

Hearing Order OH-001-2014
Trans Mountain Pipeline ULC (Trans Mountain)
Application for the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (Project)

Written evidence

**Name of Intervenors: The Simon Fraser Student Society and
The Graduate Student Society at Simon Fraser University**

1. This evidence is presented by Mr. Mark Perry, Director of External Relations for the Graduate Student Society at Simon Fraser University.

Introduction

2. The Simon Fraser Student Society (“the SFSS”) is a student-led organization that represents more than 26,000 undergraduate students at Simon Fraser University (“SFU”). Established in 1965, the SFSS operates over 300 clubs, 15 committees, a legal clinic, a food bank, and student-run businesses, restaurants and a pub, as well as advocating for broader student interests.
3. The Graduate Student Society at Simon Fraser (“the GSS”) is a student society and government for all graduate students at Simon Fraser University. The GSS represents over 4,500 students in 37 academic programs at SFU’s Burnaby, Surrey and Vancouver campuses. The GSS was founded in 2007 after a referendum in which SFU students voted to form a new society, independent from the SFSS, to represent graduate students. The GSS provides grants to students, operates a benefit plan and provides legal services, and provides free tea and coffee to graduate students, as well as advocating on behalf of students.
4. The large majority of both GSS and SFSS students (together, “the Student Societies”) are located at Simon Fraser University, on Burnaby Mountain. Simon Fraser University (“SFU”) has three campuses, the largest of which is at Burnaby Mountain. GSS and SFSS members live, work recreate, and study on Burnaby Mountain. Their livelihoods and future professional reputations

are linked to the reputation of SFU. The members of the Student Societies, and the Student Societies themselves, are directly affected by the proposed project.

5. Among the purposes of the Student Societies is to advocate for the general interests of its student members. At the direction of and on behalf of SFU students, the GSS and SFSS sought and were granted intervenor status in this hearing to ensure that any potential impacts from the Project on SFU students, past, present and future, are fully considered and given weight by the National Energy Board.

Student Concerns

6. SFU students have expressed a wide variety of concerns about issues 1, 2, 4, 5, and 9-12 on the list of issues in the *Hearing Order* OH-001-2014. Many of these concerns were expressed to the Student Societies through responses to a survey that we distributed to our members the week of May 18, 2015. The survey is discussed further in a later section. The complete responses to the survey are included as Appendix A to this document.

Renewables and the Need for the Project

7. Many students question the need for the project, as renewable energy is increasingly competitive with crude oil on price, reliability, and environmental impact (Issue 1). This student provided a representative comment to the Student Societies:

The recent fall in the price of oil has shown us that it is not wise for us to rely so heavily on a single industry for our nation's wealth. Renewable energy is the way of the future, and Canada will be left behind if we continue to invest in infrastructure and development in an industry - oil and gas - that will be rapidly declining as the world moves forward with sustainable energy development.

The need for the proposed project cannot be objectively assessed without considering competition from wind, solar, and other forms of renewable energy, and the impact that they will have over the lifetime of the proposed project. The prospective but likely effects of carbon regulation on the competitive landscape, which are likely to favour renewables, must be a part of this analysis. In the case of a burgeoning renewables market with robust carbon regulation, the proposed project could become a stranded, and a dangerous, asset.

Fire Risk, Campus Safety, and Reputational Risk

8. SFU students have also highlighted a significant problem with the economic feasibility of the project: its impact on the campus environment and reputation of SFU, locally and globally (Issue 2). SFU is a major economic engine in Burnaby and the Province as a whole. As one of the most important educational institutions in the province, SFU is essential for educating the next generation of British Columbians. It attracts thousands of international students to study here, many of whom will immigrate to Canada or contribute to our economy and society in other important ways. This is why it is so worrying to hear that SFU students, both domestic and international, are deeply concerned that about the safety and reputational effects of constructing a large bitumen pipeline through their campus.

9. One student wrote that:

I am an international student. One of the reasons I chose to do my PhD at SFU and to live on Campus because of its natural beauty (Burnaby Campus and parks nearby) and fresh air. **If I knew there is an oil company right next to my campus, I would have avoided SFU.** Knowing now that all the ugly round shape tanks nestled at Burnaby Mountain belongs to Kinder Morgan I regret my decision to come to SFU. The pipeline expansion will make me to hate the mountain and the oil giant both. **Half of my country (Bangladesh) will be submerged due to sea level rising.** I am not a supporter of fossil fuel because it is a destroyer of environment and contributes to global warming. I do understand its contribution to economy, but there is always alternatives. Please stop the expansion of pipeline and explore alternatives. [Emphasis added].

10. Another student echoed these concerns:

I would be less likely to want to go to Simon Fraser University, and I would consider the proximity of the pipeline when deciding if I was going to attend SFU, or somewhere else (which, I'm sure, international students - who generate large amounts of revenue for the university and Canada - would consider as well). [Emphasis added.]

The reputational effects on SFU, from students who are concerned about their home countries being submerged, or from students and potential students concerned about the risks of spills or fires (one student responded that "I am deeply concerned to learn that if there were a fire at the Burnaby tank farm, **there would be no escape** for the people who were on the mountain" (emphasis added)), must be a part of any analysis of the economic impact of the proposed pipeline.

11. The concern about a fire at the tank farm is a common one among our members. Students are understandably afraid of studying on a mountain, above an expanding oil storage facility, which sits at the intersection of the only two roads exiting the campus. With an expansion of the tank farm, more students will choose other, safer universities over SFU. This is a serious economic and commercial risk associated with the proposed project. This risk will materialize even if there never is a fire.

Marine Shipping and Spills

12. Students have also responded to the Student Societies with concerns about the impacts of marine shipping in Burrard Inlet, adjacent to SFU (Issue 5). On this point, one student wrote to us that:

In light of the recent oil spill in English Bay, it is evident that the presence of more tankers and the expansion of this pipeline is detrimental to our ecosystem. I strongly encourage the NEB to take a stand against this project, and other of its kind, and invest in a sustainable means of attaining clean energy. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

SFU students at Burnaby Mountain go to school overlooking the Inlet. They kayak and boat in its waters, some work in tourism. Some work in fisheries. Others work or will work in energy, oil exploration, and various other fields. SFU students are overwhelmingly opposed to the proposed project and a record of spills on the coast and the possibility of a tanker spill in Burrard Inlet is a significant cause of that opposition. We hope that the National Energy Board will give full consideration to the likelihood of a spill and the possibly irreversible impacts of such a spill on our marine ecosystem.

Potential Impacts on Aboriginal Interests

13. SFU students have also drawn attention to the fact that many impacted Aboriginal communities have repeatedly and publicly stated their opposition to this proposed project (Issue 9). One student wrote to us that:

I grew up in Kwantlen territory and am grateful for their stewardship through millennia of the beautiful lands where I was raised. I therefore support them, and will join them, in their continued defense of their lands and stand with them as they decry the

disrespect already shown to them by Kinder Morgan's test crews who conducted their work on their traditional territory without so much as bothering to inform them in advance. As a resident of Vancouver, I also stand with the people of the inlet, the Tsleil-Waututh First Nation, in their inspiring commitment to defend their lands and waters from tanker and pipeline expansion.

