Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Jami Gaither <na112792@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2017 3:02 PM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Cc: Daniel Lee Gaither Husband
Subject: DEIS Public Comment - Jami Gaither

I was offended that the DEIS sounded in large part like a very cheery presentation from the conscientious, safety focused, public utility giant… Enbridge. Yes, there were statements and commentary from various groups that appeared to be concerned more with Mother Earth than the profits of a large corporation. But these were largely in the Appendices. In addition, when I asked Department of Commerce representative Jamie MacAlister whether Tribal Resources were being given priority consideration in the matter, I was assured they were NOT. WHAT?!? The right of people to live by their ways with regard to their food, water and spirituality took no bigger place in the decision than a company's desire to make some money? It does not seem to me that the needs of the citizens of Minnesota (and anyone downstream of us) are being given due consideration.

There is an ability to see where Enbridge concerns lie if you look at this passage (Appendix P, Volume 1, page 253). 1012-1

Environmental Justice Concerns:

During hearing before an Administrative Law Judge at St. Paul, Minnesota in January, 2015, Enb staff provide testimony and were questioned about the development of this pipeline and pipeline c is part of the public record, yet transcripts are not available. Specifically, the company considered alternate route of the pipeline going down Interstate 94 as too dangerous because of the possibilit failure and crude oil flooding the highway, causing accidents and it's routing through populated are Enbridge's preferred route place the pipeline is very close in proximity to two tribal communities: R Community in Clearwater County and East Lake/Sandy Lake Community in Aitkin County. These t communities are being told they should shoulder the entire risk of the pipeline (which was too dan place along Interstate 94 or larger, non□Indian communities).[8]. At a June 30th Environmental J meeting sponsored by Minnesota PCA, the staff identified that Minnesota had subjected its population to environmental justice issues and they have born a disproportion of the envi issues[9]. This process must not continue that discrimination. We believe that this issue sh resolved long before any permits are added.

The main concerns are with infrastructure and inconvenience, not less dense human populations, food foraging environments, or birthing grounds of our migratory birds. In fact, they are more concerned about "crude oil flooding the highway, causing accidents" than how that crude oil flooding might affect the way of life for those of us who rely on wild rice and fresh fish as part of our diets.

While Enbridge calls this a Line 3 Replacement, it's in actuality a Dumping of the old Line 3 and an Addition of a new, bigger Line 3 through a new corridor. Did you know that while you can't leave a fuel tank buried in the ground long-term, we currently have no policy requiring the removal of an oil pipeline once it is no longer actively used? Why would we NOT require this dirty infrastructure be removed rather than leaving it for the

next generation to clean up? Again the main concerns are with infrastructure issues rather than clean water or wildlife and human impacts. (Appendix B, pg 14)

3.1 Risks Associated with Pipe Removal

Pipeline removal would create impacts to the environment, land use, and public a new pipeline project. Environmental hazards associated with pipe removal a disturbance of the soil, potential impacts to the groundwater, and potential im activities, natural wildlife and vegetation. Reduced soil stability during and afte also be a concern, as it can lead to increased localized erosion and destabilize hazards may cause considerable disruption to ongoing and future land manag These risks increase significantly during a large scale removal project.

Excavation of the Permanently Deactivated Line 3 will cause significar landowners and the general public. Construction activities would restrict access adjacent works areas. Removal operations at crossings would not onl interruptions and restrictions, but soil stability issues caused by pipe removal cc roads, bridges and crossings. These issues introduce risk to existing infrast roadways, railways, and other utilities.

One of the greatest risks of removing a Permanently Deactivated pipeline damaging adjacent pipelines or infrastructure, which can lead to significant publ and operational impacts. The existing Line 3 currently shares a congested ROW or six additional pipelines. Line 3 is located in the third position in roughly 75% ROW corridor in Minnesota. In the U.S., the majority of Line 3 is within 7 to 18 fe from the nearest adjacent, active pipeline. Given the proximity of Line 3 to pipelines, removal increases the chance of a release from adjacent operational either a line strike or by their fatigue due to the use of heavy equipment activities.

Enbridge assures us that, if abandoned, the old line will be purged and cleaned. If it's done in any way similarly to the "clean-up" done in Kalamazoo, reason would predict low expectations of a thorough job. The inadequate work done by Enbridge to clean up oil spills should be considered when evaluating their proposed methodology for cleaning up their abandoned pipeline. Their integrity leaves much to be desired, so much so that to work with this corporation should be seen as illogical and foolish.

When you consider Enbridge's track record, it is just a matter of time before Minnesota has to deal with ANOTHER spill. We (Minnesota AND Enbridge) already hold the record for the largest inland spill in US History. http://www.grandrapidsmn.com/opinion/happy-anniversary-the-largest-inland-oil-spill-in-u-s/article_2ade2706-004f-11e7-9023-2b31a01741a6.html Now Enbridge is looking at running pipeline that carries substances they can't even reveal the nature of to us in the public. In addition, they want to run it in places where no pipeline has gone before, including many wetlands, creeks, and large rivers. I'm hopeful the powers that be in Minnesota come to their senses and refuse to allow this to happen.

Enbridge reports in the DEIS that they have all kinds of safety programs in place to prevent "accidental releases", their euphemism for oil spills. The report says there would be a 10- minute response time to stopping a leak. (Chapter 10, pg
98)

Chapter 10
Accidental Crude Oil Releases

10.5.2.3 *Pipeline Spill Response Planning*

Control of the Applicant's preferred route (or any of the pipeline alternative routes) would be incorporated into the existing Enbridge Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system, which can automatically initiate pump station shutdowns to maintain safe operating pressures. Pipeline control operators also can manually initiate pipeline shutdown if abnormal conditions are suspected or observed. Enbridge enforces a "10-minute rule" that requires operators to shut down a pipeline within 10 minutes of observation of an abnormal condition that cannot be attributed to normal fluctuations in pressures and operating conditions.

In light of Enbridge's safety record, we need to not only consider what they propose to do but how they have done things in the past. How long did it take to respond to the leak alert on the Kalamazoo River oil spill, AKA The Dilbit Disaster? Ten minutes? Ah, no. It was slightly longer.

