

Appendix B – Discussion Guides

This appendix contains the comments participants submitted through Discussion Guides - in-person at Community Discussions and by email or mail – up to May 15th, 2014. These comments are organized according to the two questions contained in the discussion guide:

- 1) What are the impacts (positive and negative) that you see in connection with TransCanada's proposed Energy East Pipeline: In your community? Province-wide?
- 2) What are the impacts that you think the Ontario Energy Board should focus on most closely in its report to Ontario's Minister of Energy?

Comments from each Discussion Guide have been recorded separately. A copy of the Discussion Guide is available on the 'Resources Page' of the OEB's Energy East Consultation website (ontarioenergyboard.ca/oebenergyeast).

KAPUSKASING

1	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Positive – ability to be self sustainable in terms of energy as a country• More market setting (pricing) rather than relying on foreign jurisdictions• Technology is much more advanced• Environmental risk is low <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Economic benefit for Ontario• Economic benefit directly for communities -- For generations to come
---	---

TIMMINS

2	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Negative impacts – contamination of the environment, waterways, ground water, wilderness• An outdated pipeline that is over 50 years old• The lack of being able to monitor the line because of its isolation through the province• Its all about money in the end. Its not for Canadians but done for exporting of our resources• There's more risk to the environment pumping crude oil than natural gas <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All the above• Bottom line, the general American population didn't want a pipeline pumping Canadian crude oil through the states. As an Ontarian I don't want crude oil in my back yard.
3	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lots of much needed work for our members in the areas. Also roles off to local business in the area. Also tax dollars for communities in the areas. Better than rail on trucks or ships safety. (LIUNA LOCAL 493) <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Make sure all work goes to local people• Safety.
4	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Why constructing a pipeline from north to west of the country?• The old gas pipeline what kind of test for you've done?• Might get good result test from the pipeline only inside. What about outside of the pipe?• Environmental impact: how come it take a long long time to react when a spill occur?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you using an old pipeline consumption of gas distributing is diminish because they have no spare line to deliver natural gas in the north? <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> I'm not in favour of that oil pipeline because when there's a spill it take too long to react for clean up. Also not in hurry oil company to pick up the tab?
5	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting the expansion of tar sands and fossil fuel consumption increases the toxin load in the air and increases climate change effects, which in turn burdens the health industry, infrastructure, agricultural industry, and even other aspects of society. A decommissioning strategy and resource fund (such as what exists in the mining sector) is fundamental should the project be approved The psychological and social/spiritual impacts of environmental degradation are largely unstudied but constitute a growing field of interest for those concerning themselves with human health and well-being, especially as it pertains to Aboriginal populations and those who participate in land-based activities. Ecological grief and its impacts are real. <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ecological risks, including, cumulative impacts from climate change, existing resource development activities, and other environmental issues. The impacts on Aboriginal populations and their allies who are opposed to development on their lands are downstream impacts of any leaks/spills. These include impacts on morbidity/mortality rates, impacts on traditional economics, psychological/spiritual impacts. How will this project impact/come into play with existing Treaty agreements and Canada's responsibilities over the Ontario Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People.
6	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oil leaks from the pipeline and more likely to be environmentally damaging than gas leaks. This needs to be addressed. If gas leaks it vents to the air but the oil will sink into the soil on the water. Can this be detected and contained and remediated? The pipeline is old and was designed for gas. How is it being reconditioned to accommodate crude oil? This is a far better solution than the proposals to build new pipelines through the rockies on to the US but needs to be done safely and environmentally if at all. If this must be done, then there must be a commitment to not accept contamination to water or soil. Will the pipeline be thoroughly flushed when finally decommissioned? Does the pipe remain in the ground? <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> n/a

7	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax payers need to be protected from long term liability losses in the event of a major oil spill or market swing-that makes pipeline not feasible. • Clean up strategies that realize the sinking ability of crude to damage water tables. <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to compare the socio/economic impact of this proposal to an alternate proposal in an environmental review. What is the economic/environmental of renewables energy development? • What happens if the government put on carbon tax. Could the pipeline be viable?
8	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will moneys be set aside for eventual decommissioning of the pipeline so that tax payers don't pick up the final bill?
9	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What will this do to the price of natural gas if they repurpose the line which carries gas to heat our home? Could we face a natural gas shortage if we have a particularly cold winter? • This is a 40-50 year old pipeline designed to carry light natural gas. If you convert this old pipeline to carry heavy bitumen, it will not offer the same level of safety as a new pipeline. How will this old, thinner pipeline be "safe enough?" • I heard on the radio that pipeline and or oil companies can abandon a pipeline after it has completed its useful lifespan, and that the land owner is liable if there are any future problems from this abandoned line. Is this true that pipeline and or oil companies get to walk away and pass the liability to the land owner? • At the advice of the 'Canadian Energy Pipeline Association' the Conservative government dismantled the Navigable Waters Protection Act. This means that more than 2 million rivers and lakes are no longer protected and do not require an environmental assessment if a pipeline is going to go through them. Will this pipeline be running through any water ways used for drinking or swimming? • "The environmental risks posed by a bitumen spill are many times greater than with a conventional oil spill. Most of the chemicals found in conventional oil are middle weight, 'light enough to float, but too heavy to gas off into the atmosphere'. When a spill of diluted bitumen occurs it separates into condensate and bitumen. The condensate is very volatile and evaporates quickly causing serious air quality problems. The bitumen is heavy, and sinks into the bottom of river beds, or deeper into the soil making it extremely difficult and costly to remove. Almost 3 years after the bitumen spill in the Kalamazoo River, the cleanup is still not complete. What measures do you have in place to deal with a bitumen spill?"