Many SFU students share these sentiments, and support Aboriginal groups which have expressed their concerns about the sufficiency of accommodation and consultation, both as intervenors in this process and in other fora.

Impacts on Land Use

14. We have already mentioned the widespread fears of a fire at the tank farm, but potential impacts on landowners and land use also include the risk of spills in remote wilderness regions, where spills are difficult to detect and nearly impossible to clean up (Issue 10). The danger to both urban and wilderness environments from this pipeline must be fully accounted for in considering whether this proposed project is in the public interest.

Emergency Preparedness and Fumes

15. Any expansion of the current tank farm poses a danger to SFU students, both on an ongoing basis from chemical fumes and in the case of malfunctions, fires, and emergencies (Issues 11, 12). The Student Societies do not have the resources to complete an expert analysis of either the risk posed by ongoing emissions from the tank farm on Burnaby Mountain, or the risk of a fire originating at the tank farm for thousands of students uphill. The Student Societies note, however, that the current tank farm is at the confluence of the only two roads down Burnaby Mountain. This is a serious concern for students, who do not know how they would get off the mountain in the case of a serious fire. To the extent that an expansion of the tank farm 1) increases the amount of bitumen stored on site, and 2) increases the density of bitumen by, for example, reducing setbacks between tanks, it is a serious risk. With thousands of students (and thousands more staff, faculty, residents and visitors) on the Mountain at any given time, it may also be an unjustifiable risk.

Climate Change

16. Though the National Energy Board does not intend to consider climate change, our student members do. The real risk of catastrophic global climate change is a common, perhaps the most common, cause of concern among our members who comment on the proposed project. That climate change is not at issue in this process is also a frequently cited source of consternation from our students. On the one hand, the National Energy Board is considering “the potential environmental and socio-economic effects of the proposed project” (Issue 4). On the other hand, it “does not intend to consider the environmental and socio-economic effects associated with upstream activities, the development of oil sands, or the downstream use of the oil transported by the pipeline” (*Hearing Order*, OH-001-2014). Declining to consider one of the most important policy aspects raised by the proposed project calls into question the utility of this National Energy Board process. Simply put, by failing to consider a central policy plank that is directly relevant to the proposed project, the Board undermines its claim to be making a decision in the public interest.
17. Our students have commented on climate change, at length and frequently. Whatever weight the Board gives to the issue, we would like to include the following comments from one of our students:

For the past thirty years, scientists have been urging the developed world to make significant strides towards cutting carbon emissions. For the past thirty years, politicians have dragged their feet, if acknowledging this issue at all, hoping to put the problem off until they are out of office. Preventing expansion of the TransMountain pipeline does NOT represent a step in the right direction. Even without an expanded pipeline 300,000 barrels are carried from Alberta to the Burrard Inlet per day. It is understandable that, having become comfortable with our oil assisted lifestyles, we do not want to cut back. But this is not a question of cutting back. This is a question of pursuing short-term financial goals in the face of mounting evidence that our means to personal economic fulfillment is irreparably damaging our home. At this point it is essentially inevitable that global temperatures will have risen significantly more than 2 degrees Celsius by the year 2100 (See Policy: Climate advisers must maintain integrity. Oliver Geden, *Nature*, 2015). It seems to be too late to prevent eventual disaster on a global scale. But we can slow the process down, make the effects less severe, and buy our species enough time to plan for life after Earth. It’s about time people of the present moment cast aside our myopic and selfish interests. What is the point of crafting a political/economic legacy if any record of this legacy will be destroyed within several hundred years?

18. Even if the National Energy Board is determined not to consider the direct impacts of the contributions to climate change made by oil that would be transported by the proposed project, there are many indirect effects that it would be irresponsible not to consider. First, the effects of a changing climate on the integrity of the pipeline itself, and second, the commercial risk posed to SFU as an institution, and Canada as a whole, by being associated with the climate harm from the proposed project. These effects would fall under Issues 3, 11, and 12. These concerns are independent of any effect the oil in the pipeline itself may have on climate change.
19. Climate change is likely to affect stream flow, forest cover, slope stability, temperature averages and extremes, sea level, and storm frequency and intensity. Any complete analysis of the proposed project must include a detailed analysis of the integrity of the pipeline under these changing conditions.

Student Support for the Project

20. The overwhelming majority of the feedback that the Student Societies have received, and are receiving, is that students are opposed to the proposed project. But the opposition is not unanimous. One student, for example, wrote that:

I think people need to acknowledge our current need for oil. Just wanting to move towards a future that runs off of sunshine and rainbows doesn't mean we can make it happen by snapping our fingers. Negative press regarding incidents like spills is blown way out of proportion considering the relative infrequency of these events. Kinder Morgan should not be demonized. It is obviously in their best interest to ensure the safest possible transport of their products.

Another wrote that:

The project is capable of providing stable energy supplies while possessing minimal harm to the local environment.

The infrequency of serious incidents, the current need for oil, and the relative safety of pipeline transport versus rail were themes in student feedback that was supportive of the proposed project.

Student Survey and Results

21. The Student Societies solicited feedback from our members by distributing a survey to all SFU students, by e-mail, on May 21, 2015. The survey was open until May 25, 2015. We received 91 survey responses from students. Of those, 86 were opposed to the pipeline, and 5 were supportive; in all, slightly more than 94% of survey respondents were opposed to the pipeline. This overwhelming opposition is consistent with feedback that the Student Societies have received from our members by other means.

22. We invite the National Energy Board to consider these student perspectives as it decides whether or not to recommend approval of the proposed project.

Appendix A: Student Survey Feedback

Question:

What are your views on Kinder Morgan's proposed TransMountain pipeline expansion project? Say as much or as little as you like. (No offensive language, please). We will submit your comments to the NEB panel. Your comments will become part of the official record of the hearing, and will be available on the NEB's website.

Responses:

The time and money spent on a finite resource would be better served on long-term, sustainable goals. The recent oil spill in English Bay is a stark reminder of the dangers of oil transport. What it boils down to: are we interested in economy and money, or health and environment? What best serves our long-term goals as a species?

I am utterly amazed at the propaganda that Kinder Morgan is making-- that the pipe line is going to support communities and help economy. Various reports stand sharply against these claims. Public health and environment are at risk. It is my right to live in a healthy environment, even if it is at the risk of a minority becoming many folders richer and wealthier than they already are. We keep talking about leaving a better planet for our children, when the truth if the matter that we need to leave better children for our planet.

Burnaby Mountain is already suffering too much impact to its natural environment with the construction of condos and increasing deforestation. Most research universities in the world take pride in securing natural preservation areas, and it seems that Burnaby Mountain/SFU are going in the opposite direction. We must stop further developments and preserve the mountain - the few wildlife remaining has already suffered enough.

I believe that oil spills are inevitable part of the industry. The latest Marathassa oil spill demonstrates this. I believe investing in new and cleaner technologies is a better long term policy. Therefore, I am opposed to the Kinder Morgan expansion.