The first alert came on Sunday, July 25, 2010, at about 5:58 p.m. Eastern time when there was a rupture in Line 6B near Talmadge Creek, a tributary of the Kalamazoo River and a little more than a half mile downstream of the Marshall, Michigan pumping station. At first Enbridge ignored the alarm. Then the operators assumed it was a "bubble" in the line so they increased pressure (resulting in more oil spilling faster) for hours. So when did they finally believe the alarms and shut down the line? More than 17 hours later.

Yeah, let's just let that sink in for a moment. 17 HOURS. That's a LOT longer than 10 minutes. Regardless of what Enbridge claims they "will do", we know what they HAVE DONE and that needs a full review in the DEIS. A review for EVERY SINGLE SPILL. Enbridge has a worse track record than their competitors and this should be considered as we decide whether or not to grant a Certificate of Need to THIS corporation.

Also, knowing that it's only a matter of time before there is a release of Dilbit into our environment, should the State of MN decide to grant a Certificate of Need and/or Routing Permit on this project, we need to know exactly WHAT is in this Dilbit. It is illogical that a proper evaluation of the environmental impact of installing this line can be done if there is not full disclosure of the products that will be coursing through the pipeline and, should there be a failure, spreading into our natural world contaminating both land and water, animals and people. The National Science Foundation has already warned of the use of dilbit in areas with high moisture content (i.e., wetlands). Yes, much of the new proposed path lies in areas of wetlands. In addition, it's been 1012-2

noted that the density of dilbit means it will sink in water, not rise, so how are we to know when there is a release if it all stays at the bottom of the wetlands, creek or river?

If the MN Department of Commerce agrees that Enbridge has a need and allows the pipeline to be installed, the accountability for all spills will land on this Department. All lawsuits, all cleanup, all injuries and deaths, including those of plants and wildlife, would be the result of the Department of Commerce decision. When the pipeline leaks, and it will as all pipelines eventually leak, the State of Minnesota will hold all accountability.

It is far wiser to err on the side of caution, especially as the world has already reached peak oil - the hypothetical point in time when the global production of oil reaches its maximum rate, after which production will gradually decline. We are at the end of the fossil fuel era and any attempt to continue the pursuit of fossil fuels only prolongs the time until we make a transition to renewable energy. There will come a day when there is NO MORE to suck from the Earth and we humans will have to finally come to terms with the development of cleaner, safer sources of energy. We will either do it in a way that is planned or in a crisis, but we will eventually convert to renewables.

Minnesota needs to be a leader in this process. We need to show that hemp is another way to meet our energy needs. We've started that with recent legislation. If oil spills ruin our farmland, that will be a dead end. Not to mention the effect on our tourism industry. We need to continue the path of innovation and energy conservation and abandon the path of dirty oil. I say that Minnesota must, if morality is to brought to bear, act in the interest of clean water, healthy people, and safe environments. We need to say NO to another pipeline coming through our state. And we need to tell Enbridge it's time to remove the old Line 3 from the ground to assure we prevent ongoing and long-term contamination possibilities.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jami Gaither
25288 County 2
Shevlin, MN 56676

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Daniel Gaither <na72687@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 09, 2017 2:39 PM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: Comment on DEIS (docket numbers CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137)

7/7/17

To whom it may concern,

I am submitting the following comments regarding the Enbridge Line 3 DEIS (docket numbers CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137) in opposition to approval of the Enbridge Line 3 Replacement Tar Sands Pipeline Project. I feel that the current DEIS has fallen short in several key areas and believe the citizens of Minnesota deserve a higher level of professionalism from all state employees involved in this effort. The following paragraphs describe in detail the numerous flaws present within the current DEIS.

The citations throughout the DEIS are inconsistent in format, contain broken links, and cite non-existent sources such as "historicaltrauma.com" (Chapter 9 and Executive Summary). The citations are wholly unprofessional and inspire little confidence in the data presented, as well as obfuscating the legitimacy of the actual source material. On page 4 of Chapter 7, the DEIS lists the current Line 67 (Alberta Clipper) flow rate to be 570,000 bpd, which is incorrect. Line 67 has been operating at close to 800,000 bpd since 2014, which draws into question many of the subsequent calculations in the DEIS. The Environmental Justice and Tribal Resources chapters (11 and 9, respectively) are poorly cross-referenced and show a clear lack of cohesive analysis. 1332-1 1332-2

The spill analysis on pages 13-14 of Chapter 10 look at the probability of annual spills, when it would be more comprehensive and relevant to analyze the spill probability over the entire lifetime of the pipe. Page 18 of Chapter 10 claims that increased pressure as a result of higher flow rates in a pipeline has no effect on spill rates. This claim has no citation, and is highly disputable. The DEIS even states that corrosion is a primary cause of accidental release incidents (page 18, Chapter 10), without acknowledging that increased pressure and flow through a pipeline could contribute to corrosion. Chapter 10 contains no significant analysis of the increase to spill potential as pipelines become exposed over time (many of Enbridge's lines are currently above ground). Enbridge has designated the "worst-case" scenario spill data trade secret, so the public cannot review it (table 10.3-1 on page 36 of Chapter 12). The public should have access to information pertaining to serious releases of large quantities of oil into the waterways on which they rely, and be able to respond to that data. On page 45 of Chapter 10, the terrestrial wildlife at risk excludes pollinator species such as bees. Minnesota supports a significant number of pollinator species, whose populations are already stressed under multiple other environmental factors, and should therefore get additional scientific analysis - not be excluded. The description of effects on aquatic life (page 48 of Chapter 10) should include a more robust analysis of the impacts on algae, and the subsequent effects throughout an aquatic ecosystem. 1332-3

The rail alternative described on page 10 of Chapter 4 is unrealistic, economically infeasible, and not logically sound. It describes maintaining the pipeline on either side of the Minnesota border, and constructing brand new rail lines to transport the oil within the state. The analysis of rail as an alternative on page 13 of Chapter 4 does not account for the percentage of diluent needed to transport oil by pipeline, but not in rail cars, which would significantly change the volume of product to be moved. The trucking alternative described on page 17 of Chapter 4 outlines purchasing a new fleet of trucks (and replacing the entire fleet every five years) to make 4,000 trips per day in order to transport the oil across the state of Minnesota, while maintaining pipeline transportation outside Minnesota. This is absurdly unrealistic, poorly thought out, and not a serious alternative to pipeline transportation of oil. The DEIS does not consider the possibility of shutting down the current Line 3 pipeline and constructing no alternative, instead transporting the oil on other existing pipelines or phasing it down entirely. This option has been advocated by thousands of citizens and must be studied. It is also the most consistent with Minnesota's climate change mitigation goals. When the Keystone XL pipeline was denied, no oil by rail terminal was built at the international border. Today's oil prices are too low to sustain growth in the tar sands region of Canada. Exxon Mobil has admitted they have $3.4 billion dollars in tar sands oil fields that are not economically viable assets on their books in the current low price environment (below $50/barrel).

