

IN THE MATTER OF
NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD
TRANS MOUNTAIN PIPELINE ULC
APPLICATION FOR THE TRANS MOUNTAIN EXPANSION PROJECT
File OF-Fac-Oil-T260-2013-03 02
WRITTEN EVIDENCE OF THE INTERVENOR
GEORGIA STRAIT ALLIANCE

Comments on the Project from Georgia Strait Alliance Supporters

I. Introduction

Georgia Strait Alliance (GSA) is a registered charity focused on protecting and restoring the marine environment and promoting the sustainability of the Georgia Strait, its adjoining waters and communities. Georgia Strait Alliance is an intervenor in the National Energy Board's review of the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (the Project).

With 7,000 members and supporters, GSA represents the voices of many coastal communities in southwest British Columbia. In this capacity, GSA wishes to provide the National Energy Board with the views of GSA's supporters regarding the Project. To do this, GSA created a survey on its website. The survey consisted of an open ended question asking respondents to share their views on the proposed Project. In addition, respondents were asked where they live, whether they own a business in the Georgia Strait region, whether they regularly visit the region for vacation or recreational opportunities, whether overall they support or oppose the Project, and whether they would prefer to submit their name along with their comments to the Board or to remain anonymous.

GSA promoted the survey to its supporter email list, and via its website and social media channels. The survey was closed on May 19, 2015, with 95 responses received.

This evidence provides the results of the survey.

II. Survey respondents

The GSA supporters who responded to the survey have substantial connections to the Georgia Strait region:

- 85% live in the Georgia Strait region: 38% on Vancouver Island, 30% in the Lower Mainland, 10% in the Gulf Islands, and 7% on the Sunshine Coast;
- 92% regularly vacation or take up recreation opportunities in the region; and

- 21% own a business in the region.

III. GSA supporters' views on the proposed Project

99% of the respondents to the survey stated that they are opposed to the proposed Project.

The two most commonly cited areas of concerns about the proposed Project are oil spill impacts and response capacity, and climate change. The most frequently cited reasons for opposition to the proposed Project are the following:

- Oil spill impacts due to increased tanker traffic: the damage an oil spill in the Georgia Strait would do to wildlife and the environment, jobs and the economy, and recreational opportunities
- Inadequate oil spill response: resources and procedures are not sufficient to address the risk
- Climate change: the need to reduce fossil fuel production and consumption to avoid dangerous climate change, and to invest in clean energy instead
- Lack of economic justification for the project, and long term economic risk to Canada of investing in carbon-intensive products
- Wider environmental impacts of oil extraction and transport
- Lack of trust in the Project proponent in general, and its safety record in particular
- Lack of trust in the Project review process
- Oil industry's power in Canada trumping citizens' rights to a healthy environment and democratic processes
- The risks of the proposed Project outweigh any benefits.

IV. GSA supporters' specific comments

Of the 95 submissions received, 89 of the respondents provided specific comments, identified themselves and answered questions about their demographics. Six respondents identified themselves and answered the questions about their demographics and overall position on the Project, but did not provide any additional comments.

Of the 89 submissions received with comments, 80 respondents asked that their names be provided to the Board along with their specific comments about the proposed Project. Nine respondents asked that their comments be submitted anonymously.

The 89 comments are provided below. They are laid out alphabetically by last name, followed by the anonymous comments.

Jeaneen Andretta

Please oppose this Pipe line it is far too dangerous for the environment.

Bob Andrew

As per your outline, I firmly believe that the resources should go into Environmentally friendly energy resources. Wind, solar, tidal etc. How is this not the only way to go?

Peter Ballin

- 1) fossil fuel processing and consumption enhancing climate change
- 2) risk of significant oil spill in the Salish Sea
- 3) risk of oil spill from the pipe into BC's watersheds

Chris Barber

This expansion is dangerous to the B.C. coast and to all who earn their livelihood along it. The recent "minor spill" in English Bay had a horrendous effect on our beautiful beaches for days. The huge increase in tanker traffic will sooner or later result in a huge, disastrous spill which will not be able to be contained or cleaned up. As the coast is such a popular tourist destination, the chance of its ruination should not be contemplated.

Lorne Berman

port of vancouver should not be a shipping point for shiploads of bitumen that is destined to cross the pacific----it is a risky venture and accidents DO happen,inevitably,as evidenced by the recent fouling of vancouver's beachfront as a result of fuel spilling from a new ship,and not even a bulk fuel carrier.

furthermore ,the wanton extraction and consumption of this "dirty" fuel contributes to overall global warming via the greenhouse gases that result from its use.

leave the oil in the ground,or slowly and gradually remove it for use in canada,for canadians!

Vic Brice

I am opposed to the expansion of the pipeline. The risks of catastrophic spills far outweigh any benefit of a bigger pipeline. Also, any crude shipped on the pipeline should preferentially go to the refinery in Burnaby, we should NOT be exporting unrefined product when it can be used locally.

