid*

About 41% of Alberta’s installed electricity generation capacity is from coal, 40% from natural gas, and 8% from wind [20]. On a long term basis, it would possible to send excess power generated by reclaimed land renewable energy systems out along same power lines that currently are bringing power into the oil sands region. Further studies should be conducted to explore this idea in more detail.

## *4.2 Cleaning Contaminated Water*

The Athabasca River is part of the third largest watershed in the world. Processing one barrel of bitumen requires approximately three barrels of water [6]. The contaminated water is then pumped into giant man-made tailings ponds alongside the shore with no plans for their eventual cleaning. The contaminated water is produced from the process used to turn bitumen into diesel and other fuels. Reservoirs filled with oil sands wastewater are predicted to cover almost 62,000 acres by 2020 [21].

These waters are contaminated with [Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polycyclic_aromatic_hydrocarbons) (PAHs) [31]. These aromatic organic molecules can be hydrocracked by adding hydrogen to enable the PAHs to be turned into useful products such as plastics and pesticides. The renewable energy harvested by the wind and solar systems could be used to power the cracking process and clean up the contaminated water. This potential application for water cleaning can be further explored with more studies.


## *4.3 Powering Underground Electric Heaters as an Alternative to Pumping Steam Underground for Bitumen Extraction*

Another use for the excess wind power could use lessons learned from Shell Oil’s patent on installing heaters encased in pipe to liquefy the oil, so that it can be pumped to the surface [22, 23]. Wind power varies with the wind, which is relatively slowly changing variable, while solar power can change suddenly with a passing cloud. In either case, to be part of a base load supply of power sent out along power lines, excess power must be stored or used immediately. The former can be accommodated over power lines with pumped storage hydro-systems or batteries. The latter is often more difficult, however underground electric heaters can often be used with greatly fluctuating power to generate heat that is diffused slowly through the ground to lower bitumen viscosity so it can flow and be extracted from wells. The nature of some underground strata gives it a very long time constant to absorb and diffuse the energy [24, 25]. Where constant temperature is needed, large capacitor banks can be employed.

## *4.4 Exploring the Possibility Using Pumped-Storage Hydroelectricity*

The hilly nature of the oil sands region represents a suitable site to consider Pumped-storage Hydroelectricity (PSH), the largest-capacity form of grid energy storage available. This hydroelectric energy storage could be implemented by oil sands electric power systems for load balancing. With this method, low-cost off-peak power generated by the surplus energy of the wind turbines could be used to run the pumps. During peak-hours electrical demand, the stored water is released through the turbines to produce electric power. The system could be used to increase revenue by selling more electricity during these peak demands periods when electricity prices are at the highest levels.

Figure 7 shows the elevation map of the oil sands region [32] in Alberta, Canada. Observe that we can take advantage of the change in altitude from red to blue regions. The distance to the oil sands regions is near 60 km and it could be an interesting development to power hydroelectric pumps. More studies should be conducted to explore this system in the oil sands region.



**Figure 7**. Elevation map of the oil sands region in Alberta, Canada.

## *4.5 Implementing UPM’s Advanced Biofuels*

Finnish company UPM is currently implementing new technology to produce wood-based biodiesel, refining the treacly residue that is left over when wood chips are cooked into pulp. This means processing husks, inedible grasses, municipal waste, and the litter from the logging industry. This technology is environmental-friendly and designed to give Europe a competitive edge in the clean energy business.

In research published in February 2014, the International Council of Clean Transportation and NNFCC, a consultancy, concluded that biofuels made from waste could provide 16% of Europe’s transport fuels by 2030 [27] and it would create an entirely new industry sector as current production is close to zero. In addition, the International Energy Agency (IEA) calculates that the cost of producing regular gasoline will rise from $0.54 per litre of gasoline equivalent in 2010 to $0.82 per litres of gasoline equivalent in 2030. By contrast, the cost of advanced biofuel production will fall from $1.05-$1.15 per litre of gasoline equivalent in 2010 to $0.80-$1 in 2030 [28].

However, the economic and societal fruits of this innovation may be harvested somewhere other than in Europe. Policy makers in Brussels are now sidelining rules on transport fuels. As a result, biofuels companies are threatening to constrain the waste-to-biofuels industry by leaving Europe for the US, China and Brazil.

If UPM technology were used at oil sands to process the slash from land cleared to mine the oil sands, then this would result in a competitive diesel price, it would advance cutting-edge clean technology research in Canada, and it would significantly expand the energy ecosystem for investments in Alberta as companies are interested in harvesting their innovation somewhere other than Europe. Thus, this creates a huge profitable business for Alberta while positioning the province as a world leader in clean energy business.