	<p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a
10	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bad/negative: Oil pipeline should not be used for existing gas pipeline (older line). If you want -> installed no line design for oil of pipeline. Main concern is the ages. • Positive: Pipeline change bigger economic impact safety factor <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From small municipalities, the tax revenue are critical. Regional impact of project could be water crossings, i.e. water concern, environment – of course.
NORTH BAY	
11	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural gas goes through pipeline right now. Why are they not expecting for cracks right now? • What are they currently doing in terms of protection? • Inspection result should be more open for current condition of the pipes. • Impact to the community have been articulated and have to be heard – local impacts tied to global impacts. • Pipeline construction facilitates tar sands development, which increases negative global climate impact and outweighs any economic benefits. • Simple -> you can't drink money so there is no remediation possible after a spill. <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental • Source water protection • Citizens concerns • Indigenous people's concerns • Interconnectedness to global climate change • Landowners permission + consent (right of way was for natural gas – not dilbits) • Need to focus on the potential negative impacts • We now have few environmental legal protections so it's very important to consider carefully before making a decision
12	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • So many potential grades of crude oil going through the line. • Crude oil, diluted heavy, light, all with different properties and corrosion potentials • Going through a line over 35 years old where the original sand cushion base has probably settling exposing the

	<p>sharp rock base</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 41 river crossings each with a potential leak can cause drastic problems • Trout Lake source of drinking water for city population of 54, 000 <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a
13	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unreasonable risk to drinking water + all water, fishing, recreation • Need research that has been published. Need research that you can see is credible – not just say “credible research”. We want to know which resources • This is not good for the whole world, not just North Bay, this bitumen affects the CO2 levels of the WORLD!! • What’s going to happen to our natural gas supply? Gas? • More serious environmental assessment • A realistic map of water crossings – Trout Lake isn’t even on your map • Have Trout Lake designated as area of special concern <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting our source water • Independent scientific research and reporting • Leave the bloody oil in the ground • Is there emergency response training? • Do they have tried and true ways to contain a spill and clean up?
14	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the volume of “oil” being shipped and if the pipeline doesn’t go through how are they doing to ship it? • Who is looking after the pipeline, the company itself, self-regulation – this is not acceptable. <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a
15	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <p>Impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive: not on rail <p>Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UN report – exacerbates bad condition • Threat to aquifer/water shed

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No way to undo clean a spill • Perpetuates on unsustainable industry • And its only for export – will not truly benefit Canada as it is unrefined <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only option is to move it elsewhere • Alternative energies as opposed to fossil fuels – how long will this project be economically viable? • What is the pipe conversion process and how is it checked to ensure the pipe is safe (inside and outside and the ground surrounding it?) • Who will be 100% responsible for clean up?
16	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Everyone here clapped when considering C-38 has taken away our democratic rights • Impacts – the OEB has identified the impacts well • There could be lots of jobs in a green economy; It will be sustainable and a healthy future • A billion dollars to clean up a spill could be used to heal, fund new innovations and a green economy <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threat of the oil spill • People are willing to consider changing our lifestyles in order to protect our water. People have the right to choose.
17	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are citizens encouraged to give up resources, while corporations are encouraged to spend money and all resources?
18	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Divides communities over an unneeded risk transporting on unneeded product • Track record of TCPL: transparency, not reporting spills; to private citizens who voice concern; not being honest and accessible with what they are transporting, and the risks they are bringing to our community • Make note of the fault line along the route near North Bay. The province paid for a study of [SENTENCE NOT COMPLETE ON ORIGINAL DISCUSSION GUIDE] • Source water protection of North Bay/Trout Lake • Source water protection for all water at source that we could put at risk by the expansion this pipeline would allow <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reroute is not acceptable; it makes our community a bully like TransCanada

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A proposed pipeline is unacceptable – full environmental assessment must be conducted provincially • Their findings from the conversion research should be public and should be conducted by 3rd party • Include Pembina Institute to further study the climate impacts of Energy East, 32 million tons of CO2 in upstream emissions alone • Citing lack of confidence in NEB process (as seen in recent approvals and process) • Ontario should use its imagination and legislative muscles to challenge the sole authority of the federal government in this project
19	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did we get this far into the process without the larger population having the information we are having tonight? If they had this knowledge everyone would not allow it. Give Canadians the info and they can make reasonable assessments <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We also need to expand our concern and focus globally as it clearly impact far more than our own drinking water and habitats
20	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the pipeline away from the watershed – Trout Lake water is not negotiable. No more environmental studies to justify building the pipeline as it is now planned. • Unneeded risk and an unwanted product <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a
21	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative for oil -> energy -> what's the alternative? • Can't do without it • Watershed protection -> no viable alternative if water supply contaminated • Fish and wildlife -> subsistence and livelihood • Economic devastation if a serious leak/breach • Speed of pushing this • Land and resource users • Safety and malfunctions including ecological • Requirement for financial resources prepaid to province • Monitoring and audit • 3rd party review of reports and operation -> i.e. NOT TransCanada, period; transparency • Financial and personal burdens of communities to deal with this project

