Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project.

Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.

Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Lamoureux, Roger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sales/Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>GE Oil &amp; Gas AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that your letter of comment includes:

- the nature of your interest in the application
- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

Please note that I'm in full support of the Enbridge Northern Gateway Project. I'm currently employed in the oil and gas industry and feel I have a very good appreciation for both the economics and the footprint impact of this project. This project is a must deal not only for the people of Alberta but for all of Canada. Without an viable option to transport this commodity to market we will be creating economic suicide that will create a negative domino effect through out Canada. The Oil & Gas industry is the primary driving force behind Canada's stability and it is your responsibility to protect it by not bowing down to those who do not see the larger picture. Do your jobs and do the most logically thing which is to see this project moves forward!
Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project.

Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.

Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: McCollum, Rick</th>
<th>Address: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>City: Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Province: Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Postal Code: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile:</td>
<td>Email: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that your letter of comment includes:

- the nature of your interest in the application
- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

I work in oil and gas and see the overwhelming upside versus the lesser inevitable downside. If done properly this can become the status quo pipeline that delivers respect to enviro concerns / jobs / economics / political credibility overseas, as well as other issues. If done properly - the environmental impact can be minimized (the area will well recover and (I don't know - may help by providing fire walls - for example)) and the upside suggests it should be done.
Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project.

Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.

Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Payette, Renee</th>
<th>Address: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>City: Orleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Province: ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
<td>Postal Code: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
<td>Email: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that your letter of comment includes:

- the nature of your interest in the application
- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

It has come to my attention from reading in the media that the review panel chaired by Ms. Sheila Leggett assessing the Enbridge Northern Gateway Project has been turned into a joke. Ms. Leggett is biased as she has allowed people to register to speak before the panel even after the cutoff date and coincidentally they are all against the pipeline. As well, she has allowed the review assessment to be highjacked by non-Canadians who have no business sticking their noses into Canadian affairs. These projects affect our economy and provide needed jobs. This particular pipeline is wholly within Canada, so foreigners should have no say whatever.
I am writing to Prime Minister Harper, Minister Joe Oliver and Minister Peter Kent with my comments. I know that they support my views and in my opinion they should step in and reassign this review assessment so that it is ethical, unbiased and is based on sound science. As well it should reflects only the views and opinions of the citizens of our country who will be affected by their decision. Foreigners have an agenda for wanting to stop any growth and development of our natural resources and it is mostly not based on environmental concerns. It comes down to dollars and cents.

As the panel of this review assessment, I demand that you do not allow this review to be distorted and illegitimate. You must restore the integrity of the system. There is too much at stake for Canada.

Sincerely,

Renee Payette
<personal information removed>
Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
Joint Review Panel

Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project.

Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.
Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

Contact Information

Name: Jack, Sloggett
Address: <personal information removed>

Title:
City: Toronto

Organization:
Province: ON

Telephone: <personal information removed>
Postal Code: <personal information removed>

Facsimile:
Email: <personal information removed>

Please ensure that your letter of comment includes:

- the nature of your interest in the application
- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

As a consumer I support the project. It should respect the environment and create as little impact as possible.
Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
Joint Review Panel

Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project.

Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.

Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raymond, Maureen</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that your letter of comment includes:

- the nature of your interest in the application
- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

There was an oil spill in Abbotsford today at the Kinder Morgan Sumas plant. It is a fact that pipe lines do break down and oil gets spilled creating all sorts of environmental problems. There is no reason to build another pipeline, especially in through precious wilderness of our province. There is no proof that this will create more jobs or a better economy for anyone other than the higher echelons of Enbridge. Native peoples deserve the same rights as other Canadians, to be able to stop the wanton destruction of our natural world and wean ourselves off fossil fuels.
Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
Joint Review Panel

Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project.

Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.

Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Cameron, Lexy</th>
<th>Address: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>City: Lakefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Province: Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Postal Code: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile:</td>
<td>Email: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that your letter of comment includes:

- the nature of your interest in the application
- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

Submission to
Enbridge Northern Gateway Project Joint Review Panel
January 25, 2012

Dear Sirs/Mesdames,

I am writing to offer my comments about the proposed Enbridge Northern Gateway pipeline project and to register my concerns about pipelines and tar sands development in general. I am a Canadian. I was born here. I have
grandchildren who expect us to preserve our land as best we can. We have that obligation to next generations as well as to the natural world. Lately, we have not been very smart about preserving our earth. I am opposed to the Enbridge project and below I will outline just a few of the pressing reasons.