# 5 Carbon Reinvestment Tax

## *5.1 A Better Alternative to a Carbon Tax*

In Section 3 of this paper, we proposed funding for our economic models as a portion of the oil sands income (a percentage of a barrel of oil) and we argued that it was a better solution than forcing a Carbon Tax on the oil companies. In this section, we explored the possibility of using a portion of the proposed Carbon Tax to fund the economic models as a Carbon Reinvestment Tax instead of getting funding from oil sands revenue as approached in Section 3.

The percentage of oil revenues to be invested ($/bbl) into renewable energy systems as part of land reclamation efforts is a business and an environment friendly alternative to the Carbon Tax. Instead of paying a tax to the government, which removes value from a company ledger, this approach allows companies to invest in assets for its own present and future value, and thus could negate the perceived need by many for a Carbon Tax.

Currently, there are no tax incentives available that are specific to oil sands production. There may be industry-wide tax breaks, but they are the same for conventional oil production and for bitumen production [13]. On the other hand, the CO2-intensive nature of oil sands mining and production incites many to call for a carbon tax that could add at least $2 to a barrel of Western Canadian heavy crude, which the US might consider as a concession to pipeline opponents in order to be able to approve the Keystone XL [8].

Note there are about 0.5 tonnes of CO2 that can be attributed to the mining (0.07 tonnes) and consumption (0.43 tonnes) of oil sands oil (from Table 1), and some put the cost of CO2 to be up to $34/tonne or more [26]. If indeed as weather patterns continue to deteriorate and the latter cost were to come to be, a direct investment in renewables as an alternative to the tax would be much easier to justify.

A “Carbon Reinvestment Tax” in where oil producers investing in renewables (anywhere in the country) be 100% deductible would be an enormous win. This would allow to implement energy efficiency and renewable energy strategies, bring in a stronger environmental standard, monitoring, and enforcement

## *5.2 CO2 Footprint as a Function of a Carbon Reinvestment Tax*

A Carbon Tax could be thought as a “Carbon Reinvestment Tax” that companies that generate the carbon themselves apply instead of sending money to the government. Industry could benefit from not paying a tax to government, but rather self-investing for long term gain in renewables given the option.

We can think of the economic models from Figure 3 to Figure 6 from a carbon footprint as a function of a carbon reinvestment tax perspective. The correlation is evident that as the reinvestment tax grows over time, the carbon footprint diminishes over time. Observe that without stopping oil sands production, it is possible to offset CO2 by applying a Carbon Reinvestment Tax instead of a Carbon Tax which, as the same time, benefits all parties involved. In Section 3, we proposed that this amount to come directly as a percentage of the sale of a barrel of oil ($/bbl). In this section, we look at the Reinvestment Tax as a function of Alberta’s Carbon Tax.

The Government of Alberta now plans to introduce a Carbon Tax priced at $20 per tonne in 2016 and $30 per tonne in 2017 [41] as part of the climate change plan. However, the economic models outlined in this paper proves to be a better long-term solution.

**Figure 8**. A Carbon Reinvestment Tax vs Alberta’s Projected Carbon Tax (assuming values stay constant over time). Clearly, a Carbon Reinvestment Tax is more affordable in the long term and proves to be a better solution towards fighting climate change. In this example, we use a Carbon Reinvestment Tax amount equivalent to the economic model investment of $7.5/bbl with a Reinvestment Policy of $0.05/kWh cents as outlined in Figure 1.

**Figure 9.** A Carbon Reinvestment Tax as a Percentage of the Carbon Tax. The annual amount to be invested in renewables has a changing reinvestment amount per year and thus expose this behaviour, the reinvestment is not linear, but rather exponential over the long-term. For instance, in 60 years, the proposed amount for the Carbon Reinvestment Tax would equal the proposed amount for Alberta’s 2016 projected Carbon Tax

While the Carbon Tax is a good initiative moving forward by the Government of Alberta, the proposed economic model in this paper not only proves to be a better solution as we offset the CO2 in the long-term, but rather a more economical solution to the upcoming Carbon Tax.

