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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

On March 31, 2015, NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. (NGTL) filed its regulatory application for the 2017 NGTL System Expansion Project (Project), which proposed to expand its NGTL System. NGTL proposes to construct and operate new gas pipeline facilities in northern Alberta as part of its existing NGTL System. The expansion would include five new and separate pipeline section loops, totaling 230 kilometers, and the addition of two compression facilities. Approximately 91% of the project would parallel existing right-of-way or other linear disturbances, such as pipelines and roads.

The general public was invited to apply to participate in the National Energy Board (NEB) hearings by July 9, 2015. The NEB granted standing to participate to 44 of those 45 who applied. The NEB also offered a series of information sessions related to the project. On June 1, 2016, the NEB recommended that the Federal government direct the NEB to issue a certificate for the NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd.’s proposed expansion. The Board’s report recommended 48 conditions that NGTL would have to meet in case the project went ahead. The report was submitted to the Minister of Natural Resources.

In line with the interim measures announced in January 2016 on pipelines and as a complement to the NEB review process, an online questionnaire was posted on Natural Resources Canada’s (NRCan’s) website from June 1 to August 1, 2016 to allow Canadians, including Indigenous peoples and those possibly impacted by the proposed project, to provide their views.

Methodology

OVERVIEW AND SAMPLING

The research covered in this report consists of a national questionnaire inquiring about the 2017 NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. System Expansion Project. The questionnaire was made available in both official languages to the Canadian general public from June 1 to August 1, 2016.

Findings are not statistically projectable to a broader population and no estimates of sampling error can be calculated. The questionnaire included questions for classification, such as demographic questions with yes/no answers, and open-ended responses. Questionnaire participants were self-selected, inviting any Canadians with any interest to choose to take part on their own accord.

In total, 50 people participated in this public consultation questionnaire. The questionnaire took an average of 5.2 minutes to complete.

1 http://www.neb-one.gc.ca/pplctnflng/mjrpp/2017nvgsxpnsn/index-eng.html
DATA ANALYSIS

Upon completion of data collection, NRCan provided Nielsen with a final CSV file containing all responses. Nielsen cleaned and prepared the data file as necessary.

Key Findings

Participants mainly agree with the NEB’s report and assessment, and some are concerned with delays in the approval process. Furthermore, some are concerned about possible future accidents and water contamination.

The vast majority of participants were familiar with the NEB’s recommendation report, regardless of proximity to the affected areas, indicating this is a theme being followed across the country by participants of the public consultation. Those following the project have as their primary source of information the NEB website, the NGTL website and print media in general. Print media was more likely to be mentioned by participants living in an area directly affected by the pipeline, while the NEB’s website was more likely to be mentioned by those living elsewhere in Canada.

Most participants to this public consultation did not participate in the review process for the 2017 NGTL System Expansion Project. Those who participated felt that the NEB report was comprehensive and thorough.

Participants included the general public, which was the largest group, local non-indigenous residents, industry, and other participants. No participant identified as a local indigenous resident, a member of a non-governmental organization, member of the government or academic. The majority of participants did not live in an area affected by the pipeline – that is, a land crossed by the pipeline or a community near to the pipeline.
SNAPSHOT OF PARTICIPANTS

PARTICIPANT PROFILE

- General public: 31%
- Local non-indigenous residents: 15%
- Industry: 12%
- Business: 12%
- Other: 12%

Pipeline crosses my land: 6%
Nearby community to the pipeline: 19%
Elsewhere in Canada: 75%

FAMILIARITY WITH THE PROJECT

- Familiar with the NEB's report: 82%
- Familiar with the ECCC's greenhouse gases report: 76%
- Participation in the NEB review process: 15%

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

- National Energy Board website: 67%
- Company website(s): 59%
- Print media: 48%
- Friends/family: 37%
- Television and radio: 30%
- Social media: 26%
- Other government website(s): 22%
GENERAL OVERVIEW

Background

On March 31, 2015, NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. (NGTL) filed its regulatory application for the 2017 NGTL System Expansion Project (Project), which proposed to expand its NGTL System. NGTL proposes to construct and operate new gas pipeline facilities in northern Alberta as part of its existing NGTL System. The expansion would include five new and separate pipeline section loops, totaling 230 kilometers, and additional compression facilities. Approximately 91% of the project would parallel existing right-of-way or other linear disturbances, such as pipelines and roads.

