

Appendix C – Comment Form Submissions

This appendix contains feedback received from individuals through the comment form on the OEB Energy East Consultation website (ontarioenergyboard.ca/uebenergyeast) up to May 15th, 2014. Each participant's comments have been recorded separately. Participants' names or other personal identifying information (where provided by the participant) have been removed to ensure anonymity.

1	Oil should stay in the ground if we are to preserve the earth.
2	<p>Thank you for providing an opportunity to submit comments with respect to this very important issue. I would like to offer the following five comments for your consideration.</p> <p>(1) Governments must, of course, honour, to the maximum extent, the spirit and letter of all commitments to Aboriginal Peoples.</p> <p>(2) It should, of course, also go without saying that it is absolutely essential that any changes to the use or structure of the pipeline must meet the most stringent possible safety standards and that the views of the best internationally available independent safety experts be obtained and made public with respect to the issue of public safety.</p> <p>(3) Any new approval should maximize jobs for permanent residents of Canada with respect to any construction. It should also ensure that materials which are transported through the pipeline are processed to the maximum extent possible within Canada and are not exported in their natural or quasi-natural state for processing in other countries. Moreover, the owner of the pipeline should be required, as a condition of any approval, to arrange, at its cost, for the construction in Canada of the necessary facilities to process and upgrade materials which are transported through the pipeline so as to support to the greatest extent possible long-term employment for permanent residents of Canada and provide the greatest possible revenue to all levels of government in Canada.</p> <p>(4) Any new approval should ensure that Ontario receives fair compensation for allowing materials to cross its land.</p> <p>(5) Any new approval should require the companies which own the pipeline or which own any materials being carried by the pipeline to accept unlimited liability in the event of an accident. The officers and shareholders of those companies should also be required to accept the same unlimited personal liability in the event of any accidents ; i.e. the officers and shareholders of those companies should not be allowed to hide behind a corporate veil and there should be no limit on the amount of compensation that the companies, their officers and shareholders must pay to compensate victims in the event of accidents.</p> <p>Once again, thank you for inviting and considering my views.</p> <p>██████████</p>
3	<p>I oppose the conversion of the pipeline to carry dilbit for the main reason that by developing this infrastructure the rapid expansion of Alberta tar sands/oil sands is all but guaranteed. Even the International Energy Agency warns of “the long lifetime of capital stock in the energy sector.” And says that “failure to deter additional investment in emissions-intensive infrastructure, thereby ‘locking in’ emissions for decades to come” will only make addressing the climate change challenge “more costly and difficult to achieve.”</p> <p>I ask that the evidence of the critical nature of climate change as as presented by the scientific community be given particularly high weight when making recommendations to go to the NEB.</p>

	We MUST begin to stand down from our present course. The Energy East project is another major step in the exact opposite direction.
4	If the TransCanada (Energy East) pipeline is converted to carry oil, how will Ontario get its natural gas. Aren't most of us in cities now heating with natural gas?
5	<p>1. Has Trans Canada submitted proof that it is safe to convert an old pipeline from carrying natural gas to transporting diluted bitumen? Bitumen is a totally different product and, if it escapes, could poison the farmland and our rivers.</p> <p>2. I understand that the conversion will cost \$12B. Where will the money come from for this project?</p> <p>3. What will happen to our natural gas supplies?</p> <p>4. Trans Canada says it has been holding meetings where stakeholders live. I and many other Ottawans are stakeholders because we buy food grown on the farms and we drink the water from the Ottawa River system and its tributaries. Yet, Trans Canada has held no meetings in Ottawa.</p> <p>5. What emergency measures will Trans Canada take, if the pipeline bursts? Will the Ontario government demand a significant bond from the company so that there is money in reserve if the pipeline should burst?</p> <p>6. What is involved in a cleanup to restore the soil and water? All the microorganisms must be restored to the soil because they transfer minerals to our food. How will the company restore our rivers if they become polluted from bitumen? Do they have plans?</p> <p>7. How quickly can the diluted bitumen be shut off if it starts to leak or pour out of a burst pipe? How many guards will be stationed along the pipeline so that the company can be alerted to an accidental spill quickly?</p> <p>8. I understand that Trans Canada is planning to put new pipe under our rivers. Shouldn't the entire pipeline be replaced with steel of the latest standards? &. Can Trans Canada be trusted to give good and honest advice? I don't think so It was Trans Canada that advised the Ontario Government incorrectly about the location of the gas generating stations in Southern Ontario. One of their pipelines only recently burst in Manitoba. According to the recent report from the US, the Keystone XL pipeline does cross a major aquifer, yet Trans Canada has been saying that it doesn't.</p> <p>9. I don't believe that there will be jobs for Ontarians in this pipeline. Trans Canada wants to risk Ontario's rich farmland and fresh water to ship Alberta bitumen to the East Coast. Why should Ontarians take the risk?</p> <p>10. I have many more questions and comments, but these will have to do for now</p>

6	<p>Hey,</p> <p>It's my understanding that the greenhouse gas emissions that this pipeline will allow to be emitted from the oil sands won't be considered in the decision to approve or not approve the pipeline. Why is that? The oil needs a method to get it to market if it's going to be extracted and a pipeline provides that. The government has a target to reduce GHG emissions 17% below 2005 levels by 2020. 2005 levels were 737mt and with current measures in place they're expected to be 11% higher at 815mt by 2030(http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/submitted_natcom/application/pdf/final_nc_br_dec20,_2013%5B1%5D.pdf). The government can introduce some new measures, but it really doesn't look like we'll even come close to meeting those already weakened targets from my perspective. The oil sands are the largest and fastest growing source of GHG emissions in the country (7.8% of all emissions in 2013 according to CAPP, with production expected to double by 2020 and to represent 14% of all emissions according to Canada's emissions trends report, and just growing from there). So given the oil sands are a serious issue in terms of GHG emissions and this pipeline is connected to them, why not consider it in the assessment?</p> <p>A second related question. Is no regulatory approval required to start shipping bitumen by rail, or other types of oil?</p> <p>Thanks, [REDACTED]</p>
7	<p>Hey,</p> <p>It's my understanding that greenhouse gas emissions from increased oil production won't be considered as part of the implications of the pipeline, and was wondering why that is?</p> <p>It seems to me without a means to transport oil the oil won't be produced. My understanding is that much of the oil that will flow through the proposed energy east pipeline will come from the oil sands. They currently represent 8% of Canada's total emissions now according to CAPP and a Canada's Emissions Trend report says they're projected to represent 14% of emissions by 2020, and they're expected to triple production by 2045 (so maybe 20% by then?). It's the largest and fastest growing source of GHG emissions in the country.</p> <p>The current governments already weakened GHG emissions reduction targets are to reduce emissions 17% below 2005 by 2020. According to a recent report the government sent to the UN emissions are expected to be 11% above 2005 by 2030 with current measures in place (http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/submitted_natcom/application/pdf/final_nc_br_dec20,_2013%5B1%5D.pdf).</p> <p>So it looks like we're nowhere near making any GHG emissions reduction targets, the expansion of the oil sands seems to be a big reason for that, and the expansion of the oil sands is connected to this pipeline. So why not consider that in the implications of the pipeline?</p> <p>Also, a second related question. Is no regulatory approval required to have rail start shipping different types of oil? And if so why</p>

	<p>not, given that pipelines need approval?</p> <p>Thanks, [REDACTED]</p>
8	<p>This isn't a necessary step for the public, or in the public interest. This is an exercise in industrial expansion for the benefit of a handful of companies in one industry. I do not support expanding a dangerous and environmentally ruinous industry just to create a handful of short-term jobs. This permanent destruction will be around long after the short term benefits of this proposal. This proposal will soon enough need infrastructure updating and renewal. The employees hired will have been automated and layed-off. The profits will never reach Canadians, only further more exploitation and exploration by the industry and line the pockets of executives and shareholders who are nowhere near the pipeline.</p> <p>In 20 years, before the full scale of environmental destruction of this pipeline is realized, the profits will begin to slow and shareholders will demand the company make applications to loosen safety regulations, increase capacity, and make more profit. Stop expansion now of an industry NEVER satisfied.</p> <p>The only way for the industry to truly speak of the impacts accurately would be for each employee, executive, and shareholder to live right alongside this pipeline. Have it come through their property and receive no compensation when the problem does occur. Allow them to take the risk themselves- in the name profits, economy, jobs, foreign markets, exports, long-term energy security, etc. etc.</p> <p>The OEB should consider the interests of consumers not just industry. Nor should it be considered a provincial body 'representing' Ontarians.</p>
9	<p>Please explain why the "site assessments along the existing corridor between the City of Markham and Iroquois...final requirements for any additional infrastructure..." are not included in the OEB Energy East consultation process?</p> <p>Literature recently (January 2014) provided to Landowners titled "Trans Canada's Proposed Canadian Mainline Natural Gas Pipeline Expansion", indicates that "a detailed routing assessment will reflect stakeholder</p>
10	<p>This pipeline will result in disastrous consequences for the environment, human health, and the economy. I will oppose it by all possible means.</p>
11	<p>I am a stakeholder because I buy locally grown organic food and the waters from the Ottawa River basin supply my family. The risk to public health and the environment is too great from a spill that could surely come from putting diluted bitumen in the old gas pipeline. This projected pipeline will give profits to Alberta while Ontario takes all the risk.</p> <p>I do not trust the NEB as it seems to approve everything Alberta Oil wants. Futhermore the NEB is not honest with the Canadian public: why did the NEB not in Canadians about the spill in the Dene lands of Northern Alberta in 2009 until years later?</p>

	<p>If we need oil in Ontario, we should get it from Newfoundland.</p>
12	<p>Below is one article of many recent critical reports pointing to why major pipeline ruptures and ecological catastrophes are inevitable. Moving heavier than oil flammable liquids by antiquated, designed for gas pipelines through countless watersheds and communities is plain stupid, smacks of corporate greed and political expediency. My family is 100% against the transport of dicit across Canada!</p> <p>CALGARY—The whistleblower who sparked a National Energy Board (NEB) audit of TransCanada Corp.'s safety practices has lashed out against the energy watchdog for its “toothless” review.</p> <p>Former TransCanada pipeline engineer Evan Vokes criticized the audit released late last month and said the NEB is not going far enough to prevent pipeline breaks.</p> <p>“Unless the NEB is willing to engage on-the-ground to ensure that TransCanada is actually constructing and maintaining pipelines that are safe, future ruptures are inevitable,” Vokes said in a statement released by lawyers representing him.</p> <p>The audit of the Calgary-based firm's safety practices found TransCanada was non-compliant in four out of nine areas, including: hazard identification, risk assessment and control; operational control in upset or abnormal operating condition; inspection, measurement and monitoring; and management review.</p> <p>However, the board said a finding of non-compliance does not necessarily mean there's an immediate safety hazard.</p> <p>TransCanada is now required to file a corrective action plan with the NEB within 30 days detailing how it intends to fix the problems.</p> <p>Vokes, though, said he is concerned that the audit leaves a number of safety concerns unaddressed.</p> <p>“In my experience, TransCanada's management failings are systemic, and cannot be fixed by a review of what TransCanada says its policies are on paper,” he said. “Time and again, TransCanada's audit systems have failed to catch substandard engineering on its pipelines.”</p> <p>Vokes' statement issued by his lawyers claims the former TransCanada employee “specifically raised red flags regarding the strength of welds” along one of the company's pipelines in northern Alberta.</p> <p>He also raised similar concerns regarding the existing Canadian section of TransCanada's Keystone XL project, claiming the pipeline doesn't meet design standards.</p> <p>The statement goes on to allege the company modified its internal guidelines outlining what it considers an “acceptable risk” after Vokes brought the issues up with management.</p>

	<p>The NEB acknowledged a former TransCanada employee came forward with allegations of safety lapses, though it did not name the employee or specify what those allegations surrounded.</p> <p>It did say it is investigating certain steel pipe and fittings on the existing Keystone system “with the potential to exhibit lower than specified yield strength.”</p> <p>The audit comes as TransCanada awaits a decision from the United States government on the fate of the controversial US\$5.4-billion pipeline that would move Alberta oilsands crude to Gulf Coast refineries.</p> <p>THE BETTER OPTION IS TO PROCESS THE TAR SANDS BITUMEN IN ALBERTA AND TRANSPORT REFINED PRODUCT BY PIPELINE</p>
13	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I'm interested in this pipeline project.</p> <p>I just want to add that the Groundhog River between the Mattagami and the Kapuskasing Rivers was missed from your Ontario list and it also happens to be the healthiest river with a self-sustaining lake sturgeon population.</p> <p>If I read your posted document right, this error must be corrected.</p> <p>I would like to be on the mailing list.</p> <p>██████</p>
14	<p>Is there a link on your site or a more inative map showing where the proposed pipeline will run through the Ottawa Valley, Renfrew County, and specifically Laurentian Valley Twp.?</p> <p>There must be a Google map where I and others can Google in (zoom in and zoom out) to see the proposed Energy East Pipeline?</p> <p>I need to Google in and out on a Google like map to see the specific proposed route.</p> <p>If not, a lack of such a map (even the proposed route) makes it hard to discuss how the pipeline will affect me, others, the environment, etc.</p> <p>In my opinion, your colorful map_full.jpg map is too elementary and not specific enough nor inative enough for such a important public consultation.</p>