Rosalind Britten

As I have commenter status, I will provide my opposition to the proposed project at greater length and the potential for its impact on me (as the role of commenters is specified to only pertain to how they believe the project would affect them personally). That said, my opposition to the project is unequivocal, whether from a climate change viewpoint or to the serious harm it presents to every community who might be so unlucky as to have the pipeline designated to be built near it. It is disgraceful to propose the expanded shipments, whether by pipeline or rail, when it has been so clearly demonstrated in a number of instances, from pipeline spill to rail shipment explosions, that there is no safe way to transport a toxic, corrosive, explosive substance such as diluted bitumen.

Here I must intervene to mention I am aware that the Lac Megantic disaster was Bakken oil and not diluted bitumen.

The Kalamazoo disaster (albeit Enbridge, a rival company, the substance shipped was also diluted bitumen) displayed all too clearly that the shippers of the diluted bitumen (dilbit) are clueless as to how it behaves in water. For all the protestations by the shippers that dilbit floats or evaporates, clearly they are wrong. Much of the spilled dilbit remains on the bed of the Kalamazoo River.

The very building of the proposed pipeline through protected areas would be very disruptive to wildlife of those areas. The process of building, with the associated work camps and heavy vehicles, would ruin those areas, probably forever. Apart from the dangers presented to all living creatures in the areas through which dilbit carrying pipelines traverse, it is the proposal to transport the dilbit it would carry by daily tankers from Vancouver to distant shores that is, justifiably, one of the most controversial aspects of Kinder Morgan's bid.

The recent bunker fuel spill in English Bay made the shortcomings of our "world class oil spill response" all too clear. The slow response and the many hours before city officials even heard of the spill, caused a serious loss of confidence and resulted in the fuel landing up on a number of local beaches. A tanker spill of dilbit would be even more calamitous. Even crude oil is not readily retrievable. Dilbit is well nigh impossible to clean up.

The toxic nature of dilbit, its vast health danger to any living creature breathing its vapours or suffering immersion in it, the danger of any mode of transporting it, renders expanding shipments of it an extremely irresponsible proposition.

Joan Brock

I can't believe we are still having to deal with this issue, we live in a beautiful part of the world and we don't want to see more tanker traffic going through Georgia Strait. We are becoming a greedy society and have no regard for our environment. We need to clean up our world not try to destroy paradise for greedy companies and governments. Our energy should be put into finding cleaner air and less pollution not more, shame in us!

Bill Cexter

Provided the best available safeguards and mitigation measures for an accident are in place, I think the pipeline should be approved.

Jacqueline Chamberlain

Concerned about the wildlife, irreversible damage to places like Maplewood Mud Flats and the lack of timely response to any kind of oil spill.

Joseph Chapman

I am opposed to increasing the capacity of the existing pipeline and creating new pipeline to carry diluted bitumen from Alberta tar sands. An accident anywhere along the route or in the waterways traveled by tankers transporting the product would prove too costly in terms of environmental damage, clean-up to the extent possible, loss of aesthetic and property values that it would far outweigh the monetary values touted by proponents of this plan. As well, the carbon footprint of the extraction and use of tar sands bitumen will add significantly to greenhouse gases and the resulting climate instability. Whether through accident or by carbon loading our atmosphere, the proposed TransMountain project places too much at risk and threatens the already compromised resiliency of our environment and the environmental services we depend on to maintain our way of life.

Warren Cronan

The risks are too great. There is no way to adequately protect our environment in the event of a spill and most cleanup efforts seem next to useless. Also ripping up the ground destroying our forests to extract these fossil fuels and leaving a wasteland toxic to life isn't helping. Our government like many in Europe and elsewhere needs to put more effort into the development of clean energy.

Cecilie Davidson

The benefits are far outweighed by the downsides and risks.

Fran Dietz

I am totally against fossil-fuels as an energy source, especially since it is now known the harmful effects it has on our environment. The world needs to use renewable alternatives, which we already possess!! We need to wean ourselves off this poisonous substance. We will always need petroleum, but to continue pushing it through as an energy source is NOT a smart economic move. Look at what's happening in Alberta right now!! And still, Kinder Morgan wants to do a pipeline expansion project?

Dr. Theo Dombrowski

On all levels and in all ways, the expansion of the Kinder Morgan pipeline demonstrates faulty judgement, imperfect knowledge, and questionable values. While none of us can predict the future fully, and while all of us recognize the need for a "strong economy", risk-benefit analysis in combination with appreciation of complex systems (whether environmental or fiscal), will lead anyone who is willing to go beyond short term thinking, self interest, and limited knowledge to realize that the expansion of the Kinder Morgan pipeline has many more and much larger potentially negative impacts than positive ones.

Eileen Dombrowski

The proposed Kinder Morgan oil pipeline violates basic social imperatives for safe and healthy communities:

Imperative 1: Make the change from fossil fuels to sustainable energy sources -- sustainable economically, environmentally, socially.