I am concerned for the health of Canadians and the sustainability of the environment. Rather than investing in expanding current pipelines, I would rather see alternative energy sources funded and pursued. Furthermore, I am greatly concerned about a catastrophic spill on Burnaby Mountain, both for the impact on the local ecosystem and for the thousands of staff, faculty and students who may be trapped on campus with no means of escape.

This pipeline is detrimental to the well being of our community, our school, our health and our economy. I don't believe the public should have to assume the long-term and deadly risks associated with the economic gain of a private, foreign-owned corporation.

I would like to see more capital going into developing environmentally-friendly renewable energy sources and move away from the burning of fossil fuels.

Plants, animals (nonhuman and human) and environment before profits for a few!

Kinder Morgan has exaggerated the benefits of the project, and underestimated the costs and potential for environmental destruction. My opinion is based on strong evidence presented by academics, among them Dr. Doug McArthur, my professor. Please see his report, "Economic Costs and Benefits of the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (TMX) for BC and Metro Vancouver" for details. As an institution of higher learning, I expect SFU to take a stand on this pipeline based on evidence. I hope that the NEB will be intellectually honest and do the same.

I think that no matter the amount of opposition, this pipeline will go through. If not in the near future than in the distant future. I believe the key to making this successful is full transparency and LOTS of prevention and mitigation. And if something does go terribly wrong, then Kinder Morgan will have a huge problem.

There is already an existing pipeline through Burnaby Mountain. Considering that processing and using crude oil is a significant contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, I don't believe we should be increasing our supply. Also, very importantly, First Nations people have spoken out against building this pipeline on Burnaby Mountain, their native land. Although oil companies continually tout the safe transport of oil through pipelines, there are accidents and spills every day that threaten our waterways. I fear for the safety of Burrard Inlet. I absolutely oppose this new pipeline through Burnaby Mountain.

This proposed expansion has shown complete disregard for the communities it would impact most. Invest in renewable energy.

These conflicts should, must, be avoided by including all the stakeholders, students included, in the evaluation and design of such big and impactful projects.

I am opposed to this proposed pipeline expansion because of the detrimental environmental effects it will have on sea life, animals on the land, and the ecology of British Columbia as a whole. In addition, this project disregards and violates Indigenous land claims and rights.

Growing up in a rather crowded country in regard to industrial infrastructure I can say that it is a huge privilege to be surrounded by the green wilderness on the SFU campus. I walk up the mountain to work at least 3 times a week and I really appreciate this walk. By now I know almost every trail around campus and I don't want this environment to be changed. Knowing about this beautiful environment was one of the reasons I came to SFU and Canada.

I am concerned about the longterm impact on the health of our local community (Burnaby Mountain), and I am also concerned for the health of the greater Vancouver community. Oil spills are never cleaned up, they linger and their long term effects are not well linked to current outcomes. Recently several spills across North America have left significant damage. Instead of spending all this money expanding the pipeline we should be investing in green technologies and green jobs for graduates of SFU.

This is a really bad idea, and it will hurt the community and wildlife, and endanger people's health and safety. Your commercials show that everything is alright, but Kinder Morgan has a really bad track record when it comes to spills. Oh, and I really don't think American companies should be building anything with regards to another nation's oil.

I am deeply opposed to the proposed expansion of Kinder Morgan's pipeline. My concerns are primarily about the impact the expansion will inevitably have on land, which has been deemed conservation land, and on the human and non-human habitat of Burnaby Mountain and neighboring communities. My family and I live on the side of the the mountain and I strongly believe it is my responsibility to oppose the expansion for health and environmental reasons. I stand opposed to all investment in non-sustainable energy infrastructure and in favour of investment in alternatives forms of energy.

This is our mountain, and the proposed pipeline route is through a conservation area. We have a responsibility to protect it, not pump crude oil through it.

This is just a bad idea. The recent spill in English Bay and just yesterday's spill along the California Coast show us why we should not be expanding pipelines. Moreover, Kinder Morgan's 2009 spill on Burnaby Mountain speaks for itself. In response to such a spill, let's expand the pipeline? Who's running this show? In light of this risk, I, as a student, am concerned about the risk to students on campus, as well as to the many animals who live on Burnaby Mountain. The mountain is a place of serene wilderness. Moreover, the examples above, the severe drought being experienced all over the world, increasing air pollution, increasing respiratory issues world-wide are all reasons for which we need to stop expanding oil and gas production. The money is not worth it. These types of projects are slowly killing the planet and humanity. Our addiction to oil is the very reason we need to get off it.

I am an international student. One of the reasons I chose to do my PhD at SFU and to live on Campus because of its natural beauty (Burnaby Campus and parks nearby) and fresh air. If I knew there is an oil company right next to my campus, I would have avoided SFU. Knowing now that all the ugly round shape tanks nestled at Burnaby Mountain belongs to Kinder Morgan I regret my decision to come to SFU. The pipeline expansion will make me to hate the mountain and the oil giant both. Half of my

country (Bangladesh) will be submerged due to sea level rising. I am not a supporter of fossil fuel because it is a destroyer of environment and contributes to global warming. I do understand its contribution to economy, but there is always alternatives. Please stop the expansion of pipeline and explore alternatives.

I fear increased tanker traffic through the Georgia Straight. There is still oil on beaches from the "small" oil spill last month. We are not prepared for a major oil disaster but nor do I even want to risk it.

The main arguments for building the pipeline are utility/profit, and that there will be no spills from ships. Damage from building the pipeline is underplayed. Even more concerning, is that pipelines must be maintained in order to avoid leaks. We are seeing in the United States that pipelines have not been properly maintained, in order to maximize profit. I am from back east; coming across the Rockies for the first time is illuminating, to see so much natural beauty, and so little regulation. The Kinder Morgan pipeline project would need to be planned with more consideration and intelligence before I could support it. In its present state, it would be wise to refuse permission for this project to proceed.

The simple fact is this pipeline is not in the best interests of almost any Metro Vancouver or even BC citizens. The purpose of this pipeline is for a giant corporation to have higher profits. The risk is of significant damage to our ecosystem. Why would anyone allow this? The future rests not with oil, but with cleaner alternatives.

The lack of care, diligence and respect for the community, environment and Canadian interests by Kinder Morgan, and the NEB during the early negotiations of the TransMountain pipeline expansion has been an utter disgrace. Transparency has been utterly absent, leading to mistrust of both the NEB, the federal government and Kinder Morgan during the planning process. The project is both unnecessary and damaging to Canadian interests, since the tar sand are the largest environmental disaster we are capable of producing, and has tarnished Canada's reputation as an environmental leader. If we insist on exploiting this valuable resource, we should do so in a controlled, transparent manner, with maximum benefit to Canadians. Vastly increased taxes to the companies producing the oil would do nothing but good for our economy. With rising oil prices, waiting decades to extract the oil will only lead to larger profits, as well as delaying the carbon emissions. All of this ignores the abysmal safety reputation of Kinder Morgan, one which does not reassure residents living near its oil tank farm, or along the proposed pipeline route. Increased oil tanker traffic in the Salish Sea must be met with accountability in the event of a spill, since such a scenario is an international problem and Kinder Morgan, as the supplier, must be held accountable to the highest degree.