	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>██████████</p>
15	<p>I noticed more errors in the document that lists rivers and watershed in the province of Ontario.</p> <p>1.11.4 forgot to list both the Missinaibi and the Groundhog Rivers. Maybe its because they are both waterway provincial parks.</p> <p>The other more disastrous mistake is calling those river in the St Lawrence watershed and not the Arctic watershed.</p> <p>They are off to a bad start.</p>
16	<p>1) Has any regulatory agency conducted a study to determine the level of energy conservation in eastern Canada that would reduce energy demand to the point where this pipeline would be non-economic?</p> <p>2) Has any study been conducted to determine the total investment needed to reduce energy demand in eastern Canada, to the point where this pipeline would be non-economic?</p>
17	<p>At present I have 2 gas pipelines passing through my property and my house is about 60 meters from the pipelines. Trans-Canada Pipelines wants to convert 1 line to bitumen oil.</p> <p>My concern is about a leak in the oil pipeline. My dug well is spring fed and the spring flows underneath the pipeline. If there is a leak in the oil pipeline, the oil will sink and my well will be contaminated. What will TCP do to remedy this situation? Also if a leak occurs my property value will be greatly reduced. How will TCP compensate me? Will they buy me property at pre-leak valuation?</p> <p>The bitumen is diluted with benzene, toluene and other toxic chemicals. If there is a leak, these very toxic chemicals will be released into the air.</p> <p>The pipeline goes under Four Mile Creek (also on my property) which empties into Trout Lake which is the water supply for North Bay. What will TCP do if oil spills into this creek and then into Trout Lake?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
18	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I think that carrying diluted with chemicals bitumen through pipelines is a risk that I am not willing to endorse. I do not believe we are immune from what happened in Michigan's Kalamazoo river. I put the preservation of drinking water above all else. I believe the government should focus on energy conservation and alternative energy production. I do not believe we have a right to consume energy or profit from energy sales at the potential expense of future generations' well being. We must look out for</p>

	<p>public health and the interest of future generations.</p> <p>thank you, [REDACTED]</p>
19	<p>The proposed TCP pipeline, from any technical or scientific point of view should be seen to be untenable. It is simply not safe, and the implication for the Energy East conversion from natural gas to tarsands dilbit is potentially disasterous.</p> <p>I say this after having reviewed the findings of two federal regulatory studies in Canada and the US: The Transportation Safety Board of Canada report on the Trans Canada Corp natural gas explosion of Feb 19, 2011, near Beardmore, Ontario; and the US National Transportation Board report on the Enbridge spill of July 25, 2010 -- which dumped approximately 900 thousand gallons of tarsands dilbit into Talmadge Creek and the Kalamazoo River in Michigan. I urge you to please read both reports as they are basically important for your considerations. They are both very easy to find on the internet.</p> <p>Common cause in both incidents was the combination of: an aged pipeline, failed protective coatings, and stress corrosion cracks.</p> <p>The first incident near Beardmore Ontario tells us that the naturual gas pipeline that is being proposed to carry dilbit is not sustainable (it is too old and likely to be too full of stress cracks to be viable), and the Michigan incident tells us what happens when dilbit spills. Of course, it sinks to the bottom of the water system, rather than floats. Consequently, in Michigan, after three years it has cost Enbridge approximately \$1 billion, and still the Michigan environmental authorities are not satisfied.</p> <p>The vast wilderness of Northwest Ontario, through which the Energy East pipeline would transport tarsands dilbit, is the pristine watershed for Lake Superior. We must all do what we can to protect this natural environment and resource for our children -- and theirs.</p> <p>I believe, that if TCP's Energy East pipeline proposal is allowed, it will not be a matter of "if" there will be a spill, but "when" and "where" -- and how much it will cost us all. Surely we do not want such an obvious mistake on our collective consciences.</p> <p>Respectfully, [REDACTED]</p>
20	<p>To Whom It May Concern, I am 100% opposed to any construction/re-purposing of pipelines for the transportation of diluted bitumen to any location. Stopping this proposal is about three things: 1) avoiding catastrophic climate change; 2) avoiding predictable and deadly spills; 3) respecting First Nation land rights. The concern is not "if" it will result in catastrophic results it's about "when" and "where". It's already happened in Kalamazoo Michigan!</p> <p>Enough is enough - when will we begin giving the environment the respect it deserves rather than putting the interests of big</p>

	<p>corporations and the mighty dollar first?????????</p> <p>██████████</p>
21	<p>I am strongly opposed to this 40 yr old pipeline to be used to transport toxic petroleum product across our precious landscape. I am speaking on behalf of my children, and the future of not only the areas that this pipeline crosses, but the environment that our future populations will be relying on. I am thinking about these future generations, who would be furious to know, that people who cared about them did not speak up, and speak out. I don't want to be part of a generation that leaves a planet barely habitable, I want to leave a thriving healthy land that allows our future generations to thrive. So, NO, I, and every other caring individual, is opposed to this pipeline, and would rather see innovative and more creative energy (no pun intended) put towards green energy, active transportation, and truly sustainable practices for humanity. I truly hope those in positions of power choose to care about the longterm, too.</p>
22	<p>After reviewing ination pertaining to the project my personal opinion is that the social and economic benefits of the proposed Energy East Pipeline far outweigh the potential environmental concerns.</p>
23	<p>As a grandparent I have a fairly simplistic outlook on the issue of adding new pipelines in order to bring more fossil fuels to market--meaning adding more co2 and other GHG into an already saturated atmosphere and ocean environment. The message from the scientific community is loud and clear--We need to stop burning fossil fuels. Therefore it stands to reason that we need to say no to projects such as the Energy East Pipeline which by design will only exacerbate an already untenable situation--No more business as usual!</p> <p>Please tell the Energy East people no to their project and suggest they invest in clean renewable green energy.</p> <p>Thank You</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████████████</p>
24	<p>I attended the meeting in Thunder Bay last night. It was well run, with the best of intentions, but I found the whole thing surreal. It was a calm rational discussion about the destruction of a pristine environment. Pipeline spills are inevitable whether the pipeline is old or new. Look at the record. Certainly, assurances from the company that everything will be fine is not good enough me.</p> <p>CLIMATE CHANGE. Say the words out loud. It's okay. Are we all in denial here? This should be in the forefront of all discussions</p>

	<p>about fossil fuel and pipeline development.</p> <p>Last night it seemed politically incorrect to say the words. Climate change.</p> <p>Canada, the petrostate. I sincerely hope not for the sake of my grandchildren. Oil is a curse. People seem to lose their power of reasoning and greed takes over.</p>
25	<p>Hi Is there any amount of acceptable leaks from this pipeline? Is this pipe leak proof? What are your plans to obtain a 100% leak free pipeline? I do not support this pipeline with an already old and leaky pipe. [REDACTED]</p>
26	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>Further to reviewing this proposed oil route. I have determined that it would be irresponsible for us to think that there would not be any chances of oil leaks on the pipeline. This is an irresponsible decision based primarily on monetary value as apposed to looking at it from a preservation of envirnment perspective. When the pipeline leaks who will be responsible for the cleanup, the local municipalities or the company responsible for shipping the oil?</p> <p>This needs to be reviewed further, a vote should be taken. Half ass measures shouldnt even be considered when dealing with the potential to effect our environment further than we already do extracting the resources to begin with.</p> <p>If this isnt reviewed further to making a decision , maybe the public should review if our elected officials are doing their jobs to protect Canadians health and our environment.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
27	<p>The proposal calls for converting a 50-year-old natural gas pipeline to transport 1.1 million barrels of diluted bitumen through northwestern Ontario daily. The pipeline crosses the headwaters of the Current, Mackenzie, Wolf, Black Sturgeon and Nipigon Rivers, all of which flow into Lake Superior. Natural gas leaks (even explosions) have occurred but they dissipate into the atmosphere. Dilbit leaks will flow downstream resulting in far more serious impacts on human health and the environment. We do not support this proposal but if the OEB does, a new, double-walled oil pipeline be constructed.</p> <p>The Alberta tarsands currently produce 7% of Canada's greenhouse gas output. EnergyEast would boost that figure to 10%+. Globally, we hear of China's poor environmental record and yet Canada presently produces 3 times the greenhouse gas per capita of China. EnergyEast leads us further down that unsustainable road. The OEB should not support the proposal. Expanding the tarsands to satisfy corporate greed and conspicuous consumption is obscene.</p>
28	<p>I am deeply concerned by Trans Canada Corporation's Energy East proposal to export tar sands oil in converted natural gas</p>



	<p>pipelines through Northern Ontario.</p> <p>First, Energy East is not compatible with a sustainable climate. Investment in new, massive fossil-fuel infrastructure will lock us into growing carbon emissions at a time when we must quickly reduce them. If allowed, Canada will not be able to meet any meaningful climate target. Neither will it allow us to develop new alternative energies.</p> <p>Secondly, it is not safe. As a natural gas pipeline it has had 12 natural gas explosions since 1992. Stress corrosion cracking in a 40 year old pipeline will, without doubt, result in more ruptures. The bitumen itself is virtually impossible to clean up, and the diluents which liquefy it are explosive for 24-72 hours after a spill.</p> <p>Finally, just one pipeline rupture could cause significant and permanent damage to the local economy, the health of our citizens, and to the sensitive ecosystems within the Lake Superior watershed. All of these things far outweigh the perceived benefits.</p> <p>As a Thunder Bay resident, I call on Mayor Hobbs and the Thunder Bay City Council to examine this issue, participate fully in the Ontario Energy Board and National Energy Board hearings, and to take a stand against Trans Canada's Energy East proposal.</p>
29	<p>What would be the consequences of a disruption of the flow of natural gas to Eastern Canada in the middle of winter, if we had only one pipeline? Has this question ever been raised?</p>
30	<p>April 2nd 'Townhall' Smiths Falls re: Converting gas pipe to Oil!</p> <p>Good evening I'm an Edinburgh Engineer with a McGill 'Iron Ring' & also a Wharton Economist with a 'Total' solution to this problem, by bringing in an eminent Panel of three Nobel Laureates: in Physics, Chemistry & Economics.</p> <p>Using the Delphi technique the 'solution' likely found, will be to pump the Oil as far as North Western Lake Superior; & using our new Canada Action Plan, to mobilize a whole new young generation of Chartered, Professional Engineers, Technologists & Technicians, to create a transation Facility, near the Lake, in order to keep the Value Added, in Western Ontario, rather than transferring it out of Province or even out of</p>


	<p>Country! QED Of course this eminent panel likely sourced thru the Perimeter Institute could be put in our Senate, Hugh Segal has just vacated a Seat.</p> <p>Cc: Shared with the Council of Canadians rep.</p>
31	<p>How does the 'polluter pays' principle apply to TransCanada?</p> <p>It seems that it is well-established that petroleum from the Alberta oil sands is some of the most carbon-intensive carbon fuel available in the global supply of energy. It is the worst, therefore it should be used last, or not at all.</p> <p>So the companies extracting and profiting from this most polluting resource should be paying forward the damage they are contributing to the global climate, current and future generations.</p> <p>Having heard the summary report from the IPCC (just released), what is our generation of citizens, leaders, regulators, politicians doing about all this?</p> <p>Climate change is the most serious problem facing our generation. What are we doing about it individually and collectively?</p> <p>Also, what are we allowing to happen, while standing by passively...knowing in our hearts that it is wrong but somehow not seizing the moment to act and use whatever power, influence and privilege we have to stop something that is harmful?</p> <p>These are my questions,</p> <p></p> <p>Parent of two children Educated and privileged person Resident in Ottawa</p>
32	<p>Climate Change is our greatest challenge. The recent IPCC report is alarming and confirms that we have to get off fossil fuels.</p> <p>We simply can not burn all the fossil fuels that we've found; most will have to stay on the ground.</p> <p>Pipelines are too risky and simply encourage us to go the wrong way. They are old technology and one that endangers our existence on this planet. We should be phasing them out, not the opposite.</p> <p>Risk is a personal judgement, not a scientific fact, and we all decide what levels of risk we are prepared to live with in our lives.</p>