The DEIS states that the "social cost of carbon" -- an estimate of the financial burden on society due to increased climate change impacts -- of building the pipeline could be as high as $287 billion over a 30- year timespan (Chapter 5, page 443). This number is shockingly high, but a 30-year timeline is actually the shortest estimated lifespan of the pipe according to the DEIS, and many pipelines operate for over 60 years. In addition, people who are young adults right now will only be middle-aged in 30 years. The state must update the DEIS to include climate and cost modeling that assumes a 60-year lifespan or greater for the pipeline. (And obviously, we shouldn't even consider building something so costly to society!) The climate modeling does not contain a "partial displacement" scenario in which the new Line 3 takes on the old Line 3's oil while expanding by the proposed 370,000 additional barrels per day (bpd). It contains only "no displacement" and "full displacement" scenarios where the oil in the new line is either entirely in addition to existing flows or entirely offset by corresponding reductions on other pipelines (Chapter 5, page 442). 1332-4

The DEIS accepts Enbridge's word that the abandoned pipe would be monitored "indefinitely" by the company without seeking further clarity on how long indefinitely means in this case or what the consequences would be for the state, private landowners, or tribal nations when Enbridge eventually stops maintaining the pipe (Chapter 8, page 3). The entire chapter on abandonment is only 13 pages out of a 5,547- page document, a surprisingly cursory overview given that pipeline abandonment is a major concern for many private landowners as well as the Leech Lake and Fond du Lac nations. The DEIS states concern on page 7 of Chapter 8 that Enbridge's cleaning method has only been proven successful on a 12-mile stretch of pipe, while the existing Line 3 in Minnesota is 282 miles long. "It is currently unknown whether Enbridge's protocol works on a longer length of pipeline." This seems like a critical piece of data to be included in the EIS, and the document will be incomplete without a better analysis. Page 8 of Chapter 10 states "Costs for future site-specific mitigation measures (e.g. to mitigate subsidence or loss of buoyancy control) are uncertain and would depend on the nature of the mitigation measures." While the immediate abandonment costs and annual monitoring costs are quantified, there is no estimate or commitment here for what Enbridge could be held responsible for in future mitigation and clean-up. 1332-5 1332-6

Enbridge is asking for a 750 foot wide "route width" across Minnesota. This width is equal to the length of two football fields! The DEIS (Chapter 2, page 1) is not clear on the difference between the terms "construction right-of-way and "construction workspace" and "ATWS (additional temporary work space)" and "construction 1332-7

work area", so it's difficult to know how much land will be cleared. There is no way to really compare the SA-04 (southern alignment, proposed by citizens) or other alternatives, the DEIS says: "Construction for system alternative SA-04 would result in impacts of the same type, magnitude, and duration as discussed above for the Applicant's preferred route."

1332-8

Chapter 11 on "Environmental Justice" contains a GIS analysis based in poor methodology. Utilizing census tracts as the basis for the analysis is inconsistent with analyzing the actual movement of water within a watershed, which may extend to multiple census tracts. It also ignores that many people travel to utilize the potentially-impacted resources (such as wild rice), and negates the disproportionate use of certain resources by minority populations. The analysis of sex trafficking on page 10 of Chapter 11 is offensively inadequate and shows a lack of research or collaboration with impacted communities. The accompanying proposed solution is limited to "Enbridge can prepare and implement an education plan or awareness campaign around this issue with the companies and subcontractors that construct, restore, and operate the pipeline, as well as by working with local communities and tribal communities to raise awareness and provide resources to address the issue." This is clearly insufficient and lacks any systematic analysis of the problem. (Page 7 of Chapter 11 states) "In addition to the individual land use categories that would be affected by the routes, various waterbodies and streams would be crossed." However, there is no additional analysis of potential downstream environmental justice impacts.

If Enbridge's preferred route is permitted without our state agencies actually performing an independent analysis of the Environmental Impact (i.e. not just accepting the data drafted by Enbridge as valid); I submit that all individuals involved in this process be held liable and responsible for any subsequent damages to our great state due to negligence of their responsibilities as state employees.

Best regards,

Daniel L. Gaither

Shevlin, MN

--

"A frog in a well cannot be talked to about the sea." ~Chuang Tzu

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Grant Garriott <glgarriott@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 04, 2017 3:18 PM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: Public Comment: Line 3 Project (CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137)

Dear Environmental Review Manager:

We are writing to comment about the draft Environmental Impact Statement for Enbridge's Line 3 pipeline.

We own property on both Big Sandy Lake and the Mississippi River. The proposed pipeline represents a clear danger to us in light of the horrible pipeline leakage record of the Enbridge Corporation.

The draft EIS is missing information about the general economic picture for Minnesota if this project is approved as Enbridge prefers. Minnesota lakes are the source of revenue for fishing, water recreation, fisheries, and tourism in general. Where is the analysis of how a pipeline through some of the best lakes country in Minnesota will affect the multi-billion-dollar fishing, tourism, and recreation (and related) industries in Minnesota? Does Enbridge's pipeline provide enough benefits for Minnesota to balance the risk? We don't see anything about this in the DEIS. There must be an economic analysis for the EIS to be complete. 1013-1

Related to this question, we understand that a Certificate of Need must take into account whether there is a need in Minnesota for this pipeline — in other words, whether there is a *state need* (not a national need). According to statistics about the national need, U.S. fuel demand was down 5 percent in 2015 compared to its 2007 peak. In Minnesota, fuel demand was down 19 percent in 2016 compared to its 2004 peak. As higher efficiency cars and electric cars become increasingly popular, it is doubtful a new pipeline will be needed to supply needed oil. (http://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/sce/north-star-chapter/pdf/EnergySecurity.pdf). The final EIS needs to address this.