Imperative 2: Do not put communities and the natural world at risk of oil spills with all their impacts, both from oil pipelines and from subsequent shipping.

Global warming is not a niche concern. It is a massive shift in the conditions of our planet. It will affect the individual and social health of everyone now alive, and generations of the future. The proposed Kinder Morgan pipeline would draw all of us in BC further into deficit and damage.

James R. and Dian Dougan

As boaters and citizens concerned about our environment and the future of our planet, we do consider the proposed expansion and the running of another pipeline to be unnecessary for current and future needs, to be harmful, and backward and narrow thinking. If Kinder Morgan were to put their money and personnel into non-invasive, eco-friendly, and profitable natural forms of energy we all would benefit.

Bill Duggan

I am a 75 year old third generation British Columbian. My father was seriously injured at Vimy Ridge, fighting for this country he loved. If he were alive today I know he would be as shocked and saddened as I am at the lack of moral fibre displayed by the NEB- formed by our Federal Government in 1959 to REGULATE the oil and gas industry.

Oil and gas companies exist to make their shareholders money and their top executives rich and powerful. Like it or not that is our capitalist system. Labour unions have worked hard over the years to get reasonable pay and benefits for the minions who do the heavy lifting. We, the citizens, rely on Government and it's agencies to protect us now and in our future.

I accept all this as inevitable.

What I cannot accept is that an agency formed to regulate huge corporations on behalf of the citizens of our country apparently does not have the guts to do it's job. The NEB is blatantly derelict in their duty to Canada by allowing Kinder Morgan (among others) to do whatever they want while at the same time making claims of having citizen input and then allowing only 'selected' input.

My Father was willing to risk his life thousands of miles away for freedom and democracy in this country. Now I see that freedom being threatened here at home and I wonder - do I have to lay down in front of a bulldozer to protect what he fought for....

Will my grandchildren find out that the NEB was paid off... or just gutless.

Angry, Sad and hopefull.

Erin Early

I feel with the recent spill, it shows we do not have the resources to clean up. Not to mention that the whole world need to change over to clean energy or there will be no future for our kids and Grandkids. We need to preserve our clean water. That is what will need to be pipelined soon. We could get more money from California for clean water in the near future than oil.

Fossil fuel is on it's way out! Why risk it. Why spend so much money on a pipeline no one wants.

Clean air, clean water, clean energy and we all might live longer :)

Thanks.

Stephen Ellis

The tiny spill recently in English Bay was a timely wake up call for all the complacent people that think a major spill will never occur. All reports seem to indicate the whole event was a "gong show" with all levels of government agencies doing a lot of gum flapping, and finger pointing while little real action was being taken.

It frightens me to think of the results if one of the tankers carrying product from the pipeline meets disaster anywhere along our coast....I'm sure Kinder Morgan would be free of any liability arising from such an event....and I'm pretty sure we all know who would foot the bill for the "cleanup" as ineffective as it would be! We're at risk enough with the volume that is shipped out from the terminal already...let's not increase the odds of a huge environmental disaster.

Having worked in emergency response for my whole career, I know that no matter how well you plan, drill or act out disaster scenarios, events never pan out the way the "table top" exercises predict. Our agencies are not remotely prepared for a small spill as we were recently shown. A major incident would be unthinkable!

Kathleen Emerson

I was already opposed to not only the increased tanker traffic that this project would bring to our region but also the overland impacts. Following the very poor response to the recent spill in English Bay, as well as the arrogant attitude of those charged with responding - in that they couldn't 'see' or admit to how poor the response was - I am even more firmly against this expansion.

I also find it troubling that Kinder Morgan refuses to disclose their response plans - and some of this falls on our government for not demanding this as a condition of possible approval. My understanding is the government in Washington State demanded this of the company, and they complied.....

Ultimately I guess it doesn't really matter what their response plans are, as once a large spill occurs the damage is done. We need to ensure there is as little opportunity as possible for such an incident to happen.

Thank you!

Joel Erickson

The Kinder Morgan pipeline expansion project is set to deliver economic benefits to the Vancouver area and British Columbia. I was bitterly disappointed in the response to the English Bay bunker fuel spill. I had a friend in British Columbia at the time who wasn't allowed to go to the beach while on vacation. This is not acceptable. With huge supertankers moving through the Strait of Georgia we cannot afford a spill in this delicate ecological area. A spill would be downright disastrous. My family would no longer boat and cruise in these areas, and tourism would plummet. Kinder Morgan can take their oil elsewhere.

Alexander Ferguson

1. The pipeline should use the current railway right of way to Roberts Bank (plenty of space for tankers) and avoid the high risk environment of Vancouver harbour

2. The extension should not be allowed until effective spill response planning is in place, at least as extensive as that in Washington State where the oil/shipping companies take major financial responsibility and have to prove to State inspectors that the physical resources and personnel are in place for immediate implementation.

3. Global warming is critical but should be addressed as part of a national response. Other countries can do it, why not Canada?