	<p>Specifically the Energy East pipeline constitutes a risk that personally I am not prepared to assume or continue to live with.</p> <p>Please do not approve it.</p>
33	<p>Canada needs climate and energy policies before we build any more pipelines.</p> <p>THE SCIENCE</p> <p>The last stable Greenland icesheet is no longer stable and the Pacific Ocean is acidifying faster than expected. The March 31, 2014 climate impacts report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change are clear: on our current CO2 emissions trajectory we face a real threat to global security; the situation is not hopeless; and the solution is to cut emissions.</p> <p>CANADA'S GHG EMISSIONS</p> <p>However, Environment Canada's own numbers show we are on track to blow past our 2020 emission targets by 20% releasing 734 Mt CO2 in that year. By 2030, our emissions will grow to 815 Mt CO2 and much of the increase will be from the oil sands.</p> <p>CANADA RANKS POORLY</p> <p>As well, a March 2014 report from Globe International revealed that 62 of 66 Nations studied have either passed or are pushing for compelling and energy-relevant laws. Canada was not one of them. Germanwatch's Climate Change Perance Index 2014 ranked Canada 58 out 61 countries for their combined climate and energy policies.</p> <p>THREE CONCERNS</p> <p>1) National Security: A New Strategic Narrative for the USA was presented to the President of the United States in 2011. The report clearly highlights climate change must be addressed to achieve global and national security.</p> <p>2) Financial collapse: We can only burn about 24% of the known fossil fuel reserves or the impacts will become dire. This carbon bubble, caused by the intensification climate impacts, means there is a real risk for stranded assets and financial collapse. In October 2013, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was quite clear about the risks, "Unlike the financial crisis [2008], we do not have a 'climate bailout option' up our sleeves".</p> <p>In March 2014, British Petroleum (BP) called for a price on carbon to avoid the worst impacts of climate change and Shell and Exxon alerted their shareholders about the coming carbon bubble. Andrew Logan, director of the oil and gas program at Ceres said in a Globe and Mail article, "Of all the assets an oil company can own, the oil sands raises the most concern." This is not new news. A 2010 MIT report clearly stated that under carbon caps worldwide, Canada's bitumen industry becomes economically non-viable through to the 2050 horizon even with carbon capture and sequestration</p> <p>3) Missing out on the clean tech revolution: In a 2009 report in Scientific American , Jacobson and Delucci showed that we can meet the entire world's energy needs with renewables in 20 years and that we can do it for the same money that we'd be spending on fossil fuel power. A February 2014 study by the International Energy Agency found that any country can reach high shares of wind and solar power cost effectively.</p> <p>CLIMATE AND ENERGY POLICY = CLEAN TECH JOBS</p> <p>Canada needs compelling climate and energy policies and British Columbia is showing us the way. A March 2014 report by Analytica Advisors found that between 2008, when British Columbia legislated a revenue neutral carbon tax, and 2010, the province's clean technology sector grew by 48 per cent, their GHG emissions dropped and their GDP grew above the national average.</p> <p>Given these facts presented to the OEB, my recommendation is Canada needs to create a comprehensive climate and energy policy before we approve the Energy East pipelines.</p>


34	<p>First of all, thank you so much for taking the initiative to consult with citizens when the federal process has been found completely lacking on all accounts.</p> <p>I am strongly opposed to any of the pipeline projects from the Alberta oilsands, or any oilsands for that matter.</p> <p>1) Diluted bitumen is not oil. We don't know how to clean it up when it mixes with water. When it spills, it lets off toxic gases and residents must evacuate their homes. It does not flow nicely through a pipe, hence the dilution of it with highly toxic and flammable chemicals. These pipes were never made to handle dilbit, and I don't have any faith in the capability to do this.</p> <p>2) Spills from these pipelines (which are guaranteed to happen), have the potential to contaminate drinking water supplies based on the line 9 route. See #1 above - we don't know how to clean up spills in water since this stuff sinks. This is unacceptable. Water is going to become a scarcer and more precious commodity every decade going forward, and we cannot risk it for the sake of oil profits</p> <p>3) All of these pipelines are about getting oil/dilbit to offshore markets. But international companies own the oil sands. So non-Canadian companies want to sell their products (our resources) to non-Canadian buyers. It makes 0 sense for Canada to assume 100% of the environmental risk, and to have taxpayers on the hook for the environmental clean-up and remediation when spills occur.</p> <p>4) Climate change is here and now. Investing in more fossil fuel projects, especially from dirty sources like oilsands, is only digging ourselves deeper into the hole. We need to stop this "investment" now, and dedicate all resources to clean fuels.</p> <p>5) Pipelines have been trumpeted as a job creator. However, I have seen many analyses that green energy would create even more jobs. There are also other sectors that would lose jobs when spills occur (tourism, fishing, farming etc), that need to be balanced against a handful of temporary jobs in pipeline construction.</p> <p>For all these reasons, this pipeline project needs to be axed. It is not in Ontario's interest, it is not in Canada's interest, and it is not in the global interest.</p>
35	<p>I don't feel there is any benefit to Ontario for the Energy East Pipeline.</p> <p>It's not worth it. Ontarians will end up paying, cleanups, sickness, polluted water, dead wildlife.</p> <p>Limiting climate change... "means that three quarters of the fossil fuel reserves need to stay in the ground, and the fossil fuels we do use must be utilized sparingly and responsibly," Christiana Figueres of the UN.</p> <p>NASA's James Hansen says if we exploit the tar sands it's game over for the climate (I believe him)</p>

	<p>Because of extreme carbon in our atmosphere our oceans are becoming acidic, killing life in them. Life like phytoplankton. We get half of our oxygen from them. Our oceans could fail by 2048.</p> <p>I assume someone is reading this. Doesn't this scare you. People before profits.</p> <p>thanks</p>
36	<p>OEB meeting North Bay - April 2, 2014</p> <p>That meeting was excellent - a refreshing display of democracy in action! Thank you.</p> <p>I took pictures of your maps showing the pumping station on NPS 42 and these are all the current compressor stations on the current line. It doesn't have the repeater stations and there is a lot of them. I attended the TCPL EEP presentation the night before and spent some time with the Stantec location maps (Pipeline corridor with NPS 42, Kilometre posts, repeater stations (according to the explanation I got these push the DILBIT along i.e. I take it mean these are pumps - necessary to push a liquid along.) I trust you have these maps but am unsure.</p> <p>I gave a copy of 6 11X17 maps to one of your representative (a lady badge name Toina)and promised a web link to these maps along with an explanation -- http://home.cogeco.ca/~fool/ScenarioMaps.</p> <p>I explained to her that I did this because I found very few people realized where the pipeline was or the difference between transporting Natural Gas (leaks or ruptures go up into the air) and DILBIT (like all liquids will seek out watercourses -- where it has a tendency to be overwashed i.e. "a condition where it neither sinks to the bottom nor floats to the top, but remains trapped somewhere in the water column." and follows them into the main stream which is the Ottawa River (the pipeline closely follows and is normally within 20 km. of that river) which means the whole river and all the people along it are in some jeopardy in the future.</p> <p>In 2010 a puny little spill of 3,300 cubic metres went down 56 kilometres (Talmadge creek, Battle creek and Kalamazoo River in just a few days -- because it doesn't float like oil but was suspended (see above) normal catch and extract methods of the EPA and Oil Companies didn't work and that was in areas where the waters were accessible by equipment at a great many spots.</p> <p>This spill was actually very small particularly with regard to the spills reported to the Transportation Safety Board of Canada - pipelines.</p> <p>Feb 19,2011 P11H0011 Beardmore ON -- 2,790,000 m3. (this was 846 times greater than Kalamazoo) Sep 26,2009 P09H0083 Martin River ON -- 1,430,000 m3. (this was 433 times greater than Kalamazoo) Sep 12,2009 P09H0074 Englehart ON -- 3,420,000 m3. (this was 1,036 times greater than Kalamazoo) Jul 23,1991 P94H0036 Latchford ON -- 4,194,000 m3. (this was 1,271 times greater than Kalamazoo) May 30, 1979 Englehart ON Timmins Times (this was news media)</p>

	<p>Oct 13, 1977 North Bay ON Nugget(near Hwy 17) (this was news media) Oct 13, 1975 Englehart ON Wikipedia May 17, 1961 North Bay ON Nugget Airport Road. (this was news media)</p> <p>For some reason all of the above were complete ruptures of the pipe and they occurred in exposed Canadian Shield bare rocky areas: Perhaps this should be studied as part of the Risk Assessment analysis that the NEB will surely have TCPL commission and complete.</p> <p>I am trying to finish off a web page regarding this pipeline conversion and it's consequences which I will forward to you as early as possible.</p> <p>Thanking you for agreeing to be an intervenor for us before the NEB, I am</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>  <p>If this comes out garbled with that silly little box provided I would be happy to send this via regular email. I use web links to provide documentation to my statements and notice these are not provided – </p>
37	<p>I do not want a pipeline carrying oil running through our watershed area and farmland. The history of oil spills show that it happens frequently and their ability to fully clean up any oil spills show it to be impossible. This would have too large an impact on human lives that reside anywhere near this project. Water is vital to survival and this pipeline threatens Ontario's water supply. It is not worth it to the people of Ontario to risk our land and water so a large corporation can increase their profits at our risk. I do not trust their ability to ensure that our source of survival would not be threatened and they have already shown themselves to be insincere on any benefits to Ontario as it now shows that there would be none - only pure risk and history has also shown that it ends up being the tax payers of the regions of oil spills that end up footing the bill for clean up and these areas are still paying the price financially, environmentally and physically. It is a sad day when corporations making millions in profits end up being more important than generations of a country's people. Any oil spill along this pipeline would be a huge disaster to large populated areas of Ontario. It would offer us high cancer risks, loss of drinking water, loss of usable farm land and leave us all with unsaleable properties so we would be left unable to escape it. It offers nothing in return - so a lot of high risk with no benefit. NO to the pipeline. The people of Ontario are more important than this.</p>
38	<p>The proposed Energy East pipeline must NOT be approved.</p>

	<p>The pipeline a business venture. TransCanada Corp. wants the product to get out to higher-paying markets, doing so whatever way they can. First it was through B.C., then the Keystone XL, then Energy East. If the oil and pipeline industries wanted to build the nation and help eastern Canada in particular, they would have come east in the first place or built the refineries in Edmonton and helped build Canada by shipping the oil this way. It's a business venture, and it's money in their pocket primarily. We can and must be sympathetic to the needs of business and what that means to the general economy, but, because of our many other needs and concerns, we cannot and must not capitulate in this situation.</p> <p>It's high-risk. The diluent which is composed of hexane, benzene etc. in some proprietary ulation is highly toxic and volatile. Oil doesn't explode. The diluent does, as witnessed in Lac Magantic. Once it flashes off after a leak the remaining bitumen sinks and becomes virtually impossible to adequately clean up, as witnessed in Kalamazoo and Mayflower. A leak along the Ottawa or Rideau Rivers would be a similar long-lasting calamity. A leak into the Oxford or Nepean aquifers would be devastating for thousands of families south of Ottawa.</p> <p>Furthermore, the diluent has to be produced, either in Edmonton, or imported from elsewhere. In addition, once the Dilbit is refined the diluent has to be dealt with, either by local disposal, or by shipping it back by train to Edmonton. This part of the cycle of events cannot be kept out of the consideration being given to TransCanada's proposal.</p> <p>At this point in history the over-riding consideration has to be our fight to mitigate further climate change. Burning 1.1 million barrels of dilbit products per day is the exact opposite of what we should be doing as we face this most critical challenge. This is the deal breaker. The pipeline could be 2 inches thick, one solid piece of steel without a single weld from one end to the other, and perfect in every other way, but we still must be against it. The end result is the same: we would be burning more fossil fuel faster and faster, thereby destroying the future for ourselves and for the generations yet to come.</p> <p>We love fossil fuels in many ways except for this one thing: they're destroying us and our future. We must change a lot of things very fast, cutting back drastically on fossil fuels, thereby conserving them for future generations, and switching to renewables, among other things. Giving in to the oil industry, including TransCanada Corp., the conveyor of their products, is to be on the wrong side of history. The petro-age must end and a new age begun. It's now or it's game over.</p>
39	<p>In 2010 the North Bay Civic League conducted the Community Values Survey in North Bay. Over 500 people responded. The top value shared by the respondents was "Protecting the source of our drinking water is important."</p> <p>So it's little wonder that the strongest objections to the Energy East Pipeline project comes from North Bay. We have a history of caring about our water!</p> <p>Thanks, </p>
40	PLEASE STOP THE PIPELINE

	<p>PLEASE REINSTATE OUR ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS PLEASE FOLLOW THE 7 GENERATION RULES WHAT IS WRONG WITH YOU PEOPLE? WHY ARE YOU DESTROYING OUR CANADA?</p>
41	<p>I am 100% against this pipeline!!! We as a country will not gain anything from this. Just making rich people richer at the expense of our environment and fresh drinking water. I'd like to thank the government for leaving all of our fresh water unprotected in order to pass this though...</p> <p>The CANADIAN & ONTARIO GOVERNMENTS are squandering our children's future based on greed! They have allowed the cost of energy to sky rocket and will increase our poverty rates for WHAT? While they give themselves pay raises to do so.</p> <p>SHAME on you ALL!!!</p>
42	<p>Hello, I attended the OEB Energy East Consultation in Stittsville. I live in the Leeds & Grenville area (Merrickville), and am incredibly concerned about our water safety. As you heard at the meeting, our aquifer is incredibly sensitive to contaminants, I feel that as Canadians we should first and foremost have a right to clean water, and should this pipeline go through, we will more than likely have to live without it, and guess what? We can't! Should thousands of Canadians have to leave their homelands so that Transcanada can make more money overseas? Will we really continue to pollute ourselves to death?</p> <p>Sincerely </p>
43	<p>I say NO to the entire Energy East Pipeline project. Definitely no to it's passing through Ontario. Be proactive by investing in renewable resourses for the future. You can do better than oil, oil is a thing of the unenlightened past.</p>
44	<p>I am totally against the Energy East pipeline conversion for the following reasons:</p> <p>It poses a significant risk to our water. RISK. There is very little benefit to Canadians as it is for export. The benefit goes to the oil companies, some foreign owned.THEIR REWARD. Job numbers are inflated. Trans Canada has a poor safety record.</p>
45	<p>1. There is no documented plan on decommissioning the pipeline. The documents merely say "whatever the future laws require". I do not want my children to pay for problems we create today.</p> <p>2. Oil is old technology. It is climate-changing and toxic when it spills. Stop moving it around. Leave it in the ground.</p>

