MS. MARY ACKERMAN: Mary Ackerman, A-C-K-E-R-M-A-N. Mary, M-A-R-Y. I live in Hackensack, Minnesota. Zip code, 56452. I have four points to make.

Point 1. The seven spill sites addressed in the draft are not representative of

the very sensitive and biodiverse land and waters of this route. They do not address wild rice wetlands, the St. Louis River tributaries, the Nemadji, N-E-M-A-D-J-I, river tributaries, and the Mississippi River or Lake Superior. All will be impacted by the inevitable spills, leaks, anomalies.

One thing we know for sure, pipelines spill. Not if, only when. And the product, tar sands, proposed for this Line 3 cannot currently be cleaned up. There is no technology to clean up water spills of this kind. None.

My first point. Expand the modeling for water spill sites.

Point Number 2. The Enbridge permit application cites what they would do to minimize environmental impact. Nowhere does the draft identify what outside entity will monitor these promises and/or what regulations are in place to ensure these promises are contractual. 1702-1

My point. Name the outside entities we can look to and show the contracts for this critical process.

Point Number 3. In Chapter 11, titled "Environmental Justice," the draft

acknowledges that any of the alternative routes would be detrimental in the long-term for the tribes impacted. This is Point 9.6. It says there will be "profound cultural consequences." If this route went through a town or city, would this still be an option? Would it? Disproportionate and adverse impacts is the language used in 11.5 of that chapter.

My point. Choose a route that does not have detrimental impact on the tribes of Minnesota.

My Point 4. The preferred route also impacts "more wild rice lakes and areas of rich biodiversity than any of the other routes." This is from Figure ES-10 in the draft. Why would Minnesota risk that for a Canadian company's profit? And I'm quoting again from Chapter 5, 3.4. "All workers to construct the line would be relocating to Minnesota." There will be "no measurable impact on local employment, per capita household income, median household income or unemployment." Need I say, this doesn't track.

My point. The jobs argument put forth by Enbridge does not hold for short- or long-term employment for our unions.

The line risks some of our most pristine wild rice lakes and areas of rich biodiversity.

Get serious about another route now. Thank you.

MS. MARY ADAMS: Hi. Mary,

M-A-R-Y, Adams, A-D-A-M-S.

I'm a retired school administrator. And I'll tell you, when the paper copy arrived in Park Rapids on Tuesday of 6,500 pages in our library, some of us scurried over there to read that. And I know about reading a lot of stuff, but I found it daunting, to say the least.

My comments are thus, in Volume I, what is the need for this project anyway? It had been mentioned earlier today. It had mentioned the need for the project would not be addressed in the DEIS. But you know, it's kind of like putting the cart before the horse. You put the pipeline before you have determined a need for the pipeline, and worldwide oil use is down. In Minnesota it's really down, the prices are down.

So as a retired principal, I'm going to ask you to do your homework. I have a few questions. Please describe in detail how you, meaning Enbridge, can justify further extraction of fossil fuels, when the need is not proven to be there.

Also, in Volume I, Chapter 5, I

read about the greenhouse gas emissions, the heavy western Canadian sedimentary basin, which is the tar sands coming in from Canada. We cut down a lot of trees that were mentioned in this DEIS. Trees are there for the removal of carbon sequestration.

What are the social costs of plowing through this lake country, removing the trees, bringing in this tar sands oil that is diluted with filthy chemicals and made in order to make it move through the pipes.

So I have a question for you -- continued homework. I'd like to know in detail how you intend to restrict carbon emissions. In the DEIS you mentioned that you are working on renewable and alternate energy projects. That's not good enough for me.

Volume I, Chapter 5, I noticed in the DEIS, you mention the number of acres in Aitkin County and Cass County, and where's Hubbard County in this regard? Why didn't you mention the Itasca Park, the first park ever established in our state, that tourists come and we frequent a lot during the summer, fall, winter, and spring.

Also the trout streams, I was sitting over there with a friend. He's looking through the maps of the trout streams. He said, "Well, look at this, Mary." I said, "What do you want me to look at, Tony?" He said, "It says unnamed streams." Do you know that that unnamed stream was going through this marvelous wetland, the Straight River, the primary brown trout river that's coming through Park Rapids area.

