

OLYMPIADS SCHOOL/GRADE 9 AND 10 WRITING/HANDOUT 8

Announcement:

The midterm assessment is scheduled for Class 10. To prepare for it, review all the handouts and marked homework that you have received.

Handout 8 Instructions:

This week's lesson is about summarizing with purpose. Complete the exercises in *Independent Writing* to review the summary-writing skills that we learned earlier this term, then proceed to the group activity.

SUMMARY WRITING

Part Two: More Preparation for Summary Writing

In Chapter One, we practiced finding main ideas in short paragraphs and then choosing from possible restatements of those main ideas. Let's continue to practice choosing the best restatement of an author's main idea, remembering that in summary writing, we must restate the author's ideas in our own words.

Exercise I. Restating Main Ideas

Read each paragraph and underline the main idea sentence. Then choose the sentence that best restates the main idea.

1. It has been found that many obese persons eat food to get satisfaction or to compensate for personality problems. An overweight girl who is not socially accepted may make herself feel better by eating rich desserts or junk foods. Persons who are tense, afraid, bored, or frustrated may find that eating makes them feel better. A person who lacks affection or recognition may also turn to food. There is evidence that psychological factors may play a role in obesity problems for many people.

- _____ a. Obese people are not socially accepted.
- _____ b. Overweight people may be tense or frustrated.
- _____ c. Obesity may be influenced by psychological factors.

2. In the United States, formal education is not only freely available but also compulsory. American parents are legally obliged to send their children to school. However, they can choose between sending their children to public or private schools. Public education in the United States is financed by taxing everyone, even those people without children or those whose children attend private schools. Americans believe that public education benefits everyone in the society. Every child is thus entitled to get twelve years of schooling at public expense.

- _____ a. Children can attend public or private schools.
- _____ b. Public education is free in the United States, and every child must go to school.
- _____ c. Public education is good for the whole society.

3. The memory unit of a computer is where information is stored. It is similar to a filing cabinet where both information for solving a problem and instructions on how to use the information are stored. Computer systems contain internal memory units for the storage of instructions and data; in addition, they may include external systems to increase the memory capacity and provide flexibility. Without this storage, the computer would have no heart.

- _____ a. The heart of the computer is the memory unit.
- _____ b. There are internal and external memory units.
- _____ c. The memory unit of a computer is like a filing cabinet.

4. Being a good parent does not come automatically, and it is certainly not easy! To reduce pain, increase safety, and ensure the health of the newborn, many modern parents educate themselves about behavior and care during pregnancy and childbirth. Prospective parents should also take steps to learn effective parenting techniques. Reading about childhood development and behavior or attending classes on parenting can contribute to success and reduce the frustrations and anxieties that inevitably occur.

- _____ a. Being a parent can be frustrating.
- _____ b. Being a good parent involves training and effort.
- _____ c. Good parenting is quickly achieved by most people.

5. Many people complain about not being able to remember names when they meet people for the first time, but memory experts tell us that there are rules to follow and tricks to use. First, be sure that you hear the name clearly when the person is introduced to you. If you don't, ask that the name be repeated. Next, ask how the name is spelled; you will be sure that you have understood it then. Another aid is to try to make some remark about the name, such as, "Oh, I once had a teacher by that name!" Also, try to use the name appropriately throughout the conversation and use it again when you say goodbye. All of these suggestions will help you to remember names, but the best way is to try to visualize something tangible that the name makes you think of or to relate the name in some way to the person's face. Can you think of a way that a person meeting you for the first time could remember your name?

- _____ a. A lot of people have trouble remembering names.
- _____ b. Experts suggest several ways to help us remember names the first time we hear them.
- _____ c. Using a name over and over in a conversation can help you to remember it.

GROUP ACTIVITY/MINI COMPETITION

Your teacher will form groups of 6. Two students from each group will be responsible for summarizing one of the sources below. These two students will use no more than twenty words to summarize the articles.

Next, the couple will share their summaries with the rest of the group. The group of six will then synthesize all the sources to form a coherent paragraph (about eight sentences) that contains an interpretative claim (i.e., a thesis statement).

The group with the most accurately researched, insightful, and coherent paragraph wins!

SOURCE A (web resource: <http://news.nationalpost.com/full-comment/green-jackson-rail-is-quite-safe-but-pipelines-are-the-safest-way-to-transport-oil-and-gas>)

Green & Jackson: Rail is quite safe, but pipelines are the safest way to transport oil and gas

Kenneth P. Green and Taylor Jackson, National Post | August 14, 2015 | Last Updated: Aug 14 7:31 AM ET

Oil and gas pipelines are a critical piece of Canada's energy infrastructure. In 2013, this mode of transportation moved more than 2.4 billion barrels of oil and gas. But accidents do happen, as seen with the recent oil spill in Alberta where a Nexen oilsands pipeline recently ruptured, spilling a large quantity of oil southeast of Fort McMurray. Such accidents are unfortunate and regrettable; and this recent accident has stoked concerns, particularly from pipeline opponents, about the safety of oil and gas pipelines.

