

Thursday February 17, 2011

Ms. Kerstin Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge St., 27th floor
Toronto ON M4P 1E4

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

RECEIVED

FEB 28 2011

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD
OFFICE OF THE BOARD SECRETARY

By courier

Dear Madame, *2/28/11*

Re: EB-2011-0024, Letter of Comment

Please find attached, seven copies of my letter of comment, concerning the Enbridge Pipeline EB2011-0024, to be filed with your proceedings.

Thank you,

Andrea Loepky

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]



RECEIVED

FEB 17 2011

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

RECEIVED

Date: 17/02/11

FEB 17 2011

Re: EB-2011-0024 LETTER OF COMMENT

Submitted by: Andrea Loeppky

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

[REDACTED] a

As a board member of Concerned Citizens of King Township and a resident of the Municipality of King, I support the Municipalities' request to conduct a review of the route approved by Ontario Energy Board for Enbridge's natural gas pipeline to supply the York Energy Centre.

As I understand it, the proposed plan entails running a 650 psi high pressure pipeline, 17 km from the gate station at as the eastern edge of the village of Pottageville, westward along Lloydtown-Aurora Road, north on Jane Street, east on Hwy #9 and finally north to the power plant at 18781 Dufferin Street. An alternate preferred route (Route 4) would bypass the length of the main thoroughfare in the village of Pottageville by heading westward away from the village and north on 8th Concession to Hwy #9.

According to the Enbridge website, the selected route passing through Pottageville has the advantage of avoiding potential damage of large specimen trees along other routes and would cross fewer municipal and agricultural drains. However the disadvantage of the preferred route is there are more potentially contaminated areas and has the highest number of residential properties with groundwater wells within 200 feet of the proposed pipeline route.

An alternative route would by-pass schools and communities, except for residents and school in the village of Ansnorveldt where the power plant is being built. This pipeline route poses serious and unnecessary risks to the children who attend Kettleby Public School on Lloydtown-Aurora Road and the residents of Pottageville, particularly those living along Lloydtown-Aurora Road where many older homes are situated close to the road allowance. Due to the very high pressure of this pipeline, a breach by construction equipment working in this densely populated section, could result in a much higher magnitude explosion resulting in significant destruction and casualties.

Enbridge claims that any re-routing would result in damages, specifically delays and costs, to the company and its customer York Energy Centre. They state that it is unfair to the public interest to review the approved route. One must question whether the public interest is truly threatened by a delay since this is a dedicated pipeline to supply a peaker generation facility. Presumably the public interest is concerned with ensuring adequate power in peak electricity demand periods. Since it is widely known that Ontario has surplus energy, a delay does not put the general public in jeopardy. It should be noted that the magnitude of the potential time delay has been left unspecified by Enbridge. Furthermore, Enbridge has not specify the cost differential for a change in routing, although they acknowledge that the contract to construct the remainder of the pipeline has not been awarded.

It would appear that in this matter, costs and environment concerns held higher weight than the safety and socio-economic impact on local residents of Pottageville and Kettleby area school children. It would seem irresponsible to subject citizens to a heightened risk when alternatives are readily available and the impact to the company and general public are presumably minimal.

Andrea Loeppky