The general public was invited to apply to participate in the NEB by July 9, 2015. The NEB granted standing to participate to 44 of the 45 who applied. The NEB also offered a series of information sessions related to the project. On June 1 2016, the NEB recommended that the Federal government direct the NEB to issue a certificate for the NOVA Transmission Ltd.’s proposed expansion. The Board’s report recommended 48 conditions that NGTL would have to meet in case the project went ahead. The report was submitted to the Minister of Natural Resources.

In line with the interim measures announced in January 2016 on pipelines and as a complement to the NEB review process, an online questionnaire was posted on Natural Resources Canada’s (NRCan’s) website from June 1 to August 1, 2016 to allow Canadians, including Indigenous peoples and those possibly impacted by the proposed project, to provide their views.

Methodology

OVERVIEW

This research consisted of a national questionnaire for the 2017 NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. System Expansion Project, which was fielded from June 1 to August 1, 2016. The questionnaire was made available online to the Canadian general public during the aforementioned period. This report analyses the findings from the 2017 NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. System Expansion Project (NGTL).

SAMPLE DESIGN AND SELECTION

Findings are not statistically projectable to a broader population and no estimates of sampling error can be calculated. The sample of questionnaire responses included questions for classification, such as demographic questions with yes/no answers, and open-ended responses. Questionnaire participants

---

were self-selected, inviting any Canadians with any interest to choose to take part on their own accord. 50 Canadians participated in the NGTL questionnaire.

**QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN**

Natural Resources Canada designed the questionnaire in both official languages.

**SURVEY ADMINISTRATION**

Canadians were invited to complete the 2017 NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd. System Expansion Project questionnaires online from June 1 to August 1, 2016. The questionnaire took an average of 5.2 minutes to complete.

Natural Resources Canada informed Canadians participating in the questionnaire of the purpose of the questionnaire, how their information would be used, and coverage under the *Privacy Act*.

Natural Resources Canada used Fluid Surveys through its website to publish the questionnaire and receive comments from participants.

**DATA ANALYSIS**

Upon completion of data collection, Natural Resources Canada provided Nielsen with a final CSV file for the questionnaire. Nielsen cleaned and prepared the data file as necessary. As requested by Natural Resources Canada, a data file and a set of cross-tabulation banners were provided based on quantitative analysis of open ended questions with demographic information based on pre-selected drop down menu responses. Nielsen’s data analysis procedures are outlined below:

**Data Validity and Integrity Checks:** Nielsen’s custom system immediately identifies cases where the response length is unrealistically short, contradicts established facts or presents patterns of response deserving attention. As a result, Nielsen can determine whether a case should be excluded from the final qualitative analysis if necessary. All of these checks are performed manually and cleaned out of the data in the back end of the project. Nielsen uses a checklist to ensure all data that is delivered to the client has gone through a rigorous quality control process.

**Data Analysis:** Nielsen prepared an analysis plan that included key banner breaks as required. Once the questionnaire data was collected and cleaned, Nielsen ran a series of data tables that provided results for all questions in the questionnaire, both overall and broken down by selected “banners.” This permitted the comparison of results from various sub-group segments of interest based on demographic questions.

---

5 Some participants took an additionally long time to complete the survey (one person completed the questionnaire over a period of 20 hours), which increased the average completion time to 53 minutes. After removing the outliers, the average completion time was 5.2 minutes.
DETAILED FINDINGS

Profile of Participants

This section reports the profile composition of participants.

PARTICIPANT CATEGORY

Participants were asked to identify themselves with the category best describing them, namely: local indigenous resident; local non-indigenous resident; business person; non-governmental organization; industry; government member; general public; academic and other. Participants were allowed to choose multiple categories or none of them.

The largest group of participants was the general public (31%), followed by local non-indigenous residents (15%) and business persons, industry members, and other types of participants, each with 12% of mentions. No participant self-identified as a local indigenous resident, a member of a non-governmental organization, a member of the government or an academic.

The chart below shows the distribution of the participants according to the category best describing them.

Q10. Which category describes you and why you are interested in the proposed 2017 NGTL System Expansion Project?
Base: All Responses (n=26).
PARTICIPANT RESIDENCY RELATIVE TO THE PIPELINE

Participants were asked to indicate where they live relative to the pipeline. One quarter of the participants live in areas directly affected by the pipeline, including 6% living on land crossed by the pipeline and 19% in nearby communities. The remaining three quarters of participants live elsewhere in Canada.