Unfortunately, however, tragic incidents such as this often detract from one of the most important infrastructure questions: what's the safest way to transport the oil and gas that our modern society requires?

In a recent Fraser Institute study, we examined whether pipelines or rail were safer for transporting oil and gas, using data from government sources. The study focused on the number of occurrences or accidents per million barrels of oil and gas transported.

The result was clear. Both rail and pipelines are quite safe, but pipelines are without a doubt the safest way to transport oil and gas.

In every year from 2003 to 2013, pipelines experienced fewer occurrences per million barrels of oil equivalent transported than did rail. Overall in this period, rail experienced 0.227 occurrences per million barrels of oil equivalent transported compared to 0.049 for pipelines.

This means that rail is more than 4.5 times more likely to experience an occurrence.

Additional data on pipeline safety from the Transportation Safety Board also calls into question the often worst-case scenario rhetoric that surrounds pipeline debates. Consider that 73 per cent of pipeline occurrences result in spills of less than one cubic metre and 16 per cent of occurrences result in no spill whatsoever.

The vast majority of pipeline occurrences — more than 80 per cent — also don't occur in the actual line pipe. Rather, they happen in facilities that are more likely to have secondary containment mechanisms and procedures.

But perhaps the most telling statistic regarding pipeline safety is that 99 per cent of pipeline occurrences between 2003 and 2013 didn't damage the environment.

Debates about pipeline expansion often ignore these realities. But make no mistake: transporting oil and gas by rail has been booming in the absence of new pipelines. According to the Energy Information Administration, annual exports of oil by rail to the United States in 2010 amounted to a measly 42,000 barrels. Fast forward five years to 2014 and that number has spiked to 42 million barrels of oil. These numbers will continue to rise if new pipelines are not built.

So while pipelines may attract much of the attention, rail too is not without its share of accidents. A string of events earlier this year led to new regulations, which may not provide much additional benefit, seeing as many of the newly required safety measures existed during the Lac-Mégantic tragedy.

In both Canada and the United States, rising oil and natural gas production necessitates the expansion of our transportation capacity. Yet proposed pipelines continue to linger in regulatory limbo, facing stiff opposition and little political support, best exemplified by the premier's national energy strategy, which managed to gloss over Canada's pipeline conundrum.

However, on the mode of transport, the choice is clear: it should be the safer one — pipelines.

National Post

*Kenneth P. Green and Taylor Jackson are co-authors of the Fraser Institute study *Safety in the Transportation of Oil and Gas: Pipelines or Rail?* Available at fraserinstitute.org.*

Summary of Source A (maximum 20 words):

SOURCE B (web resource: <https://thewalrus.ca/pressure-test/>)

Pressure Test

BY MAX FAWCETT FEB. 21, 2017

In July 2015, near Fort McMurray, Alberta, 5 million litres of bitumen emulsion leaked from a pipeline at CNOOC-Nexen's Long Lake facility and spilled over an area the size of two football fields. There have certainly been more destructive pipeline leaks: this one was largely contained to the adjacent land, and the oil didn't make its way into any significant body of water. It ended up killing just five birds, twenty-five frogs, and eight rodents. And yet, for an industry desperately trying to reassure the public about the safety of its operations—an issue front and centre thanks to Justin Trudeau's November 29 announcement of cabinet approval for the expansion of Trans Mountain and the upgrade of the Line 3

pipeline—the Long Lake spill remains profoundly unsettling. The rupture occurred in a high-pressure, double-layered section of pipe that had been installed barely more than a year earlier, and was outfitted with leak-detection technology. But that technology didn't identify any problems—instead, the leak was noticed by a contractor who just happened to be walking near the site.

A decade ago, pipelines were viewed simply as unremarkable pieces of infrastructure, no different from sewers or electrical transmission lines; in the wake of the 1989 Exxon Valdez disaster, most negative public attention focused on ships. The safety record of pipelines was—and is—a mostly enviable one. According to the National Energy Board, the approximately 73,000 kilometres of federally regulated pipelines that move around 1.3 billion barrels of crude oil annually in Canada lost an average of 1,084 barrels—the equivalent of a cup over the length of a football field—to spills each year between 2011 and 2014. When incidents do occur, the vast majority take place within tank farms, loading stations, and other well-prepared sites where they can be cleaned up easily, with minimal effects on the environment. But it's the remaining small fraction of total barrels spilled that has sparked a battle between those who favour pipelines and those who oppose them—and created an opportunity for entrepreneurs.