So my question is, what drilling, what drilling fluids are you using if you have to cross under the Straight River? It's harmful to wildlife. It damages the vegetation. When you're driving under those streams in the river bed, what are you putting in there? Some of us would like to know. 0800-1

Volume 3, "Accidental Crude Oil Releases." Question, to what extent would the EPA, the Army Corp of Engineers, DNR, and the PECA be involved in the permitting process?

When I read through the DEIS, it says, "Oh, we'll get a permit from DNR, and then we'll get another permit from DNR; DNR, DNR, DNR. I'd like to know the extent that

you're going to rely on all of these organizations to prove what you're doing.

I have another question -- I'm almost finished -- are the standards that are set by the Federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Administration for the extraction of fossil fuels and building -- for the building and maintenance of oil pipelines, is that adequate? Why; why do you think it's adequate? Why not?

We have a lot of wonderful pristine water up in this country. It's not compromised water. What research and preparedness is made to respond soundly when a tar sands spill occurs? How will our aquifers be protected? 0800-2

The MPCA said, quote, "Difficulty of responding to remote spills due to swamp land inaccessibility of the preferred route."

How crucial is that finding? Why is that so important?

And lastly, the Yellowstone River in Montana a couple of years ago, there were 40,000 gallons spilt into the

Yellowstone, but the cleanup wasn't hampered by winter weather conditions. That stuff sinks to the bottom.

So I'm asking Enbridge what's the key takeaway from the spill in Montana considering the uneven terrain and the winter conditions?

So I'm finished. I have 4,000 more pages to go through. Join me. Get a comment in to DOC by July 10th. Please, please, please help us.

Thank you so much.

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Mary Adams <mmkadams65@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 05, 2017 3:00 PM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137
Attachments: Jamie MacAlister III.doc

ATTN: Jamie MacAlister

Jamie MacAlister, Environmental Review Manager
MN Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 280
St Paul, MN 55101-2198

CN-14-916
PPL-15-137

Chapters 1-5

No analysis of the NEED for this project and continued use of fossil fuels

MEPA requirement is not being meet. The decline of overall energy consumption in MN and nation has declined. Exporting tar-sands was not addressed, ie lack of transparency. Why has the pipe itself been enlarged to 36 inches? The economic evaluation is incomplete.

P5-432-443 Green house gas emission from tar sands must be addressed in detail. Removing large swaths of forests sequestering carbon contributes to global warming. The social and economic costs of CHG is lacking.. Mentioning the applicants commitment to renewable and alternative energy projects is unconvincing.

P5-304 Hubbard Co is not mentioned in the acreage noted, nor is Itasca Park and the Straight River Aquifer. MPCA "impacts from construction of additional pipelines and infrastructure, emergency response and spill prevention, water crossing body method and time frames, waste water issues, water quality, watershed and wetland issues" would be serious. The DEIS does not address this sufficiently. Permanent right of ways, construction work, temporary access roads and permanent roads will be long lasting. The negative ramifications need analysis. An independent analysis of acreage impacted is needed. Endangered and threatened species, including pollinators, was lightly treated and needs to be thoroughly studied and transparent. 1202-1

P5-254 Frac-out.. 'Drilling fluids only into waters identified as sensitive or impaired'. Is that true?

P5-257 Trout streams. {Straight River, a well known trout stream) 'construction crossing impact would be permanent to short term and minor to major, depending on the crossing'. That's not good enough, raising a red-flag for the reader of the DEIS.

Volume III Accidental Crude Oil Releases

Ch 10 All spill release data appears to be provided by ENB. What is the work history of Cardno and Barr? Are we assured there is no conflict of interest? There appears to be no independent 3rd party analysis. What does "spill frequency" mean? Benign locations-7 sites-all water- are too few. Extrapolating these to all other water bodies, regardless of terrain and topographical conditions at modeling sites lacks credibility. Transparency seems nonexistent when it comes to 'data protective order', which protects oil companies and excludes the public, does not comply with MEPA and federal law. The DEIS favors Enbridge. No winter spill analysis, no reference to The National Academy's Study on Tar Sands Oil Spills and the difficulty/impossibility of timely clean-up and long term devastating effects on lakes, streams, wetlands and low-lying forested areas. No economic analysis of the costs of oil releases and damage to natural resources based on cost. No "life of the project" risk assessment with the pipe in the ground 50 or 60 years. 1202-2

Block valves are too far apart. Averaging 12 miles. Stray voltage corrosion and pinhole leaks often are not detected in a timely fashion. Data is missing for all the lakes, rivers, wetlands and ground water recharge locations. The Stantec Report locations are not representative of the entirety of the preferred route.