Participants living in areas crossed by the pipeline participated in this public consultation, while 57% of the participants living in nearby communities completed it, a similar proportion to those living elsewhere in Canada (56%).

Q2. Please identify where you live in relation to the proposed project?
Base: All Responses (n=36).

REGION OF PARTICIPANTS

Primarily, participants derive from Alberta, with others located in Ontario, British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Quebec and Ohio.

---

6 The participants’ location was based on their IP address. Each participant was also asked for the first three letters of their postal code, but not every participant provided an answer. In the case that an IP address was not available, the postal code provided was used. If neither were available, the location was not included in this description.
PARTICIPATION IN THE NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD REVIEW PROCESS

Among those who participated in this public consultation, only 15% participated in the National Energy Board review process. The majority (82%) did not participate and 3% were unsure.

Q5. Did you participate in the National Energy Board review process for the 2017 NGTL System Expansion Project (e.g., as an intervenor or commenter)?
Base: All Responses (n=33).

PARTICIPATION IN THE NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD REVIEW PROCESS BY RESIDENCY RELATIVE TO THE PIPELINE

Both participants who live in areas crossed by the pipeline did not participate in the National Energy Board review process for the 2017 NGTL System Expansion Project. Among those living in communities near the pipeline or elsewhere in Canada, participation rates were similar: 14% and 17% respectively.
Q5. Did you participate in the National Energy Board review process for the 2017 NGTL System Expansion Project (e.g., as an intervenor or commenter)? Base: All Responses (n=33).

Q2. Please identify where you live in relation to the proposed project? Base sizes vary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline crosses my land (n=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby community to the pipeline (n=7)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Canada (n=24)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram:**
- Pipeline crosses my land (n=2): 100% Yes
- Nearby community to the pipeline (n=7): 14% Yes, 86% No
- Elsewhere in Canada (n=24): 17% Yes, 79% No, 4% Not sure
Familiarity with the National Energy Board Report

This section summarizes the levels of familiarity and engagement with the project.

FAMILIARITY WITH THE REPORT BY THE NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD

The majority of participants (82%) are familiar with the report by the National Energy Board related to the pipeline. Only 12% are not familiar with the report and 6% are unsure.

Q3. Are you familiar with the report by the National Energy Board related to this project? Base: All Responses (n=33).

FAMILIARITY BY RESIDENCY RELATIVE TO THE PIPELINE

The two participants who live in an area crossed by the pipeline were familiar with the report. Among the seven participants who live in nearby communities to the pipeline, five were familiar with the report, a lower proportion than among those living elsewhere in Canada, 83% of whom were familiar with the report.

**Small sample size. Results should be interpreted with caution.**

Q3. Are you familiar with the report by the National Energy Board related to this project? Base: All Responses (n=33).

Q2. Please identify where you live in relation to the proposed project? Base sizes vary.
FAMILIARITY WITH ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE CANADA’S ASSESSMENT

Over three quarters of participants were familiar with the Environment and Climate Change Canada’s assessment of upstream greenhouse gases related to the pipeline project, while 18% were not familiar and 6% were unsure. Familiarity with this report is slightly lower compared to familiarity with the report by the National Energy Board.

Q4. Are you familiar with Environment and Climate Change Canada’s assessment of upstream greenhouse gases related to this project?
Base: All Responses (n=33).

FAMILIARITY WITH ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE CANADA’S ASSESSMENT BY RESIDENCY RELATIVE TO THE PIPELINE

Consistent with familiarity with the report by the National Energy Board, the two participants who live in areas crossed by the pipeline were also familiar with the ECCC’s assessment of upstream greenhouse gases related to this project. Among the seven participants who live in nearby communities to the pipeline, familiarity is lower; only a little over half (57%) are familiar, compared to 71% who are familiar with ECCC’s assessment of upstream greenhouse gases. Among those living elsewhere in Canada eight in ten (79%) are familiar with the ECCC assessment, similar to the proportion familiar with the National Energy Board report (83%).

**Small sample size. Results should be interpreted with caution.
Q4. Are you familiar with Environment and Climate Change Canada’s assessment of upstream greenhouse gases related to this project? Base: All Responses (n=33).
Q2. Please identify where you live in relation to the proposed project? Base sizes vary.
SOURCE OF INFORMATION

Participants were asked for their primary source of information about the project and each of them was allowed to choose more than one source. For the majority of participants, the National Energy Board website is a primary source of information about the project (67%). Other important sources of information included the company websites (59%) and print media (48%). Friends and family (37%), television and radio (30%), social media (26%), and other government websites (22%) were mentioned by fewer participants.