Thank you,

Grant & Kathy Garriott

51130 207th PL

McGregor, MN 55760

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: Mae Gibson Wall

Street Address: 4229 44th Ave. S.

City: Minneapolis State: MN Zip Code: 55406

Phone or Email: mae.gibson@gmail.com

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

- The EIS only analyzes impact on the environment for the next 30 years, when, if built, it would exist indefinitely. 0680-1
- There is no spill analysis for multiple rivers (including St. Louis River ~~and Kettle~~ River 0680-2 & Nemadji River) that will be impacted & which could also impact the Mississippi River & Lake Superior.
- The EIS does not address the impact on our vulnerable Native communities who would be adversely affected. The EIS neglects to address the structural and environmental racism that it would perpetuate.
- The section on effects on aquatic life does not include the impact on algae & other significant microorganisms.
- The EIS does not explicitly and sufficiently address global environmental impacts and greenhouse gas emissions.
- The EIS does not address the impact on the bee population, including risk to important pollinators.
- The EIS does not include analysis of cleaner energy alternatives.
- Chapter 9 - the EIS avoids drawing conclusions about the impacts on tribal people.

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

(1 additional page)

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: Mae Gibson Wall, (continued)

Street Address: 4229 44th Ave. S.

City: Minneapolis State: MN Zip Code: 55406

Phone or Email: mae.gibson@gmail.com

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

11.4.1 • While the EIS acknowledges that "the addition of a temporary, cash-rich workforce increases the likelihood that sex trafficking or sexual abuse will occur," it DOES not state how it would address the significant problem beyond preparing "an education plan or awareness campaign." This is absolutely not a sufficient response to this problem.

• The "No Build" alternative is not sufficiently analyzed & considered. There is no discussion of renewable energy or conservation.

• The 7 sites chosen for spill modeling are not representative of the locations & resources put at risk along the entire corridor, including Lake Superior. 0680-3

• The risks of pipeline abandonment are not adequately assessed

• There is no discussion of exposed pipe, how fast it will corrode or how much currently buried pipe will become exposed once it is emptied.

• The DEIS does not discuss the unprecedented challenges of human casualty, displacement, conflict, natural disaster, & biodiversity loss that climate change is causing and how this will further the risk of Line 3.

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

MS. DAWN GOODWIN:

(indiscernible). My name is Dawn Goodwin. My Anishinaabe name is Gaagige yaashiik, G-A-A-G-I-G-E Y-A-A-S-H-I-I-K.

I stand before you today, I speak for many people, and I thank all of you that came here today. This is very important. I don't even know where to begin. I'm going to start with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that was put out. I agree that it doesn't even barely -- it barely touches the surface of who we are as a people.

There's some part that stuck out with me as I was reading chapter 9 dedicated to the tribal resources. And as I was reading that, I come to one and it says, "Historically birch bark, cedar was used." I'm telling you, we are here. We're not a was. We are is. We use birch bark for our lodges, for our canoes,

0833-1

0833-2

for food serving, for whittling our wild rice in the traditional way. We use these things. We pick our medicines. We go out and harvest our foods.

Granted, right now I'm not doing that as much as I would really like to. On Sunday I could have been out picking birch bark, I could have went to the pow wow to celebrate life and each other.

But no, I was at home. I was reading the DEIS. I was reading this federal Indian law book, Federal Indian law, our 1855 treaty. Our treaties are the supreme law of the land. And it needs to be respected. Our people are hurting. We're tired of being stepped on. Look at when these first pipelines were put through, 1949, we're talking. We have two corridors of pipelines.

Where were our people then? Does anybody know? Other than the native people, we know. We know what was happening to our people then. We were being relocated.

So we're tired of this. These pipelines got to go through during that time. Our people couldn't defend themselves. They

didn't know that they are putting these pipelines through. My mom was eight years old in 1949. Did she have much of a voice? Probably not. She grew up in Bagley. I grew up in Bagley.

I want you to take -- look, we are in Clearwater County. Doesn't that resonate anything to you? Clearwater County. Three rivers start here. We have the Wild Rice River that flows south and west. That would mean crossed under by Enbridge pipeline.

We already worry about what are there from the Koch brothers.

There are spills there that haven't been cleaned up. We know this. There is a lady that had a spill back in 1980. It was never properly cleaned. And she may have settled out of court with the Koch brothers. We'll find out. I know it was up two years ago.

So we have Wild Rice River, which flows, and then to Mahnomen's source of drinking water. It goes through all our communities. Our children fish and swim in the river. We rice this in the fall. We pick

berries in July, right down from the Mississippi River where Enbridge would cross again. 0833-3

So here's another river that starts in Clearwater County; the Mississippi. That's considered the heart of Turtle Island. And you want to put a pipeline under that and also underneath the Clearwater River, which starts over -- was it First Lake or Third Lake there?

So we got three major rivers starting in Clearwater County, which would all be in danger of pipeline. Not to mention all the streams and creeks, not to mention the Continental Divide. So we got water going this way, water going that way.

We have rights. We have water rights. This book here tells us all about it, the rights we have. In Arizona they just won a water rights trial -- a case.

So as we gather, no, I'm not for this pipeline. It needs to be -- the old one needs to be taken out, and the new one does not need to exist. It's full of tar sand, which other people have said is very

carcinogenic.

I made lots of notes here. I looked at the Draft EIS, too, and I seen in there -- it was a misprint -- it said the Land of 1,000 lakes, so we need to make a change in that. We are the Land of 10,000 lakes. 0833-4

And I believe that the Certificate of Need should be denied because it would adversely affect us. The consequences to our society is less favorable.

And to also address, does the project comply with other laws? Well, like I said, 1855 treaty, the Clean Water Act. How about sulfate levels? Well, I guess we'll change the laws and try to irradicate those, or change the sulfide levels in the midst of all of this. It's wrong.

So we learn the rules of the game and then you change the rules while we're playing the game. That doesn't make sense.

I want to know how many -- how much oil is really used per day in our country. How much domestic oil do we use daily, how much imported oil is used on a daily basis, and what is this oil used for,

other than fuel for cars and buildings?