# Section 6 - Symbiotic Approach with Labour Unions

## *6.1 Labour’s Role in Harvesting Natural Resource Wealth*

Canadian union members play an essential role harvesting their natural resource wealth, adding value to it, and delivering it to consumers. Canadian union Unifor, like all Canadians, have a vast stake in the future prosperity of Canada’s resource industries. The union is intensely concerned that Canada’s resource wealth is managed in the long-term interests of working people, their communities, and the environment. The prosperity of the nation depends on how resources are harvested, how the environmental consequences of resource industries are regulated and managed, how the benefits of resource production are shared, and how successfully resource bases are used to leverage other jobs and economic opportunities.

Unifor represents workers in the energy sector including a small share of those who work in bitumen extraction, and also some who work in pipelines, refineries, and other energy-related operations. As we confront the economic, social, and environmental challenges associated with resource developments, several core progressive principles should be applied to build a productive and sustainable energy resource sector.

## *6.2 Mitigations, Transitions, and Adjustments*

Unifor, just like many other Canadians, is opposed to Keystone XL, not just for environmental reasons, but also for economic reasons as well. However, the union is not opposed to the expanded development of the oil sands. They strongly believe that further development must take place within the constraints of binding greenhouse gas limits, proper environmental and First Nations’ approvals, and a commitment to more processing of the resource in Canada.

The ups and downs of resource development impose tremendous strains on workers, who face job insecurity, pressure to relocate, and disrupted lives. If Keystone XL were to be built, the oil will be sent to Texas for refining. As a result, refining jobs in Canada will be reduced or stagnate. Construction jobs are temporary within the oil sands industry and there is no guarantee that renewable jobs would happen in Alberta (or in Canada) regardless of whether the pipeline gets built or not.

Although unions, not just Unifor, are strongly opposed to building the pipeline, the model presented here constitutes a symbiotic approach to mitigate the situation in case the pipeline ever gets built. The mitigation development we present in this paper could be treated, politically, as a way of “*forward planning*” as we would already have a model that could mitigate the situation beforehand. This would save significant time and speed up the negotiation process for the parties involved.

In the possible scenario that Keystone XL is approved under the next US presidency, the idea of a transition fund not only for the environment, but also for workers and their communities would help mitigate these effects. Efforts to create good, sustainable jobs in our resource industries will require pro-active training and skills programs. A solid transition funding in place will be necessary to train workers and keep jobs implementing the green solution outlined in this paper. In order to gain support from workers that extract and refine oil there would need to be provisions to help those workers transition into the green jobs such as building wind and solar solutions. These transitions would help workers retain their jobs by assisting affected workers and communities to take advantage of the new opportunities within the energy industry.

Furthermore, these transitions in place would play an important role to minimize the impact of workforce adjustment situations on indeterminate employees, on the department or organization, and on the public service

Finally, it would align perfectly with the long-term vision of the Government of Alberta with respect to advancing and improving our research and development of green technologies in Canadian soil.  There is no reason why employment and security should be threatened by the transition to a greener economy: in fact, if done correctly, workers will benefit.

## *6.3 Stronger Environmental Standards Could Lead To More Jobs*

A key concern is the impact of unregulated bitumen expansion on Canada’s overall greenhouse gas emissions. Without a national strategy to regulate and reduce emissions, the expansion of bitumen production will more than offset all other emissions-reduction efforts in other parts of Canada such as the important phase-out of coal-fired electricity generation, and hence defeat the overall goal of contributing to global efforts to slow and limit climate change.

Export pipelines such as Keystone XL would facilitate a massive expansion in bitumen production in Alberta, but this would be done at a time when Canada still has no long-term plan or long-term targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Improving the environmental performance of resource industries will require many strong measures, including careful limits on the scale of operations and the pace of expansion; imposing strict regulations on emissions and waste; fostering energy conservation and green energy sources; and requiring resource companies to internalize the cost of environmental clean-up.

Resource industries face a special challenge, and bear a special responsibility. However, the process of harvesting and processing resources must change to become sustainable, fair, and socially beneficial. In Section 3, we discussed that we could found our economic model by taking from a percentage of the oil sands income instead of having a Carbon Tax. In Section 5, we explored a Carbon Reinvestment Tax as a function of a Carbon Tax and we argued that the reinvestment tax is better suited than a Carbon Tax. In many instances, stronger environmental standards can lead to more work and more stable work in the long-run. A carefully managed, sustainable approach to resource production is much better than in the short-run boom-and-bust employment cycles so typical of resource industries in the past. Working people need both secure jobs and a healthy sustainable environment. Enormous economic benefits would be generated by a long-term green economic strategy.