Q9. What is your primary source of information about the project?
Base: All Responses (n=27).
SOURCE OF INFORMATION BY RESIDENCY RELATIVE TO THE PIPELINE

Among the two participants living in areas crossed by the pipeline, a broad range of sources were mentioned: the National Energy Board website, other governmental websites, the company’s website, television and radio, friends and family and other sources were all mentioned by one participant or the other; print media was mentioned by both participants. Print media, the National Energy Board website and television and radio were the most mentioned information sources among those living in communities crossed by the pipeline or shipping routes. The company’s website, social media, and friends and family had the same amount of mentions. Participants living elsewhere in Canada also had a broad range of mentions with the National Energy Board website receiving the most mentions (at 58%), followed by company websites (54%), family and friends and print media (29% each) and other government websites and social media (21% each). Television and radio and other sources were mentioned by 17% and 4% of those living elsewhere in Canada respectively.

**Small sample size. Results should be interpreted with caution.**

Q9. What is your primary source of information about the project? Base: All Responses (n=27).
Q2. Please identify where you live in relation to the proposed project? Base sizes vary.
Views about Issues Surrounding the National Energy Board Report

This section includes common themes regarding participant views about issues with respect to the National Energy Board report. Based on the limited number of participants in this consultation, we have included all verbatim responses below, allowing for a transparent view of all opinions presented.

ISSUES RELATED TO POTENTIAL IMPACTS NOT CONTAINED IN THE NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD REPORT

The public consultation asked participants whether there were other specific issues related to potential impacts that were not contained in the NEB report. Three participants provided a response and all responses indicated that the report was thorough and covered all items. All three responses came from participants living elsewhere in Canada. Two of the three were familiar with both the report by the NEB and the ECCC’s assessment of upstream greenhouse gases, and they participated in the NEB review process for the 2017 NGTL System Expansion project. The verbatim responses are presented below.

“No, I believe the NEB report and process is thorough and comprehensive."

“The Board report was thorough and detailed.”

“No.”

Q6. Are there other specific issues related to potential impacts that you feel were not contained in the NEB report?
Base: All Responses (n=3).

VIEWS ABOUT THE PROJECT THAT ARE NOT ADDRESSED IN THE NATIONAL ENERGY BOARD REPORT OR IN THE UPSTREAM GREENHOUSE GAS ASSESSMENT

Participants were asked about any views they may have about the project that are not addressed in the NEB report or in the upstream greenhouse gas assessment. Of the twelve participants who provided a response to this question, the majority agrees with the NEB’s assessment that this project is of public interest and meets the criteria and the needs for the pipeline.

Some participants expressed their concern over the delays with respect to the approval of the project, particularly considering the positive technical assessment from the NEB report. One respondent expressed the need for consistent and constant oversight of the project during and after construction. It is worth mentioning that both participants living in areas crossed by the pipeline expressed no concerns over the project. All verbatim responses are presented below.

The Project is of Public Interest to Canada/ No Concerns About the Project

“I agree with the NEB’s assessment that this project is required and in the public interest. I would like to see a speedy review and approval by the Government of Canada.”

“I believe that pipeline development in Canada is highly vital.”
“I have no concerns with this project crossing my land.”

“This pipeline crosses my property, I have read and heard all related views to these topics and am comfortable with what decisions will be made going forward.”

“The NEB covered this just fine. Their technical assessments meet the criteria and the needs for this pipeline project.”

“We must continue to improve our production facilities for the betterment of all Canadians.”

“No.”

**Concerns over Delays to Implementation**

“If the Applicant for the Project has completed adequate consultation, and the NEB report is supportive of the Project as a non-green-field expansion for gas (not oil) pipelines (i.e., +90% of the construction will be to already disturbed lands), why is the Project being held up at this point under the auspices of additional required consultation on the Crown’s behalf? It would seem that the change in government is throwing both the NEB’s regulatory review and previous Crown consultation out as invalid, while punishing Alberta’s economy and local communities who typically rely on industry construction for their livelihood (regardless of any business/company impacts). Does the government believe it will get to a point where Aboriginal groups and Metis communities will agree that Crown consultation was adequate on any specific project? There is additionally a lack of clarity around how this process is to unfold - the Minister of NRCan requested a two-month delay to its processing time for the Project and published this survey. Since then, no further information has been issued, and no process updates are available with respect to what the government plan on doing with this survey feedback, or what the next steps are. Will there be a summary issued of feedback received? When will the Project be issued a final decision? What about the socio-economic impacts to those regions who depend on oil and gas industry projects? How much weight is being placed on Crown consultation versus safety, economic opportunities, energy infrastructure or even environmental issues within the context of project that may serve the broader nation in terms of gas supply, but is being evaluated currently only on aboriginal issues by the federal government?”

