

RED INK REVIEW



BIDEN IS EXPECTED TO CANCEL THE KEYSTONE XL PIPELINE PERMIT ON HIS FIRST DAY IN OFFICE.

MICHAEL D. SHEAR, THE NEW YORK TIMES

President-elect Joseph R. Biden Jr. is expected to cancel the Keystone XL pipeline permit on his first day in office, quickly reversing his predecessor's approval of a project to move oil from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, according to a person familiar with Mr. Biden's plans for his first days in office.

Environmentalists have long targeted the nearly 1,200-mile pipeline as both a contributor to climate change and a physical symbol of the country's unwillingness to move away from an oil-based economy.

Many Republicans, including President Trump, argued the pipeline would create jobs and help local economies.

In late-2015, former President Barack Obama rejected the permit for the project, arguing it would undermine American leadership on the transition to sustainable fuels. Mr. Trump's administration reversed that decision in early 2017, giving a green light for construction of the project to begin.

Construction has hit other economic and legal roadblocks since then, but environmentalists were pleased when Mr. Biden said during the presidential campaign that he intended to once again cancel the permit.

That is expected to happen on Jan. 20, amid a flurry of other executive actions that Mr. Biden plans to take to demonstrate his determination to reverse Mr. Trump's legacy. Ending the Keystone project would send just such a signal.

Had it been completed, the pipeline was designed to take as much as 830,000 barrels a day of Canadian and North Dakota crude to refineries in Texas and Louisiana for processing into oil that could be exported overseas or used to enhance domestic supplies.

OMITTED KEY FACT

This leaves the impression that the Keystone XL pipeline would have a meaningful impact on emissions. In fact, a 2012 State Department report estimated that the pipeline would emit 1.44 million metric tons of carbon dioxide per year during operations, which is about 0.03 percent of all U.S. energy-related CO2 emissions and 0.004 percent of global energy-related CO2 emissions from 2019.

OMITTED KEY FACT

A 2014 State Department report published during the Obama administration concluded that the pipeline project would generate 1,950 annual construction jobs over a two-year period.

OMITTED KEY FACT

Even without the Keystone XL pipeline, the US is set to import a record amount of oil from Canada in 2021, both by train and existing pipelines that are in the process of expanding.

RED INK KEY

We will be highlighting examples of bias that fall under the following categories:

- **Misleading anecdote** – Framing of an isolated incident as representing an occurrence or trend that is more widespread than it actually is
- **Author's unattributed opinion** – Making unfounded assumptions about how someone mentioned in the article is feeling or thinking
- **Omitted key fact** – Leaving out crucial contextual information
- **One-sided narrative** – Overemphasizing one side of a two-sided story
- **Biased sourcing** – Citing biased sources to support a biased narrative
- **Twisted context** – Quoting someone without providing all the information necessary to understanding that person's intended message
- **Outdated stats** – Using outdated information or statistics to argue a point—e.g., making a point about health care access using information published in 2018, which collected data from 2017
- **Biased labeling** – When a reporter fails to correctly label a source “liberal” or “conservative” when citing it. Or, when a reporter labels a person or group with positive or seemingly nonpartisan labels, such as “an expert” or “advocacy organization”, when it is a lobbying, party or industry organization
- **Shaky statistics** – Mathematically incorrect sourcing of statistics—e.g., saying “10 percent increase” when they mean a “10 percentage point increase”
- **Shaky statistical interpretation** – Using legitimate statistics, but coming to an unfounded conclusion
- **Questionable anonymous sourcing** – Over-reliance on anonymous sourcing in an article or giving vague attribution when more specificity is required
- **Questionable statistical sourcing** – Citing a biased or unreliable source of statistics
- **Misleading headline** – When the headline presents a sensationalized or otherwise inaccurate overview of what is actually written in the article