# 7 Conclusion

This paper showed that a symbiotic model to short and long term energy needs can lead to an overall reduction in atmospheric CO2. It is appears to be economical and politically prudent to undertake as soon as possible a project to install a reasonable number of wind turbines on reclaimed oil sands land in order to better investigate the hypothesis presented here to ascertain true costs, risks, and benefits with respect to ultimately widespread application of this reclamation strategy.

In addition, a more detailed business analysis (short and long term return of investment ROI) of the hypotheses presented here should be developed, including:

1. The requirement of investing a significant percentage of gross income from oil sands into renewable energy sources as part of land reclamation and to provide electricity for extracting and processing oil sands, cleaning up contaminated water, and selling excess electricity back to the grid.
2. The time effect cost of releasing more CO2 in the short term in exchange for a longer-term greater cumulative reduction in CO2.
3. The ability of a) above to encourage the US to approve of the Keystone XL pipeline which would save significant rail transportation costs.
4. A symbiotic model to pipeline design should also be investigated that considers using landfill liner techniques and water storage tanks normally for irrigation and as emergency spill receptacles.

# Acknowledgments

The co-authors of this paper would like to deeply thank Professor Alexander H. Slocum for providing the vision behind this project and the idea that shaped the economic model presented in this paper. His passion and uncanny love for energy systems to solve humanity’s grand challenges makes him a truly remarkable role model and a great source of inspiration.

We would also like to show our gratitude to Canadian labour union Unifor who saw the vision of this project and provided insightful ideas that were key in this paper. Finally, we also thank economist Jim Stanford who gave us comments that greatly improved this paper.

# Appendix

**Cumulative Carbon Saved Calculation:**

For Wind Energy:

(Total number of installed wind turbines / Number of turbines to be built for land area) \* CO2 saved by not burning coal to produce energy generated by wind (magatonnes/year)

**Cumulative Carbon Burned Calculation:**

**A - Oil Production Calculation**

As of 2011, we use 693.5 million of barrels per year

**B - Calculation of total CO2 from Oil Sands**

We use 348 megatonnes per year

**C - CO2 offset Calculation**

The CO2 offset percentage is obtained with the following formula:

To compute the amount of CRCS (Cumulative Ratio Carbon Saved):

Where:

To compute the standard CB (Carbon Burned) term:

Where:

* from Table 1

# References

[1] Attanasi et al. [*Natural Bitumen and Extra-Heavy Oil*](http://www.worldenergy.org/documents/ser_2010_report_1.pdf) . Survey of energy resources (22 ed.). [World Energy Council](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Energy_Council). pp. 123–140. 2010.

[2] *About Oil Sands: Facts and Statistics*. Retrieved March 13, 2014 from

http://www.energy.alberta.ca

[3] [*Alberta's Oil Sands: Opportunity, Balance*](http://www.environment.alberta.ca/documents/Oil_Sands_Opportunity_Balance.pdf). Government of Alberta. March 2008. Retrieved March 19, 2014 from http://environment.alberta.ca

[4] Poisson et al*. A Time Series Analysis of Canadian Gas and Oil*. Energies 2013, 6, 5940-5959. November 2013

[5] Daly, John. *Canada Considering Nuclear Reactors in Alberta Tar Sands Fields.* Retrieved on April 2, 2014 from http://oilprice.com

[6] Mettler, Peter. *Petropolis: Aerial Perspectives on the Alberta Oil Sands.*

Documentary. 2009.

[7] Biello, David. *How Much Will Tar Sands Oil Add to Global Warming?* Retrieved on March 13, 2014 from http://www.scientificamerican.com

[8] Philips, Matthew. *Why Canada’s Oil Sands Look Like a Shaky Investment*. Retrieved on April 6, 2014 from http://www.businessweek.com/

[9] Swift, Anthony. *A deeper dive: State’s environmental review of Keystone XL tar sands pipeline shows it is not in the nation’s interest*. Retrieved on April 6, 2014 from http://switchboard.nrdc.org/

[10] U.S Department of State. *The Final Environmental Impact Statement*

*(FEIS).* Retrieved from March 13, 2014 from http://keystonepipeline-xl.state.gov/

[11] *Crude Oil Forecast, Markets & Transportation*. Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP). Retrieved on July 2, 2015 from http://www.capp.ca

[12] Prystupa, Mychaylo. *Alberta doctor tells U.S.: Canada is lying about oil*

*sands health effects*. Retrieved Feb 27, 2014 from

https://www.vancouverobserver.com/news/

[13] Rapier, Robert. The Cost of Production and Energy Return of Oil Sands. Retrieved on April 1, 2014 from http://theenergycollective.com/

[14] *Canada’s Oil Sands – Opportunities and Challenges to 2015: An Update – Questions and Answers.* Retrieved on April 2, 2014 from http://www.neb.gc.ca/

[15] LeBlanc et al. *Using Molten Salt Nuclear Reactors in the Oil Sands*. 2012 World Heavy Oil Congress (WHOC’12). Aberdeen, Scotland. 2012.