	<p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3rd party inspections • Alternative alignments locations assessments -> opportunity to comment on • Traditional and non-traditional land and resources uses • Monitoring and malfunctions -> including effects of earthquake • Rush to risk potential effects
22	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why does the pipeline have to go by a series of lakes? • What is the “material safety data sheet” on dilbit? • If a leak occurs, toxic chemicals will be released into the air, this will cause health effects on the population exposed • They need to do a full environmental baseline documentation before oil flows, and ongoing monitoring of water, soil, groundwater and air. <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a
23	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All positive and negative impacts of any aspects of this project bypass North Bay with pipeline...the pipeline cannot be stopped -> move it up the escarpment • Concern oil is for export and not energy security • No positive, impacts evident -> this is short term, jobs will only be short term -> how is this positive when shipped offshore? • If slightest chance of a leak, it will be catastrophic, but it is there and evident • Is supposedly TransCanada “doing their best”? But this is not enough • How does an emergency response crew respond to a leak underground in a timely manner? • Pipeline must not go through our watershed • Stop transporting crude oil everywhere. Just don't transport it • We need a price on carbon pollution. We need worldwide carbon caps, we need policy on this -> needed before building/converting more pipelines • Past history of other pipeline bursts, explosions, incidents • Need to consider this project's safety on its own and not against other industry/transportation methods such as rail and highway • What is the urgency for this project? Let's get it right. • Community: drinking water from Trout Lake is a right! • Province-wide: costs on province to handle a clean up that municipalities cannot handle

	<p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our government needs to listen to our concerns • Focus on all negative impacts, safety, water sources close by, financial impacts, long-term finances are illogical (20 yrs) • What are long-term impacts? • Insurance policy on a spill -> from various levels -> compensation for property owners • Jobs and economy -> need to have defined numbers on this -> but we need jobs in solar, wind etc. • Oil and tar sands is a dying industry • Oil subsidizes to green infrastructure • Put a price on carbon emissions and let the free market take care of itself • Get Trout Lake back on list of protected waterways • State of democracy in Canada • Make overlapping jurisdictions of federal/provincial/city; present an integrated focus and ensure that Ontario has a mandatory safety focus • The actual accountability and responsibility that a pipeline company has according to legislation and case law at the federal and provincial levels. • How does the development of the Canadian tar sands contribute to an environmentally friendly energy sector in Ontario? • Why TransCanada natural gas pipelines are under-utilized, and is this self-inflicted by TransCanada itself? • Impact on ground, below ground, stability of the pipe vibrations, safety • Who will pay for a spill of the pipeline?
24	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive economic impacts past short term • Long term negative consequences to Canada through increased bitumen (unrefined) exports • Safety record of TCPL compared to other companies in the industry is flawed <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the NEB has previously ignored climate change as a factor in it's environmental assessment, the OEB should place it back on the table • The OEB should focus on the democratic deficit the oil and gas industries is creating by placing the pipeline across Ontario • Against the wishes of it's citizens
25	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORA Board Member + Herbalist/Teacher: How will the natural gas be moved if crude is in the line? • Bill c45 was a mistake – fix it first • Protect the water! Protect our people!

	<p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have lived off the grid for the last 10 years on reserve. • I work full-time, unfunded, teaching people (and children) how to reduce their footprint! • Consider education not destruction!
26	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the federal cabinet has the ultimate decision, and we know that the Harper government is pro-oil and handicapped by the deals it has made with China, then is this process legitimate? Does this process have any power to influence the ultimate decision? <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send a STRONG message that North Bay does not want this pipeline conversion • For all its technology, this pipeline is a 20 century idea in the 21st century
STITTSVILLE	
27	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In light of the Premier's challenge, in her capacity as Minister of Agriculture, to create thousands of new agricultural jobs, I would respectfully request that the OEB focus on additional safety measures and increased frequency of inspections in the vicinity of provincially or federally inspected abattoirs. Farmers in Ontario rely on these abattoirs (i.e. Pakenham, Cobden, etc.) to provide local food to Ontarians, and those abattoirs rely on clean water to provide services to farmers.
28	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I can't find any positive connection in the proposed pipeline. Our area has a high risk aquifer -> I am incredibly concerned about our water – why should we give up our clean water so that another corporation can make more money? Why not invest in clean energy? <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on water! You can't drink money -> aquifer concerns • Environmental impacts/climate change • Renewable energy please
29	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive: economic impact from building 30 pumping stations at approximately 25 million per station • Economic impact from building 100 km of new pipeline

	<p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety of watercourse crossing • Inclusion of shut off valves at water crossing
30	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed pipeline does not line up with a long term vision of an Ottawa/Ontario/World economy that is sustainable and based on 'green' jobs • It does not make sense to take on the massive risks of the proposed pipeline when we need to be moving away from a fossil fuel based economy • Instead of investing in this pipeline, we should be investing in an economy where pipelines are not needed
31	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <p>All negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Danger to water • Danger to farming • Impact on world heritage site designation • Climate change (expansion of tar sands); export of oil; transportation of diluent <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OEB must include the impact on and of climate change in its environmental and socio-economic considerations
32	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <p>Community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing positive. Risk to water supply for all our livestock and 2/3 of our residents as our aquifer is rated as HIGHLY VULNERABLE. Risk to the Rideau River, which plays a crucial role in the economy of our community. We are located on the CP rail – a route over which massive increase of diluents world travel if the pipeline is approved <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed pipeline traverses a region, which has recorded earthquake activity at 5.6 on the Richter scale. Can TransCanada prove the pipeline will withstand this and one of 6.6 and 7.6...? • Rest of the world transitioning away from fossil fuel reliance – our green economics must continue to keep pace • OEB must demand the NEB makes the reporting of spills instantly available to all citizens as the Americans do • We must be responsible as wealthy, healthy citizens of this world to the very physical make-up of the planet and the

