

From: [registrar](#)
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Letter of Comment FW: Consideration of climate change in: Enbridge 2021 Dawn ParkwayExpansion, file number EB-2019-0159
Date: Tuesday, February 4, 2020 1:15:26 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[oledata.mso](#)

John Pickernell, Manager, Applications Administration

2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor, Toronto ON M4P 1E4 | ☎ 416-440-7605 | registrar@oeb.ca | OEB.ca |



From: Miriam [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, February 2, 2020 11:33 PM
To: BoardSec <BoardSec@oeb.ca>
Cc: Jeff.Yurek [REDACTED]
Subject: Consideration of climate change in: Enbridge 2021 Dawn ParkwayExpansion, file number EB-2019-0159

To the Ontario Energy Board:

Thank you for opening this important question to public input.

I strongly maintain that your consideration of the above file must include both

- i. impacts related to the methods of upstream natural gas extraction (such as hydraulic fracturing) for natural gas that will be transported through the pipeline, and
- ii. impacts related to the ultimate downstream consumption of the natural gas transported through the pipeline.

My position is based on scientific research which is widely available and accepted by the vast majority of climate scientists, including the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change.

- i. This <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2019/08/190814090610.htm> is just a sample of the widely available information and research which indicates clearly that the increase in methane gas, a potent and dangerous greenhouse gas, in the atmosphere, is directly related to fracking. For this alone, fracking should be banned, even without consideration to additional environmental damage that this practice has been proven to cause.

ii. We are living in a time of emergency, although in our part of the world those of us who have a roof over our heads, air conditioning, and have not suffered flooding, are temporarily sheltered from the impacts of climate change. However, we must not be short-sighted about it: our children and grandchildren are the ones who will be confronted with the worst impacts. Again, science is practically united behind a call to urgently and drastically reduce human greenhouse gas emissions which are quickly leading the environment to a series of tipping points and run-away heating, droughts, wildfires, flooding, extreme storms, and the breakdown of global food supplies. We have one atmosphere, and every molecule of CO₂ that goes into it will remain there and continue to wreak havoc for many years.

I have found this EPS explanation about the difference between carbon dioxide and methane very helpful -- each is dangerous in its own way:

The Global Warming Potential (GWP) for a gas is a measure of the total energy that a gas absorbs over a particular period of time (usually 100 years), compared to carbon dioxide.[1] The larger the GWP, the more warming the gas causes. For example, methane's 100-year GWP is 21, which means that methane will cause 21 times as much warming as an equivalent mass of carbon dioxide over a 100-year time period. [2]

one pound of methane equals one pound of carbon dioxide

Carbon dioxide (CO₂) has a GWP of 1 and serves as a baseline for other GWP values. CO₂ remains in the atmosphere for a very long time - changes in atmospheric CO₂ concentrations persist for thousands of years.

Methane (CH₄) has a GWP more than 20 times higher than CO₂ for a 100-year time scale. CH₄ emitted today lasts for only about a decade in the atmosphere, on average.[3] However, on a pound-for-pound basis, CH₄ absorbs more energy than CO₂, making its GWP higher.

<https://www.epa.gov/climateleadership/atmospheric-lifetime-and-global-warming-potential-defined>

Canada (as well as the State of New York, Hamilton, and over one thousand other national and local jurisdictions) has declared a climate emergency, and public awareness of the problem and of the need for urgent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions is on the rise, as indicated by public opinion polls. As a result, the use of natural gas can be expected to drop drastically in the near future.

The OEB must consider the grievous, long-term environmental harm that will be caused by allowing the construction of a pipeline which will transport a short-lived and harmful commodity.

Thanks for your attention.

Miriam Sager