Burt Fidler

It is completely irresponsible. NO effective oil spill clean up exists and sooner or later there will be a spill. No economic or financial argument will convince me that the risk is worth it.

Deanna Fourt

I am firmly opposed to the Kinder Morgan pipeline. We need to get off of fossil fuels before our world is destroyed by rising greenhouse gas emissions. Planning for expansion of an oil pipeline is a complete waste of time. Even should our world leaders fail to cap greenhouse gas emissions the environmental damage that spills will cause to the area where we fish, swim and are inspired by the beauty of nature is completely unacceptable. We need to learn to do more with less.

Lorraine Fralin

It is with such sadness that our Federal Government and the US Federal Government representatives look no further than the end of their noses in regards to alternative environmentally clean products to heat homes and buildings, to provide water and protect the land, wildlife and marine life at the same time. Under water turbo energy is one fantastic way to provide clean water based energy that would provide heat. It is clean, energy efficient, easy to install and does not interrupt marine habitat or life. Solar energy is another way to go by using the natural rays of the sun. Geothermal heating could work as well. Dams ruin waterways and creates disruption for any peoples that live along the particular river that is been damed. It is so important for our children and grandchildren and all future generations that we as global citizens leave a fantastic legacy of good instead of destruction! We all need to take responsible and the best, right, accountable and moral way. I say NO to the Kinder Morgan Pipeline!!

Wayne Froese

It would take quite the head-in-the-sand approach, to pretend to not know that the Kinder Morgan project is widely opposed, by the majority of people that know anything about it. So I will merely add my name and my voice to that majority: it is NOT in the public's best interests, and it does NOT benefit anyone other than the stakeholders.

The last thing the globe needs now, is Tar Sands fossil fuels.

C G

Kinder Morgan's proposed TransMountain pipeline expansion affects everyone in BC – but only a tiny fraction of us have an official voice in the NEB review process.

Ian Gartshore

This proposed project would further entrench Canada as a fossil fuel exporter, thereby robbing us of refining jobs, endangering our land and waters, and limiting our competitiveness in renewable energy development. Given how renewable energy creates far more stable and local jobs and economic output per dollar of investment investing in this proposed project does not make economic or environmental sense.

It is now time to leave the era of burning fossil fuels and embrace the superior and sustainable path now being embraced by most of the world.

Heather Gee

A large proportion of residents in this area - specifically well-educated people - do not want any more pipelines in this area. If you didn't know, this is an area prone to earthquakes and there are many dormant volcanos which are predicted to erupt in the very near future.

Another major reason is that pipelines, ships, etc regularly leak oil into our environment. We oppose all pipelines for those reasons.

Manfred Gerschack

Leave fossil fuels in the ground.

Any mode of transporting them is prone to failure sooner or later. In particular any failure of the pipeline or a spill from a tanker carrying the volatile tar-sands sludge would be disastrous to the environment and to our coast.

Norman Gleadow

No more oil should be shipped through West Coast ports. The dangers far outweigh the economic benefits. Refine the oil in Alberta so that we get some value added to this non-renewable resource.

Tom Gray

I do not think an expansion of the pipeline is necessary. My main concern is the existing pipeline is some 60 years old and should be decommissioned and replaced with a new pipeline that will probably meet current needs and not always be a concern of leaks or a catastrophic rupture. The existing steel pipeline should be recycled in China. The expansion project is only to satisfy Asian markets and is not necessary for domestic markets.

Tierney Grinavic

It is way past time to get off of fossil fuels. How about a pipeline to the sun?

Lana Halme

Too risky for Burnaby residents, too risky for our precious and already reassured Salish sea. Not necessary after subsidies are redirected to clean technology.

Miranda Harvey

First of all, what's the great need here? Fossil fuels are on their way out, with even China favouring solar and wind power. This seems like a desperate last-grab at an unjust profit that benefits private pockets far more than it does Canadians. It's also terribly shortsighted. Secondly, it puts our beautiful and near pristine water and landscapes at further risk. We've already seen how poorly the coast guard handled the recent spill near Burnaby - and it's not their fault, it's the government's for shutting down what little protections we have. I am not confident that any government can manage any threats to our environment, including responding to accidents, and I do not trust private companies to do that work for us. Please do not approve this worrisome project. Push our country forward by investing in alternative energy.

Valerie Hennell

We strongly oppose the expansion on environmental grounds.

Joanne Hill

This project puts BC's greatest resources at risk. The route is challenging land and sea, and the risks are great. The people of BC are opposed to this. We are entitled to be heard. The Gulf spill, the Exxon Valdez and the recent Vancouver spills demonstrate that there is no such thing as a "World Class Cleanup" , despite what Christy Clarke may say. Those who stand to benefit financially will dispute this point. They have so much to gain. We the citizens of B.C. And Canada have everything to lose.