As a student and employee on SFU's Burnaby campus, and as a parent with a child enrolled at an on-campus childcare facility, I have significant concerns regarding the environmental impacts and overall safety of the proposed TransMountain expansion project. Our air quality on campus was negatively impacted by the recent fire at the downtown port, such that the campus childcare facilities needed to retreat indoors and limit outdoor air exposure. Local waterways and shorelines have been negatively impacted by recent fuel spills. Such occurrences in recent months have emphasized the risks to both our environment and our health.

I am concerned about the environmental impact of the pipeline project, possible leakages and what building the pipeline does to the natural habitats of animals and plants.

opposed.

I do not want a pipeline in a heavily populated, environmentally sensitive (earthquake-prone), area. I would be less likely to want to go to Simon Fraser University, and I would consider the proximity of the pipeline when deciding if I was going to attend SFU, or somewhere else (which, I'm sure, international students - who generate large amounts of revenue for the university and Canada - would consider as well). I think this project is dangerous, and - in light of the many incidents in the lower mainland over the past 3 months - the region does not yet have the tools to handle emergencies. I also see no benefits to me, or any other taxpayers, to constructing this pipeline. I just see risks. Kinder Morgan can't even call their pipelines "safe."

We are at a global crossroads in our approach to energy use. Every conscious person needs to STOP the addiction to fossil fuels and contribute to energy sources that protect the planet. It's your home too - look after it!!

This is a short sighted project that will immediately exacerbate environmental harms and set the stage for future dangers while further subjugating the rights of first nations peoples and their relationships to the land. The best case scenario is to prolong the death of the oil and gas industry by a matter of mere years while risking the people and animals in the region and sovereignty of first peoples for much longer. Metro Vancouver and BC in general should be investing in renewable energy that creates lasting economic wellness not short lived construction jobs and livelihoods tied to a dying industry.

Risky for the nature and endangers safety and also will eventually changes the nature such as affecting the plants, trees and wildlife in that area as well as students health.

Burnaby Mountain is a beautiful natural area in the middle of a city. At the same time a company, whose risk assessment is questionable at best, is planning to jeopardize this nature as well as major outdoors recreation area of students. We have seen major oil spills recently, e.g. the English Bay spill, which can never be deleted as well as a recent pipeline oil spill in California on May 18. Pipelines are not safe and there is absolutely no way the safety of this TransMountain pipeline can be assured. We do not want it here.

I completely against the TransMountain pipeline expansion project. I am very concerned about the environmental issues may be caused by the second pipeline. Various unbearable incidents related pipeline and oil spills have been reported not only in the BC area but also in all over the world. Once an

incident happens, it's too late to save our precious environment. We should learn from the past. We should not add risky factors for our environment.

I think people need to acknowledge our current need for oil. Just wanting to move towards a future that runs off of sunshine and rainbows doesn't mean we can make it happen by snapping our fingers. Negative press regarding incidents like spills is blown way out of proportion considering the relative infrequency of these events. Kinder Morgan should not be demonized. It is obviously in their best interest to ensure the safest possible transport of their products.

We need a clean and quiet studying environment. No matter whom want to destroy it, we would fight against him.

Please protect our natural environment and do not risk our lives to chase convenience.

We need to move to green and renewable energy sources. We all know the government nor the K.M. is ready for a major spill. The environmental impacts would be huge. Plus with plummeting oil prices does this even make sense anymore?

I am discouraged by the lack of public outreach by Kinder Morgan, but I am even more discouraged by the outright dismissal of the views of residents of Burnaby (and of students at SFU). This is an unpopular pipeline, and the people who stand to be most affected by it are continually kept away from the decision making process.

The risks of this project are too high, and the number of people opposed to the project and their very valid reasons show that the project should be reconsidered. I am opposed to the pipeline.

Opposed.

The oil spill in Santa Barbara, California has illustrated to citizens (again) that pipelines are unsafe, hazardous, and detrimental to human health and ecosystems. The expansion of the existing TransMountain pipeline could lead our SFU community down a similarly dangerous path. It is immoral and unjust to further risk the lives of thousands of students (~25,000 students), faculty and staff to this danger.

I am very opposed to this project. Aside from concerns about environmental and community safety, there is absolutely no need for such a project. As a country we need to transition to renewable energies as quickly as possible in order to avoid the worst global effects of climate change. The oil industry therefore necessarily can no longer exist in anything close to its current form. Building new infrastructure to support the oil industry therefore makes no economic sense, since within a few short

years it will need to no longer be used if we wish to have any hope of a planet left. Instead of building new expensive infrastructure that disrupts communities, puts people and the environment at risk, and needs to be obsolete in a few years anyway, we should invest in renewable energies.

I am strongly opposed to it.

The fact that Kinder Morgan/Trans Mountain has already spilled oil in Burnaby and has treated the local community with such intense animosity (e.g. aggressively not allowing photos to be taken near their facilities, tracking members of the public through the RCMP etc) during this time is a warning as to how little respect they have for the neighbourhoods they work in. A KM/Trans Mtn spokesperson on CBC radio could not even defend his company's behaviour with any confidence. They are absolutely untrustworthy and corrupt. I have zero confidence that they would ever take responsibility for any accidents or put the community first.

The Kinder Morgan Pipeline poses a significant threat to the health and safety of both humans and animals alike. It will devastate natural environments and habitats and will ultimately lead to an increase in tanker traffic in our shared waters. Even with safety precautions, the government has shown a clear denial of the negative impacts this oil transportation could have on our natural environment. BC does not want to risk our environment to increase government oil profits. PEOPLE BEFORE PROFIT!

Although I've only started at SFU in Fall 2014, I definitely have seen the effects of the pipeline. As an avid runner, I take advantage of SFU's proximity to the Burnaby Mountain Conservation Area on a near-daily basis. In the fall, my running partners and I observed oily water on trails such as Pipeline trail. There were caution signs, so clearly people were aware of this leak, and yet no effort was made to deal with it... In addition to all of the First Nations rights issues, I think the environmental concerns are very real and immediate. If we cannot be sure of the safe operation of the existing pipeline, what guarantee can we expect that the new one will be safe?

There is absolutely no reason to support Kinder Morgan. I cannot fathom why democracy is not working at all here - that Canadians have no defense against both the provincial govt and the federal governments. The NEB has been shown by ethical human beings, professors and scientists -- to have NO INTEGRITY whatsoever. This is the corporate takeover. Kinder Morgan even had the outrageous ignorance to ask First Nations' people how often they ate salmon anyway? AND to suggest oil spills created jobs!!!! I wonder if they have children? Are they not understanding the potential devastation? The CERTAIN devastation? Now KM is attacking Canadian citizens who incidentally are paying for the policing of themselves against KM. This is beyond ridiculous. IT is time to take control of our resources and our water and not be used as pawns between Corporate Interests and government decisions that are based on corporate funding. This is an absolute textbook case of conflict of interest. Because we no longer live in a democracy, it is too dangerous to put one's name on anything. Private citizens and charities are being punish-audited for speaking out. One SFU prof was even approached by police because he took a photo on Burnaby Mountain. How frightening is that? Why are the interests of a questionable corporation KM being placed above those of Canadian citizens? Thus, I remain anonymous.