	3. Let me repeat that: leave it in the ground.
46	<p>I am concerned that this project's risks outweigh any possible rewards (especially for Ontarians). The pipeline route will cross countless important watersheds that feed into the drinking water for a large portion of North Americans. Recent history does not give the public any comfort that resource companies are willing to responsibly manage their pipeline assets - spill after spill clearly demonstrates that companies are willing to pay the cleanup costs rather than maintain, inspect and repair their facilities.</p> <p>I am also concerned that such a massive risk comes seemingly without any benefits for most Canadians - other than those working in the tar sands or at the Eastern refineries.</p> <p>I believe this project should be rejected in light of the severe environmental concerns. If the OEB were to approve this section of the pipeline, they should mandate a minimum of \$10B in insurance or bonds to cover any possible spill or accident that would jeopardize Ontario's ecosystems.</p>
47	<p>I live in Ottawa which is fortunate to have the Rideau River, Rideau canal and the Ottawa River run through or by it. In case of any environmental event along the Rideau River where the Energy East pipeline is projected to cross, all the above water-ways would be affected. This would mean the drinking water not just Ottawa but all the communities down river from it.</p> <p>The decision might make financial sense to the petroleum corporations but not to those who will have to live with the disaster.</p> <p>Thank you. </p>
48	This pipeline is a terrible idea. Tar free 613!!!
49	<p>I oppose the Energy East pipeline for several reasons, which I summarize here. The pipeline will carry an enormous, almost inconceivable amount of oil every day: 1.1 million barrels. This is not regular crude oil: it is diluted bitumen, which is even worse. For one thing, it sinks in water in case of a spill and is much harder to clean up, witness the spill in Kalamazoo, Michigan, a few years ago. The waters in and around Ottawa and throughout Ontario where this pipeline would pass will be vulnerable to spills and adverse environmental impacts. The proposed pipeline would make use of existing infrastructure but reverse the flow. This infrastructure is now old and cannot be safely upgraded to handle the greatly increased flow. Furthermore, we should be doing much more to avoid use and consumption of fossil fuels. This is even more necessary now as we become aware of the harm done by climate change, caused by increasing greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, much of them from burning fossil fuels. Ontario would be a conduit for this energy but would derive little or any benefit from it; it would be our risk and the fossil fuel industry's reward.</p>
50	<p>The pipeline may be good for short-term business, but it is bad for the future of the environment and our current way of life. The way we currently live is untenable and this pipeline would bring about its end sooner than expected. I am strongly opposed to this pipeline and I urge you to put a stop to it.</p>

51	<p>As I understand it The eastern pipeline will replace natural gas with oil. How will this impact the supply of natural gas to Eastern Ontario?</p>
52	<p>My family and I are strongly opposed the proposed Energy East tar sands pipeline through Ottawa. Those who support the pipeline will argue that a spill is unlikely, while those who oppose it argue that it is a real probability, given time, and unpredictable factors such as human error, natural disasters, and maintenance neglect. It does not matter who is right. What matters is if - or when - there is a spill, it would be a health, ecosystem, and economic disaster. If there is a spill, there are no real consequences for those supporting the pipeline at this time. So, they are risking very little in promising that there will be no problems. The government needs to step up and take responsibility for protecting the health and environment of its citizens. Short-term economic gain for a select group of individuals should not trump the greater good. The added consideration is that the pipeline is encouraging the expansion of the tar sands in Alberta. This will not have long-term benefits for all of Canadians or for the national or global environment. It is important for public officials and elected representatives to represent and plan for the long-term interests of Canadians, the Canadian environment, and the Canadian economy. The long-term health of the economy cannot depend on the expansion of unsustainable and environmentally damaging natural resource extraction such as Tar Sands in Alberta.</p>
53	<p>A fervent NO to the Energy East pipeline transmitting dirty oil through Ottawa.</p>
54	<p>The IPCC and many other bodies have been clear: we have to drastically and quickly reduce the consumption of fossil fuels.</p> <p>Pipelines have risks, direct and indirect, known and not so well known, that I do not want to take.</p> <p>Some of these risks and consequences will be borne by future generations, which is unacceptable to me.</p> <p>We should be working so that fossil fuels and related infrastructure become obsolete not more predominant.</p> <p>Please do not approve this project.</p>
55	<p>First, I would like to direct you to my NEB filing on the line 9B reversal http://www.neb-one.gc.ca/fetch.asp?language=E&ID=A3I8X9 where many of the same arguments apply. I am in the region of overlap between refineries fed on light sweet oil and those using increasingly carbon-intensive bitumen. If Energy East achieves its long-term goal of convincing refineries in Montreal, Lévis, and St John to invest in the delayed cokers or related equipment that would convert them irrevocably from light sweet oil to bitumen, then I would no longer have the option to choose a gas station having a lower carbon intensity for the same fuel product.</p> <p>The other issue is the current shortage of natural gas in Ontario. The OEB has approved doubling the rates for natural gas relative to April 2012. This is caused almost entirely by the failure of natural gas pipelines to supply their market at a reasonable rate. TCPL is proposing to aggravate this artificial scarcity and inflated transportation rates even further by taking part of its</p>

	<p>mainline capacity off the market. Having spent a great deal of their own money on reducing Canada's GHG emissions, Ontarians would now spend even more of their money in increasing those emissions again.</p> <p>Recent and future cost increases in Ontario can already be attributed to this project. In a move incompatible with its common carrier status, TCPL has been moving its natural gas customers to long-term multi-year firm contracts rather than interruptible ones, essentially asking utilities to predict the weather and economy years in advance. This type of contract has the effect of creating artificial scarcity like what we are now experiencing. Ontario consumers and the Ontario economy have already started paying the price for Energy East through these contractual changes that are designed to make room in the pipeline for Energy East. Perhaps by inflating the price, TCPL can cause a reduction in demand for natural gas and prove there is spare capacity in the mainline, but that is asking the entire Ontario economy to pay the price for the increased profitability of one regulated company.</p> <p>http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/battle-between-transcanada-and-customers-reflects-changing-market/article13744933/</p> <p>Looking at the entire effect on GHG emissions, Energy East would</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) increase the price and reduce the supply of natural gas, the lowest-emission fuel available 2) replace that capacity not only with higher-emission oil, but even higher-emission bitumen, whose emissions continue to increase as open-pit mining processes are replaced with twice-as-ghg-intensive in situ processes such as SAGD. 3) in total, carry a great deal more embodied carbon for roughly the same number of joules. 4) force the entire set of eastern refineries to retool so that they can no longer handle lower-GHG grades of light oil and are instead dependent on a continuing supply of higher and higher emissions bitumen. <p>Few single regulatory approvals have such a massive impact on half of the country. For Ontario and for Canada, this project has large negative impacts and no positive impact.</p>
56	<p>My main concern with the Energy East pipeline is with the quality of the product being transported. Whether transported through a pipeline or by rail, however, the bitumen is transported, it poses too great a pollution and contamination risk for Ontarians to bear as this chemical sludge is not intended to supply the Ontario marketplace with oil.</p> <p>Because we are simply space to be traversed, I believe it is imperative that the Ontario government ensure the on-going health and safety of its residents by implementing strict regulations as to WHAT kind of fuels can be transported through Ontario and HOW they should be transported.</p> <p>No one in Ontario wants another Lac Magentic, nor another Bitumen spill like that in Kalamazoo River in Michigan, which has already cost more than a \$1 Billion to clean up. Not in our beautiful province. Not in our lakes and rivers, not in the Rideau watershed, which feeds into our Nation's capital.</p> <p>If this pipeline is to be built, which I oppose because of the low quality of product that will be transported, Ontario must insist that</p>

	<p>the product shipped through it is as safe as possible and that ALL costs associated with any spill will be covered 100% by TransCanada. I would also like to see additional fines implemented for spills which will be a breach of contract if their marketing propaganda is to be believed.</p> <p>Your job (as I see it), should you decided to seriously take it on, is to ensure Ontarians are protected at all times from the harmful effects of dangerous, hazardous and toxic fuels being transported through our province. The best way for you to ensure that happens with the Energy East pipeline, is to mandate that only REFINED fuels can be transported through Ontario, whether it be through a pipeline or by rail.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>██████████</p>
57	<p>I am strongly opposed to the Tar Sands pipeline running through Ottawa.</p> <p>For an oil spill to occur, the results would be devastating/catastrophic to the population of Ottawa where everything is concentrated in a small area.</p> <p>There should be no pipe lines where humans are living, eating and sleeping!</p> <p>To say that there will be no accidents or spillage is to deny the history of pipe line and their horrible effect on the environment [toxins, pollutions, etc.]</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>██████████ Teacher OCT</p>
58	<p>I fully support the plans for this pipeline. I strongly disagree with the opposition organized by Ecology Ottawa and others, many of which receive provincial and municipal funding grants.</p> <p>Kanata, Ottawa</p>
59	<p>In no way should we encourage or support this sort of oil-based development. It should be clear to everyone by now that Canada, and the world, is too dependent on oil as an energy source, to everyone's detriment and cost. This pipeline is just part of a larger oil project, and the costs, and risks are just too great. We should NOT be transporting oil long distances like this. The large energy projects that we should be supporting and encouraging are those that do not have such a wide-ranging risk and cost, both to the producers, transporters, and consumers.</p>

	Thank you.
60	<p>Ottawa is the green capital of the country - don't threaten this with the proposed Energy East pipeline.</p> <p>The possibility of a leak that could devastate aquifers, poison our city's water supplies, shut down the Rideau River all the way downtown, even affect the health of our city's residents is not acceptable.</p> <p>Even if a spill never happened, we know this project is meant to allow the Alberta Tar Sands to expand. This means more greenhouse gases, and more climate change impacts. That's a certainty and not a reality I support</p> <p>This pipeline is bad for our city and bad for our climate. We say no to tar sands passing through Ottawa.</p>
61	I don't want dilbit being pumped through my watershed (or anyone's, for that matter). The possible benefits of temporary job creation can never outweigh the significant risks (ecological, social, and economic) associated with a leak, which is inevitable if you let the industry push nasty, corrosive dilbit through this pipeline.
62	<p>Anything that supports Alberta's Tar Sands is bad practice. Ottawa needs to adopt strategies for transportation that encourage more people to use mass transit and/or means that are not reliant on fossil fuels. Instead of a pipeline running through Ottawa carrying dirty oil, Ottawa needs charging stations for electric cars running through it's main corridors... through the micro-fit program there is plenty of electricity generated through solar panels to make this a net zero GHG-producing alternative.</p> <p>Continuing to stimulate the Tar Sands is delaying the day when we turn away from fossil fuels, and honestly, we really can't delay much longer.</p>
63	This project incurs risks for the City of Ottawa and its rivers and the canal if there is a spill. Even if a spill never happens, allowing this project to go ahead will mean an expansion of the Alberta Tar Sands. This will mean even greater emissions of greenhouse gases, and more climate change impacts. Given the UN report that came out recently, this is not the direction in which Canada should be going; rather we should be investing in cleaner sources of energy.
64	I am very concerned about the potential negative impact that a pipeline leak could have on the land and waterways of the Ottawa area. For example, any leak in the proposed route of the pipeline under the Rideau River could potentially pollute the entire Rideau River basin. This would be disastrous. Regardless of whatever safety measures are put in place, there is no way to guarantee that this won't happen.
65	<p>Add me to the very emphatic NO PIPELINE group, please. This is a terrible, disasterS-waiting-to-happen, idea that enables a larger, even more terrible idea (the tar sands exploitation).</p> <p>Sincerely, A Taxpayer & Voting Citizen</p>