Lucie Honey-Ray

I live in the Village of Belcarra and am strongly opposed to more tanker traffic! Our bay already fills up with large tankers and with the recent oil spill from a tanker it is a hot topic for us. Our ocean front is home to many otters, birds, and seals - all of whom would be greatly affected by the traffic and in the event of an oil spill. Accidents happen and it is bound to happen again! In addition, people may not understand that at times we have 3 to 4 tankers anchored in the Burrard and Iloca Inlets - when there is fog they blow their horns all night long....ugh

Esther Johnson

our coast eco system is fragile as is the route. I drive a car and depend on the product. I would like to see Rupert used as the port and the refining done in Alberta closer to the sight. BUT mostly I'd like better use of power we already have. with improved solar power use.

Don Johnson

This pipeline is all based on making money and has no concern for the environmental consequences. We should be spending more time and money on alternative methods of power. How ridiculous it is to use so much energy to get the oil and gas out of the ground, plus all the pollution.

Joyce Frohn Joyce

Why spend money on pipelines when it would be better spent on solar and other renewables?

Akio Kimoto

- I would rather keep our parks, coastline, and environment clean and intact.
- I would rather have our government care more about the health and well being of its citizens, communities, and land than money to be made from Tar Sands Oil.

Lisa Lambeth

An emphatic "NO!" To this proposal. The environmental risks are much too great. This government's needs to start listening to it's employees (the residents and taxpayers of BC) and cease it's arrogant, insistent love affair with its own rhetoric. I am opposed to the KinderMorgan project 1000%!

Kimberly LeDuc

Increasing the amount of oil being moved to the coast from the Tar Sands will increase the number of tankers which ply the west coast of B.C. More tanker traffic will mean increased numbers of oil spills. The harmful effects of oil spills on the marine environment are unacceptable risks. There are already very many challenges facing the species in the sea on the west coast.

We do not gain well enough financially to accept this increased risk. The damage from oil spills is catastrophic and will permanently degrade the biodiversity of the marine life with which it comes into contact. We see very devastating effects from oil spills and bitumen which would be sent down the Kinder Morgan's proposed TransMountain pipeline contains chemicals which have potential to be even more harmful than even raw tar sands.

Fran Manary

The oil and gas companies across Canada have had free reign, especially the NEB, and have run roughshod over the rights and thoughts of Canadians for too long now.

Time to step back and give Clean Technology a chance!

Dell Maxwell

I do not believe that there is any way that anyone can guarantee that there will never be an oil spill. Kinder Morgan does not have a reputation of no oil spills, in fact just the opposite. Their ridiculous ad campaign is about how important families and the environment is to them and yet if that was true they would not be proposing a pipeline through pristine territory with hundreds of watersheds, where just one spill could do irrefutable damage to our environments. A threefold increase in tanker traffic will put our coastal waters and wildlife in jeopardy. An oil spill on the coast would be disastrous. We saw very clearly from the small oil spill in Vancouver Harbour recently that no one is prepared for even a small oil spill. And then it was even more upsetting that most of the authorities tried to cover up the truth. I live on a Gulf Island. I can't imagine what increased tanker traffic will do to the area, for sure it will increase the possibility of a marine accident and an oil spill which will cause irreparable damage. In the past 10 years Kinder Morgan has reported 13 oil spills. Three of those in 2013 and one in 2014. If you were an independent contractor would you hire someone with this kind of reputation to build something that needed to protect you and your family's and your province's environment? Let us consider our environment first! I say NO to this increased pipeline expansion project.

Al Maxwell

Dear representatives of the common Canadian viewpoint,

Count me in the corner opposed to expansion of transport of oil products across BC. I would be happier if Kinder Morgan's application for an increase in production were not granted, and ecstatic if they were told to shut down their operations altogether. Their continued existence in Burrard Inlet is an affront to Canadians, like me, that believe that an alternative power policy needs to be developed. This oil thing has gotta stop.

I've been by turns a commercial fisherman and a sailor for most of my 65 years in BC. I've been around the plant where Kinder Morgan claims its perfect safety record, and I know its not true. Any spill is unacceptable, and there have been at least one that I remember caused by neglect at Kinder Morgan's hands. Human beings are not infallible.

The consequences were contained, but I've dived up around that area, and its a desert underwater. I can't help but think that KM has had something to do with that.

The days of overlooking the greed that pushes companies to expose our environment to harm are gone. Scrutiny by citizens is intense. We can no longer be sold on economic benefits that are nothing compared to the profits made by the oil compnies. Not fair, any longer, and not worthy of a country with far seeing ambition for a clean future. Not my Canada!

Please deny the appiication.

Respectfully,

Al Maxwell

Al McEwan

I feel that growth in transporting bitumen by pipeline and tanker is too risky to regional ecology and economy. One spill would change everything. Carbon based fuels must be phased out rather than increased for the sake of our planet's atmospheric balance.

Marolyn Anne McGinnis-Anderson

My husband and I moved to Bowen Island for our retirement. Little did we think we would have defend our right to clean ocean beaches, or feel threatened by the presence of large oil tankers in the Salishm Sea, English Bay or Howe Sound when we go sailing or kayaking. We have children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren that deserve to have an environment free of oil pollution, clean lakes and rivers. We owe that to them. It should be our legacy.

