

# KEYSTONE XL



## SEIS CHECKLIST FOR REPORTERS

The State Department will soon release a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline. TransCanada's application for a Presidential Permit for the northern segment of Keystone XL offers the State Department an opportunity to evaluate significant changes in the project, consider new information, and address gaps in the prior environmental review.

### FIVE MAJOR ISSUES THAT THE SEIS SHOULD INCLUDE:

- Keystone XL will lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions**

The SEIS should find that building the Keystone XL pipeline will unlock additional tar sands development and increase greenhouse gas emissions. There are an estimated 240 gigatons of carbon stored in the tar sands, about half the carbon budget (500Gt) that scientists estimate we can use to stay under 2 degrees of warming. [According to a June 2012 report by the Congressional Research Service](#), building Keystone XL would be the equivalent of adding at least 4 million new cars to the road. Keystone XL would expand dirty tar sands mining practices and lure the U.S. into a long-term commitment to an energy infrastructure that relies on extra-dirty oil. For example, [building Keystone XL would wipe out the benefits of new standards](#) that would have cut greenhouse gas emissions from medium to heavy duty trucks announced by the Obama administration.
- TransCanada has a poor safety record**

TransCanada is currently under a sweeping investigation by Canadian regulators after they confirmed the account of a whistleblower documenting repeated violations of pipeline safety regulations by the company. This is the latest in a long series of accidents, shutdowns and pipeline safety infractions that have hounded TransCanada. Moreover, experiences from the Kalamazoo spill have demonstrated that tar sands spills are significantly more damaging than conventional crude spills. The SEIS should consider TransCanada's plans, policies, and practices and evaluate the impact of tar sands spills along sensitive rivers and aquifers along Keystone XL's route.
- Keystone XL will hurt — not help — U.S. energy security**

Keystone XL is a tar sands pipeline through the United States, not to it. Industry has made it clear that Keystone XL is part of a plan to find markets for tar sands outside of the United States - while America's communities, land and water bear the risk. The SEIS should evaluate the tar sands pipeline in context of industry's plan to divert tar sands from the Midwest to the Gulf Coast where it can be refined and exported.
- The public needs an appropriate public comment period to weigh in**

Given the serious environmental impacts from the pipeline, the public should be given sufficient time to comment on the EIS. An appropriate period would be 120 days, with the State Department holding public hearings along the pipeline route. Then, the State Department should produce a Final EIS that takes the public's comments into consideration.
- Keystone XL will have a negative effect on refinery communities**

Low-income communities will bear a disproportionate share of the contamination of air and water created by spills along the route of Keystone XL and refinery emissions from processing dirty tar sands. The SEIS should evaluate which communities will be adversely impacted by Keystone XL and propose substantial measures to mitigate those impacts.