Are the alternatives to plastic being produced? Of course they're there. Are we using alternatives to plastic?

0833-5

We need to change as a people what we're choosing to do. And we need to figure out how to reduce the use of oil, not perpetuate the dependency upon it.

I want to speak about the section about climate change. Locally, we have noticed a drop in our water levels, and I'm going to mention the Buckboard Hills. The Buckboard Hills are on the eastern border of this pipeline.

Very important area, I don't know. It's considered a geologic anomaly, the Buckboard Hills. Do people know that? I don't know if they know that, but it is.

And a geological anomaly is considered because the glacier didn't scrape it away and pushed it up and stopped there and began to recede.

So in our Buckboard Hills, where many people still practice the traditional ways of gathering, hunting, they've noticed a

ten-feet drop in water in some of their lakes.

So speaking to climate change, we're seeing it. We've seen it as harvesters, the fluctuation and change. There's been years where we have bumper crops, various, and then the very next year, very few.

We talked also about -- also carbon trading credits. Canada doesn't have to do anything about their tar sand oil. They don't need to address it. It's dirty, very dirty oil, extreme extraction. Puts a lot of extra CO2 in the air. They don't have to because of carbon trading credits.

So I really encourage people to take the time to really understand the whole picture here. For instance, when I talk about the carbon trading credits, because Canada can say, "Well, we're doing this hydroelectric," so they're trading -- "so then we're cutting down on carbon."

So -- which makes it easy for them just to continue on with their tar sand project.

And another thing I want to mention is climate change. In the climate

change there was mention of some electromagnetic storms that take place, and this is a concern.

Also, we are a major flyway for birds, so the majority of our migratory bird population, they're born here in this area.

I also noticed what was missing, too, is there's no mention of endeavors for prairie restoration, wildlife habitat and water restoration.

Just down the river from where it crossed over by County 2 it says, "Save the Stream"; Coffee Pot Landing, "Save the Stream." I said, "Okay. I will save the stream."

All right, and thank you everyone for listening. I will -- I guess I promise I will write a statement, and I plan to attend other meetings. Thank you.

MS. DAWN GOODWIN: (Speaking Ojibwe.) My name is Dawn Goodwin, my English name. I come from White Earth. Yes, I come from that way. It doesn't mean that this isn't my home also. This is the 1855 Treaty area. My family lives here. My sister lives a mile away from the pipeline. My mother lives a mile away from the pipeline in Bagley.

So one concern that came to me that I did not address yesterday at our Rice Lake meeting was, if there was a spill, what about the exposure? What would my loved ones and my community people be exposed to that's lacking in this? It looks great, looks really thorough, whatnot; but it's a bunch of fluff.

And like Irene said, the chapter on tribal resources really -- it went in length about our history and treaties and whatnot, but -- and then it just got really loose at the end and thrown together and, oh, well, yeah, yeah, whatever. But from what I got out of that, at the end it says --

just kind of thrown together there that, oh, yeah, the natives think this way and they all think that way, and they don't really have much to say about this or that or whatnot, don't want to address, they're outside of the scope, blah, blah, blah.

And what I come from out of that is, yes, us native people, we're standing together. We have one voice, as we know we want to protect our environment and our people and our water, the animals, the air. We want to protect that. That's one voice, and we want you to hear that here.

Sure, you might not see a lot of our tribal members here. There wasn't a lot of tribal members at ours. And it makes me wonder, makes me worry. But whoever's supposed to be here tonight is here. And I want to explain a little bit maybe why they aren't here.

And there's a section there in the DEIS talking about the historical trauma. And I met this gentleman when we challenged the state on our ricing rights, which we did win. And he was talking about -- to a reporter about historical trauma. And he said what, historical trauma; that don't exist. And I looked at him, and I'm like what? He's like, no, it's not historical; we're still living it. So

now I'm calling that contemporary trauma.

We talked about this a little bit yesterday, that this is traumatizing to us. A lot of the people that I know that I want to come and be heard can't come here. It's too much. It's too emotional. So much anger. And to me this is traumatizing.

I vow to learn my language. I wanted to just put everything into learning my language. And then I started learning about tar sands and trade secrets and loopholes and whatnot. So I just had to combat that with doing my homework here about Line 3 and tar sands and combining that with my Anishinabe. That's the only way I could cope.

So, yeah, I'm being traumatized. I've been traumatized for many years now, just completely out of my mind. I have important work to do with my community. We have people dying from heroin overdoses, suicides. We just had a young girl two nights ago commit suicide. I can't be worried and so entrenched in trying to figure out how we're going to beat Enbridge and Line 3 when I have so much more important work to do. And it's really sad that my love and care for my people is being taken away because I have to concentrate on this.

So I say I'm speaking for many people. I'm part of a group called Anishinabe Nago. It's the gatherers, the berry pickers. We're gathering to save what we have left. So I represent them. I represent the gatherers, the harvesters. We're trying to continue our way of life, but this is impeding on it. And we don't want to stand for it anymore. We're not going to stand for it anymore. And I take solace in knowing that there are many people out there that have our backs. They know what's important in life. 0835-1

I'll talk a little bit more about some of the DEIS. Yeah, there -- it was lacking in information about tar sands and what kind of fumes and whatnot are coming from that. So I worry about my family members that live close by. But one thing I do notice, all the way from Clearbrook to Bagley to Bemidji, Cass Lake, BugONayGeShig School -- and I don't know if the schools further on -- they're all in the path of the pipeline. They're all next to it. Our children, if there's any spills, are going to be exposed to that.

And I felt also it was lacking the scientific knowledge of what bitumen is, what dilbit is, what's in it. And as I looked up some -- you

can't really find too much information as you're just generally going on the Internet about what is in tar sands because of trade secrets. But what I did find, it was like emulsifiers and -- which are probably chemicals, I imagine. And then they put water in there. Then it's an electric charge just to get the tar sands to flow through the line. So it's lacking some of that very important information.

Also, Enbridge, I believe that the certificate of need should not be granted. It should be denied because Enbridge cannot 100 percent guarantee that a major or minor dilbit spill will not happen. Now, I read that awhile back, when I was reading some criteria for certificates of need, and I couldn't find that. But I did notice at one time. And then when I went back to look for it, I couldn't find that. But, yeah, you can't 100 percent guarantee that there's not going to be a spill. So I believe that the certificate of need should be denied upon that.