[16] Leach, Andrew. *Rubin, oil sands, and the bitumen bubble*. Retrieved on April 6, 2014 from http://www.macleans.ca/

[17] *Wind Turbine Technology*. Retrieved on April 8, 2014 from http://www.sre-tech.com/

[18] *Carbon Sequestration Facts.* Retrieved March 19, 2014 from http://www.forestecologynetwork.org.

[19] Kelly-Detwiler, Peter. *As Solar Panel Efficiencies Keep Improving, It’s Time To Adopt Some New Metrics*. Retrieved on April 1, 2014 from http://www.forbes.com/

[20] *Electricity Facts.* Retrieved on April 1, 2014 from http://www.energy.alberta.ca/

[21] Loon, Jeremy Van. *Land of Oil Lakes.* Bloomberg Businessweek November 2013, Issue 4356, p15-16.

[22] Sandberg, Chet, Hale, Arthur, Kovscek, Anthony R., *History and Application of Resistance Electrical Heaters in Downhole Oil Field Applications*, SPE Number SPE-165323-MS

[23] *Shell Oil tests new oil shale technology.* Retrieved on April 6, 2014 from http://www.petroleumnews.com/

[24] Closmann et al. *Method of producing shale oil from a subterranean oil shale formation.* 1970. US Patent US3501201 A

[25] Bass et al. *Direct electric pipeline heating*. 2000. US Patent US6142707 A

[26] *Some firms are preparing for a carbon price that would make a big difference*. Retrieved on April 8, 2014 from http://www.economist.com/

[27] *Waste-Based Biofuels Sector Needs Smarter EU 2030 Package To Realize Its High Potential*. Retrieved on April 19, 2014 from https://www.upm.com

[28] Oliver, Christian. *Biofuels: Wasted energy*. Retrieved on April 17, 2014 from http://ft.com

[29] *Oil Sands 101*. Retrieved on August 20, 2014 from http://www.energy.alberta.ca/OilSands

[30] *Oil Sands Facts and statistics*. Retrieved on August 20, 2014 from http://www.energy.alberta.ca/OilSands

[31] Canada-Alberta Oil Sands Environmental Monitoring Information Portal. Retrieved on April 1, 2015 from http://jointoilsandsmonitoring.ca

[32] *Oil Sands Air Quality Monitoring.* A-MAPS Environmental Inc. Retrieved on June 25, 2015 from http://www.amapsenv.com

[33] Lewis, Jeff. *Alberta NDP's plan to increase carbon fees another strain on oil industry.* Retrieved on June 25, 2015 from http://www.theglobeandmail.com

[34] Judd, Elizabeth. The Appetite for Renewables. Retrieved on June 25, 2015 from http://www.miningmagazine.com/

[35] Crooks et al. *Oil companies seek lasting cost cuts after crude price plunge.* Retrieved on April 25, 2015 from http://www.ft.com/

[36] Smith, Aaron. *Oil prices at 2013 high above $103 a barrel.* Retrieved on June 29, 2015 from http://money.cnn.com/

[37] Tencer, Daniel. *CNRL's Steve Laut Says Oilsands Face 'Death Spiral' If They Don't Cut Costs*. Retrieved on February 19, 2015 from http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/

[38] Lewis, Jeff. *Shell pulls plug on long-delayed Alberta oil sands mine*. Retrieved on February 23, 2015 from http://www.theglobeandmail.com

[39] *Backgrounder: Managing Canada’s resource wealth in the interest of Canadians and the environment*. Unifor Union. December 2013, p.2-13

[40] Suzuki, David. *Carbon Tax or Cap and Trade*. Retrieved on June 29, 2015 from http://www.davidsuzuki.org

[41] Wood, James. Alberta boots carbon tax to $20 a tonne starting in 2016 as part of climate change plan. Retrieved on July 22, 2015 from www.business.financialpost.com

1. Professor, corresponding author, [slocum@mit.edu](mailto:slocum@mit.edu), +001.617.0012, MIT Room 3-344, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA [↑](#footnote-ref-1)