	<p>poorest of the poor who will be impacted by our actions releasing massive amounts of CO2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exposure of highly vulnerable aquifers to potential known contamination
33	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any positive benefits has short term and not worth the loss of water, risk or the increased climate dangers – this will affect our health <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take info seriously • The climate impact of increased GHG's • The risk to water of any spill • OEB don't follow the pattern of the NEB
34	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key issue when considering more tar sands oil moving through Ontario is the impacts of GHG on climate change. Please stop the need of Energy East and structure dollars (public and private) to renewables, Ontario prefers to see regional-based energy solutions <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TransCanada or any other pipeline owner and use must disclose all "incidents" public and be they large or small – this is one condition to agreeing to pipeline in Ontario
35	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risks out weigh benefits lack of TransCanada ability to protect environment • This pipeline would undo/cancel the climate benefit of Ontario shifting out of coal • NEB process is flawed! Undermines democracy • Increased reliance on fracked gas which so many negative environmental and human health impacts • Natural gas shortage, UNESCO world heritage site is threatened, additional climate change caused by increased rate of exploitation of the tar sands, health and livelihood of First Nations who live downstream of the Alberta tar sands jeopardized, increased rail traffic from returning diluent from East coast to Alberta • Inevitable oil spills will contaminate land, surface and ground water including aquifers and recharge areas, proprietary info regarding contents of tar sands bitumen which makes it difficult for first responders to react with knowledge and puts themselves and others at risk • Keep the oil in the ground • We need it here in Canada and we can process it here • Tourism threatened by oil spill and an oil spill is inevitable • Cost of clean up of bitumen spills which history shows us would be borne largely by Canadians not oil companies • Consistency and composition of tar sands diluent which makes clean up of oil spills essentially impossible

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profits of pipeline would be prioritized while risks borne by society, oil mostly or completely exported and would not provide Canadians with oil or jobs • Project would be a poor investment for Canada and especially Ontario as the same amount of investment in energy conservation and renewable will result in more energy and more jobs for Canadians • Project would be short sighted as the experts say 2/3 of energy must stay in the ground to avoid catastrophic climate change <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • n/a
36	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huge issues with pipeline safety engineering integrity and environmental, socio-economic impacts including the issues below: • Old pipeline designed for gas will be under high pressure and carry corrosive dilbit • Risks the explosion of Lac Magantic from diluent from oil and rail transport • Inadequate oil spill detection technology • Few jobs, oil mostly is totally exported • Misinformation from TransCanada -> who is responsible for ensuring there is truth in their advertising • Climate change impacts of increased exploitation of tar sands • Project not needed. We need renewables and conservation • Health and livelihood impacts on First Nations • Downstream of tar sands • The pipeline will leak -> its not worth it – too destructive • Its not in Ontario's interests -> we take the risks but not the benefits • Gas shortages and prices • TransCanada's safety record is poor and they even fired a whistle blower because he wanted the company to follow the rules • NEB process flawed including the PM and cabinet which do not make evidence-based decision causing negative impacts on human health <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pipeline safety (spills of corrosive dilbit will cause groundwater contamination) • Environmental and socio-economic negative impacts -> more jobs if invested in energy conservation and renewables especially in Ontario instead of in Alberta • Oil spills of dilbit can never really be cleaned up and dislocations of huge populations when this happens • Impacts of climate change caused by increased rate of exploitation of tar sands, increased rail traffic from refined diluent to West • Conversion of old gas pipeline to carry corrosive and toxic oil is dangerous and irresponsible

- Threat to ground water and aquifers
- Diluent formulas proprietary so dangerous for emergency first responders and communities

37

Answers to Question 1

- The proposed pipeline could have an impact on the watershed from North Bay all the way to Montreal, where the river flows into the St. Lawrence River;
- The mainline pipeline that currently exists crosses many tributaries to the Ottawa River, including the Montreal River, the Madawaska River, Mississippi River, Rideau River, and South Nation River;
- The Project Description mentions that new crossings of the Madawaska and Rideau Rivers will be installed, so there will be construction on these crossings;
- The newly constructed portion of the pipeline will cross the Ottawa River itself, just east of Hawkesbury, upstream from Montreal;
- The Ottawa River watershed provides drinking water for the relatively large municipalities of North Bay, Ottawa, Gatineau & Montreal, as well as many smaller ones, including Stittsville, along the route of the proposed pipeline;
- In addition to surface water for drinking water, there are important aquifers in the watershed that provide drinking water for many communities;
- The Ottawa River is home to great biodiversity, including more than 300 species of birds and 96 species of fish;
- The Ottawa River is a world-class recreation destination, as evidenced by the fact that hundreds of thousands of people swim, fish, paddle, sail, and powerboat in the river.

Answers to Question 2

- The impacts we see in connection with the proposed pipeline in the Ottawa River watershed are primarily environmental considerations, namely the potential of leaks and spills of crude oil or, worse, diluted bitumen (“dilbit”), due to a pipeline failure. Such leaks and spills could be caused by many things, such as damage to the pipeline by third parties, internal corrosion, weld seam failures, or natural disaster. They could result in irreparable damage to the water quality of wetlands, watercourses, and/or waterbodies in the Ottawa River watershed; and serious harm to fish and wildlife, and fish and wildlife habitat in the watershed. We are also concerned with the climate change implications of the proposed project.
- We think the OEB should seriously assess in its report to Ontario’s Minister of Energy the impacts of this project on pipeline safety and the natural environment in Ontario, in particular:
- Pipeline integrity: What is the risk to Ontarians of a rupture in the pipeline, in particular in the converted section? We know this pipeline is approximately 50 years old and was not originally designed to carry crude oil/dilbit, or operate at the pressure required to move the oil/dilbit through the pipeline. We know that pipeline conversions such as this one are a fairly new practice and one big rupture on a converted pipeline has occurred and been much publicized, in Mayflower, Arkansas in March 2013, which endangered local water bodies. And we know that industry and its regulators have concerns about the integrity of these pipelines.
- Leak detection: What is the risk to Ontarians of leaks along the pipeline that go undetected for any period of time? We know that with the Enbridge rupture in Kalamazoo, Michigan, many hours (approx. 17) passed before the

company learned of the spill, and that was because a municipal utility worker reported the spill, even though alarms had gone off in company headquarters. We know that Energy East will have a leak detection system for the pipeline. But will it provide sufficient assurance against harm to the waters in the Ottawa River watershed?