And along with that, the failure of technology and human error has caused spills, and those are on fairly new pipelines. So I do not trust the technology.

Another thing I would like to mention is the Clearbrook hub. Not a very good idea, I don't think. And I hope a lot of other people agree with me.

I want to create an animal for you. Especially the Anishinaabemowin people, you'll get a vision in your head. This animal I created, it starts in Clearbrook. It's the Ezigaaginebigowi. That's a wood tick snake. Scary sounding, a wood tick snake. 0835-2

So with all that being said, a lot of people covered very many different facets here. We know that it's very poisonous. We know that it's going to harm the people in this region; not just the native people, but the people that live here. Here, you don't want to leave it in the ground.

We're asking for a full environmental impact study and removal of the old Line 3 in the 1855 area. We'd like an impact study done to the earth below that line. We want to know what's been going on there.

We also want a complete environmental impact study of the -- I'm not going to say replacement; I would say that would be a -- I lose my words sometimes -- a relocation of Line 3. It's

not a replacement. It's a relocation and a rebound.

MS. DAWN GOODWIN: All right. Just like yesterday, I like to talk. Surprisingly, I don't -- I'm not a talker. I don't like to be up here, but I need to be.

So directly or indirectly you'll be committing genocide, and it's negligent.

And for one last comment here, I want to talk about the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. There's a mission here: Protect and improve the environment and enhance human health.

This is MPCA's mission statement, so you might want to listen. Their vision: Clean water, air, and land, support healthy communities and Eco systems and a strong economy in Minnesota.

Core values: Number one, people. We value and support a motivated, talented, and diverse workforce. Hashtag, PCA people.

Leadership: We set a vision of environmental and human health protection in an open, ethical, and accountable manner. Hashtag, PCA leads.

And then the next one is

collaboration -- I'm not going to go through -- and then outcomes: We measure our success by our environment and public health outcomes achieved. Hashtag PCA outcomes.

Then there's -- they're data driven and a learning organization.

DNR, their mission is to work with citizens to conserve and manage the state's natural resources in a way that creates a substantial quality of life. Same goes to Army Corps of Engineers.

If you support this DEIS, you're going against your mission and your vision and your core values.

So with that being said, I want you to think about water and how you've used it and even the role water plays. And I want you to look, when you're watching an important meeting somewhere, what's the star of the evening? Water out on the tables.

So I want you to think about what's in your body. What percentage of water are you? 66 percent of your cells are water.

So with that being said, (speaking Ojibwe).

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Ken Graeve <kmgraeve@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 6:07 AM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: Invasive Species impacts of the Line 3 Project, Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Docket Numbers PPL-15-137 / CN-14-916

Noxious weeds and invasive plants impacts of the Line 3 Project as described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Docket Numbers PPL-15-137 / CN-14-916

My professional experience lies in the fields of ecological restoration, environmental compliance on construction projects, and invasive species control and prevention. This includes ten years of involvement in the management of invasive species on the construction and operation of linear infrastructure projects. My work has included hands-on control and monitoring efforts, providing training and technical support, developing contractual requirements and policies, and sitting on statewide advisory and regulatory committees. Based on this experience I have noticed serious flaws in the analysis provided by the DEIS on the potential impacts of invasive species.

The DEIS fails to provide an adequate assessment of the possible impacts from noxious weeds and invasive plants and does not even mention invasive earthworms, a serious threat to northern Minnesota forest ecosystems. The document downplays the risks and potential impacts of spreading invasive species as a result of this proposed project. The document predicts that impacts from invasive species will be short term and minor. This assessment is not founded in an honest view of the resources through which the proposed pipeline would be built, nor does it show a complete understanding of the impacts of invasive species. 2630-1

At one point the document states that impacts from invasive plants are difficult to quantify. While this is true, there are estimates of the economic impacts. An analysis published in 2005 estimates that non-native invasive plants cause $34.5 billion in economic impact to agriculture and forestry in the United States every year (1). Agriculture and forestry are two industries critical to the regions of Northern Minnesota that would be crossed by this proposed pipeline, and the threats posed by invasive species need a detailed analysis in this review. More difficult to quantify are the impacts of invasive species on ecosystems and biodiversity, but they are widely recognized as one of the leading causes of species extinctions worldwide. Once invasive species become established in an ecosystem, they are nearly impossible to eradicate. The result is a permanently altered ecosystem, an impact which cannot possibly be classified as “short-term.” 2630-2

Given the high quality natural areas through which this pipeline is proposed to travel, ecological threats posed by invasive species deserve detailed analysis. According to Table 5.2.5-17, there will be 215,882 acres of Sites of Biodiversity Significance within a half mile of the preferred route. By definition, these acres are ecologically intact and therefore highly vulnerable to invasive species that could be spread by construction and operations of a new pipeline. Two of the primary types of ecosystems that represent these ecologically significant areas are forests and wetlands, and both are at risk from invasive species in the ways described below. Impacts to this many acres of land cannot objectively be considered “minor”. 2630-3

Invasive species that threaten forest ecosystems in Minnesota include common buckthorn, garlic mustard, and invasive earthworms. Buckthorn and garlic mustard invade woodlands and shade out understory species. They dramatically reduce biodiversity by crowding out native understory vegetation through shading and allelopathy. Invasive earthworms dramatically change the soil of infested forests by compacting soils, accelerating nutrient leaching, removing leaf litter, and decimating the soil fungal. All of these impacts harm native vegetation, including rare species of wildflowers and economically important species of trees.

Minnesota wetlands are threatened by invasive species such as purple loosestrife, hybrid cattail, reed canary grass and non-native subspecies of common reed. All of these species can invade healthy wetland ecosystems and crowd out native plants through aggressive growth and alterations in nutrient cycling and surface hydrology. Types of wetlands threatened by these species include ecologically rich wet meadows and shrub swamps as well as economically and culturally important wild rice waters.

Table 5.2.5-13 lists occurrences of several threatened and endangered species native to forests and wetlands that are avoided by the APR, but the spread of invasive species into these “avoided” areas would result in catastrophic impacts to those rare species. By failing to fully consider invasive species, that table gives a deeply flawed analysis of the true impacts of the project.