Environmental Impacts

While the impact on public health of the development of tar sands is a grave issue (see below), the clear and present danger about oil is transport of oil over water via tankers, over land via pipelines, as well as offshore drilling.

Oil spills are COMMON. Spills are NOT outside the norm with regard to oil extraction and transport. They happen daily, in varying degrees. We hear altogether too many stories about the slow response to spills by authorities and especially energy producers. We hear about inadequate clean up. We hear about how the public has to step in and perform clean up themselves and even pay for clean up.

BP. There is the most glaring example of failure to date. While authorities, BP and its sub-contractors (such as Halliburton) wrangle over who’s to blame, the fact remains that there was a colossal failure and some say that half of the 5 million barrels of oil from the Deepwater Horizon disaster are likely still in the ocean! The Exxon Valdez disaster was huge and oil from that one is still washing ashore, some 23 years later!

The full effect of the BP oil spill will likely never be fully known. A year after, in April of 2011, scientists were reporting that the Deepwater Horizon:

"...gushed vast amounts of crude into one of the most important marine ecosystems in North America, a more menacing picture is beginning to emerge. Dolphins are dying. So are whales. Some of the area’s most iconic sportfish and seafood species are developing ugly lesions. And scientists are warning that the amount of oil left dwarfs the entire Exxon Valdez spill."

"One study in late 2010 found that crabs and starfish have died in an undersea blanket of hydrocarbons, in part because only 10 per cent of the oil on the deep ocean seabed had been consumed by microbes. Evidence on the region’s coasts also suggests crude continues to sweep ashore."

"And it’s not just dolphins [and whales]. Sea turtles are also being stranded at high rates. The numbers are " alarming,” Prof. MacDonald said. “The dolphins we’ve been seeing are coastal species, so they are exactly in the area the oil was concentrated."

"In Louisiana, fishermen are reporting that some of their red snapper catch is infected with what James Cowan, a professor in ocean and coastal sciences at Louisiana State University, calls “severe bacterial infections and lesions on their skin and damaged livers. It’s right now about around 10 per cent or less of the fish that are being caught, but the numbers are increasing.”"

"More worrisome: The lesions appear to be spreading to other species, including red drum, coastal sharks and sheepshead. “We’re seeing something emerge now that’s starting to sort of smell like longer-term impacts,” Prof. Cowan said."

See:

In July of 2010, several months after the BP disaster, two oil pipelines in Dalian, China spilled at least 400,000 million gallons of oil into the harbour and Yellow Sea and covered an area of 430 square kilometres. The explosion created huge fires and it is anticipated that the effects of the spill will be seen for the next ten years. (See:
http://www.boston.com/bigpicture/2010/07/oil_spill_in_dalian_china.html ; and see:
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/07/21/china-oil-spill-grows-off_n_653852.html#s120708 )

The following BBC link reports about another oil spill in China but it is especially interesting to note the numbers of
spills being referenced; see the right hand side of the page. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/8438362.stm

Closer to home, an Enbridge pipeline burst near Kalamazoo, Michigan, in July of 2010 as well. It took 18 hours after internal alarms went off for Enbridge to alert local authorities to the problem. In fact, prior to Enbridge doing anything, authorities were swamped with 911 calls from residents saying the whole town smelled of gas and reporting cases of nausea. The oil from the ruptured pipeline saturated a 5 acre wetland and coated a 30 mile stretch of river with an estimated 1 Million gallons of oil. The response and the clean up efforts by Enbridge appear to have been slow, inadequate and ineffective.