Steven Koles is the president and CEO of Calgary-based Hifi Engineering, a company whose technology would almost certainly have prevented the leak at Long Lake. Its fibre-optic cables, which are installed alongside pipelines, sense minute changes in temperature, pressure, and acoustics and relay real-time data to operators. This information allows them to respond to problems within minutes and to address weaknesses or leaks before they turn into something that requires a cleanup crew and a crisis-management PR team. Hifi has deployed its technology in what Koles calls “high-consequence areas”—river crossings and hillside erosion zones, for example—and while its installations so far have been limited to stretches of pipeline less than forty kilometres long, he says they've been asked to present proposals for more extensive systems.

The cables cost between \$10 and \$15 per metre, Koles says, meaning that a company operating a 100-kilometre pipeline would recoup its investment through sales in just ten and a half months. But more important is the technology's ability to prevent spills—a feature that could help companies reassure Canadians who are increasingly uneasy. “I'd say the industry has lost some face with the public,” Koles says. “I think there's an expectation that you have to do more to achieve 100 percent safety.”

For Randy Meyer, the vice-president of corporate development and logistics at Altex Energy, the answer to safer shipping may be taking the product out of pipelines altogether. The industry, he says, should be looking to ship more by rail, and his firm currently has the capacity to move 154,000 barrels per day that way. This suggestion could raise serious concerns—calling to mind as it does the Lac-Mégantic rail disaster of 2013, in which an unattended seventy-two-car freight train crashed and exploded in the Quebec town, killing forty-seven people. But Meyer isn't proposing to ship the kind of oil carried by tanker cars. Instead, he wants to ship “neatbit”—essentially raw bitumen without the added diluent that allows the product to flow through a pipeline. After all, he says, it's the diluent, not the bitumen, that's the problem.

“You take a product that is very difficult to set on fire—the flashpoint of bitumen is north of 200 degrees Celsius—and when you add the diluent, you lower that flashpoint to about room temperature,” Meyer says. Altex's website features a video in which Meyer tries, unsuccessfully, to set some of the raw bitumen alight with a blowtorch. “It also flows a lot like molasses or very thick honey, so it's not going to flow out into the environment,” he says. According to Meyer's analysis, shipping neatbit by rail from Alberta to the Gulf of Mexico—a corridor with pipelines that rely on coal-powered electricity—would produce fewer greenhouse gas emissions than moving heavy oil through a pipeline. The energy efficiency of the journey, he says, is equivalent to a “good-sized SUV” driving the 300 kilometres from Calgary to Edmonton on 1.5 litres of fuel. And the emission profile of this mode of transport is enhanced by the fact that moving raw bitumen by rail doesn't require the construction of new pipelines—the environmental cost of building the infrastructure is already sunk.

Meyer isn't the only person touting the environmental benefits of moving raw bitumen by rail. Cal Broder has spent the last year trying to sell the energy sector on BitCrude, a proprietary technology, developed over the course of a decade, that transforms pipeline-ready bitumen into a solid product—as soft as a brick of butter or as hard as a lump of coal—that can be put into shipping containers and moved to port for export. “I think most people are more afraid of the movement of oil than they are of fossil fuels themselves,” Broder says. It's the movement, after all, that creates the most immediate risks, be it exploding rail cars or pipelines that dump their cargo into rivers and streams. But BitCrude doesn't present those risks, given that it can't explode, is incapable of spilling, and doesn't mix with water.

A number of options, then, offer the possibility of safer oil transport—there's just one problem. The energy sector just doesn't seem interested in deploying new technologies. It took decades for the industry to adopt steam-assisted gravity drainage in oil sands, a technique that is now standard. “In other industries, there's such a thing as a first-mover advantage,” Koles says. “You get to something before somebody else, and that innovation makes you more competitive.” But because of the industry's cautious approach to change, the energy sector is a place where everyone is content to be second—and nobody really wants to be first. Broder has run headfirst into that reluctance when trying to convince companies to give his product a try. “It always goes back to, ‘It's impossible.’”

But no matter how much technological sophistication goes into a given pipeline or line of rail track, it's impossible to guarantee a zero-incident record. “I don't think that there's anything that anybody could do that would be 100 percent without risk,” Meyer says. “The question is whether you're at the first decimal place of risk or the twenty-fifth decimal place.”

Max Fawcett (@maxfawcett) has written for the Globe and Mail, Hazlitt, and Eighteen Bridges.

Meredith Holigroski is the magazine's junior designer.

Summary of Source B (maximum 20 words):

SOURCE C

The symbolism of Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain pipeline

ARNO KOPECKY FEB 23, 2018

SPECIAL TO *THE GLOBE AND MAIL*

Arno Kopecky is an environmental journalist and author based in Vancouver.