Ann McIntyre

As a frequent traveler and sailor through the Gulf Islands, Vancouver, the Sunshine coast, northern Vancouver Island, and the northern BC coastline, I oppose the pipeline expansion. The region is under too much environmental pressure already. I believe the additional risks and hazards of this pipeline are too much to add to the ecosystems of the Georgia Straight Region. This area is so beautiful and is

becoming so distressed. Please keep the oil in the ground, our planet, and climate can't take more abuse.

Sandy McNamee

It is beyond time to keep fossil fuel in the ground and switch over to more sustainable energy sources without the devastating impact on climate change. There are endless and needless risks to the environment in the whole process of extracting fossil fuel from the tailing ponds to the pipeline to the tankers where one accident can have irreversible consequences for the land, the sea, the rivers and the myriad forms of life. To even risk harming salmon spawning streams or whale feeding grounds or sandy beaches used by migratory birds on the Pacific flyway is beyond obscene to me.

To be at the point in time where profits are pushed as more important than the health of our one and only planet makes me ashamed to be part of the human race.

Prudence L Moore

The pipeline expansion is dangerous to the environment of the Burrard inlet and Georgia Strait, and the millions of people that live in the area. The harbour is already busy with much large freighter traffic and the likelihood of a spill is huge. I swim in the ocean regularly and we are blessed with clean water and beaches. We have a responsibility to future generations to preserve the health and cleanliness of the ocean and beaches of BC.

The age of fossil fuels is over. Now is the time to take the millions of dollars needed to expand the pipeline and invest in conservation and renewable sources of power. We can and must do it.

Graham Mulligan

I am concerned about Climate Change and the continuation of human caused (anthropogenic) Green House Gasses that further extraction and burning of fossil fuels will cause. The Kinder Morgan proposal will add to this hazard. I am also concerned about the increased number of large ocean-going vessels in the Salish Sea and along the Pacific Coast of BC. This increase in traffic will disrupt regular ferry traffic and all other lighter marine traffic . Furthermore, any discharge of fuel or cargo, accidental or otherwise, will be damaging to the valuable environment of this coast.

Richard Palmer

Transportation of oil through the waters off of southern Vancouver Island is too dangerous to be economically viable. A pipeline heading east to serve the nation's oil needs would make more sense.

There is no way to remediate any serious spill on the south coast.

Jo Phillips

Kinder Morgan has shown consistent disregard for people, the ecology and the laws along its pipeline routes, worldwide. Despite constant promises to invoke the latest in oil spill technology should a leak occur on land or sea, there IS no "state of the art" oil spill clean-up technology for large spills. The "technology" simply compounds the toxicity of the oil/dilbit and makes ecosystems recovery even more impossible. We need to focus our attention, money and effort on sustainable sources of energy production and leave the tar and the oil and the natural gas in the ground.

Sheila Pratt

If the public were told 1)how much money the proponents are spending to promote this project and how much they stand to benefit if successful and 2)how much money the opponents are spending to oppose this project and how much they stand to benefit if they are successful, I think the proponents would be seen to be spending somewhat more than the opponents.

I remember the issue with tobacco: who spent the money and who stood to gain. We see drug companies promoting their products at some cost and then frequently having to withdraw their products. This has happened in many industries and it all comes down to whether or not one trusts those who spend a lot of money and stand to benefit or one trusts those who neither spend a lot nor have a lot to gain financially. I trust the latter and so I am completely opposed to Kinder Morgan's pipeline expansion.

Of course, there is always the "science" to be considered. I did not trust the tobacco industry scientists; I trusted their opponents' scientists. Now I do not trust Kinder Morgan/industry scientists, but I certainly do trust the opponents' scientists.

Irwin Rapoport

The pipeline project must be rejected outright, and kinder morgan's safety record, as well as all the other pipeline companies, is extremely shoddy.

Just say "no" to this and all pipelines.

Ryan Riddle

our waterways as well as the people and industries who rely on their health are more important than the export of more raw resources.

Vic Rittinger

Being a life long resident of the Lower Mainland and boater along the west coast, I am strongly against Oil tankers being in English Bay and feel even stronger about having them transit up Burrard Inlet and through the two narrows. It's inevitable an accident will happen.

Sharon Rogalsky

Expansion of this pipeline is dangerous on so many fronts, both for the communities through which it would pass, and for the coastal environment through which vessels would travel. Any risk is too much.

Let us focus on new energy sources and leave the old fossil fuels in the ground where they belong.

June Ross

I am a 72 year young grandmother of one! I have waited my lifetime for this now three year old grandson.

I have always been a community activist and will continue to be so for my grandson, my two sons and for the other generations that may follow. I say MAY, because at the rate our Canadian Government and foreign owned corporations are proceeding, there will be nothing left...no planet left...for future generations! I will oppose the taking of fossil fuels from our earth until the day I pass away and I will be a strong advocate to "LEAVE IT IN THE Ground"!