This video by Beth Wallace, a researcher who works with the U.S. National Wildlife Federation, is well worth reviewing: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7XW8KTrrtUo

Bitumen traversing through a pipeline is apparently much more corrosive than raw oil. That may have played a role in the Kalamazoo pipeline rupture. Oddly, a much anticipated report which Enbridge is supposed to be producing to determine the cause of the ruptured pipeline, has been delayed until the Fall of 2012 (six months late and more than two years after the spill). See: http://www.freep.com/article/20120116/NEWS06/120116011/Report-about-cause-Enbridge-oil-spill-delayed

Economic Implications

In terms of the economic implications of development of tar sands, I think several factors must be weighed. One is related to how natural resources are developed, to the detriment of other forms of industry, i.e. disproportionate money and attention to exploiting natural resources rather than developing other forms such as the manufacturing sector and/or the services-oriented sector. In other words, should there not be more effort put into developing sustainable and non-polluting industries?

The federal and provincial governments are giving the oil industry about $3 Billion in subsidies annually. The Harper government had promised to reduce subsidies, yet there seems to be little action on this front. It is recognized that subsidies undermine efforts to develop more sustainable forms of energy. Here is what the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) reports about our country:

"As a member of the G20, Canada has recognized that efforts to deal with climate change, wasteful energy consumption, market distortions and barriers to clean energy investment are undermined by inefficient fossil-fuel subsidies and has pledged to phase out its inefficient fossil-fuel subsidies over the medium term." Further, IISD acknowledges that while there has been reduction of some forms of subsidies “a number of significant subsidies remain and new ones have emerged.” "


However, by far the gravest concerns about the economic impact of side effects of oil development, spills from ruptured pipelines and spills from tankers and offshore drilling, is the cost of clean up.

This financial cost is utterly huge and I suspect is never fully borne by the companies responsible. Fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico are complaining that they are not adequately compensated for loss of livelihood from the BP spill. Clean up is never complete. The public always seems to be on the hook for clean up. The polluters do not pay the costs to public health. And so on.

Health Implications of Tar Sands Development

There is no question that the development of tar sands has detrimental effects on the health of people living in proximity to projects.

"High levels of carcinogens and toxic substances have been found in fish, water and sediment downstream from Alberta’s huge oil sands projects, according to a new study. ...The 75-page report, written by Kevin P. Timoney, an
ecologist with Treeline Environmental Research, was commissioned by the local health authority of Fort Chipewyan, Alberta, where many residents say they believe the oil sands developments to the south are damaging their health."


Alberta Health Services commissioned a study of health issues at Fort Chipewyan yet took the extraordinary position of providing to the public misleading spin, if not outright misinformation, about the study’s findings! A scientist called Gina Solomon discusses the report and states that –

"The results of the cancer study were never presented to the community, and the government claimed there was no problem. That’s where I came in. One of my colleagues asked me to peer review the Alberta Health Services cancer investigation. To my surprise, the actual report did not align with the headlines."

See: http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/gsolonon/the_other_oil_disaster_cancer.html

In fact, within the Alberta Health Services media release is a copy of the study (see: http://www.albertahealthservices.ca/500.asp) as well as the reports of the peer reviews by scientists, most of whom indicate that there are indeed higher levels of cancer, and rare cancers especially, at Fort Chipewyan. One of these doctors, Dr. John Dennis, goes so far as to say:

"In reading this draft of the report, I repeatedly winced as I digested passages that seem to place too little emphasis on protecting the community, and too much emphasis on obtaining an unrealistic ‘proof’ (at the 95% CI) that there is a cancer increase. I do not believe that this is the intention of the authors, but do believe that this may be how the report is perceived as it is currently written and presented."

Tar Sands Impact on Wildlife

I will not go into a great detail of detail here as it is well known what impact oil operations have on wildlife. Tar sands tailing ponds attract migratory birds. We’ve seen many thousands of birds who have died in tailing ponds. According to Global Forest Watch Canada –

"...the world’s only wild flock of whooping cranes flies over the oilsands as it migrates annually between breeding grounds in Wood Buffalo National Park, located on the Alberta-Northwest Territories border, and winter grounds along the Texas coast."


The devastating effects of spills on marine life are also well documented (and I discuss this somewhat in my commentary about the BP spill).

Conclusion

In closing, I realize that your mandate is to review the merits of the Enbridge pipeline projects and not the pros and cons of Alberta’s tar sands. However, I think it important that the panel keep in mind that the tar sands are not a benign industry. There are clear and very serious issues surrounding Alberta’s tar sands operations.