- Emergency Management: i) The Ottawa River is an interprovincial river, and thus subject to regulation and oversight by the federal government as well as the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Municipalities would also, of course, be involved in any cleanup of a spill. Has the Ontario government been given enough assurance by Trans Canada that a spill or rupture could be contained by a well-coordinated response before unacceptable damage is done to the waters, wetlands, and habitat of the Ottawa River watershed? Also, are Trans Canada's emergency management plans tailored to the different needs and players involved in the different regions through which the pipeline passes? li) What amount of money is Trans Canada willing to devote to a cleanup in the event of a spill? Obviously it can be very expensive to clean up such a spill. We know Enbridge has already spent more than \$1 billion to clean up the dilbit that spilled into the creek that was a tributary of the Kalamazoo River in July 2010 and, due largely to the properties of bitumen, that cleanup is still not considered complete. Are Ontario's municipalities going to be on the hook for the cost of the cleanup operations? We can imagine they don't have the money or other resources to manage this; is it their responsibility to bear the burden for this risk?
- Quality Management: This relates to the design, manufacture, and construction for the new build section of the pipeline. Are adequate safety measures being taken to protect the newly constructed section of pipeline from spills, particularly where it crosses bodies of water? Are shut off valves being installed in the pipe before and after crossings? Are double pipes being used for water crossings? Should these and other precautions be required to make the risks inherent in this project acceptable to Ontario?
- Climate Change: We think the Ontario government should give due consideration in its report to the implications of this 40 year project to Canada's contribution to global greenhouse gases. The Pembina Institute has published an overview of the climate considerations of this pipeline project and they have shown that the oil required to fill this pipeline would significantly increase Canada's greenhouse gas emissions. This is at a time when we are past needing to show serious action to reduce these emissions, as the most recently released Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report has made very clear. This is a separate concern of ours, from the ones related to pipeline spills, but an important one, as an environmental organization working to protect and preserve the ecological health of the Ottawa River watershed. We think it is an issue that must be addressed in the context of the approval of this pipeline.
- Conclusion: There is the potential for a damaging oil spill, or certainly more than one, to occur in Ontario, into the Ottawa River watershed during the estimated 40-year life of this project. Furthermore, if this project is approved it will take Canada even further away from meeting its climate objectives than it already is. We want to urge the Ontario government to take these risks seriously in coming up with its position on the project, and in its report to the NEB.

CORNWALL

38

Answers to Question 1

- Pipelines are the ONLY safe way to get crude from the oilsands. If we don't approve it will be transported out by

	<p>DOT 3– empty Coke cans on the railroads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Keystone XL has the same thickness walls throughout. What are the thickness of these walls? Especially on the previous gas section. • Are there any pipelines that could transport Bakken oil getting it off railroads? • The US gets a 30% discount on Alberta oil. Will this oil also be discounted? <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil should be sent south and the west coast. It is a third of the distance to New Brunswick
39	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Va faire monter de dugaz qui est une energie non. Pollutant au transport et utilization • Dans un spill l'huile va polluter les nappes d'eau souterraints • TransCanada vail fournir l'eau potable a CFS residents • Les residents d'ontario ont tout a perdre pour le transport h'huile et TransCanada pipe line vont profiter 100% de la situation <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D'avoir a investor sur les pipes line au gas que d'avoir de pipe lines qui transportent de l'huile qui profiteront a des pays entranger qui competinent directement a l'economie Canadien - NE
MAIL	
40	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This project if it gets the go ahead to proceed will benefit the community with jobs for local unions like the labourers local 607 who members need the work. Spin off for local business. I can't see too many negative points with this project other than making sure safety is in place (environmental). The province should look at this as a step forward for moving oil across our own country (exporting products) this could be cheaper for fuel prices later. Also making sure the province looks at ways the line is not going to leak, proper installations. <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The board should focus some of the efforts if a proposal gets the green light. That the pipeline is the safest and most efficient way to move the product. We all have to look at the destruction the rail system has caused just in the last yea with derailments and the disaster in Quebec to see that it is an environmental nightmare to use trains. Make sure the old line is safe to transport product if not replace large sections so of these pipes are from the 60s.
41	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I see security in oil and gas if this pipeline proceeds. There is also a net economic benefit to reversing the pipeline

Answers to Question 2

- There are jobs and security. No negative impact

EMAIL

42

Answers to Question 1

- I am not in a position to speak of any positive impacts the Energy East pipeline will provide. I am a landowner of a 150 acre farm within the boundaries of Ottawa near Richmond, Ontario. Two TransCanada pipelines run through the eastern and northern sections of our land. Following are some of the negative impacts the conversion to transport crude oil through our farmland will have. It will directly impact my life and those living and farming in the community.
- The conversion of these lines will create a decrease in the value of our property. My property as well as those in the surrounding area will certainly be less appealing in the real estate market. Living 500 yards from pipelines with crude oil and other toxic substances is not conducive to attracting people to our community.
- A leak in these lines will threaten our drinking water – our home and our farming income. Crops and waterways will become contaminated with diluted bitumen. Wildlife will suffer. The ecosystem will be forever damaged and altered. Human lives will be compromised with poisonous toxins present in our soil and water supply.
- The chemicals used to enable the crude oil to flow, is extracted at the end of the line. It is then shipped back to Alberta (to be re-used) mostly by rail. Given the devastation a mishap in the shipping methods will create, (Lac Megantic) the additional quantities of these chemicals required (enough to maintain 1.1 million barrels per day through our community) will result in the potential of more frequent disastrous and catastrophic mishaps.