66	<p>As a resident of Ottawa, I do not want the Energy East pipeline going through my city. This pipeline is bad for the global and national environment and carries with it a significant risk of oil leaks, poisoning our city's water supply. I am proud of my city's green record and this would be a step in entirely the wrong direction. Thank you!</p>
67	<p>Our government has cut staff and programs across all major federal departments, particularly at Environment Canada, and recently announced further job cuts from this year.</p> <p>Moreover, the federal government has also diluted/deregulated environment, health, and safety assessment laws such as the CEAA, and hampered UN negotiations meant to protect our environment and health.</p> <p>Under these circumstances, I believe that the risks of the Energy East pipeline and tar sands expansion are increased.</p> <p>I agree with The Council of Canadians that this export pipeline would pose serious threats to local water supplies, communities and coastal waters. It would promote the expansion of the tar sands, which contaminate the water, land and air of nearby communities, and stand in the way of the alternative energy future we need. It will increase the risks to all of us to live in a safe and healthy way due to the risks of: pipeline spills, reckless tar sands expansion, disregard for indigenous rights, energy shortages, bad investment, and runaway climate change.</p> <p>Also, I agree with Greenpeace Canada that we "cannot build" our country and communities "around a project that will poison our water, violate treaty rights and further accelerate a global climate crisis that is already resulting in weather disasters around the world".</p>
68	<p>This pipeline proposal is dangerous in two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) possibility of spill--it is known that dilbit is more corrosive than normal crude oil. The claimed benefits are not justified by the dire results of a spill in the many urban and natural areas which would be affected. 2) expansion of tar sands--the harvesting of the oil sands is a major contributor to greenhouse gases causing climate change, as well as polluting the air, soil and waterways in northern Alberta. Much of the crude bitumen will be exported; rather than benefiting Canadians by supplying their energy needs, it will enrich oil companies, mostly foreign-owned. <p>This pipeline will face major opposition from communities that are potentially affected.</p>
69	<p>The entire conflict is based on the predominant concepts about energy which have governed applied science for the past century. This approach to engineering has entailed the observable results of extensive pollution, too much carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, acidification of the oceans, and warfare to gain control of these resources.</p> <p>We cannot fix this situation without addressing its cause: the concepts governing physics and engineering.</p> <p>The so-called "four laws of thermodynamics" upon which 'classical' EM engineering stands are not 'laws' in the commonly-understood sense. They are just descriptions of what happens under specified conditions.</p>

And if those conditions are changed, different principles can be applied -- and are being applied, in various directions of research that reference the wider set of more complex equations that were actually written by James Clerk Maxwell. What are known today as "Maxwell's Equations" were not his; they were written later by Oliver Heaviside, who discarded a substantial portion of the electrodynamics discovered by his predecessors.

It is Heaviside's oversimplified 'four laws' which have bequeathed to us the dominance of the combustion paradigm. Thus the extraction and burning of fossil fuel resources, with the deleterious effects of doing so, are constantly expressed by our civilization's technology, and the financial and social systems established to create and sustain these mean that the combustion paradigm, and the mantra "energy in equals energy out" continues to dominate the economy.

To get humanity to leave the bitumen and other oils in the ground will require that science gets outside the box of the 'four laws of thermodynamics' and embraces wider theoretical concepts being put forward by independent researchers.

For a start on this conceptual liberation, I suggest systematically and thoughtfully reading "CHASING THE WILD DRAGON: Foundations of a New Science" by T.E. Bearden.

The author explains the conceptual basis for engineering a "hidden" electrodynamics inside the scalar potential (inside voltage), which enable access to increased output beyond what we pay to put into our devices, generators and engines. Thus the 'energy out' can exceed the energy we put in because the design can incorporate the energies available by other means than combustion. The article begins at:

< <http://www.hsv.com/writers/bearden/page001.htm> >, which has separate URLs for each page, and for each side-note.

Developments of products based on these new concepts of physics includes "Low Energy Nuclear Reactions" (LENR) which emerged from "cold" fusion launched by the Pons and Fleishman discovery. Though initially MIT greeted that with derision, the university is now involved in ongoing research, that also NASA is pursuing. New theoretical explanations are being written to describe the 'excess heat' being derived from this technology -- 'excess' heat being the aspect of James Clerk Maxwell's original work which was discarded by Heaviside. It was only a mindset of 'not allowing' heat beyond what the closed-system technology was designed to produce that would prompted a researcher to define that heat from the 'infolded' electrodynamics as 'excess'. It's not 'excess' but part of the wider field of quantum mechanics which though experimentally proven is contrary to "classical" (Heaviside) engineering.

Another, already 'mature' field of clean energy is "Brown's Gas", for which Yull Brown had patented an effective and safe generator achieving 'hydrogen on demand' with high efficiency. Although the American captains of industry had all enjoyed a private demonstration of this system over two decades ago, and though they were intrigued, they did nothing to implement it. If knowledge of alternatives were enough, North America would already be using an atmosphere-neutral energy technology, and the oilsands would be untouched wilderness today.

In contrast, when Yull Brown put on the same demonstration in Beijing, the Chinese promptly put him in charge of a factory and

today are continuing to produce Brown's Gas technology, and to train thousands of students in its use.

China does not export any of this. But a nation that can run even some of its industrial and home energy applications on water will have an inherent economic advantage over nations that must pay for increasingly-expensive fossil fuels such as oil and gas. Note that so-called 'biofuels' are still expensive, and divert arable land away from food production).

For further background on hydrogen from water and the highest-efficiency generators, please listen to the interview with Andrew Michrowski, president of the Planetary Association for Clean Energy (PACE). In Part 2, he explains the circumstances and human social and psychological context in how these decisions get made.

We owe it to ourselves and future generations to widen the discussion of options for how humanity can obtain and use energy. Fundamental physics, electrodynamics, and quantum mechanics are complex and hard for laypersons to understand. But we can understand the historical consequences following from the past decision to adopt a limited set of principles to govern the applied sciences. And we can grasp that further options exist if we can widen that foundational framework.

In the meantime, we are being subjected to limitations in the marketplace. Even the advanced engineering most recently from Volkswagen, of a car capable exceptional efficiency, is not going to be available in North America. Instead, only a few will be hand-built, and obviously will be too high in price.

< <http://cleantechnica.com/2013/10/04/volkswagen-xl1-worlds-most-efficient-car-makes-its-us-debut-ct-exclusive/> >

< <http://www.digitaltrends.com/cars/how-vw-milked-261-miles-from-a-single-gallon-of-gas-with-the-record-breaking-xl1/#!DXQ58>>

Remember the film "Who Killed the Electric Car?" (If not, please get this and watch it as an example of how the marketplace has been and is being limited in choice. In one remarkable scene, people who loved their electric cars are put in handcuffs to keep them from interfering with destruction of their cars!) This Volkswagen market decision seems to follow the same pattern -- or strategy. Allow the non-polluting car only to be leased, keep the price high...

Lacking the specified drive-train elements required to be classified as 'green' is put forward as the reason it won't be sold in the United States. However, it is because this car is so much more advanced than the engine designs requiring those add-ons, that those mandated add-ons aren't even needed in this new German-engineered design.

The regulators' and planners' minds are still inside that box. Can we please open that box and let everyone out?

And can we then open up this marketplace held captive to the oil-combustion paradigm to allow for new concepts and real consumer choice?

Another example of a vehicle technology that should be on the market and isn't, is the compressed-air car. In hot climates (or hot seasons) that would be the ideal choice because the motor runs cold, instead of belching out heat.

The version designed in France by Guy Negre, a Ula-1 engineer, can run either on compressed air or on fuel. Its range is sufficient that compressed air operation would enable most commuters in Paris to get to work and back home, thus solving the smog problem. Negre explains that a piston needs compressed air to work anyway, so he found ways to bypass the need to heat up that air in the engine itself.

And an Italian immigrant to Australia, Angelo di Pietro, invented a rotary piston that eliminates most of the energy-wasting drive train as it can be installed directly onto the axels. I actually interviewed this man for the article which I wrote a few years ago. Still, nothing has happened to bring about compressed-air vehicles as a method to reduce urban pollution and smog.

It has been frustrating to me, as a person who has written articles such as that, and who has been observing these advances taking place, to see all of it being ignored. Back when Ballard first announced their technology the Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) cell co-developed with Japanese researchers, I wanted one. It was designed to generate electricity from a small amount of natural gas, while the byproduct heat from that process would be sufficient to warm the house.

But that was too efficient! In reply to my letter urging opening up the market to PEM cell household co-generation, the Ontario government said it was not approved, and that approval would be held up for at least fifteen years! No explanation. So the marketplace forces everyone to install a traditional furnace that does nothing but burn fuel to make heat; it doesn't even generate or store enough electricity to ensure its continued operation if the grid goes down. That is ridiculous, in my view.


A furnace salesman reacted to my complaint indignantly; it seemed to me that he was in conflict of interest. His company wanted to sell me electricity as well as require me to burn fuel for heat. They didn't want me to have my own independent source of both.

What do the majority of people want? Money-saving, energy-saving, and environment-protecting options in a truly free market. Our best option is to promote these new directions in science, and to redirect investment toward them.

The present confrontational debate is conceptually framed to defeat dissent. Buttressing the oil industry stands the petrodollar system, so that financial arguments are the trump card to stifle debate. An Enbridge spokesperson interviewed on CBC Radio's The Current talked condescendingly about having a 'grown-up' discussion, and proceeded to dismiss even the idea of refining oil in Alberta (a source of employment) as 'uneconomic'. The emotional word "grown-up" in this context is a smear-word, in effect characterizing anyone who advocate environmental protection as 'childish' -- without saying so directly, so that the industry can avoid the charge of having said that. Experts in psychological manipulation are behind such clever tactics.

It's time to have an "adult conversation" now, in the quite legitimate sense of that word. It's adults who are concerned about the health of future generations. Thus we must talk not only about clean-energy science and technology (non-polluting, atmosphere-neutral, and low-cost quantum physical applied science), but also about re of the financial system. Instead of a petrodollar that forces us to value oil above all else, we need a new basis for the symbolic means of exchange so that the money itself is not hog-tying the marketplace captive to oil, driving wars for control of resources, pipelines and wealth.

Even under the limits of classical combustion technology, higher efficiency is already possible, as interim solutions while we await

	<p>the more dramatic new advances based on quantum mechanics such as LENR.</p> <p>We need a whole shift of consciousness to open up the science to new concepts which will be far more efficient than anything yet allowed onto the market. If this is done, then it could be possible to do an end-run around the pipeline issue, and to liberate the market and consumer choice.</p>
70	<p>Dear OEB,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to the new pipeline proposal running through Ontario. I am very proud of Ontario being the first province to eliminate coal energy - I think that it is a very innovative step towards our collective future. I believe that allowing a pipeline of oil sands crude oil through our province makes us complicit in the release of massive amounts of GHGs, which is a step in the opposite direction from the closing of our coal power plants.</p> <p>This is the time to take a stand and demonstrate that we do have the technology and knowledge to further reduce our oil dependence. I believe that Ontario can lead the way in North America - someone has to.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p></p>
71	<p>no pipeline.... boo....</p> <p>take the money and use it to develop solar and wind energy!</p>
72	<p>HOW can turning a natural gas pipeline into one that transports bitumen be safe???</p>
73	<p>As a local who currently lives and who has grown up in Ottawa, I greatly disapprove of the pipeline being built, especially through the Ottawa area. My hope for Ottawa is to be an eco-friendly city and a role model to other Canadian cities as a green capital. For this pipeline to be built, it can result in devastating effects for the environment. All the good that comes out of this pipeline is to create profits for the people in charge of the oil industry, and anything they say about it being eco-friendly is propaganda. The government should be researching and taking steps to limit the need for oil power in general, so that we can have a more sustainable way of life for the future (that should go without saying). Please take my disapproval for the pipeline in consideration, and I hope you will make an ined decision based on the livelihood of Canadian citizens, and not the pockets of politicians and corporations. Thank you for taking the time to read this,</p> <p>Nathan Bowler</p>
74	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Canada needs climate and energy policies before we build any more pipelines.</p>

THE ENERGY EAST PIPELINE WOULD DRAMATICALLY RAISE CO2

A Pembina Institute report claims the proposed Energy East pipeline will increase annual carbon emissions by the equivalent of seven million cars per year.

1) <http://www.thesudburystar.com/2014/02/06/energy-east-would-dramatically-raise-carbon-emissions-report>

THE SCIENCE

The last stable Greenland icesheet is no longer stable (2) and the Pacific Ocean is acidifying faster than expected (3). The March 31, 2014 climate impacts report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change are clear: on our current CO2 emissions trajectory we face a real threat to global security; the situation is not hopeless; and the solution is to cut emissions (4).

2) <http://phys.org/news/2014-03-greenland-implicated-sea-level.html>

3) <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/pollution-sours-pacific-ocean-more-than-expected/>

4) <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/mar/31/climate-change-five-key-points>

CANADA'S GHG EMISSIONS

However, Environment Canada's own numbers show we are on track to blow past our 2020 emission targets by 20% releasing 734 Mt CO2 in that year. By 2030, our emissions will grow to 815 Mt CO2 and much of the increase will be from the oil sands (5).

5) http://unfccc.int/files/national_reports/non-annex_i_natcom/submitted_natcom/application/pdf/final_nc_br_dec20,_2013%5B1%5D.pdf

CANADA RANKS POORLY

As well, a March 2014 report from Globe International revealed that 62 of 66 Nations studied have either passed or are pushing for compelling and energy-relevant laws (6). Canada was not one of them. Germanwatch's Climate Change Perance Index 2014 ranked Canada 58 out of 61 countries for their combined climate and energy policies.(7)

6) <http://www.sciencerecorder.com/news/emerging-economies-enforce-climate-laws/>

7) <https://germanwatch.org/en/download/8599.pdf>

THREE CONCERNS: National Security, Financial Collapse and Missing out on the Clean Tech Revolution

1) National Security: A New Strategic Narrative for the USA was presented to the President of the United States in 2011. The report clearly highlights climate change must be addressed to achieve global and national security(8).