It is not at a case of IF there is a pipeline break or IF there is a freighter that is capsized, or springs a leak.....it is WHEN! Any of us who have been on this planet for a period of time understand and know that well. To try and tell us differently? it falls on deaf ears!

The rape and pillage of our resources, particularly the bitumen from the highly toxic tar sands must STOP! It is ridiculous beyond any measure of sanity!

Without the environment there will be no economy and no jobs.....there is no room for a trade off between environment versus economy. The environment must trump every other card..including pressures from Foreign Corporations.

I say NO....a thousand times No to any pipelines or tankers plying our coastal water. LEAVE IT IN THE GROUND!

Fred Schloessinger

The risks of spills doing permanent damage are great, and sending tar sands oil here is at best only a temporary solution for oil users, and does great harm to the environment.

Jack Stevens

We as coastal people, are stewards of the ocean for all Canadians and must work in concert with First Nations peoples to ensure that the oceans remain as pristine as possible to safeguard a food source which may be our last best option for survival.

We cannot accept any more pipelines to off load oil in coastal waters. Any oil spill threatens our lives and every species who depend on the oceans.

No to Kinder Morgan and no to any similar proposal.

Harold Stirland

1. Fossil fuel use and production, including oil, must decline, if we are to avoid the devastating effects of greenhouse gasses on the planet. The world is acting. Canada is acting. This will speed up in coming years.
2. As the world turns to green energy, fossil fuel use is being curbed by carbon taxes, or by other penalties.
3. Compared with conventional oil, the Alberta Oil Sands product is more expensive to produce, and emits more ghgs in its production. These factors make it more expensive, and less competitive on the world market.
4. As world oil use declines, as it must, there will be an oversupply on the market. World oil prices will decline, and the oil from the oil sands will be even less marketable.
5. Because of declining marketability for the oil, the Kinder Morgan Pipeline Expansion Project has clearly no economic justification.

Susan Stout

Much too dangerous to humans, wildlife and wilderness

KM has never yet handled even small spills efficiently

Jennifer I Sullivan

I do not want my basement to fill up with bitumen oil. I do not want to end up paying for restoration of my property or any BC land after an oil leak. I don't want the BC coast filling up with supertankers loading and transporting the bitumen oil to Asia. I don't want any part of the BC coast or the open water to suffer the consequences of any leak or spill from these supertankers.

If Kinder Morgan can guarantee in writing that it is impossible for any of its proposed pipeline expansion to leak on land, that it is impossible for any of the supertankers used to transport its bitumen oil to leak while loading or in transport and if Kinder Morgan will guarantee that it has set aside enough money to cover complete repair and restoration of any incident, were it to occur, then I would consider this project

Shirley Theriault

I believe it is very dangerous despite their assurances. We have seen too many disasters & how little prepared anyone is when they happen.

The promised jobs are empty ones too. Once the pipeline is finished too will be a lot of the promised jobs.. We are much too dependent on fossil fuels like oil. There are cleaner ways of getting energy.

Bonnie Thompson

We have lived here on one of the Gulf Islands for almost 25 years. In that time we have seen many changes, some good, some not so good, but none as dangerous to these beautiful, peaceful islands as Kinder Morgan's proposed pipeline expansion project. The wildlife, the sea life, the natural life, the island way of life are all under dire threat from this expansion project, & for what? This expansion is not needed, not wanted, not sound, not wise, not natural, not worthy, not anything but a real danger to all life in this region. Please, let life continue in it's beauty & harmony in this area-- don't subject all life here to money grubbing international plunderers.

Stephen Thompson

Pipeline expansion only drives the fossil fuel industry into greater problem production for the earth with increased carbon pollution of our air and water. Tar sands oil is the most polluting. Future breaks in the pipeline will produce pollution that can not be cleaned up as proven by previous leaks. Water born tankers will have a negative effect on Puget Sound and other inland waters. When they leaks the devastation will last for decades. The industry has no proven clean up procedures. Dispersants are not a clean up strategy.

Louis Vallee

Why should this area accept the risk just to create a greater profit for the oil industry. There is already a ready market for oil. I understand selling on the open market would give the oil companies more revenue but at what risk . We have millions of people in this area who could be affected by an oil spill. The studies for spill response despite the nearly 1000 page report was not done under real west coast condition but in tanks. Did not one of your top scientist resign, calling this whole process a scam. Shame on you. You should be individually and your future generations held responsible if an accident occurs, then you would not grant approval so easily.

Kate Vincent

The effects of the proposed expansion of TransMountain pipeline will endanger the environment and way of life of the inhabitants and the rest of the flora and fauna of the region through the increase in the number of pipelines carrying diluted bitumen through the area and especially the increase in supertanker traffic in the waterways of the area. We cannot afford even a small spill in our waters.

Kinder Morgan has an abominable safety record and we cannot rely on this company to operate safely.