The likelihood of invasive species being spread by this project and causing such impacts is not accurately depicted by this DEIS. There is ample evidence of the degree to which linear infrastructure such as transportation and utility corridors serve as vectors

for invasive species (2,3,4,5,6). Much of the research is in regards to roadsides but also applies to utility corridors. The corridor creates an altered, disturbed vegetation regime that favors the growth and spread of invasive species. Invasive species are introduced into and spread along the corridor by construction and maintenance equipment. Seed and other propagules are spread in soil attached to tires and tracks of all types of work vehicles as well as in clippings that land on mowers. Having been spread along the corridor, the invasive species are able to move off of the right of way into any favorable habitat. These adjacent favorable habitats could be crop fields, pastures, forests, wetlands, and meadows. The damage that can be caused by such infestations can often be severe and irreparable, and can extend well beyond the immediate vicinity of the corridor to affect vast landscapes.

2630-4

The DEIS claims that impacts from invasive species would be short term and minor because "invasive plant management measures would be in place during and after construction, as identified in the Applicant's Environmental Protection Plan…" This analysis is flawed in two important ways. First, it fails to distinguish between risk and consequences in its analysis. Regardless of how effective is the Environmental Protection Plan at preventing the spread of invasive species (and thus reducing the risk), the potential consequences of an invasive species infestation remain the same. Second, the DEIS places a profound faith on the infallibility of the Environmental Protection Plan to prevent invasive species spread. On a major project like the one proposed, vegetation management is usually one of the lowest priorities. This increases the likelihood of mistakes in the prevention of invasive species. Furthermore, assuming that the plan will be implemented perfectly over 340 miles of construction is reckless hubris. Invasive species can be spread along a construction project in many different ways, such as in soil, equipment, mulch, shoes, clothing, and seed (even with regulatory oversight, as evidenced by the introduction of Palmer amaranth into MN in 2016). It would be nearly impossible to ensure that all of those potential sources of spread are perfectly controlled on a 340 mile construction project. Once introduced, it only takes a single infestation of invasive species to spread out over and impact hundreds of acres. When (not if) these impacts occur, they will be permanent and major.

2630-5

Page 5-199 inaccurately downplays the risk of spreading invasive species by saying that the "project would be required to manage all noxious weeds for which federal, state, or local…regulations exist…" This statement demonstrates a poor understanding of the Minnesota noxious weed law, both in how species are listed and in how it is enforced. The organization of the noxious weed list prioritizes control of species that can cause harm but are not yet widespread. The intent is to focus resources on the prevention of future harm. The result is that there are many species that are ecologically very harmful but are so widespread that they are not on the noxious weed list or are listed in lower categories. The reasoning is that any requirement to control such species would divert all available resources away from less common species upon which control efforts would have a much greater relative impact. A prime example is common buckthorn, a species for which control is not required under the noxious weed law because it is on the "restricted" noxious weed list. The restricted list prohibits sale or spread but does not require control. Non-native subspecies of common reed also pose a severe threat to multiple wetland types. As with buckthorn, common reed is not required to be controlled by the MN Noxious Weed Law because it appears on the restricted list. Two other examples are hybrid cattail and reed canary grass, both of which can completely alter shallow marsh and wet meadow wetlands, respectively. These species do not appear on the noxious weed list at all because they are so widespread. Despite being widespread, none of these species would be present in the high quality ecosystems traversed by this project but they could all very likely be spread into those ecosystems by the construction or operation of this pipeline. Therefore, the commitment to manage all species for which control is required would do nothing to prevent spread and impacts of these and other species, all of which pose severe threats to the forest and wetland ecosystems in the project area. The DEIS assertion that the Applicant's management of weeds based on the noxious weed law would render the impacts short term and minor is either completely disingenuous or reflects a deep mis-understanding of the regulatory and ecological milieu of invasive species in Minnesota. The other misunderstanding of the noxious weed law is in how it is enforced. Noxious weed enforcement is handled by the Minnesota Department of Agriculture and is delegated to counties and townships. At the state level, there are approximately three FTE employees who work on noxious weed control, which is hardly sufficient for effective statewide enforcement even without responsibility for overseeing effective prevention and control along a 340 mile pipeline. At the county and township level, enforcement is handled in an inconsistent manner from one jurisdiction to the next. The requirement for these local governments to enforce the noxious weed law is an unfunded mandate, and many county agricultural inspectors and township weed inspectors bear that responsibility in addition to numerous other duties. Some counties do not even have an active agricultural inspector. The result is an enforcement system that is completely inadequate for ensuring the complete prevention and control of invasive species upon which the DEIS bases its claim that impacts will be "short-term and minor". The EIS needs to re-examine its estimate of invasive species impacts with a more accurate understanding of the species that could be spread along the pipeline, the impact they would cause if they were spread along the pipeline and into adjacent natural areas, and the regulatory context of invasive species control in Minnesota.

Based on the reasons described above, the DEIS presents a deeply flawed analysis of the true impacts of invasive species that could result from this project. Such impacts need to be re-assessed with a more realistic understanding of the ecosystems at risk, the vast harm that can be caused by invasive species, the propensity for linear infrastructure to spread invasive species, the true difficulty of preventing spread on linear projects, and the limited reach and enforcement of the noxious weed law in Minnesota.

References:

1. Pimentel, D, R. Zuniga and D. Morrison. 2005. Update on the environmental and economic costs associated with alien invasive species in the United States. Ecological Economics, Volume 52, Issue 3, p 273-288.

2. Christen, D., and G. Matlack. 2006. The Role of Roadsides in Plant Invasions: A Demographic Approach. Conservation Biology. Volume 20, No 2, 385-391.
3. Mortensen, D.A., E.S.J. Rauschert, A.N. Nord and B.P. Jones. 2009. Forest Roads Facilitate the Spread of Invasive Plants. Invasive Plant Science and Management. 2: 191-199.
4. Gelbard, J.L. and J. Belnap. Roads as conduits for exotic plant invasions in a semiarid landscape. Conservation Biology. Volume 17, No. 2, 420-432.
5. Christen, D.C. and G.R. Matlack. 2009. The habitat and conduit functions of roads in the spread of three invasive plant species. Biological Invasions, 11: 453-465.
6. Brisson, J., S. de Blois, and C. Lavoie. 2010. Roadside as invasion pathway for common reed (Phragmites australis). Invasive Plant Science and Management, 3: 506-514.