Answers to Question 2

- The focus must be on ensuring that TransCanada provide guarantees by way of financial compensation to protect landowners safe drinking water supply OR SIMPLY MOVE THE PIPELINE AWAY FROM OUR WELL-HEAD PROTECTION AREAS. The Ontario Clean Water Act covers protection of water supplies from activities that adversely affect or have the potential to adversely affect the quality of any water that is or may be used as a source of drinking water. The Ministry of Environment must conduct a wellhead protection assessment for Source Protection Regions.
- Ensure that TransCanada provides guarantees that farmland will remain free of any contaminants that will affect livestock, destroy crops, fruits and vegetables, etc. Crops and goods raised on these farms reach consumers at many levels and our governments have the responsibility to ensure safety of our food production. Farmers who risk losing sales of their goods due to contamination caused by pipeline leaks must be protected! Loss of income for farmers is a real threat. Loss of income in the fisheries business is a real threat. Livelihoods are at risk.
- TransCanada must take responsibility for the decrease in our land value and property taxes must reflect this decrease as well.
- Pipeline integrity and landowner complaints and concerns must be addressed by TransCanada promptly and efficiently. Since 2010 I have experienced three issues with the pipeline on my property. Two issues deal with safety and one with property maintenance. The first safety issue took three years to be resolved by TransCanada. I

	<p>reported a damaged Test Lead to TransCanada in May 2010 and it was not repaired until July 2013. A “slip-up” was what the Landowner Agent called it. The function of a Test Lead is to provide accurate voltage readings to alert personnel of electrical discontinuity and low pressure within the line and monitors the effectiveness of the cathodic protection. These readings should be done at least annually but preferably at six month intervals to avoid a longer period for corrosion to exist.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The second safety issue was brought to their attention on March 10, 2014. A rumbling noise was originating in the pipeline on our property. To date engineers and inspectors of all sorts from TransCanada have not been able to discover the cause. • The third issue deals with property maintenance. During the construction of the pipelines over 30 years ago, the slope of the land on the eastern side of our property was altered as a result. They dug three ditches in the field affected to compensate for the altered level of the land and yet the field is continuously flooded from spring to June or so every year making it impossible to work this portion of land until very late in the season. My requests to have this issue resolved go unanswered. • In short, TransCanada must resolve landowner concerns and reports of damaged equipment immediately. • The economic value for TransCanada to proceed with the Energy East Line is the only consideration being realized – the economic value of our farmland, our food supplies is not.
43	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no positive impacts. Until Canada has an energy strategy it is lunacy to allow a decades long commitment to a pipeline that is transporting unrefined bitumen across our land. This does nothing to address the energy security of Ontarians and poses risks to our natural environment and communities. Worse than this it completely negates the reduction in greenhouse gases that Ontario will manage to achieve by closing the coal plants. <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of a spill on our communities and natural habitat. Question the supposed benefits and refute the claims that this will bring energy security to Ontario. Reject large long term energy projects which will increase our carbon emissions and don't allow this pipeline to be approved until Canada has an energy strategy that outlines our move away from fossil fuels over time.
44	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Positive and Negative Impacts of the proposed Energy East Pipeline in North Bay...and Ontario: • I have difficulty in identifying any positive impact. The creation of jobs by the pipeline does not hold sway with me because I understand there will not be many jobs, but more importantly, we need to create green economy jobs. This is a time to move away from the use of fossil fuel, especially tar sands oil, and begin building an economy not dependent on oil. A green economy does provide jobs, and these jobs contribute to resilient communities---something we need now and in the future. • Negative impact: I am strongly opposed to conveying poisonous bitumen through our pristine drinking water system. It would be like living with a time bomb, wondering at what point the leak will burst and contaminate our water. We know that the pipeline will rupture at some time; it cannot be made to be 100 % safe. There is no

alternative to clean water. Our very lives depend on it, and clean water is a human right. There is an alternative, however, to oil; we need to begin now to develop those alternatives. If the pipeline is allowed to carry bitumen and a spill occurs, the clean up will be difficult and can never return our Trout Lake to its pristine state. We know that a clean-up can only be partial. It is unreasonable, unfair, and unjust to expect North Bay citizens and people of the surrounding area to live with this risk of impending disaster. The future of our city is at risk....and for what? a few jobs?...to be able to contribute to an outdated oil economy of Canada? The oil companies have now been identified as the major polluters of green house gases. We need to change this course we are on.

Answers to Question 2

- Focus for OEB in its report to the Ontario Minister of Energy: **Drinkable water is a human right** [and animal right, for that matter]; no bitumen should be allowed to cross our watersheds. Begin to focus on developing a green economy as our main economy. Please convey to the Government of Canada that this pipeline is **not** in our best interests.