“Why is the NGTL 2017 Project being delayed by this survey? The schedule for construction could very easily be adversely impacted by this survey process, so what meaningful impact do the results of this survey provide if the NEB has already provided the recommendation to approve the Project after their extensive reviews of the environmental studies required for the Project? Is this survey not a direct affront to the jurisdiction of the NEB? The NEB would have done adequate consultation with other federal departments such as Environment Canada prior to an approval recommendation. Is NRCAN’s survey an indicator that the NEB’s authority is being questioned internal to the federal government by other departments? Why wouldn’t this survey have been administered in parallel with the applications to
participate in the hearing? If interested parties had feedback would it not have been collected then? The public was invited to participate in that process through advertisements placed by the NEB.”

“This project would provide many job opportunities for many Canadians. There are many related industries Alberta, BC, Ontario, and even in the US that would benefit from this project’s approval. Please listen to the Canadian public and support jobs. The[n] if the project has met the requirements of the studies above (National Energy Board report and greenhouse gas assessment) then the project should be approved promptly. To Summarize: The Canadian government should demonstrate that it is efficient and fair, in reviewing this project.”

“Canada is a first world country when it comes to oversight. Canada is a third world country when it comes to getting anything done. I am a citizen that does not wish to lower my standard of living and lower Canada's place in the business world by stalling every pipeline project. The longer these delays take, the poorer Canada becomes.”

Other Themes

“I feel that a more consistent and constant oversight of the project during and after construction is needed. As well, I believe that better regulation in terms of maintenance and safety procedures and protocols is imperative to protecting communities, drinking water, groundwater and native land.”

Q7. Please elaborate on any views you may have about the project that are not addressed in the National Energy Board report or in the upstream greenhouse gas assessment.

Base: All Responses (n=13).

ISSUES RELATING TO POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO RESIDENTS OR THEIR COMMUNITIES

Finally, participants were asked if they had any issues relating to potential impacts to them or their community. Six participants provided a response. Two participants mentioned concerns over possible spills and the contamination of drinking water and farming lands. Two participants expressed concerns over the economic impact the construction delay may cause and the other two expressed no concerns about the project. Verbatim responses are presented below.

Concerns about the Safety and Maintenance of the Pipelines / Contamination of Groundwater

“I am concerned about the oversight of the safety and maintenance of the pipelines and how it possibly could have an impact on the probability of disasters and mishaps. I am also concerned that in an attempt
to save money, the company could be cutting corners and ignoring rules and regulations, thereby putting groundwater, farmland, natural parks, and drinking water at risk.”

“I live in the community of Chilliwack BC of 90,000 people and fear that our aquifier which serves as drinking water for us will be contaminated on any oil spill. If it has to be built then build it outside of Chilliwack’s aquifier. Also reroute the existing pipeline to follow the same route. That is my concern.”

Concerns over the Delay of the Construction

“The construction of these pipeline additions provide high-paying jobs needed in my community. Fort McMurray has been hard hit by the declining economy, by wild fires, and now by unnecessary additional processes such as this NRCAN survey that stand in the way of on-time construction of critical energy infrastructure supported by companies like my family-owned business. If CPCN is not issued in a timely manner, the winter construction season (already hampered by KWBZ restrictions for caribou habitat) for 2016/17 will be lost and it will cost local companies the opportunity this project provides to survive in this market.”

“Yes, there will be extra jobs created with this project, and will help keep jobs in our rural community. Farming is number one job creator here, but oil and gas employ a lot as well.”

No Concerns

“No”

“The pipeline crosses a couple of my properties. Any and all work that has been completed on these properties have been worked and cleaned up to the standards that were promised. I have no issues with this project.”

Q8. Are there specific issues relating to potential impacts to you or your community?
Base: All Responses (n=6)