I am extremely opposed. There has not been enough respect afforded to residents opposed to this project. Nor enough attention paid to the negative effects.

The world does not need any increased chances for oil spills. I would much rather support cleaner and safer forms of energy and technology.

I'm concerned about the increased tanker traffic off of our coastline. The supertankers will cause too much risk and too much disruption (traffic and underwater noise) to the lives of the marine life living here.

Nobody wants an environmental disaster but without industry of this nature the growth of our economy suffers. The alternative of continued use of rail to transport the product to ports is far more dangerous in my mind. Improvements to monitoring procedures and vessel construction as well as heightened awareness from public safety authorities will all help to minimize risks. My concern is not with Kinder Morgan, but rather with the condition and safety of additional foreign tankers in our harbours. That is where the greatest risk lies, and where the attention should be focussed.

I am absolutely and unequivocally opposed to Kinder Morgan's proposed pipeline expansion project, just as I am opposed to any expansion of pipelines across the country. Extracting and shipping more and more oil from the Alberta oil sands is irresponsible, short-sighted and harmful to our environment and our futures as Canadians. The vast majority of scientists around the world are in agreement that in order to slow down climate change, we need to leave most of the existing oil reserves in the ground. Instead of investing in these types of carbon-producing projects, world governments need to invest in clean energy solutions for the future, i.e. solar energy. I shudder to think of what kind of a world we are leaving our children and grandchildren. Sacrificing their futures for the sake of "growing our economy" while bowing to the economic power of a corporation is ridiculous. This is all not to mention the contaminated water sources that are resulting from companies' relentless pursuit of tar sands development. What will we have left after all of our water, land and air are destroyed? We cannot buy a new earth! I ask the NEB to consider what a grave offense it would be committing by allowing the TransMountain pipeline expansion project to go through.

NEB is a captured regulator in my opinion.

Don't do it! Please keep our environment happy!

Please take the students and the residents' benefit in consideration. Burnaby Mountain should be and should always be a place for great minds. Don't disrupt the peace here please!!!

Burnaby is my home and where my children will grow up. I will do as much as I can to protect this place. Kinder Morgan's expansion of pipelines will endanger the natural environment and lives here. It's time for us to put nature and lives before economic interests.

The Trans Mountain pipeline expansion is a foolhardy and irresponsible proposal which must not be approved. My generation, and my children's generation, will surely see the devastating impacts of global climate change in our world. By directly contributing to the expansion of fossil fuel producing industries this pipeline runs counter to any responsible efforts to diminish these horrific and inevitable climate change impacts. The global impacts of climate change include rising sea levels, ocean acidification, increased desertification, more extreme weather patterns and species extinction, all of which will disproportionately impact developing nations in the global south. This is textbook environmental injustice, as the countries least responsible for climate change will be most impacted by it. Thus in solidarity with future generations, and with countries far away from me, I cannot support this pipeline expansion. My other primary reason for opposing this proposed expansion is the opposition from First Nations groups whose traditional lands and waters stand to be most directly affected by the increased tanker traffic, and increased risk of spills. I grew up in Kwantlen territory and am grateful for their stewardship through millennia of the beautiful lands where I was raised. I therefore support them, and will join them, in their continued defense of their lands and stand with them as they decry the disrespect already shown to them by Kinder Morgan's test crews who conducted their work on their traditional territory without so much as bothering to inform them in advance. As a resident of Vancouver, I also stand with the people of the inlet, the Tsleil-Waututh First Nation, in their inspiring commitment to defend their lands and waters from tanker and pipeline expansion. An oil spill in Burrard Inlet would be catastrophic for their traditional way of life and cultural heritage as a people. This is indefensible, in an era of decolonization and cultural resurgence for Aboriginal peoples in Canada, and represents a kind of neocolonization where profits come before people, and displacement through environmental destruction is but the cost of doing business. Finally, as a graduate student at SFU, increased pipeline activity in and around my workplace places me at increased risk of chemical exposure. However, this is the least of my concerns as I am AS opposed to this pipeline "in my backyard", as I am opposed to it in anyone else's backyard. As they have been saying in France anti-LNG movements, "not here, or anywhere else!". Please do not approve this pipeline expansion proposal.

Sincerely, Scott Neufeld

There's a few things happening preventing people, including myself, from having a well educated opinion. 1). Proper information hasn't been properly given. 2). False advertisements suggesting the benefits of natural fuel and it's role in our society. and many others. Overall, the expansion/creation of any pipeline would have a lasting negative effect. But what say do we even have? If we say no, there will inevitably be another proposal. If we continue to say no, there will be a pipeline constructed up north, somewhere where our urban communities wouldn't care about because it isn't 'home' or their location of habitation. Honestly, I don't think the questions should even be directed at whether the pipeline should be built or not. The questions should be directed at whether we should continue to invest in something that obviously causes more harm than could. Questions should be on how much we should be divesting from this method of producing energy and investment in more socially conscious endeavors. Also, why are upstream activities, development of tarsands, and downstream activities not part of of the list of issues the board will continue. With an expansion of pipelines, there will obviously be an increase in extraction, production, and transport of such commodities. In turn, they are directly

related to the environmental and socio-economic well being of both BC/Alberta and the waters of BC's coast. You can't just consider the construction of the pipeline and not consider the life of it and how it impacts the other parts of such a gross operation.

I strongly oppose the Expansion Of Kinder Morgan's Pipeline. It's my personal belief that in this day and age we should be pursuing more sustainable and environmentally conscious means of attaining energy. In light of the recent oil spill in English Bay, it is evident that the presence of more tankers and the expansion of this pipeline is detrimental to our ecosystem. I strongly encourage the NEB to take a stand against this project, and other of its kind, and invest in a sustainable means of attaining clean energy. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

There are other ways of safely transporting oil such as by rail or road. Seems like they're just trying to increase their profits by not paying shipping. There are an abundance of trucks why not use those instead when there is a majority of nay sayers. Kinder Morgan is a typical profit margin centric company. I live at the foot of Burnaby Mountain and my family and I have been affected by the oil spill at Burrard Inlet. While our house was left untouched, the smell was so strong it stuck to my clothes just from walking home. Even with the windows closed, the smell permeated through the walls. I am scared of the impact of another spill in my area. The Kinder Morgan Pipeline will not only affect my home, the one place in the world where someone should feel safe, but also my education and my community. I have not seen enough evidence in support of the pipeline to justify supporting it. I have wanted to attend SFU as long as I can remember, but the Kinder Morgan Pipeline will change my post-secondary experience by hindering my commute and impairing my studies with noise pollution.