8) <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/A%20National%20Strategic%20Narrative.pdf>

2) Financial collapse: We can only burn about 24% of the known fossil fuel reserves or the impacts will become dire (9). This carbon bubble, caused by the intensification climate impacts, means there is a real risk for stranded assets and financial

collapse. In October 2013, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) was quite clear about the risks, “Unlike the financial crisis [2008], we do not have a 'climate bailout option' up our sleeves”. (10)

In March 2014, British Petroleum (BP) called for a price on carbon (11) to avoid the worst impacts of climate change and Shell (12) and Exxon (13) alerted their shareholders about the coming carbon bubble. Andrew Logan, director of the oil and gas program at Ceres said in a Globe and Mail article, “Of all the assets an oil company can own, the oil sands raises the most concern.” (14) This is not new news. A 2010 MIT report clearly stated that under carbon caps worldwide, Canada's bitumen industry becomes economically non-viable through to the 2050 horizon even with carbon capture and sequestration. (15)

9) <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2012/03/26/432617/the-20-trillion-carbon-bubble-interview-with-john-fullerton-part-one/>

10) <http://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-24450438>

11) <http://www.vancouverobserver.com/blogs/climatesnapshot/bp-calls-global-carbon-price-avoid-worst-impacts-climate-change>

12) <http://blueandgreentomorrow.com/2014/03/14/investors-warn-of-carbon-bubble-as-shell-predicts-climate-regulation-will-hit-profits/>

13) <http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/blog/post/print/2014/03/exxonmobil-acknowledges-climate-change-to-shareholders>

14) <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/exxon-leads-the-charge-on-the-car>

15) <http://globalchange.mit.edu/research/publications/2021>

3) Missing out on the clean tech revolution: In a 2009 report in Scientific American , Jacobson and Delucchi showed that we can meet the entire world's energy needs with renewables in 20 years and that we can do it for the same money that we'd be spending on fossil fuel power (16). A February 2014 study by the International Energy Agency found that any country can reach high shares of wind and solar power cost effectively (17).

16) <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/a-path-to-sustainable-energy-by-2030/>

17) http://www.iea.org/newsroomandevents/pressreleases/2014/february/name,47513,en.html?utm_content=bufferc3755&utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter.com&utm_campaign=buffer

CLIMATE AND ENERGY POLICY = CLEAN TECH JOBS

Canada needs compelling climate and energy policies and British Columbia is showing us the way. A March 2014 report by Analytica Advisors found that between 2008, when British Columbia legislated a revenue neutral carbon tax, and 2010, the province's clean technology sector grew by 48 per cent, their GHG emissions dropped and their GDP grew above the national average. (18)

Given these facts presented to the OEB, my recommendation is Canada needs to create a comprehensive climate and energy policy before we approve the Energy East pipeline.

18) http://citizensclimatelobby.ca/sites/default/files/files/CCCL%20Media%20Packet_Clean%20Tech%20Report%202014.pdf

75	<p>I oppose the pipeline.</p> <p>The direct risk of the pipeline is high, exposing the population and the property value to high danger for little reason and reward. Additionally, indirectly it further locks us into a low income carbon-intensive future when we should be moving as quickly as possible towards a high income clean energy future.</p>
76	<p>I am 100% opposed to this undertaking. The number of permanent long term jobs is minimal, the environmental risks across a great swath of the country are too great, Trans Canada pipeline's safety record is poor.....to name but a few concerns. Please listen to the majority of citizens as we oppose this initiative and reject it!</p> <p>Thank you</p>
77	<p>I am very concerned about the proposed Energy East pipeline being converted to carry tar sands bitumen through eastern Ontario. This appears to be a pipeline to facilitate export, and not domestic consumption. I am not convinced this would provide sufficient economic benefit to Canadians in order to balance the environmental impacts. I also worry about the possibility of a spill. I believe that we must start acting now to REDUCE our fossil fuel consumption, given the very real climate change predictions for the future. To approve this pipeline would be the wrong decision, going in the wrong direction.</p>
78	<p>While spills along the pipeline are of great concern, even greater concern is that the pipeline will facilitate more tar sand extraction with concurrent loss of boreal forest, contamination of water systems etc. With accelerating climate change, clearly we must shift away from oil altogether; it's a question of when. Rather than investing in this pipeline, wouldn't it be better to invest in solar and wind energy, phase out noisy gasoline cars, replace them with quiet clean electric cars, and save the health of ourselves (up to 90% of city air pollution is vehicle-related) and the health of the planet in one move? !</p> <p>If Canada continues to drag its feet, insisting on using this ugly, toxic fuel rather than moving with the times as China, Germany and parts of Europe are doing, we are going to be increasingly falling behind economically - in addition to being a leading cause of environmental degradation.</p> <p>Canada must smarten up - and as soon as possible. Phase out oil. Renewables are the way of the future.</p>
79	<p>Dear OEB,</p> <p>In this era of environmental degradation and the consequential climate change, we need to get past the idea that we need to rely on dirty oil, or oil of any kind. I don't want an old pipeline, or a new pipeline, transporting the stuff near Ottawa, across rivers and natural habitats. I want to see energy conservation, zero energy buildings and an increased awareness amongst all citizens to change how we are living. Perhaps in the long run, you could put money towards education promoting optimal change for the good of all, especially future generations. Could you focus your time and energy towards energy conservation? That would be awesome.</p> <p>Please scrap the plan for the pipeline!</p> <p>██████</p>

80	<p>I am a resident of Eastern Ontario who relies on well water from the highly vulnerable aquifer that the Energy East pipeline will cross. I also live next to the Historic Rideau Canal and Rideau River. I am alarmed that the Ontario government would even contemplate allowing such a venture to proceed.</p> <p>I am not convinced that the 'benefits' of the pipeline outweigh any risks particularly as the vast majority of benefits will go to company shareholders and those who export the crude oil the pipe will carry.</p> <p>When a spill occurs, local municipalities will be unprepared for the level of clean up required stretching resources and staff and further endangering residents along with the environment.</p> <p>Any spill will would lead to mass evacuation of the area along with personal losses that would be borne by residents not the pipeline companies.</p>
81	<p>A responsible government would be searching desperately to find viable alternatives to traditional, polluting energy. Not our Canadian government. They want to rush through building a pipeline (to wherever) so that they can double, triple, quadruple tar sands production. Tar sands are the blight of this country. Canada's reputation has changed drastically over the last few years from polite peacekeepers to that country that destroys their own water, clean air, wild animals, arable soil, and human rights in the name of resource extraction.</p> <p>As for Energy East, NO ONE WANTS IT (except for the people at the top getting rich at all costs). We know it will leak. We know it will cause immeasurable destruction to our environment. Our voices should matter. Then again... this is the new Canada.</p>
82	<p>I prefer to invest in sustainable technologies. The longer we support limited fossil fuels , the less of that most powerful energy will remain for the most important uses for next generations. We need to invest in alternate sources of energy now!</p> <p>I do not support the EE pipeline.</p>
83	<p>I wish to state my concerns about and my opposition to the Energy East Pipeline. I am concerned about the likelihood of spills or leaks and the impact this could have on the local aquifer and the wells it feeds. I believe that in the future, Ottawans will be more dependent on locally produced food and losing local farmland to an oil leak or spill would be tragic. Secondly, I am concerned about the increasing dependence of our economy on oil extraction and export, given that this is not a renewable resource and given that international markets could decline as the international community moves to reduce carbon emissions to alleviate climate change.</p>
84	<p>We do not want this pipeline constructed instead we need the Ontario Energy Board to make decisions that stop aiding the acceleration of the distribution of fossil fuels.</p> <p>We want our province, Ontario, to stand up to big oil and to re-direct those big business interests who are contributing to the disasters caused by oil production emissions, and therefore climate change.</p>

	<p>This is THE energy issue that should be addressed - what alternative sources of energy production can we develop, create to provide Ontarians with clean sustainable energy for the future.</p> <p>This is the real hard work that needs doing.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>██████████ and family, Ottawa</p>
85	<p>To Whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am adamantly opposed to this proposed oil pipeline to shuttle oil from Alberta through my living area, and thus risking wildlife and public health. The Government of Canada under the leadership of Prime Minister Stephen Harper has already taken many steps against it's people and it's environment by investing so much in the Alberta Tar sands. The Athabasca Chipewyan First Nations Canadians living in the shadow of the Alberta Tar Sand mining Operation have faced severe health issues because of benzene poisoned ground water. Poisoning which our own Government attempted to hide from the public claiming that the dangerous benzene bi-product was "naturally occurring". Not only has our government poisoned their land, but they are "squatting" on it with no right to be there without the express permission of the chiefs of the nearby tribes. The land which the Tar Sands inhabit is a part of a large habitat given to the Athabaskan First Nations by the Crown. An agreement which must be honored; and, I ask, if the Conservative Government is so willing to dismiss the land rights of the First Nations, who is anyone to stop them from polluting the environment of others who do not hold such a right. With young Native people developing cancers and entire families dieing because of corporate bureaucracy, a stand must be taken in order to stop anymore needless pain, suffering, and death which is tantamount to manslaughter. It has been proven time and again that oil spills, no matter where on earth they happen, have extremely serious consequences to the health of the Environment and people. Because of the Harper administrations dismissal of facts in the case of the First Nations and their less than stellar track record divulging the truth of safety standards when it comes to Canada's oil, I stand against this decision. It is not safe for families, it is not safe for communities, and it is not safe for Canada's wildlife.</p> <p>I want NO OIL in the 613.</p>
86	<p>For my 2 cents worth, I'd just like to say that I am very concerned about this pipeline proposal. It is my understanding that this pipe was not originally made to transport diluted bitument. We've seen numerous examples of pipelines rupturing and spilling dilbit. I believe the pipe for Energy East is almost 40 years old and was intended for a different, less corrosive kind of crude. How can we be assured that there will be no cracks or leaks in the pipe? If they want to ship oil sands bitumen through Ontario and Ottawa, shouldn't they replace the pipe so that it is reinforced to accommodate dilbit? Given the potential risk and the fact that this will only exacerbate Canada's greenhouse gas emissions, I really don't think this is a good idea for our energy future.</p>

	<p>██████████ Ottawa</p>
87	<p>I say NIMBY (not in my back yard) to the eastern pipeline. If Albertans are hell bent to have their tar-sands crude refined, let them do it in their back yard. Our country should not be raping the land for a resource that is worsening our environment and our climate. As an Ontarian I say we use our human intelligence and imagination to produce less harmful alternate solutions to burning fossil fuels.</p> <p>Questions: I looked to the ination provided by transcanada with regards to the safety of the pipeline and found the 99.9994 per cent safety record to be an unbelievable number for the future. Will the OEB expect a more detailed risk assessment of the present proposal? Will the proponents of this pipeline proposal pay a penalty for any error in their analysis and be completely responsible for restoring the environment in the event of a leak?</p>
88	<p>For me and my family and friends, the prospect of an oil spill from this massive pipeline is terrifying. The sensitive aquifer, the potential of Rideau and Ottawa Rivers being irreparably polluted, all are VERY important risks to consider.</p> <p>But to be honest, I might weigh in favour of those risks if this fuel was NOT contributing to the planet's imminent demise. Climate change driven by fossil fuel burning all over the planet has put at risk the entire biosphere and every species on our planet.</p> <p>I have worked my whole adult life to understand these incredible systems and try to relate to people the importance of a functioning ecosystem to societies health and wellbeing.</p> <p>I beg you to do your absolute best work to relay these concerns which I feel are held by many. And I will continue to struggle to spread the detailed concerns about climate change to my community and beyond.</p> <p>Sincerely and with gratitude for your efforts! ██████████ BSc Honours, Research Assistant, Community Organizer</p>
89	<p>As a land owner within 350m of the proposed energy east pipeline, I have have many major concerns that Trans Canada has not sufficiently addressed.</p> <p>The impact of a spill related to a pipeline rupture or a slow persistent leak could be catastrophic to the highly vulnerable Oxford aquifer. My well is on this aquifer and we rely upon it for our domestic consumption, and garden crops.</p> <p>We swim and fish on the Rideau river and other waterways and this project would put our valuable fresh water at risk of contamination for the long term. All of this would have a devastating effect on the health and safety of my family, my community and the environment.</p> <p>The monitoring of the pipeline is not 100% accurate so it's inevitable that a leak would continue without detection for too long. The volume of the pipeline means that a small percentage error in the monitoring is still a huge spill leaching toxic products into the environment. Who would pay for the ongoing well water chemical analysis which I will have to have done? How will I or</p>