I understand that the Enbridge Northern Gateway Project hopes to construct two pipelines, each 1,170 kilometres in length, from Bruderheim, Alberta to Kitimat, B.C., and a marine terminal at Kitimat which would have two ship berths and 14 storage tanks.

One pipeline would carry 525,000 barrels of bitumen per day; that is 22,050,000 gallons per day. The other pipeline would carry 193,000 barrels of ‘condensate’; that is 8,106,000 gallons per day.

A rupture in either one of these pipelines, through the pristine forests of British Columbia and across thousands of rivers and streams, would be beyond disastrous! Further, clean up in remote areas and through mountains would be utterly impossible.
For this reason, I implore you to deny the Enbridge Northern Gateway Project in its entirety.

The risks are too great, the benefit too small. We know that more spills and ruptured pipelines will continue to occur. That is guaranteed. So, we need to know when to say 'no' and now is the time.

Thank you.
Dear Joint Review Panel,

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the important issue concerning the proposed Northern Gateway Pipeline. I am a retiree, who has a keen interest in the future of our world, especially the type of legacy that we, who are currently alive, will leave to our children and grand-children.

After a career of working with families, youth and children, I am able to count the number of stressors in many families lives, as too numerous. It is well documented scientifically, that in countries such as, Kenya, Uganda, Brazil, Mexico,
Bolivia, India, Somalia, and many other equatorial nations, that anthropological climate change is excelerating existing stressors upon families, in the form of scarce food and water supplies and a migration to urban slums.

It is also well documented that the continued use of fossil fuels, of which the industrialized world is a primary user, contribute to harmful climate change.

I know that your mandate is restricted to the pipeline and not the Tarsands, but if the pipeline is constructed, it will only aggravate the conditions existing in some equatorial countries. We know how globalization has connected us to our neighbours on the other side of the planet. The struggles that we are aggravating for our neighbours through our continued carbon addictions, need to be abated, by a serious reflection upon transitioning now to clean technologies.

When my grandchildren ask me "grandpa, what did you do to help?"----I am hoping that, in part, I can say that I wrote you this letter. All of you have a huge opportunity to say something so much greater to your grandchildren.

I know that you will be under extreme pressure as you formulate your conclusions, but remember your grandchildren, as the proposed jobs and economic benefits from the pipeline will likely be far from their memories and the quality of their lives.

Please recommend the rejection, of the proposed Northern Gateway Pipeline.

Best regards,

Howard Kirkham,
Victoria, British Columbia
Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project. Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.

Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Bagnall, Jessica</th>
<th>Address: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City: Prince Goerge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Province: British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
<td>Postal Code: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile:</td>
<td>Email: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that your letter of comment includes:

- the nature of your interest in the application
- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

To whom it may concern,

I am a twenty year old Canadian female, with an academic interest in political science and a personal interest in the sustainability of nature. I am deeply concerned with the impact to the earth from Oil production. The blasts and blows of the processes of this industry have far passed the limits of what may be deemed ethical. To continue with this custom in economics would be unwise if we want to remain a healthy, living community. It is a part of the governments duty to protect its people, especially at times where the people are destroying themselves. Of course there are economic ties with this trade procedure, but when do we draw the line? Other cases in history have proved that ethics over-rule the economic surplus. One example is the abolition of the slave trade, which ended due to a
speech by William Wilberforce declaring that all citizens were to blame for letting slavery abide. Another case of ethics ruling over economics is that of witch hunts. Before witchcraft became legal; many detectives, lawyers, judges, and executioners were at profit from the custom. Therefore, the ethical nature of Enbridge should be first and foremost to this debate, and even further the unethical nature of this trade industry should be reason to deny the motives of this corporation. Say No to Enbridge.
Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project.

Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.

Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: soch, maureen</th>
<th>Address: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>City: peterborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Province: on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Postal Code: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile:</td>
<td>Email: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that your letter of comment includes:

- the nature of your interest in the application
- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

against the pipeline and the corporate interests interfering with my government
Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
Joint Review Panel

Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project.

Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.

Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>macneil, kelly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>miss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province:</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Code:</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please ensure that your letter of comment includes:

- the nature of your interest in the application
- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

This is more of a question then a comment.
i would like to know how many canadians out of the thirty five or so million who live in this country will actually be
benefited with a full time permanent job if this project gets the go ahead. i would also like to know how many
canadians will be affected by a pipeline line bursting as this will undoubtedly happen because it is happening with other
pipelines as we speak and who do you think will inherit the mess when all is said and done
Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
Joint Review Panel

Letter of Comment

Contact information and written comments will be placed on the public registry for this project.

Hard copy filings may be made by mail, courier, hand delivery or fax at the address below.

Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
444 Seventh Avenue S.W., 2nd floor mailroom
Calgary, Alberta T2P 0X8
Facsimile: (403) 292-5503, or toll free at 1-877-288-8803

Date: 25/01/2012

Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paterson, Tom</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveying and Environmental Technician</td>
<td>Burnaby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Vancouver Engineering Services</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facsimile</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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- comments on the application
- any relevant information that will explain or support your comments

Comments

Attach additional pages if necessary.

The following views are mine and do not necessarily reflect those of my employer, at least in part.
My intent is to communicate to the Enbridge Pipeline hearing panel 3 main ideas.
1) My background as a part time commercial fisherman very familiar with the approaches and Kitimaat area and my technical background that has helped give me a balanced viewpoint of industrial development; the last time I was actively involved with commercial shrimp fishing in the area was the fall of 2009. I went to BCIT, a Burnaby technical institution, in the early /80s, and after obtaining a technician’s diploma of land surveying proceeded to work off and on since in parts of BC as a surveying technician. In 2001 I again completed a BCIT program, this time a bachelor degree in environmental
technology. I have participated in 2 public hearings, the first for the Kemano Completion project in 1993, and the Leggatt Inquiry into aquaculture in 2001. I wish to comment on the proposed Enbridge pipeline project as a believe I have a balanced viewpoint. I believe that BC, particularly the north, will be far better off without this project proceeding.

2) Part of my environmental degree involved researching and writing a short paper on the effects of oil spills on the BC coast. This paper was recognized by the geography dept. of Douglas College, and led me to conclude that oil tankers larger than what we presently have travelling in our coast are too big a risk.

3) I also want to conclude my comments with an alternative way for Enbridge to spend similar money that they are proposing with this project on another more practical and better project. I have navigated a commercial fish boat approximately 12 metres long in Grenville Channel at night near Gil Island in 2003 when the late Queen of the North ferry was beside me and the crew. I got a very clear perspective on just how little room exists for vessels when a large vessel is near. In the fall of 2009 I witnessed several severe storms while moored at the MK Marina wharf beside the Kitimaat Village reserve, including one that put a small frigefiter on a nearby reef. I want to say to all oil executives involved with this hearing that they should spend some time on boats in the same waters in the approaches to Kitmaat to understand just how treacherous these waters are. I also used to fish with my parents in the 60s and 70s for salmon in many of the areas in the approaches to Douglas Channel, including Camaano Sound, and can attest to the marine diversity and richness of the area, and how it would take an incredibly long time to recover from an oil spill.

The main reason that Enbridge should not build this proposed pipeline is that the money will be better spent on a similar pipeline to Eastern Canada. Canada imports a great deal of foreign oil, so instead of being so intent on exporting our oil, we should simply save the country a lot of money by just using our own. Due to the obvious destructive consequences of adding too many hydrocarbons to the atmosphere, mankind is going to be forced to go to energy sources alternate to oil and gas anyway, so we need to start now. It makes no sense to be in such a hurry to sell a non renewable resource, especially oil from the tar sands whose manufacture results in an enormous quantity of polluted fresh water.

I want to conclude by saying that I am extremely dissappointed in our minister of environment apparently being such a spokesperson for the oil industry and apparently not capable of standing up to the Prime minister to insist that an envionmental viewpoint be better considered with this proposal.
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Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Scarlett, Donald</th>
<th>Address: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>City: Kaslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Province: B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
<td>Postal Code: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
<td>Email: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I have resided in British Columbia for the past 40 years and I have traveled along the entire corridor contemplated by the Enbridge "Gateway" pipeline project. I have seen the disastrous effect on the local environment and local residents of flawed high level decision-making firsthand. I live in the midst of the area affected by the dam construction projects of the Columbia River Treaty.