Metro Vancouver does not have the resources to deal with an oil spill and it seems that oil companies and municipal governments care more about making money off of oil than protecting our ecosystems and communities. Following this year's spill in English Bay, it was made clear that this city is not prepared for a spill of any kind, big or small.

I find the proposed pipeline expansion project, the provincial government's unabashed sponsorship of it and its shortsightedness offensive. The inevitable & potential longterm cost to our environment far outweigh any short term financial boost our province might reap. Kinder Morgan, an American company, would undoubtedly be the "person" benefitting the most from this project, at the expense of millions of Canadians (and other life in our province). I cannot disapprove the project enough.... it's not worth it.

I believe that the pipeline is not a bad thing. Pipelines are some of the safest ways of transporting oil. A lot of people complain about the increased traffic in the inlet but honestly, that's what an inlet is for; to move boats through it. Oil is a necessity for all of us whether we like it or not. Eliminating the pipeline doesn't help and more likely than not Kinder Morgan will and should find another way to transport the oil. By the way, fear mongering in your emails doesn't help anything. Bringing up isolated issues without discussing the numerous days without incident is shortsighted and uneducated.

they can never make sure there won't be any oil leakage happen in the future, once it happen, it will cause a lot of problem. And the expansion thing will badly destroy the life of the creatures on mountain, there will be cutting tree, animal can't find a place to live, please help us keep our environment, please! I am opposed to the pipeline project. I feel that the project will cause long term or even irreparable damage to the ecosystems of Burnaby Mountain. It is not sufficient to think only of profit for the immediate future, but to consider how future generations can best benefit from our actions. Kinder Morgan's existing pipeline has already caused an oil spill on Burnaby Mountain. In addition to the ecosystem, families with young children also live on the mountain, and it is imperative to consider the impact on the residents' health in the event of a spill. Burnaby Mountain is uniquely beautiful, and I believe it is in everyone's interest to preserve and protect it.

In my opinion, the expansion of the TransMountain Pipeline project is a gross miscalculation of short-term profits over long-term sustainability and quality of life, and I stand fully opposed. The oil industry in Alberta is slowing down, and rather than (wisely) re-evaluating our options and investing in new, sustainable forms of energy production, Kinder Morgan seems intent to double down on a losing hand. Oil prices are at an all-time low because of a global surplus, and yet, Kinder Morgan wants to double (potentially triple) the amount of oil being shipped out of the Burrard Inlet, adding more to an already inflated market. Global carbon monoxide levels have officially passed the threshold of 400 ppm, which scientists have largely agreed was the "point of no return" from which we have caused irreparable damage to the environment. The Arctic ice shelf is ready to collapse this year, and to ignore these global indicators that the oil industry is heading towards a similar collapse is truly ignorant. Putting aside the fact that this is a non-renewable resource that can (and will) run out within our lifetime, especially at the current rate of extraction, there is the matter of other environmental concerns. Kinder Morgan plans to transport heavy crude in the new pipeline, which has a much higher rate of corrosion than other forms of oil. Based on the fact that many (already existing) pipelines have worn down at extremely fast rates, and recalling the disaster in Burnaby in which homes were drenched in oil, building another pipeline just increases the chances of an environmental disaster occurring in what is the world's last temperate rainforest - British Columbia. Furthermore, based on the response to a relatively minor spill of bunker fuel from a grain ship into English Bay recently, it has very clearly been demonstrated that we are not prepared to promptly clean up a spill when it happens. The current oil spill in California from a pipeline (May 2015) should demonstrate just how probable a spill is, as well as the terrible after-effects. Safety matters are also a strong concern of mine, especially as an SFU student. It is disturbing to me that most students are not aware of the tank farm currently occupying Burnaby Mountain, which could potentially kill or injure thousands and effectively take out a road, trapping students on top of the mountain, if anything ever happened to it. Adding in another pipeline just increases this risk, and yet, Kinder Morgan has clearly stated that they feel no responsibility or accountability to Simon Fraser or its students in terms of a safety or evacuation plan. Going back to the idea of non-renewable resources, I have to wonder if the oil industry collectively failed Grade One. I clearly remember my teacher's lesson on how non-renewable resources are precious, and must be protected and used wisely. Why is Kinder Morgan in such a rush to sell Canadian oil off to the highest bidder? Knowing that we are eventually going to reach the end of the well, why aren't we conserving or banking our oil supplies, and putting oil revenue into exploring renewable resources? Resource extraction and climate change also disproportionately impacts those from lower socioeconomic status, as well as people of colour, particularly First Nations in Canada. I cannot support this industry, as it destroys the health and homes of fellow Canadians, many of whom are unable to effectively stand up for themselves. Burnaby Mountain is only one part of the pipeline - it will run through many areas with less privileged citizens, who do not have the resources to protect themselves. The tar sands themselves have been killing the Chipewyan First Nation slowly by

contaminating their air and water. I speak up on their behalf. This is also a matter in which we must prove that corporations do not have more power than government and citizens, if we have any hope of avoiding a complete meritocracy. Not only are the majority of citizens living in the areas where the pipeline will run fully opposed to the expansion, but the Mayors of Vancouver and Burnaby have also opposed the pipeline. Furthermore, the proposed expansion is on unceded Coast Salish Territories, which the respective First Nations groups from the area have the true rights to. These rights have been upheld in a court of law, and the groups have clearly said NO to the pipeline expansion. If you were to ignore all of the reasons listed above, I would still oppose the TransMountain pipeline expansion for one simple reason: Industry has a responsibility to the citizens which it directly effects. I believe that more strongly than anything else. The citizens are telling you, loud and clear: WE DO NOT WANT THIS. Not now, not ever. If over 100 citizens choosing to go to jail over soil sampling didn't prove that, just wait and see. We will stand opposed. The pipeline shall not pass.

For the past thirty years, scientists have been urging the developed world to make significant strides towards cutting carbon emissions. For the past thirty years, politicians have dragged their feet, if acknowledging this issue at all, hoping to put the problem off until they are out of office. Preventing expansion of the TransMountain pipeline does NOT represent a step in the right direction. Even without an expanded pipeline 300,000 barrels are carried from Alberta to the Burrard Inlet per day. It is understandable that, having become comfortable with our oil assisted lifestyles, we do not want to cut back. But this is not a question of cutting back. This is a question of pursuing short-term financial goals in the face of mounting evidence that our means to personal economic fulfillment is irreparably damaging our home. At this point it is essentially inevitable that global temperatures will have risen significantly more than 2 degrees Celsius by the year 2100 (See Policy: Climate advisers must maintain integrity. Oliver Geden, Nature, 2015). It seems to be too late to prevent eventual disaster on a global scale. But we can slow the process down, make the effects less severe, and buy our species enough time to plan for life after Earth. Its about time people of the present moment cast aside our myopic and selfish interests. What is the point of crafting a political/economic legacy if any record of this legacy will be destroyed within several hundred years? And speaking of selfish interests, I have a selfish interest in not dying an excruciating death in an uncontrollable oil fire. Per a recent Vancouver Sun article, Burnaby Fire Department deputy chief Chris Bowcock has publicly stated that, if a fire were to erupt at the Burnaby mountain tank farm, ``firefighters would have to let a flaming oil tank burn out for three to four days. He also pointed out that people at SFU would be trapped in the event of a major fire, as the only access roads to the university run close to the tank farm and would be closed." One may object that Kinder-Morgan is capable of responsibly dealing with fires on their own. Yet the same article asserts that ``Bowcock is still waiting on Kinder Morgan to provide detailed "fire preplans" on how the company would handle a major fire." Of course, to think that a company that values its own profit over the future viability of the human race would value the safety of 25,000 odd people would be dangerously optimistic. I could go on for quite some time about the potential economic/environmental/social dangers posed by the pipeline expansion, but people tend to respond much better to succinct arguments. Much like the human race with respect to climate change, I have likely already gone too far.

