

December 18 , 2015.

Ontario Energy Board  
P. O. Box 2319  
2300 Yonge Street, 27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Toronto, Ontario. M4P 1E4

Attn; Kirsten Walli  
Board Secretary

Subject: File # EB-2015-0303  
Application by the Ministry of Natural Resources  
On behalf of Enbridge  
Regarding Application by Enbridge to Ministry of Natural Resources to drill new gas injection well.

Good Day

Your process allows for comments to be made with regards to the issues surrounding this application.

The issue I have is with the applicant's treatment of the landowner and the timelines they set for us to be able to knowledgeably and in an informed manner make a suitable decision on whether to allow, or not drilling on our properties is found to be insufficient an unfair.

In this case I was advised that they wanted to drill another well on the property at a meeting on October 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015 at which time I verbally indicated that I was probably not in favour of the well being drilled.

In November I found a rain soaked UPS pouch in my back yard dated November 6<sup>th</sup> indicating they had applied to the Ministry of Natural Resources for permission to drill the well and that they would be starting work on the drilling pad on November the 23rd, 2015 and in the meantime they stacked out the property. The document pouch contained an application with a yellow signature sticky on it requesting me to "sign here". The cover letter was written in a way that it left me with the feeling that they were doing this regardless of what I wanted or not. A telephone voicemail was left with the land representative which reflected the hopeless I felt. This hopeless resulted in a communications breakdown between the applicant and myself as the applicant did successfully via voicemail and repeatedly try to contact me but from my point of view this was a cut and dry thing given their letter and my voicemail and the apparent fact that they were doing this regardless of what I wanted so no response was provided. (Working situation limits my ability to do so person to person during their business hours)

On November 8<sup>th</sup> another UPS document pouch was delivered and due to domestic circumstances was set aside for a week only to find that there was an avenue of review with the OEB application but the deadline for this was December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2015 only four days henceforth. My domestic situation and workplace workload and schedule (Normally 7 to 5) does not favour me being able to become knowledgeable and informed as such to be able to argue my position nor obtain council able to do so on my behalf.

Note: Approximately two years ago the applicant purchased property beside our property with or without the intention on which this well was *to have been drilled*.

Comments:

- I find it hard and unfair given the time the applicant would need to spent in advance to scope out and prepare a Project of this nature that the Landowner is only given a nine week window to make an informed decision on allowing drilling on ones property or be excluded from the process. A heavy handed tactic by the applicant to insure they are favoured by your decision by eliminating the Landowner from contention in eliminating suitable preparation time to mount an argument or case against them.
- To date the matter of compensation has not been formally presented by the applicant so how can one make a decision on whether that is of value or not. As in most cases the matter of compensation is a matter of precedent set within the industry and that compensation is what it is and does not reflect the fair market value, Fairness being a value we as a nation pride ourselves on.
- Fixed compensation seems unfair given the hundreds of thousand of dollars saved by the applicant by drilling on our land over theirs. It would be good etiquette to share with ones host one would think.
- Given the applicants recent Nexus Project this field was developed to my understanding to support their commercial enterprises and therefore, the fair market system should be applied to this situation.
- Of concern is "the matter of fact we're doing this attitude" that comes with the applicants position in matters of this nature.

Summation:

My issues are with the process and how the process appears not to address or take into consideration the Landowner in the decision making process. Hopefully, if this is a common issue found in situations of this nature that the Board will take a progressive attitude and revise the format to cover these needs.

Granted this is based only on the information collected with regards to making this application (as time has not allowed for much else) and may or may not be correct. Hopefully, if incorrect it will be seen fit to advise me of that error and given the information provided herein, use said information favourably to benefit these concerns and position during the decision making process.

We also appreciate that there seems to be a standard protocol and guideline you are required to base the decision on which appears not to favour or consider the concerns presented and seemingly favours that of the applicant.

The option to become an "Intervener" is not an option that my domestic situation or that of many others would allow time or cost wise nor does the cost of counsel and the time to retain said counsel and allow them to prepare their case, fit within the timelines provided.

*My argument against the applicant is with the time given between notification and required action date as being insufficient and giving them unfair advantage. Compensation as provided does not reflect fair market value for the rights granted and that the cost in time and monies to fight this inequality exceeds any future value to be realized.*

Sincerely,

Richard Wellington, Landowner