Much should have been learned from that experience. The Treaty dams were supposed to generate electricity "too cheap to meter" and the reservoirs were to provide recreation and tourism; their construction would provide employment, etc. The reality was that employment was short lived and benefited mostly strangers to the area, that most of the benefit of cheaper electricity went to the major population centres, and the loss of communities and roads
and farms as well as productive forest land was a very high price to pay for a few huge reservoirs that fluctuate so much in level that neither recreation nor tourism has lived up to the promise.

Have we learned anything since then? It appears not. The Joint Review Panel appears to be set up to hear people who live on the coast and along the pipeline route tell how damaging it inevitably will be—and then recommend "mitigation" so it can be approved. But there is no way to mitigate the loss of a substantial section of British Columbia's coast in the very likely event of a maritime spill, nor the fouling of watercourses and forest land with bitumen sludge.

Enbridge—and every other pipeline company—has suffered repeated "spills" everywhere it operates. A 2007 "pipeline performance" report by the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board found 12,848 pipeline incidents across 377,000 kilometres of energy pipelines over a 15-year period. Internal corrosion was the most prevalent cause of pipeline failure at 57 per cent followed by external corrosion at 12 per cent. B.C.'s Oil and Gas Commission reported 37 "pipeline incidents" in 2009 and that internal corrosion was the "predominant hazard" and accounted for about 40 per cent of incidents. I understand that Enbridge's Kalamazoo River spill was blamed on corrosion as well.

Enbridge's response has been to promise "to employ the best steel on the market for its pipeline along with a corrosion-prevention program that includes protective coatings and 'cathodic protection' to guard against electrochemical corrosion." Unfortunately for Enbridge's credibility, protective coatings and cathodic protection are effective only against "external" corrosion. Given the length of the proposed pipelines over difficult and often remote terrain, spills are inevitable and clean up is neither practical nor historically credible.

Much the same truth applies to maritime spills; the size and number of tankers proposed, combined with the navigation hazards and weather make a spill inevitable.

So if the pipeline and the tankers inevitably will spill bitumen into what is now a very clean environment, will the Joint Review Panel attempt to identify ways to mitigate the damage? If you do, you will be failing in your professional duty and doing a great disservice to Canada. Enbridge can promise to spend millions, but that type of damage in that clean environment can not be reversed or mitigated in any meaningful way.

The Joint Review Panel must--this time--recognize that there are projects and development that simply cannot be built in a manner that offsets their inevitable damage via corporate financial benefit. From the viewpoint of the Canadian citizens who live along the pipeline route and on BC's north coast, all the substantial benefit will go to others, while all the harm will land in their laps. From the viewpoint of Canada, the environmental and social price of the "Gateway" pipeline and tanker project is such that it outweighs the financial benefit that would go to some large--mostly foreign--corporations. Your decision is easy--if you will just honestly consider the facts. I sincerely hope the Joint Review Panel will find it possible to discharge its duty to recognize when mitigation is not possible and that increased corporate wealth cannot outweigh destruction of Canadians' livelihoods and environment.

Respectfully, Donald Scarlett
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Joint Review Panel - Enbridge Northern Gateway Project
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Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Burns, Ted</th>
<th>Address: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>City: Chilliwack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization:</td>
<td>Province: BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Postal Code: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facsimile:</td>
<td>Email: &lt;personal information removed&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I'm concerned about the environmental impacts of the pipeline and terminal and am forwarding a proposal that could help mitigate or compensate for adverse effects - a northern gateway environmental trust fund. Such a fund would be somewhat similar to the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Compensation Program in that science based projects to improve habitat conditions/ecosystems in the pipeline corridor would be funded. The fund should also have a community component whereby environmental stewardship groups could present projects for support. Such a fund would not have to be directly tied to an adverse environmental impact but should be utilized to improve the environment in the corridor.

Trusting you will consider this notion...