I am deeply opposed to this proposed expansion. Quite apart from the fact that I want to see Canada move away from fossil fuel production, instead of towards more (I'd like to have clean air to breathe when I'm old!), I am deeply concerned to learn that if there were a fire at the Burnaby tank farm, there would be no escape for the people who were on the mountain. I am even more concerned that Kinder Morgan lacks a safety plan in such an event. Furthermore, I am disgusted at the way that the NEB has

slanted these hearings in favour of Kinder Morgan, and how Kinder Morgan are so willing to disregard the wishes of the people of the community, who have made it abundantly clear that they do not want this project to go forward.

I think that expanding oil access to Metro Vancouver is a monumental mistake. It has been proved in recent months that the area is NOT prepared for an oil spill, even a small one. It would seriously impact our fishing and tourist industry as the environment would be damaged. The rippling effect of a tarnished record of being a pristine environmentally friendly area would have unknown consequences. I think that the pipeline crossing First Nations land, belonging to people who oppose the pipeline is an insult. Kinder Morgan does not respect people or land. Furthermore Kinder Morgan AND the current pipeline do not have a good environmental/spill history. Including one into Burrard Inlet and one on the Mountain in the last 10 years. Allowing this development would be an irreversible mistake.

Shame.

I do not support this pipeline because increasing the amount of fossil fuels we transport increases the probability of a spill occurring, regardless of how supposedly "safe" the pipeline is. The fact that a spill response plan has still not been shared with firefighters (as stated by New Westminister's chief firefighter at the town hall meeting earlier this year) and the slow spill response in English Bay about a month ago is extremely worrying to me as someone who appreciates the natural beauty of our coast. Furthermore, the pipeline is going to cross through a lot of remote wilderness. A spill there would be hard to detect and even harder to respond to, and I have very little faith in KinderMorgan being responsible or caring the least about our forests. The pipeline may employ many people when it is being built, but the number of operator jobs will actually only be a small handful. Contrast this with the number of jobs at stake if a spill should happen, especially for those who are employed by the sport fishing industry. I believe that we do not need to expand our use of fossil fuels and should instead put more focus on a more sustainable future. If Canada can embrace change and invest in greener technology, we can become a world leader in the energy industry of the future instead of getting left behind with diminishing returns from an industry based on a dirty, increasingly expensive, and finite resource.

The project is capable of providing stable energy supplies while possessing minimal harm to the local environment.

This proposed pipeline expansion is indicative of an exploitative and ecologically damaging industry's attempt to maintain an unsustainable energy production and distribution method in the pursuit of profit. The contemporary innovations in the alternative energy sector conspicuously demonstrate the attainable potentiality of divesting from fossil fuel dependency, and Canada must be at the forefront of this necessary transition, both in the interest of job creation and the economy, as well as environmental concern and responsibility. Countless precedented cases clearly indicate the socio-ecological precarity associated with fossil fuels, and so we must work towards providing substantive solutions rather than maintaining and promoting a destructive status quo. Moreover, the extractive multinational corporate owned fossil fuels regime further promotes global social stratification and inequality, as well as the

foreign repatriation of profits, all of which prevents substantive economic articulation in Canada. Investing in the local alternative energy sector will provide massive economic and ecological benefits that contemporary fossil fuel development cannot. Lastly, the NEB's blatant disregard of the democratic process indicates the emergence of a new constitutional agreement in Canada, one where the interests of capital and big business take precedent over those of the body politic. BC made it abundantly clear that the Kinder Morgan project was not welcomed, and despite the wishes of the people, the NEB has actively worked towards insulating life affecting economic decisions from the democratic process. As such, in the interest of the environment, the economy, and democracy (i.e. in the interest of humanity and the planet), the TransMountain pipeline expansion project must be rejected.

For reasons of privacy I prefer to give an anonymous response. I am opposed to the expansion for a number of reasons. First, the possibility of a spill or the pipeline being the source of other environmental damage. Second, sufficient safeguards are rarely, if ever put in place to protect the environment except as a minimal requirement to satisfy a political or economic agenda and to gain assent. Protections cost money and that is diametrically opposed to profit motives. The third and most important reason is that I am of the opinion that in endeavors that may cause unrecoverable environmental damage that British Columbians generally, and Canadians specifically must demonstrate that important matters that will have long term effects must be dealt with with the highest sense of responsibility, and we must demonstrate this responsibility at the national and the global level. By this I mean to say that sovereign Governments must act in ways that demonstrate leadership in the protection of all natural resources to all other sovereign nations. I hold this opinion based on the fact that no nation can any longer consider itself apart from the concerns of the global environment. If Canada is to undertake, or permit the undertaking of such energy initiatives we must establish that we are operating at a level above reproach, so that we may rightly participate in a global economy that protects our natural resources with an eye to the future, and we may partake in the governance of the global ecosystem. At some point in time it is my opinion that there must come to exist a kind of UN of the Environment, a supra-national organization that will seek to protect the interests of all nations and all living things as a necessary measure for our collective survival and thriving. Even a "least harm" model is insufficient today, our hard science informs us that all things are inter-connected and there is no longer such a thing as a minor incident with minor implications anywhere. For example, it seems to me that the global community (pardon the use of over-used and perhaps trite terms) can no longer tolerate the cutting of first growth or rain forests in equatorial forests. Speaking metaphorically, these forests are the "Lungs of the earth" and no sovereign nation has a right, for purely economic reasons, to destroy these forests. For another example, there is emerging evidence of problems associated with the pollution and other squandering of fresh water supply now. While all nations and all people have a right to economic stability and a modicum of prosperity, this cannot be obtained at the expense of all other nations and people. Frankly speaking, it is suicide to think otherwise. Once natural resources that permit the ecosphere to flourish are damaged beyond repair, or destroyed entirely, no amount of monetary resources will provide the capacity to recover. At some point we will have no choice but to dictate what particular nations may or may not consume or destroy, or damage if those actions affect all people, species, and the environment. In preparation for such a supra-national administration, we must take the first steps to demonstrate responsible and wise management, and especially the exercise of care of the environment, on every level. As such, I hope that in this instance resisting the building of an expanded pipeline that we demonstrate a willingness to hold ourselves to a higher standard of conduct that sees beyond purely profit and economic motives of private concerns (which albeit benefit nations), to a realistically grounded basis for conduct necessary for the far distant future and the preservation of our planet. The questions are many: Do we need the pipeline or does it merely make more money for a private interest