45

Answers to Question 1

- Frankly, I do not see any significant and lasting positive result from the repurposing of the TC pipeline that runs through North Bay's sole source of drinking water, as well as along the Trout Lake watershed. The obvious negative impact is the high risk not only to our drinking water because a spill or rupture is likely to happen, sooner or later, but also the repercussions when it does happen, will be felt by the North Bay community as a whole. While TC says they would cover the cost of clean up, we know that there will be other costs never covered such as the drop in property values as people try to sell housing in a city with such a spill.
- Cleaning up such a spill or rupture in a deep body of water such as Trout Lake would be very difficult. Tar sands bitumen sinks in water, making it impossible to clean up. There are also many streams that flow through the watershed that empty into the Lake where the pipeline goes. So the water could be affected in the watershed before it even gets to the Lake, as well as wild life living in or near the water. Someone has to advocate for those who have no voice in this matter, ie. for other living creatures who are dependent upon the environment in and around the Lake.
- This pipeline and others such as Line 9, run through a huge swath of Ontario. The potential for environmental risk is great when so much of this particular pipeline runs through the Canadian shield where ruptures are more common because of the rock through which they are built, and where over the years, the buffer is not there to cushion the pipe. How will the citizens of Ontario benefit from this pipeline? Instead, it appears as though we will shoulder the cost when spills and ruptures occur but the benefits will really go to the oil companies and those offshore who will buy this unrefined oil in places like China.
- The other significant negative impact is the increase in carbon emissions that we are creating by allowing this tar sands oil to be extracted first of all, but then pumped through our land. Climate change is real. Scientists have been warning us for years now. When are we going to stop contributing to the destruction of the planet? Thus, I am not in favour of a diversion of the pipeline route around the watershed. I don't want a pipeline carrying tar sands bitumen at all.
- Finally, another negative impact is that by carrying on with an oil-based economy, we are not moving forward with

	<p>the development of alternative sources of energy such as other countries in the world are doing. We are operating defensively by thinking we have to accept this because it might mean adding a few jobs to the economy. Let's be leaders in Ontario instead of just accepting what crumbs are thrown to us by a project like this that threatens to destroy our water, our wildlife, our communities, our land and the future of the generations to come.</p> <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the above
46	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My community will see little direct benefit other than temporary increases in accommodation and restaurant demand and perhaps some minor local hauling and aggregate sales during the period of any construction in our vicinity. If approved and completed, immense wealth will flow through our land daily, but we will not share equitably in that wealth. Despite claims made in the economic benefits paper released months ago by TransCanada, the main beneficiaries of the project seem likely to be small elites at both ends of the pipeline, investors and foreign owners. In terms of indirect benefits, the level of inequity in present provincial and national societies also means we will not benefit equitably in any dividends from accelerator/multiplier driven economic growth. Never-the-less my community will experience all the risk of potential catastrophic environmental damage from a pipeline rupture. I am not aware of any assured indemnification or restoration funding by TransCanada to provide fair compensation and restoration to current Provincial environmental standards for any damage done. I also am unaware of assurances of safety and maintenance standards except lofty assertions of excellence from TransCanada. The reality is that failures are inevitable, and the pipeline industry does not have an impressive record of providing adequate compensation or restoration for damage resulting from its operations. <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I think the most important impact is whether Energy East contributes to the Public Interest. Ultimately NEB decisions are based on whether a proposal contributes adequately to the Public Interest. The NEB definition of Public Interest is at: http://tinyurl.com/o4pf9fw I think that anything submitted to the OEB, and from the Ministry of Environment should be stated in terms of the contribution of Energy East to the Public Interest.
47	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <p>In Our Community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very few if any positive impacts. Some short-term job opportunities may be provided if a pumping station is to be built. The pipeline already employs some people, but additional permanent jobs are most probably not going to be created just because the pipeline may carry oil instead of gas. • No additional tax revenues will be payable to our municipality, since extra land is not being obtained. • Our major concern is the issue of water contamination in the event of a pipeline rupture. We live in a very "aqueous" environment, with a substantial number of lakes, rivers, streams and marshlands in our area, and there are many reasons why it is imperative that every effort must be made to preserve these precious resources. We are aware of recent oil spills in Kalamazoo, Michigan; and Mayflower, Arkansas, and the problems which ensued: lack of

	<p>appropriate emergency response, ongoing health problems, and a seriously damaged environment for years after the event.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This potential problem is exacerbated by the fact that the material which is to be transported is diluted bitumen, a product far more hazardous than “regular” oil. In the event of a spill, hazardous volatile hydrocarbons would be released. Bitumen sinks to the bottom of a water body, making clean-up more difficult than it would be with “regular” oil. <p>Province-wide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In recent years, Ontario has made significant progress towards the reduction of greenhouse gas output. In contrast, the Alberta oil sands project has had the exact opposite effect. This Alberta oil is being shipped to the east, mainly for export and quick profit, while Ontario experiences risk to the environment and human well-being, for minimal gain. <p><u>Answers to Question 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kenora and the surrounding area, with its multitude of lakes, rivers and wetlands would be SERIOUSLY jeopardized in the event of a diluted bitumen spill. (We are aware of previous disasters in this regard.) • We <u>all</u> stand to lose if greenhouse gas emissions cannot be adequately controlled. Ontario is doing its part; Alberta is not. • I got the impression that the NEB is not scheduling a hearing in Kenora – they should definitely include us in their itinerary!
48	<p><u>Answers to Question 1</u></p> <p>The proposal to convert the aging 40 year old NAT gas pipeline going through Ontario to transport diluted bitumen raises great concern for the following reasons:</p> <p>Province-wide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pipeline will remain commissioned for many more years to come and knowing that it is made from carbon steel there will be perforation occurring in the weaker weld spots from inside and outside of the pipes. Common sense tells me that small leaks and ruptures are going to occur. This decision by TransCanada Corporation is an illustration of carelessness and disregard for people of Canada and the environment. This is going to put the future acceptance of oil pipelines at risk in Canada when the public becomes aware of the incidences caused by this aging pipeline. Up until recently the pipelines in Canada have been known to be a safe mode to transport hydrocarbons throughout our country and it should remain this way forever. • Knowing that there is already a second pipeline that is 48 inches in diameter carrying NAT gas that would be running in parallel just 10 metres away from the proposed converted pipeline, if it were to explode from a gas leak it would also take out the pipeline carrying diluted bitumen in that section. This would result in a significant spill and would also intensify the explosion that would affect a large area. Having both pipelines in parallel simply doubles the chance of a disaster. Water tables will be contaminated for many years to come. This will also result in human injuries and fatalities in populated areas near the pipeline. • Ontario tax dollars will likely have to step in to clean up spills caused by the aging pipeline. This province is already so far in debt and cannot afford to take any further financial risks if this proposal is accepted.