	<p>government officials know which analysis to run when the composition of the product is proprietary and subject to change without our knowledge.</p> <p>The flow rates and directions of all of the aquifers along the proposed route are poorly understood as is their interaction with diluted bitumen. How can such a significant risk be properly assessed with this major gap in knowledge.</p> <p>If Trans Canada is committed to a safe operation, they should be proposing measures which are best practices such as using new pipe, installing a cement cap on the pipeline, double wall pipelines with integrated leak detection, automatic and continuous cathodic protection monitoring and redundant operations centres to name a few.</p> <p>This project puts Canadians at risk for little to no benefit.</p>
90	<p>I oppose this pipeline for many reasons. There are obvious health, safety and environmental concerns for the citizens of Ottawa and Eastern Ontario. There are concerns about how this pipeline will enable great expansion of the Alberta oil sands which will greatly contribute to increased green house gasses and contribute to even more climate change.</p> <p>There are other reasons, though, that may not be as readily obvious as the ones mentioned above. Tourism is a very important part of Ottawa's economy and unsightly lines and potential spills will cause havoc with that key industry. Ottawa also has one of the largest number of working farms within its boundaries and these can also be threatened by spills, construction, and clean up activities.</p> <p>It seems to me that the risk is being borne by the residents of Ottawa while the rewards will be reaped by others far from any danger or damage. On the other hand the rewards for green energies can be enjoyed by everyone including the environment.</p> <p>This pipeline is not worthy of support.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>██████████</p>
91	<p>This pipeline will harm our region in three ways. It increases the probability of a spill to unacceptable levels. It increases the extraction of fossil fuels, endangering our descendents. It wastes financial and human resources on old style dirty energy, rather than steering our economy towards new sources of clean energy.</p> <p>The harms are obvious and predictable, and wishing no harm to come to the land and our descendents, I firmly oppose this proposal.</p>
92	<p>I don't want the increased risks of tar sand transportation to endanger anyone along the pipeline, let alone my local environment. Considering what I've been hearing about this (old pipeline, designed for regular petroleum and not tar sands, the frequency of</p>

	<p>spills, TransCanada's safety history), I don't see how this can even be considered.</p> <p>I do not believe risking our health is a price we should be paying for maximizing their profit and attempting to sustain petroleum supplies.</p> <p>If our energy needs require this kind of sacrifice of our health, we need to change our plans on energy use instead.</p> <p>Individual capitalist ventures often fail, yet capitalism continues to flow through the path of least resistance, so the same way we should not give pity to the weeds that need clearing, nor should we pity regulating the businesses that threaten our health and lives directly or indirectly through our ecosystem. Let it profit in some other way that does no harm to us. Let it spend some of it's money in order to change to a new business and survive. This is not where we should compromise.</p> <p>This is what regulation should be used for, and I hope you do your part in support of our future health. Thank you.</p>
93	<p>Dear OEB Energy East Consultation,</p> <p>I am opposed to the Energy East pipeline. Scientists now say that at *current* rates of carbon dioxide emissions, within about 14 years, we will reach a tipping point beyond which climate change will be unstoppable and catastrophic. We need to get off fossil fuels altogether if we want to avoid a situation of extreme, persistent drought conditions throughout much of the world. If we don't get off fossil fuels, no amount of 'adaptation' will avoid massive starvation for much of the world's population.</p> <p>Pipelines such as the Energy East project would actually *increase* our rates of fossil fuel use, which means we would have even less time to get off fossil fuels. So, this and other pipelines would virtually ensure global climate catastrophe.</p> <p>We should not allow this pipeline.</p> <p>Many thanks for this opportunity, sincerely, [REDACTED]</p>
94	<p>I do not agree with the Energy East pipeline. We should be protecting our waters and lands before there are none left to protect! This is a risk we cannot afford.</p>
95	<p>I feel this project should not go ahead due to the risk of a spill. This will impact people's ability to use the water for agriculture and for drinking (survival). For this reason alone, this project should be a non-starter. As a society, we have to support cleaner fuels, not just short-term profits for shareholders.</p>
96	<p>I wish to voice my opposition to the Energy East pipeline. Firstly due to my concerns about the potential for a spill, which do not seem worth the risk no matter what revenue sharing agreement can be reached with its developers. Secondly due to its associated climate change emissions. Little emissions are directly attributable to the pipeline itself but the upstream expansion of oil and gas production capacity that it will help justify will have massive GHG emissions. Ontario has in recent years shown how</p>

	<p>serious it is about GHG emissions with its coal phase out. Our province should not effectively neutralize its own costly policies by allowing this pipeline to be constructed. Ontario is developing its renewable energy capacity and Canada as a whole should do the same. The province should voice its position on GHG emissions and energy production by not consenting to this pipeline.</p>
97	<p>As a resident of Kenora, Canada and this planet I oppose the Energy East Pipeline and here are my concerns.</p> <p>locally this project has incredibly high risk with no reward for Kenora residents. pushing highly toxic chemicals and oil which cannot be cleaned up when it is mixed with water, through an old pipeline that was not designed for high flow oil, through remote regions which will likely not have leaks detected quickly and will face limitations to accessing in event of leak, across our lands and rivers which sustain the traditional hunting and fishing of the First Nation people of the region and the modern tourism and resource economies of the region along with providing incredible intrinsic value, makes this pipeline a terrible choice for our region. There may be a few short construction jobs but nothing economically significant, there will be energy supply issues due to demands for the pumping station, there is a very real danger that everything we love and survive on will be destroyed.</p> <p>As a Canadian the economics still doesn't line up. There will be no reward for the average Canadian living outside of Alberta. The few who are going to find great economic reward over the next thirty years will not be Canadian citizens or perhaps the upper 1% who do not need our support. Trying to fill a global demand for oil consumption economically can not occur through this energy intensive type of extraction, there is going to be carbon taxing and a rapid move away from oil as an economic stronghold. If we put our eggs in this basket we are going to be left behind with a depleted economy and destroyed lands, waters, and people in world markets where innovation into new sources of energy is the clear way of the future. We need to start visioning a new world and a new economy.</p> <p>Globally, and nationally/locally, the impact on climate change of oil consumption and exploitation is too great to ignore. It is agreed that climate change is happening, that our quality of life and potentially our survival is in peril. Canada needs to be leaders in climate defence, not one of the greatest abusers. We need to pursue alternative energy like deep geothermal drilling to make us a carbon neutral nation with a great economic future. We need to say no to this pipeline.</p>
98	<p>There are many obvious reasons against the development of the Energy East pipeline, that writing about this subject seems almost counter-intuitive. In fact, I would be hard pressed to find any reasons to support it.</p> <p>It is of great concern that human beings can disregard with such ease the well-being of our species and our ecosystems. When monetary value is the sole motivator for our actions, we can expect just that - monetary well-being. For some.</p> <p>I am holding the hope that reason, common-sense, and humanity will eventually prevail. Many of us continue to believe in and fight for it. Join us in transitioning to greener energy sources, and follow the example of other civilized European countries. Do it for your children, grandchildren, or whomever else you care about and who will inherit these lands.</p>
99	<p>Ice is [REDACTED], from Kenora Ontario. I am very concerned about the plans to use the pipeline to transport oil to the east, through our region.</p> <p>The information that I have been learning involving this plan, has convinced me that the environmental risk is extremely high with little or no economic benefit to us in the long term.</p>

	Our economy and lifestyle depends greatly on our freshwater systems. I do not support any decision to have oil transported through pipelines in our region.
100	I am in full support of this project. It is in our national interest. I would like to see that there is enough money put aside by the company, and maybe the Province of Alberta to clean up spill. I see the provinces along the route taking a high risk for a break and clean up and Alberta receiving a lot of royalties. Perhaps if the oilsands were nationalized the benefits would be better distributed and that would create a more supportive public.
101	I just want to comment that I don't agree with this proposed pipeline as a solution for the transportation of oil products cross country. I firmly believe that this type of investment in and expansion of the exploitation of oil sands resources is short sighted, unsustainable and will eventually lead to the degradation of our environment and planet. Climate change is a scientifically proven fact at this point and to argue it is folly. Proposing to transport this volume of oil through our area of the country that contains dozens of pristine, unique and very special Lake Trout lakes just goes to prove the short sightedness of this proposal and also shows me that those who have devised this plan do not fully understand the implications and risks of what they are proposing. It is my hope that many more people in our country take a stand on this and are willing to go to great lengths to oppose this plan and show the type of real environmental leadership we as Canadians pride ourselves on. Thanks for reading.
102	I have attended many information sessions on this topic over the past year and sincerely hope the OEB rejects the TransCanada's proposed Energy East Pipeline. Projects like this involving aged pipes built to carry natural gas have resulted in numerous serious spills in the United States already. Why would this project be any different. Also, there are no actual benefits to the people of Ontario. Jobs created will be short term contracts. No additional tax revenue can be gained from existing pipelines. The bitumen in question will be sold to the highest bidder once it reaches the east coast - it's not even being sold to Canadians, let alone Ontarians. Environmentally the risks are inconceivable. We are being told that seismic testing to determine the soundness of the 40+ year old pipes in question is too risky, but it's sound to carry diluted bitumen through our rivers, water recharge zones and aquifers? As a land owner and tax payer I am increasingly worried about this project. We are on a well in a rural community that depends upon the Rideau River for employment there are too many risks for my family. I have little faith in the NEB to protect my interests. If this pipeline does go ahead we will be considering relocation. We cannot see this run through our back yard and we are not comfortable paying taxes to help fund this dangerous project.
103	I do not support the Energy East Pipeline proposal. I do not believe this to be a viable alternative, nor do I see this as a safe way to transport oil. I do not wish to see this project go through, as I believe this will be a threat to our area and many others. Expanding the oil sands is a short sighted project, that only threatens to increase environmental destruction, and contribute to global warming.

	Please mark my comments down as a no to this project.
104	<p>I do not support this project.</p> <p>I would like to see a cleaner, more viable alternative to Oil instead of expanding production of the oil sands.</p> <p>This project would threaten many areas and watersheds, and I do not believe that using existing pipelines to transport would be a safe option.</p> <p>Invest in a cleaner future.</p> <p>My vote is No.</p>
105	<p>Hello,</p> <p>The Energy East proposal is a very bad idea, to put it politely. I can see no possible benefit to the people of North Bay, Ontario, or Canada. It is designed to benefit only the foreign oil companies, which seem to have been given the keys to our country, while the people will get to deal with the inevitable disaster of a Dilbit spew. TransCanada's record of gas leaks and oil spills should be enough to stop this plan.</p> <p>The Ontario Government should use whatever influence it might have to make our province safe from the extreme danger to our land and water this pipeline conversion would present to the citizens.</p>
106	<p>In your consultation process, you ask what impacts are important to Ontarians. I suggest the following priorities.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impacts on greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As an intervener, the OEB must ensure that the NEB list of issues for the energy east project review includes impacts on greenhouse gas emissions, climate change, and increased production in the Alberta tar sands. This project is directly linked with these issues. • This project will cancel many gains that Ontario has made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. • This project will directly cause a huge increase in greenhouse gas emissions through the expansion of the tar sands, at a time when all jurisdictions across the world need to focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions. 2. Impacts on First Nations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding tar sands production increases already devastating effects on the local and regional/downstream environments and the people that live there. • Treaty rights and pipeline right-of-way. 3. Impacts on the environment, in particular water quality, from the inevitable spill(s) of diluted bitumen. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is clearly evident that sometime in the near or distant future large amounts of diluted bitumen will spill from the pipeline.