that will make more money by enabling more air carriers to haul more air passengers. Is expansion of such wise or inevitable, or might we begin looking for alternatives now, rather than later. There are only rare instances where future generations in their times have looked backward in history and lauded the actions of the people who exercised wisdom in their time, to both protect themselves in their time, and to protect those in the future. British Columbians and Canadians ought to take wisdom as a notion and attitude immediately in regards to this proposed pipeline expansion. If there is an alternative to what I see as these far-reaching concerns, I fail to see it. I sincerely think and believe that Canada should stand above others now, so that we may command respect for our foresight and wisdom, to the benefit of all. If indeed it comes to pass that a supra-national organization must police the use of natural resources of world to protect it, we will have earned that authority, though we hope that should never come to pass if we, and other nations act responsibly now. If this seems naive, I apologize, though I truly do not see any alternative but to exercise wisdom over profit motives, or mere convenience. In closing, I can only ask which is the most intelligent approach if we are intelligent? Thank you.

I oppose the TransMountain pipeline expansion project.

(My comments can be used, but please use them without my name attached.) I am opposed to this project, first and foremost, because I am opposed to further expansion of the oil sands. The Canadian federal government has committed to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions along with the international community, but has also acknowledged that current policies will not be enough to meet those targets. With the oil sands contributing to a substantial and ever growing proportion of Canada's emissions, policies will need to be put in place to reduce emissions from the oil sands - whether those be emissions regulations or carbon pricing. Existing oil sands operations will need to make substantial reductions to their emissions, through more efficient technologies and carbon capture and storage, if Canada is going to meet its targets. Until existing operations can prove that they can achieve near zero emissions, further expansion of the oil sands should not be permitted if Canada is serious about its climate change targets, which means that pipelines to transport additional bitumen will be unnecessary. Furthermore, if Canada implements serious climate change policy, oil sands expansion may become uneconomical, which will again make additional pipelines unnecessary. Oil sands expansion and building more pipelines is inconsistent with Canada's climate change goals, and therefore the government cannot allow the former unless it has no intention to meet its climate targets. I realize that the NEB has little interest in hearing my concerns about climate change, but I am voicing them anyway, because as a citizen of Canada, climate change is a serious concern to me. Pipelines cannot be separated from their impact on emissions, and climate change cannot be left out of the conversation when discussing environmental impacts of a pipeline project. The NEB's disregard for climate concerns are a clear sign that the NEB process is majorly flawed. I would like to note that as a student studying sustainable energy, I am not in any way anti-energy or anti-development. In fact, I am very interested in energy development, and hope to build my career in the energy field. However, as a young person, I would like to see the energy system evolve in a way that is sustainable and will enable our environment to continue to thrive, for my continued well-being and for future generations. Canada can build a strong economy based on green jobs and industries, including those related to renewable and clean energy technologies and development, and it is in the clean energy industry that I plan to build my career. The recent fall in the price of oil has shown us that it is not wise for us to rely so heavily on a single industry for our nation's wealth. Renewable energy is the way of the future, and Canada will be left behind if we continue to invest in infrastructure and development in an industry - oil and gas - that will be rapidly declining as the

world moves forward with sustainable energy development. Furthermore, as a student at SFU, I do not want to see further pipelines being built on Burnaby Mountain that will posed increased risk of spills. I spend significant amounts of time on the Mountain - attending classes and working on my research, cycling along the roads, and running along the trails in the Conversation Area. An oil spill - like the one that happened on Burnaby Mountain just a few years ago - could severely impact my ability to do these things and would threaten the ecosystems that I currently have the good fortune to enjoy.

I am opposed to the Kinder Morgan TransMountain pipeline expansion project due to the threat and damage it will cause to the surrounding environment.

This expansion will likely lead to further dependence on fossil fuels, while increasing the cost that Canadians pay to access those fuels on the global market.

It'll be a threat to the community near campus.

More pipelines are not necessary and pipeline companies are not in the business of cleaning up after their messes once they happen. What they are good at is hiring lawyers to get out of taking responsibility for the damage that their company bring to the ecosystem.

People at SFU would be trapped in the event of a major fire, as the only access roads to the university run close to the tank farm and would be closed. As a student attending this university, I do not agree to the TransMountain pipeline expansion.

The pipeline is not only a health risk to all students who attend the Burnaby campus due to the potential of an oil spill and/or fire at the nearby tank farm, but it also threatens one of the things that makes our university so special: the fact that it is surrounded by nature. Should a spill occur near the mountain and/or a leakage or fire occur at the tank farm, the aesthetic of the environment surrounding the university will be tarnished for decades to come. Students benefit in no way from this pipeline.

I'm totally against it. I can see no serious justification for doing it in the first place, and the risks seem unacceptably enormous. I'm sorry for not being more quotable here, but this just seems like an issue that from a reasonable perspective is unbelievably easy to resolve. It's just a really, really bad idea.

They are a large corporation that inserts itself into environments with due process. The pipeline has significant social and environmental impacts. I'm worried for the future of all SFU attendees and residents.

Well their our concerns as of last incident not related to KM but the ship with a fuel leak with the fall out if a tanker had a incident the response on behalf of the government was way to late the contingency plans for this was terrible, KM could of stepped up and helped out with the emergency response or lack their off from both the provincial and federal govt s more consultation with first nations and other groups need to occur... the echo system will pay the price for the negligence on these parties its not about the money its about making this a success for everyone... KM needs should of started this discussion on their media long ago, their timing is terrible....

A conservation area should be 'conserved'. Please find an alternate route so that the ecosystem of Burnaby mountain is not disrupted.

This project carries too much risk for catastrophe provided by a foreign oil company.

The proposed project will greatly reduce Canada's ability to become a world leader in sustainable energy and technology. We must reduce -- not grow -- our dependence on fossil fuels if we wish to develop a healthy, diverse, and robust economy.

The proposed pipeline is to support a foreign market and not for domestic use. The financial benefits to the company and to government does not match the cost of a disaster if it were to occur. Most recently the west coast has experienced two accidents with spills or leaks from tankers. The marine mammal life provides livelihood for many westerners. The impact of a spill or leak will have irreversible impacts. The marine mammal life of the pacific already face tremendous challenges with global warming. The risks outweigh the financial benefits and the government needs to realize that we the human race rely on the pacific, and we need to protect and manage the resource for future generations. British Columbia is also known for its tourism industry and this project could wipe it out. People from all over the world come here to see our beautiful west coast. It could all be lost. Accidents will happen and it is just a matter of time and despite the best efforts to mitigate against a spill, we are not equipped to deal with such. The recent spill is a prime example. The courts also indicate that government need to get consent from aboriginal groups along the proposed pipeline. I'm aware there are aboriginal groups who oppose the project. The process to determine the application must be objective in its deliberations otherwise democracy is has no meaning.