Sincerely,
Ken Graeve
Saint Paul, MN

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Ken Graeve <kmgraeve@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 5:14 AM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: Wetland Impacts of Line 3 Project DEIS, Docket # PPL-15-137 & CN-14-916

Surface water and wetlands Impacts of the Line 3 Project as described in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Docket Numbers PPL-15-137 / CN-14-916

My professional experience lies in the fields of ecological restoration, environmental compliance on construction projects, and invasive species control and prevention. This includes several years of experience with wetland restoration, including design, planting, monitoring, and maintenance. Based on this experience I have noticed serious flaws in the analysis provided by the DEIS on the potential impacts to wetlands.

Inconsistent impact estimates

The DEIS shows inconsistencies in its estimates of the number of acres of wetlands impacted by the project. Table 5.2.1.3-1 estimates the number of acres of wetlands crossed by the APR in all states would be 313 acres. Table 5.2.1.3-6 estimates that the APR would cause long-term to permanent and major impacts to 440 acres. These discrepancies need to be cleared up so that regulators and the public can effectively analyze the impacts of the proposed project. 2632-1

Alternatives comparison

The DEIS admits that "The Applicant's preferred route has the largest total wetland impact from construction and operation of all CN alternatives." (p 5-130). Table 5.2.1.3-6 bears this out, showing an estimated 440 acres of construction-related impacts from the APR compared to 34 acres from SA-04.

On page 5-119 the Applicant makes numerous commitments to minimizing wetland impacts. One of these commitments is "Designing and planning Project pipeline routes and infrastructure sites to reduce impacts on sensitive wetland resources…" However, the Applicant's preference for a route that impacts far more wetlands than other alternatives demonstrates that it is already breaking this commitment. The analysis needs to be revised to include a clear explanation as to why the Applicant prefers the route with far greater wetlands impacts than any other proposed alternative.

Hydrologic connectivity

Northern Minnesota, including the area that would be crossed by the applicant's preferred route (APR), includes vast wetlands. Table 5.2.1.3-6 estimates that the APR will impact 440 acres of wetlands. However, many of the wetlands in Northern Minnesota, such as peatlands, tamarack bogs, and wet meadows have very narrow hydrologic requirements. Slight changes to hydrology can drastically change these ecosystems. Slight changes over significant distances, such as those seen by linear infrastructure projects, can cause drastic changes to vast acreages of these ecosystems. This often happens on road projects, where the compaction and fill for the road bed cause slight flooding on one side of the road and slight drying on the other side. These slight changes extend for hundreds of feet and cause significant changes in wetland type over many acres in both directions. Similarly, hydrologic connectivity is bound to be impacted by the trenching and filling involved in a pipeline project. For example, page 5-167 states that 51% of the APR occurs on hydric and compaction-prone soils. It is highly unlikely that a 340 mile project will completely avoid compaction. Any soil compaction in wetlands such as those described above may disrupt hydrologic connectivity. The lateral effects of such hydrologic alterations could result in wetland impacts well beyond the immediate footprint of the construction corridor. Similarly, pages 5-75 and 5-76 claim that impacts to hydrologic connectivity from access roads would be permanent and minor. This section fails to mention that minor hydrologic changes can result in major changes to wetland types. Therefore, the estimates of wetland impacts provided in Table 5.2.1.3-6 may be well below actual impacts and must be re-evaluated. This environmental impact statement needs to re-assess wetland impacts to fully account for the possible effects on hydrologic connectivity of equipment traffic within the corridor, trenching and backfilling, and access road construction. 2632-2

Construction Stormwater

The DEIS repeatedly assumes that impacts to surface waters would be minor because of requirements of the NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit. This is stated in relation to stormwater runoff and erosion (p 5-66), total suspended solids and sedimentation (p 5-67), changes in stream flows (p 5-68), and surface water quality (p 5-69). These statements rely on false assumptions about contractor behavior, the scale of this project, and Construction Stormwater Permit enforcement in Minnesota. Mistakes in erosion control and stormwater management are common on construction projects. Enforcement of the NPDES Construction Stormwater Permit in Minnesota is handled by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, which assigns enforcement for almost the entire northern half of Minnesota to two employees (https://www.pca.state.mn.us/water/construction-stormwater-contacts). Inevitable human error and strained enforcement capability will likely result in numerous mistakes. Even if these mistakes are minor, the amount of minor mistakes that could occur on a 340 mile project would add up to overall impacts on wetland and other surface waters that are anything

but minor. This EIS needs to provide a more honest assessment of the types of erosion control and stormwater management impacts that are typical on construction projects rather than the perfect scenario portrayed in the current DEIS.

In summary, this Environmental impact Statement needs to more fully address impacts to wetlands and other surface waters as follows: Discrepancies in estimated acres of wetland impacts need to be cleared up so that regulators and the public can effectively analyze the impacts of the proposed project. The analysis needs to be revised to include a clear explanation as to why the Applicant prefers the route with far greater wetlands impacts than any other proposed alternative. The analysis needs to re-assess wetland impacts to fully account for the possible effects on hydrologic connectivity of equipment traffic within the corridor, trenching and backfilling, and access road construction. This EIS needs to provide a more honest assessment of the types of erosion control and stormwater management impacts that are typical on construction projects rather than the perfect scenario portrayed in the current DEIS.

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: Cedrik Gustafson

Street Address: 200 Robert St.

City: Clearbrook State: MN Zip Code: 56634

Phone or Email: Cedrik.gustafson@mnlimited.com

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

I would like to comment on the draft EIS statement 0397-1
that says. there is no local construction jobs added with
the Pipeline. This is false, the local communities in the
area are relied on heavily for the construction and
Maintenance of the pipeline. I am from Clearbrook
and atleast a quarter of the people work directly for the
pipeline. Gustafson + Goodge, Chirps, and Minnesota Limited have
lots of quality workers that work on the pipeline every day.
I myself am a Foreman/Sup. for Minnesota Limited,
On My Crew I have 12 workers from Clearbrook, Gonvick,
Thief River and Viking. I really support the pipeline
and hope it passes.

Thanks!

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