1202-3
1202-4

Economics Ch 5-11
What is the data source for workforce numbers? Numbers vary from 16 permanent jobs to thousands of part time positions. No long-term assessment on tourism, property values, post construction impacts, costs and road maintenance are evident. Faulty, inflated numbers misleads the publics grasp of the project..

Route Analysis
Corridor Sharing. The DEIS indicated the proposed route would house additional pipelines in the future. We would have a "pipeline corridor" passing through pristine lakes, forests and wetlands. What does the future plan look like for increasing the number of 36 inch pipe lines within the corridor?
Minnesota Biological Survey Sites of Biodiversity Significance and MN Wildlife Action Network identify Species in Greatest Conservation Need. Enbridge preferred route most negatively affects these sensitive areas. If ever there was a case to be made for SA-04 it is now. 1) it avoids Northern Mn watersheds 2) it crosses agriculture lands, co-located with existing pipelines and access roads already in place when an emergency arises. 3) it fragments less natural habitat 4) it would mostly have a short term effect on croplands 5) spills would effect high quality agricultural soils vs high quality forested and aquatic habitats at risk 6) job creation. SA04 extends the pipeline directly to northern Illinois, positively creating more jobs for pipe fitters and additional contractors.
The DEIS appears biased to END field work on the applicant route. Thee is no field data on other routes. Truck and train = false equivalence. Quantitative and qualitative analysis needs work!

The Tribes
I shall let the tribes speak for themselves recognizing their vulnerability. Income from wild rice beds threatened with profound cultural consequences. How does one restore wild rice beds?

Acknowledging Participants
Cardno, Barr acknowledged. What roles did MPCA and DNA play in developing the DEIS? They assisted. What does that mean? 10% 20% 50% 70% 90% involved? The public expects them to analyze and protect pristine lakes, forests, wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat. Water is life!

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Mary Adams 24985 Great Pine Dr Nevis, MN 218 652 3519

‘

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Mary Adams <mmkadams65@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 10:02 AM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: CN-14-916 PPL-15-137
Attachments: Jamie MacAlister Environmental Review Manager July 10.doc

Comments on DEIS

Jamie MacAlister Environmental Review Manager
MN Dept. of Commerce
85 7th Place Ease, Suite 280
St. Paul, MN

July 10, 2017

Comments: CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137

DEIS

- Does this pipeline provide enough benefits for Minnesota to balance the risks? Hunting, fishing, tourism and recreational opportunities are abundant, providing a source of revenue for counties impacted. Such information is lacking. Ther must be an economical analysis for the EIS to be complete. 2479-1
- Corridor Sharing. If the preferred route is approved I would like to know what the future expansion plans are for the corridor. This must be stated in the final EIS. Accumulation of multiple pipelines increases additional spill risk, widens the corridor resulting in increased detrimental effects on water, forest, wetlands and wildlife. The public needs this information.
- Fuel demand in Minnesota is down 19%. I would like to see the need for tar sands oil addressed in the final EIS. A thorough explanation as to why this state should assume the risk when oil will be exported to ports around the world.
- Where is the "no build" option? Why is a 36 inch pipe replacing a 34 inch pipe? Address it, please.
- Drilling fluids. The DEIS is deficient in its consideration of carcinogenic properties (i.e. benzene) in its "drilling fluids. The public needs to know what toxins affecting aquatic life and our waters are used.
- Herbicides. Forest fragmentation and widened corridors will affect pollinators, who are in need of protection. What sprays will be used to keep corridors open and how often will that occur? Widening in sensitive landscapes is not covered.
- Stray voltage leaks. Negative ramifications of pipelines located under electrical lines is not addressed. Include it in the final EIS.
- Construction Impacts. 60 miles of new right of way roads will occur. It is likely END underestimates (5600 acres low) without regard to contrary evidence submitted during Sandpiper. Likely impact may be 7500 acres or more. An independent analysis of this topic needs inclusion in the FEIS. Include water- 192 surface, 6 outstanding. Wetland acreage and construction impact to groundwater 1000 vs 2500 ft for SA04.
- Pipeline Abandonment. Analysis was limited. Decommissioning was based on a 12 mile test. Pipes in the ground can over time result in groundwater movement as well as erosion. What chemicals for flushing out abandoned pipes are used? Further explanation is needed.
- Spills. No economic analysis of costs of oil releases and the damage to natural resources (based on costs) is included. Methodology was faulty. There is no justification for the method of calculation included in the DEIS. Block valves average 12 miles apart. No record of the Sandpiper Oak Ridge block valve study. No long term risk assessment. No "life of the project" risk assessment. The pipe 2479-2