My community

- The pipeline section that is 32 years old in my community travels through Ottawa's North West end (Carp area) and there are many residential properties located directly next to the pipeline easement. These homes are at risk of becoming unlivable for decades to come due to land contamination caused by diluted bitumen. All it takes is the smallest leak from the pipeline that goes undetected over a period of time or a sudden rupture due to the high pressure in the pipe. Drinking water from wells will be unsafe for many residences and farm land will no longer be productive.
- In my local area there is the Burnt Lands Alvar that is an area of provincially significant Natural and Scientific interest and the pipeline travels adjacent to the area. The Burnt Lands Alvar is the most extensive alvar east of the Frontenac Axis and is an outstanding example of this globally significant habitat. It supports some 82 breeding bird species, 48 butterfly species and 98 owl moths. This area is also known for its botanical diversity and rare plant concentrations. A pipeline rupture in this area would contaminate the water shed.
- It is my understanding that the federal legislation (NEB act) prevents the land owner from taking any proceedings against the utility company for damages during the time the pipeline is in production. After the pipeline has been decommissioned and the process of pipeline abandonment has been completed, any issues resulting from the pipeline afterwards (further down the road) will fall in the hands of the land owner if the utility or facility companies go out of business. This directly affects the land owners property rights in the following way:
- Should my land be rendered unfit to live in due to a pipeline, I will not be able to seek fair financial compensation from the utility or facility company. In speaking with a TransCanada representative about how they would go about compensating the land owner the answer I received was far from clear. It is my understanding that the utility company will appoint a property value assessment firm and have them favor the lowest possible property value estimate that is going to be much lower than the actual Real Estate market value.
- Both TransCanada corporation and their Land Solutions affiliate made it clear that they will not be offering any on-going compensation (land rent) to the land owner to make up for the risks involved with having diluted bitumen travel through their property. Given the public interest and publicity from the media about pipelines these days, this will limit future prospective buyers from taking interest in my residential home and farm. It seems to me that if TransCanada corporation is paying taxes to the Ontario government to have the pipeline run through the province, the land owners who are exposed to the greatest risks of having this pipeline run through their property should receive rental income as well. The agreements that have been in place between TransCanada and the land owner are from several decades ago and will no longer be applicable if the new proposal gets accepted.
- The utility and facility companies are not required to remove the pipeline on residential and farm land after its end of life. Loss of land use within the easement will be enforced by law due to dangers caused by weakening pipeline walls. The land owner should have the same rights to the land they once had and shouldn't be faced with any loss of land use. In speaking with a Land Solutions representative who is affiliated with the TransCanada corporation, I asked if the pipeline would be removed from my farm property after the pipeline has been decommissioned. The person from Land Solutions covering my area said that it would be next to impossible to remove all the pipelines as it would be far too costly for the company. This has me deeply concerned as the pipeline will likely remain in the ground afterwards and they will likely do the minimum clean up.

- In the event the utility or facility companies were to go out of business, it seems that the land owner would become responsible for any contamination caused by left over bitumen residue that might have been left behind from the clean-up after the pipeline has been deemed abandoned. Any contamination that would affect other nearby land owners would make the owner with the abandoned pipeline liable.

Answers to Question 2

- Given that we are dealing with an aging pipeline that will be converted to transport diluted bitumen this will very likely result in many spills over the coming years. Given the fact that this converted pipeline will be running in parallel (10 metres away) to a second NAT gas pipeline it also increases the risk of far greater explosion that will cause wide spread bitumen contamination and may result in human injuries or casualties in more populated areas such as we witnessed with Lac Mégantic. Allowing the use of this aging pipeline will leave the OEB in a very difficult set of circumstance that will not only ruin their reputation, but will leave them overwhelmed with never ending set of circumstances. If Canadians want to recognize oil pipelines as a viable solution this energy east pipeline should be stopped until proper measures are put in place to ensure safety for our people and our fresh water reserves.
- Property owners are receiving absolutely no benefit to deal with the risks of having this diluted bitumen oil pipeline run through their property. Property devaluation is a sure thing as reports of failed pipelines will continue to be published throughout the media. The land owner should be collecting rent on the pipeline easement just as they are paying taxes on the land to the Ontario Government.
- Pipelines that were installed by the utility company should also be removed when they are no longer in use. Abandoned pipelines that are left in the ground will discourage future prospective buyers from buying my property.
- Canada is known for its fresh water supply that has now become the most valuable resource in the world. Such destruction to our water tables caused by this aging pipeline will prove to be far more detrimental to our economy in the future.