	<p>Diluted bitumen has a deadly and lasting impact on the environment, as seen from spills in other jurisdictions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A spill will destroy water quality that is essential for all life. • People depend on good quality water for drinking and for a significant part of the economy that includes tourism, fishing and hunting, boating, and other 'outdoor' experiences. <p>4. Impacts on the economic transition from oil-based technologies to alternative technologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ontario (and the rest of Canada) needs to reject economic development projects such as Energy East that slow the transition from oil-based to alternative technologies; that increase the impacts we already experience from oil-based technologies and cause overall economic regression. • Conversely, Ontario and the rest of Canada needs to promote projects that support initiatives to shift away from oil-based technologies; that cause overall economic progress. • The OEB (and everyone else) needs to challenge the agenda of Stephen Harper and the federal conservatives with their focus on using and expanding oil-based resource development as the basis for Canadian economic health and growth. <p>Conclusion: The OEB should recommend that the NEB and government of Canada reject this project. The risks it presents to our environment and economy are not worth any perceived or real benefits.</p>
107	<p>As a resident of Lanark County and a landowner in both Lanark and Renfrew counties, I am concerned about the risks of TransCanada's proposed Energy East Pipeline to Ontarians' health and livelihood.</p> <p>In Renfrew County, the Energy East Pipeline would carry 1.1 million barrels a day of diluted bitumen across the Bonnechere River, the Madawaska River, Hanson Creek, Waba Creek and the Mississippi River. What happens when diluted bitumen leaks into water? When 877,000 US gallons of diluted bitumen leaked into Michigan's Kalamazoo River on July 26, 2010, the liquid chemicals dispersed after two weeks and the bitumen sank to the bottom of the river. Four years later, it is still being cleaned up. (http://michiganradio.org/post/sections-kalamazoo-river-closed-finish-oil-cleanup)</p> <p>Reality contradicted the prediction from a lab experiment commissioned by Enbridge, which "attempted to simulate the conditions that exist in the environment," and found that most of the oil remained on the water's surface after 11 days. The model failed to include "a crucial element—suspended material such as sediment and organic matter—found in virtually every body of water. Sand, clay and floating plant matter can drag down floating oil." (insideclimatenews.org, Mar. 14, 2013)</p> <p>York University history professor Sean Kheraj, who has documented Alberta pipeline spills for 40 years, says, "Even a relatively small spill in a critical body of water can have enormously detrimental effects on people and wildlife." (http://www.seankheraj.com/?p=1257)</p> <p>Pipelines leak and rupture. As pipelines age, they weaken from corrosion, and diluted bitumen is "the most viscous, sulfurous and acidic of oil produced today", according to Scientific American (Apr. 4, 2013). In addition, these pipelines "have to flow at higher pressures that may contribute to rupture."</p>

	<p>Further, the Scientific American article says, "Even brand-new pipelines can spring a leak: TransCanada's Keystone I Pipeline, which began carrying dilbit from Alberta to the U.S. Midwest in 2010, has already suffered 14 different leaks." According to globalnews.ca, "Alberta's had an average of two crude oil spills a day, every day for the past 37 years."</p> <p>A pipeline leak could ruin large amounts of Ontario's drinking water, agricultural land and recreational waterways, threatening both residences and livelihoods.</p> <p>I assert that the proposed Energy East Pipeline poses enormous risks to Ontario's land and water resources with no offsetting benefits and urge the Ontario Minister of Energy to reject TransCanada's proposal.</p>
108	<p>As a lifetime resident of the Kenora area, I do NOT wish to have the Energy East Pipeline Project proceed for the following three reasons:</p> <p>1. Economic & Local Environmental</p> <p>There is no significant benefit to our region in terms of long-term jobs or taxation revenues. There are, however, significant risks to our economy, not to mention to our health and safety should a dilbit pipeline rupture and pollute our land and water, or a train carrying diluent - so necessary to this whole scheme - derail and incinerate. Since dilbit cannot be effectively cleaned up from complex ecosystems, in the event of a rupture, the environment will suffer, along with our tourism industry, the mainstay of our local and regional economy. We are being asked to bear the burden of all this risk and TransCanada gets all the benefit. No thank you.</p> <p>A question has come up recently in Kenora as to where TransCanada intends to source electricity for its proposed new pumping stations for Energy East. Who will provide this massive amount of new electrical capacity, in a market that is already short on supply to meet the high demands of other regional, growing industrial sectors, such as mining and forestry?</p> <p>Finally, on the local scale, who will hold the company accountable for doing anything more than just a window dressing sort of clean up, in the event of a spill? Who deems a site remediated, and how would we, the citizens of Ontario, the unwilling beneficiaries of this scenario, be compensated for our losses?</p> <p>Nationally, the oil sands make up only 2% of GDP, (conventional fossil fuels provide another 4%) so no great financial benefit there either. This is a dying, dirty industry. The rest of the world is focusing on clean, renewable energy while Canada is still relying on technology courtesy of the age of the dinosaurs to propel us into the future. Around the world, many investors are already divesting their shares in the oil industry in order to escape the possibility of stranding their assets when global temperatures rise only another 1.2 degrees Celsius, the level at which catastrophic environmental shifts would be irreversible, and would put the persistence of human life in jeopardy. Putting further investment in this sector is a poor economic bet for Canadians.</p> <p>2. Safety</p> <p>One of my greatest concerns about Energy East revolves around safety. TransCanada has a history of blowouts in our area (e.g.</p>

	<p>Stewart Lake Dec. 11 1996; Otterburne, MB January 2014). I am concerned that the proximity of explosive natural gas lines to a retrofitted bitumen line puts the latter at great risk of a breach in the event of a future natural gas explosion.</p> <p>I am concerned that the existing pipe has not been designed to carry or support the additional load of liquid bitumen. The additional weight of this denser, heavier product will place additional stresses on the pipe, potentially causing the pipe to sink in wetlands, bogs, and other areas with less bedding. It may cause the pipe, where it is already resting on, or thinly separated from, underlying bedrock to become distorted, stretched, or punctured by the rock substrate. The entire subterranean profile of the pipe could become altered under the addition weight stresses of the dilbit, leaving the pipe stretched, strained, and suspended between subterranean terrain peaks.</p> <p>The remoteness of the wetlands through which the pipelines passes here in Northwestern Ontario prohibits quick access to a) even detect a spill, and b) to mitigate spill damage rapidly. The time delay from realizing there is a leak, to turning off a valve, to getting personnel on the ground to halt the leak, even if it was ten minutes, as the company suggests, would still be enough to allow a million litres of oil to escape into the region's bogs and wetlands, and once that happens, these complex ecosystems can never be properly cleaned up.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the largest bog wetland in North America runs from Hudson Bay to the central United States, and includes our region. Energy East would go right through it.</p> <p>3. Global Environmental</p> <p>This project would exacerbate the expansion of the oil sands, an industry that is already an environmental disaster, growing like a cancer in our country. The greenhouse gas emissions stemming from the oil sands not only negates all of Ontario's successful green energy incentives, but exceeds our nation's carbon dioxide emissions twice over. What kind of responsible global citizens are we? Stand up, Ontario, and reject this carboniferous-age thinking and stop the wanton waste of this limited resource!</p> <p>A projected increase of 1.2C over the next 35 years will likely catastrophically destabilize our climate, but if we extract and use what is presently known and available in global reserves, we will exceed what is safe to burn by five times that amount! Let us not be contributors to our own suicide machine or inflict a death sentence on our innocent fellow inhabitants of this planet. As responsible global citizens, we must slow the fossil fuel sector, not contribute to investments that will help it to expand.</p>
109	<p>I attended the OEB session in Kenora and have the following comments:</p> <p>TransCanada has been a responsible operator and corporate citizen in the Kenora area for over 50 years. They safely and affectively operate a compressor station right in the city of Kenora.</p> <p>Using currently under utilized pipeline system that is already constructed and proven is clearly the most effective way to safely and reliably transport oil to Quebec and the east coast. TransCanada has effectively maintained their pipelines through regular maintenance programs, state of the art technology (through the use of pipeline inspection testing and in lone inspection methods)</p>

to continuously monitor and improve the health of their pipeline systems. I am confident that TransCanada will take all reasonable steps to ensure their pipeline system remains safe in this application by continuing to take the following steps:

- implementation of a quality assurance and control program for the fabrication, coating, and installation of the pipeline and associated facilities
- External corrosion protection technology
- ongoing integrity testing and maintenance over the life cycle of the asset
- 24 hour operations and monitoring of the system through state of the art technology
- aerial patrol
- employees strategically located along the pipeline route to continuously monitor and respond to issues in a proactive manner

TransCanada has one of the lowest incident rates in the industry and has safely operated over 68,500 km of pipeline for over 50 years.

Clearly the benefits associated to this proposed project include direct benefits to the local communities, the province, and the country through the employment of local labour and services. The project will create over 10,000 direct jobs in Canada (over 2,200 in Ontario alone - not to mention 5,825 indirect and induced jobs in Ontario) through the project cycle and another 1,000 jobs in Canada through the 40 year operating cycle. It will contribute \$35 billion to the Canadian GDP of which \$13 billion would be in Ontario. The project and the long term tax revenues that Canada would see directly would be \$10 billion of which \$3.5 billion would be injected into Ontario directly. The hotels and restaurants across Canada will be full during the construction of this pipeline.



The economy in Ontario and quite frankly in Canada is in need to a national project of this magnitude for the reasons mentioned above.

It is clear that western Canadian crude oil will get to market. It is a question of how it will get to market. Oil pipelines in Canada have a 99.9994% safety perance record. Railways have 25 times more incidents and trucks have 3,000 times more incidents than pipelines. When I consider this, clearly the utilization of a proven pipeline system with a very reputable Canadian company that holds to its values as a corporate citizen is the safest, most affective way to get the oil to the marketplace. Energy East will also see that the oil services Canadian refineries in Eastern Canada, creating energy security for the nation.

All of the impacts mentioned above. If the OEB truly cares about our safety and economic health they will promote pipelines as the safest way to transport oil to the market place. Clearly we need to ensure water courses and water supply sources are protected. I am confident that TransCanada will ensure they design and build this pipeline system with the safety of the communities and the environment at top of mind. They will install heavy wall pipe in high potential impact areas, they will have automatic shut off valves strategically located along the pipeline route. They will have effective emergency management plans and programs and will continue to work closely with local emergency services organizations in the unlikely event of an incident to ensure it is responded to immediately. I know they would take full responsibility and pay for any damages associated to an unlikely event. They will continue to demonstrate that they are a good corporate citizen.

110

It was reported on the news this morning that the federal government will be voting next week on passing the proposal for the

	<p>Energy East project. As one of many who draws our drinking water directly from Trout Lake, I heartily oppose the pipeline transporting oil through North Bay and under Trout Lake. There are not too many cities that can say that about their lakes.</p> <p>I attended a couple of meetings and TransCanada's response to ensuring that all precautions are being taken was to reply that they would adhere to Canadian Standards. In my books, that is not good enough. There should be at least a secondary containment pipe around the proposed gas pipeline that runs under Trout Lake. Increasing the fines to the oil companies should there be a spill or having them put up 1 billion dollars, does not protect our environment. This in effect is "OUR RISK, THEIR REWARD" As for creating jobs, what good is a job if we jeopardize our health and no water to drink. Water is the lifeblood of everything on earth!</p>
111	<p>I would like to request that the Ontario Government engage in a full environmental assessment of the Energy East Project, with full public participation. As a province rich in natural resources and an economy which depends on maintaining sustainable resource development and use, I believe the Energy East Project represents a high risk to the residents and businesses in Ontario with little reward. The Ontario government has a responsibility to ensure that they do a full environmental, social, and economic impact assessment of the Energy East Project including baseline studies of all properties within 1 km of the proposed conversion pipe or new pipe. Regulations, conditions of operations need to be established to protect all Ontarians from a potential spill, leak or rupture that could result into a toxic legacy for generations to come. Ontario's needs to protect and guard its clean water, clean air and a clean natural environment so it remains for present and future generations "ours to discover".</p> <p>I believe that we must know exactly what is being shipped through the gas pipeline prior to approval being given to the Energy East Project. And that we do not rely on assumptions, generalities or proprietary exclusions, that full Material Safety Data sheets must be provided containing all the materials that will be transported within the pipeline, that there is independent peer reviewed scientific proof of the 100% safety and integrity of the pipeline against corrosion, leaks and spills, and that there is a guaranteed end of project plan that details how the pipeline will be safely removed, and disposed of that and a fund placed in reserve to guarantee this plan is paid for by the company and not the residents of Ontario.</p> <p>With so much to lose and virtually nothing to gain, Ontario must act on behalf of its residents to ensure we protect our current economy and jobs. It is up to the Provincial government to ensure that there are financial and expert resources available to local communities and private landowners to do the proper studies, assessments and provide technical information.</p> <p>The government of Ontario has a responsibility to ensure we do not allow materials to cross provincial borders without a full environmental assessment.</p> <p>Please add my name and contact information to the stakeholder's list concerning the Energy East Project.</p> <p> North Bay, ON </p>

112	<p>I would like to request that the Ontario Government engage in a full environmental assessment of the Energy East Project, with full public participation. As a province rich in natural resources and an economy which depends on maintaining sustainable resource development and use, I believe the Energy East Project represents a high risk to the residents and businesses in Ontario with little reward. The Ontario government has a responsibility to ensure that they do a full environmental, social, and economic impact assessment of the Energy East Project including baseline studies of all properties within 1 km of the proposed conversion pipe or new pipe. Regulations, conditions of operations need to be established to protect all Ontarians from a potential spill, leak or rupture that could result into a toxic legacy for generations to come. Ontario's needs to protect and guard its clean water, clean air and a clean natural environment so it remains for present and future generations "ours to discover".</p> <p>I believe that we must know exactly what is being shipped through the gas pipeline prior to approval being given to the Energy East Project. And that we do not rely on assumptions, generalities or proprietary exclusions, that full Material Safety Data sheets must be provided containing all the materials that will be transported within the pipeline, that there is independent peer reviewed scientific proof of the 100% safety and integrity of the pipeline against corrosion, leaks and spills, and that there is a guaranteed end of project plan that details how the pipeline will be safely removed, and disposed of that and a fund placed in reserve to guarantee this plan is paid for by the company and not the residents of Ontario.</p> <p>With so much to lose and virtually nothing to gain, Ontario must act on behalf of its residents to ensure we protect our current economy and jobs. It is up to the Provincial government to ensure that there are financial and expert resources available to local communities and private landowners to do the proper studies, assessments and provide technical information.</p> <p>The government of Ontario has a responsibility to ensure we do not allow materials to cross provincial borders without a full environmental assessment.</p> <p>Please add my name and contact information to the stakeholder's list concerning the Energy East Project.</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>Kapuskasing, ON</p>
-----	--