will be in the ground indefinitely. 50-60 years! No winter spill analysis. Maps indicating first responder assess are lacking. All of the above must be in final EIS. 2479-2 Cont'd

- Line 3 and Route Alternatives. It appears to be based on END field-work on the applicant route. Qualitative and quantitative analysis was poor. No field date was provided for other routes. Environmental impacts focused on route comparisons rather than identifying overall impacts. System alternatives SA04 and Line 3 fit neither CN rules nor MEPS rules. It appears to be prejudiced by length without consideration of alternate routes. SA04 should be considered.

Now is the time to be on the right side of history. Climate change, dire that it is, provides a great economic opportunity. Fossil fuels are driving up climate change. The price of solar has plummeted, as citizens around the globe recognize the perils of continued extraction of fossil fuels. Fossil fuels will always be around, not totally eliminated, however, the trend moving forward towards alternate energy is gaining traction. Oil companies can get on board and successfully be a part of the future.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIS.

Mary Adams
24985 Great Pine Dr.
Nevis, MN 56467

218-652-3519

MINNESOTA

Comment Form
Line 3 Project Draft EIS Public Meeting

Please provide your contact information. This information and your comments will be publicly available.

Name: Don Arnosti

Street Address: 1722 Princeton Avenue

City: St. Paul State: MN Zip Code: 55105

Phone or Email: donarnosti@gmail.com

Please share your comments on the Line 3 Project Draft EIS. What could be improved in the EIS? What is missing?

Missing information: What is the intended destination of the excess capacity (beyond current Line 3)? Example: is the oil intended to be shipped via the Great Lakes? Via pipeline to Chicago or Detroit? Etc.

I think this lack of information makes it impossible to determine that there is any real need (as viewed by Minnesota for our citizens) for a new, larger pipeline.

The EIS lacks information on how, if this pipeline is built, it will be decommissioned in the future — and, how the PUC can assure that the pipeline company, not the public at large will pay for this decommissioning?

The EIS must include all the information provided by MPCA + DNR natural resource experts to their administration and the DOC. Last year, this group of experts favored the southern route through Swamland as least harmful. 0644-1

If including additional pages please number them and tell us how many you are providing:_____ pages

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Clare A <clareauchterlonie@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 22, 2017 4:41 PM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137

CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137 comments.

The 7 sites chosen for spill modeling are not representative of the locations and resources put at risk along the entire corridor. A more thorough analysis of different locations is needed - for example, what about Lake Superior?

I am concerned about abandonment. The risks of pipeline abandonment are not adequately assessed. For example, there is no discussion of landowner property values and the effect that an abandoned pipe could have on them, especially if there is indeed "legacy contamination" on people's land. It merely says "In the near term, impacts on socioeconomics are anticipated to be minimal" (Chapter 8). What about the long-term? 0498-1

There is also no discussion of exposed pipe, how fast it will corrode, or how much currently buried pipe will become exposed once it is emptied. "When a pipe is empty, the weight of the liquid load that once contributed to buoyancy control is lost. As a result, the pipe could become buoyant and begin rising toward the surface at watercourse crossings, in wetlands, and in locations where soil density is low and the water table is high" (8.3.1).

Regards, Clare Auchterlonie
213 Calle Miramar #6
Redondo Beach
CA 90277