But, most importantly, it is imperative that we begin to wean ourselves as a society from using fossil fuels. Providing more capacity is irresponsible behaviour and wasteful of resources which could be better invested in clean, renewable alternatives.

Vern Warnock

I don't feel we should expand these pipelines so big corporations can extract it even faster when the economic benefits to British Columbia won't be as great as they claim but the risk to our water ways will be enormous. They couldn't even handle the minor spill right in front of Vancouver on a calm sunny day ,I can't imagine if it happened on a larger scale in the winter on a stormy day farther away from

shore. I have boated on this coast from the Alaska pan handle to the Gulf Islands and would hate to see it destroyed for corporate greed.

Debra Weikum

I believe more money and time needs to be invested alternate energy resource development. The ecosystem of the strait is under considerable pressure from climate change, fish farms, logging activity and freighter activity. The risk of a spill from the pipeline is not a reasonable risk in a body of water already under pressure.

Christine Westland

Living in Birch Bay within a 5-mile radius of BP Refinery and the proposed Gateway Pacific Terminal, I am strongly opposed to another pipeline, with will carry the world's dirtiest oil Southwest through Canada, to be carried by tankers into the Salish Sea. We already have too much traffic amongst our islands - islands which bring thousands of tourists each year, as well as a thriving fishing industry. More tankers means most risk - risk of an oil spill, which would invade our waters with disease causing pollution and will affect everything good about the NW ecosystems. I pray that Kinder Morgan's plan to build the TransMountain pipeline will be rejected at every level.

Scott White

This spells nothing but bad news for our oceans. For oil? How absurd is that?

Owen Barry Whiting

" We could choose not to believe in the fiction of perpetual growth on a finite planet, there are alternatives to jobs that fuel consumption". Author unknown.

Edward Wilson

I believe the pipeline should not be built since it would become a stranded asset. The large amount of money required would make Kinder Morgan determined to use it against all reason once fossil fuels become outmoded. For the survival of civilization, a large part of the remaining fossil fuels must be left in the ground.

Darlene Wolf

Negative.

Anonymous comments

No more tankers in the Salish Sea!

I am very much opposed to this project going forward. We do not need anymore oil we need to focus on alternate energy sources such as solar and wind and wave energy. The risks are too great to allow more oil to be flowing in our environment be it m on land or sea. The tar sands are a disaster in the first place and should never have been allowed to go ahead .

Not interested in the pipeline in Langley or along BC rivers or major waterway.

This and other pipeline proposals are disasters waiting to happen. The profits of the few should never come before the public interest and safety. Review boards should serve the people who hire them-the public who pay taxes-not political or corporate interests. Full environmental reviews of theses types of projects are not done. Safety records of pipelines are awful. Corporations lie all the time. Legitimate peaceful protest is crushed. Environmental groups and individuals are harassed. The democratic process is stifled with narrow interests and dominance of the party in power. I love this country enough to protest the abuse of our resources and people as we move toward fascism and destruction. I am totally opposed to oil shipment by pipe, rail, or tanker. It risks our lives, livelihoods, and the environment we all depend on-just for rich company profits.

This project is taking us backwards. Dirty energy is out, green energy is in, and its inevitable. Green energy is what the people want. Only the people with financial interests want this project to move forward (ie. investors, CEO's).

Lets support and subsidize green energy projects.

A flawed investment project.

The son of the Chinese Premier has already declared China's intention to be energy independent and to stop using fossil fuels that are polluting it's environment and killing it's people. They have charged all their scientists to bring Thorium and their molten salt reactors to be on line in ten years. As has India and at least a dozen other countries in the world.

The Kinder Morgan expansion would cost billions to construct and yet not have a market after the many years it would take to complete. The Kinder Morgan investors would be wise to pay attention to the changing world market forces.

Canada is going to be left behind in the renewable energy race, paying for it by subsidizing and hanging onto a sunset industry.

Indefensible step toward enabling the use of more fossil fuel in an age of climate change.

Threatening our environment on every level.

Slowing the progress in the drive for alternative energy.

Trashing beautiful BC.

We do not need the added risks to the environment that this pipeline poses. Historically, these type of pipelines have multiple issues and bad performance. Let's put the welfare of humans and every other component of the ecosystem we call Earth first and consider the economic interests second. Why not consider be more self sufficient and make quality of life more of a priority? Canada is a lovely place and one unspoiled in comparison to places such China or Japan. Let's keep it that way.

To risk our rivers, farmland, oceans and our health so that an irresponsible company with a track record of serious safety violations can sell dirty oil to an undemocratic country that is soaked in pollution for the sake of profits that will probably end up largely in a secret Bahamanian bank account while we try to pick up the pieces seems to be a somewhat ludicrous idea. I guess that is what is called good 'business sense'

V. Conclusion

This evidence is provided by Alexandra Woodsworth, Energy Campaigner at Georgia Strait Alliance

Date: May 25, 2015