Spare a thought for Rachel Notley. While you're at it, spare another for John Horgan and Justin Trudeau. Three star-crossed allies, progressives all, steering ships through a Kinder Morgan tempest no pundit can describe without saying "collision course." Shakespearean, ain't it?

There's tragedy, comedy and irony galore. Ms. Notley's take on *A Midsummer Night's Dream* with her midwinter ban on British Columbia wines – which was lifted on Thursday – lent itself so well to "Reign of Terroir" jokes that it can only end up raising the provincial wine industry's profile. As for Alberta's oil industry, this is more like *Much Ado About Nothing*. Whether the oil sands grow or shrink has much less to do with any one pipeline (even one that leads to almighty tidewater) than the global price of oil. What about all those Kinder Morgan jobs? Comedy. Anyone serious about creating oil-sector jobs for Canadians would be pushing to refine bitumen at home instead of exporting it raw. That's why Unifor, the biggest union in the oil sands, intervened against the project in the NEB hearings.

But the notion that Kinder Morgan's Trans Mountain pipeline expansion would add carbon to the atmosphere is comedy, too. If Kinder Morgan isn't built, trains will keep moving the bitumen they're already moving, at least until a higher force than pipeline capacity reduces Fort McMurray's output. Everyone just makes less money that way.

When a country already has more than 840,000 kilometres of pipeline running through it, the fight over roughly 1,000 new kilometres is symbolic for both sides. But symbols matter. Now Trans Mountain has come to symbolize everything from the oil sands to climate change and reconciliation, and everyone's job is at stake.

None more than Ms. Notley's, our likeliest candidate for tragedy. Alberta's most progressive premier in more than 30 years, the woman who imposed a provincial carbon tax and raised royalties on oil sands operators and lifted Alberta's minimum wage from the lowest to the highest in the country, Rachel Notley will not be replaced by someone nicer. Alberta's profoundly oil-positive United Conservative Party, freshly merged and braying at her heels, threaten every last NDP policy with a Trumpian corrective. They'll probably win the next election, too. Ms. Notley's only hope is in proving to Albertans she can fight as dirty as any conservative would to protect the Symbol.

Enter John Horgan, stage left. Poor guy. He's running a province whose biggest, greenest city overwhelmingly voted against a once-in-a-generation opportunity to massively expand public transit, but has already proved itself willing to get arrested en masse in anti-Kinder Morgan protests. Mr. Horgan's first major decision as Premier, the tortured approval of the Site C dam, earned him the condemnation of every environmentalist and First Nation leader in the province, if not the country. Now that he's following through on his campaign promise to "use every tool in our tool box" against Kinder Morgan, fans and critics are trading placards. Never mind that Site C will keep far more carbon in the ground than any thwarted pipeline.

The thing is, pipeline battles on the coast aren't about pipelines or even climate change. They're about oil tankers. Want symbols? Wild salmon and orca populations are rapidly approaching extinction in southern B.C. Yes, oil tankers do already ply these waters. No, we don't love hearing that the only way to pay for sorely lacking coastal protection is to heighten the risk of an oil spill by tripling the number of tankers.

But that's the deal. Enter Justin Trudeau, our doomed and dashing Hamlet, haunted by the ghost of his father, asking not to be or not to be, but can the ends justify the means? The greater the ends, it seems, the crueler the means. For all his capacity to renege on inconvenient promises, Mr. Trudeau clearly does regard the fight against climate change as a Very Great End. He knows we're losing the glaciers whose meltwater irrigates half of Canada's agriculture; he's aware of our metastasizing cycle of flood and forest fire; he's already dealt with one wave of climate refugees, from Syria (yes – that war was largely triggered by a calamitous drought that beggared a million farmers); he knows this is just the beginning.

Against all that, he weighs the spill risk of one new pipeline, twinned to a pre-existing condition, with a corresponding increase in tanker traffic through relatively safe waters in which oil tankers can so far boast a 100-per-cent safety rate. Without Kinder Morgan, Mr. Trudeau mutters, pacing the stage from left to right, you lose Alberta; without Alberta, you lose your national climate-change strategy, your coastal protections, your whole progressive agenda. You lose everything.

Enter, in our closing act, B.C.'s coastal First Nations. Of course, they've been here all along – Mr. Trudeau made them some promises, too. But so far, his definition of consultation looks a lot like the old one: a process to determine not if a project should proceed on Indigenous territory, but when. The courts may yet cancel Trans Mountain because of it, as they did Northern Gateway. That's probably Mr. Trudeau's best hope for a happy ending. He's created his own Birnam Wood, an army of First Nations and their allies ready to lead the march to Dunsinane Hill, aka Burnaby Mountain and the terminus of the pipeline, for the biggest act of civil disobedience our generation's seen.

It isn't a question of if, but when.

Summary of Source C (maximum 20 words):
