0831

50 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 MR. JASON GEORGE: Jason George, J-A-S-O-N, G-E-O-R-G-E. 10 I work for the International 11 Union of Operating Engineers, Local 49. 12 Just a 13 couple of comments. One in particular, it's been said, but I think it's worth reiterating. 14 15 The jobs estimates that are in the EIS are just 16 woefully wrong. To say that there's going to 17 be zero jobs created locally in the building of 18 this pipeline is just, quite frankly, a joke. 19 There's -- I know personally 20 hundreds of 49ers that built the Clipper. 21 Personally, I know them. These are the same 22 people that are going to build Line 3 when it 23 gets permitted. They live around here. So to 24 say that there's no impact is just not at all 25

0831-1

1 accurate. There's people in the room that built the Alberta Clipper here tonight. 2 Just wanted to put that on the 3 record, make sure you get that right. 4 That 5 needs to be changed immediately. The second point is more of a 6 7 process point. There is a statutory process 8 timeline. I'm not talking about whether you're 9 for the pipeline, against the pipeline. I'm just talking about the process. 10 There are laws 11 on the books that outline how long this is 12 supposed to take. They were not followed for 13 the Sandpiper project. I would strongly encourage the Department of Commerce, the PUC, 14 15 to stick to the law. Follow the science. 16 Whether or not you're going to determine this project is good or bad, at least the people in 17 18 this room and all around the state deserve a timely answer. 19 So I really would encourage folks 20 to -- the department, PUC, to follow the law, 21 the statutory timeline, stick to the process. 22 23 When -- I believe the company 24 will show that this project meets the

> Shaddix & Associates - Court Reporters (952)888-7687 - 1(800)952-0163 - reporters@janetshaddix.com

requirements, and when it does, the Department

25

0831-2 0831

|

51

		52
1	of Commerce should recommend a permit, and the	
2	people in this room should get to work.	
3	Thank you very much.	
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

rge@local49.org>
017 2:23 PM
e Comments
3 Replacement DEIS
on Line 3 DEIS.pdf

Comments for the record are attached

Docket #'s CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137

Jason George Director of Special Projects International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 49 Cell: 612-791-2585

Confidentiality Notice

This e-mail and any attachments hereto contain confidential information. This information is intended solely for use by the individual or entity named as the recipient hereof. Access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any review, disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this transmission is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by e-mailing us via return e-mail. Please permanently delete the e-mail and any attachments that you received. Thank you.

International Union of Operating Engineers

LOCAL NO. 49, 49A, 49B, 49C, 49D, AND 49E MINNESOTA • NORTH DAKOTA • SOUTH DAKOTA

CLAYTON J. JOHNSON, President BRUCE A. STAHNKE, Vice President TIM L. OLSON, Recording-Corresponding Secretary ERIC R. O'GARY, Treasurer



GLEN D. JOHNSON Business Manager/Financial Secretary

Affiliated with the A.F.L. - C.I.O.

2829 Anthony Lane South, Minneapolis, MN 55418-3285 Phone (612) 788-9441 • Toll Free (866) 788-9441 • Fax (612) 788-1936

6/29/17

Comments related to Enbridge Line 3 Replacement Project DEIS

Docket numbers: CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137

To Whom It May Concern:

I write on the behalf of the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 49. We represent close to 14,000 heavy equipment operators, hundreds of whom make their living building and maintaining pipelines. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Enbridge Line 3 Replacement Project has some deficiencies that we wish to comment on. There are two specific issues that stand out.

The first relates to job creation for local workers. The DEIS claims that no local jobs will be created by this project. This is absolutely wrong. We offer two specific points of evidence that clearly demonstrate the inaccuracy of the local jobs claim in the DEIS. When the Albert Clipper (Line 67) project was built in 2008-2009 in northern Minnesota hundreds of Local 49 members, Minnesota residents, worked on that project. When Line 3 is constructed, the number of local construction workers building the project will be at least this amount if not greater.

In addition, we would like to point out that trades collective bargaining agreements guarantee at MINIMUM 50% of the labor force building the project will be members of the areas local unions. Enbridge has committed to using union contractors to build Line 3, meaning that these agreements will be in effect, and therefore ensuring local workers will perform work on this project. It is also worth noting that in our experience, because Minnesota has the most skilled tradesmen and women in the nation, when pipelines are built in Minnesota, far more than 50% of the workers are local residents.

The other glaring inaccuracy of the DEIS, and an accusation that has been repeatedly made by pipeline opponents, is the assertion that pipeline projects bring with them an increase in drug and sex trafficking activity to local communities. This is simply not true in Minnesota, and is very offensive to the men and women that work in the pipeline industry here.

We looked at and analyzed the arrest records for the time period before, during, and after the most recent major pipeline project that was built in Minnesota, the Alberta Clipper Line 67 project. We specifically analyzed the arrest records in the counties where the pipeline was built, and documented the number of arrests for narcotics and prostitution in these counties for the two year period before, the two years during, and the two years after construction of the project which was in 2008-09.

1030-1

1030-3

1030-2

The facts clearly show there was not a significant increase in arrests for prostitution or narcotics during construction of the Alberta Clipper project in the areas where it was constructed. In fact, narcotics arrests went down during the two year period of construction compared to the two years before construction in these counties. Arrests for prostitution were lower during the construction of the Alberta Clipper project than they were for the two year period after the project was completed.

We encourage staff to look at the statistics from the MN Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Criminal Apprehension. These facts clearly indicate the narratives put forward in the DEIS and by pipeline opponents about increased criminal activity related to pipeline construction are completely false. We expect pipeline opponents to lie to instill fear, that's what they do, and they do it well. We don't expect state funded reports to make very serious claims that are so easily proven false. We hope you will correct the record on this point.

Other than the inaccuracies that we have commented on, the overall DEIS is solid. The process put in place by the Department of Commerce has been sufficient, and we are pleased that so far the timelines have been largely followed. On this point, we would like to encourage the Commerce Department, and the MN Public Utilities Commission to continue to follow the statutory timelines for pipeline permitting. The timelines were largely ignored during the Sandpiper Pipeline process, resulting in great uncertainty, and ultimately an abandonment of the project.

This can't happen on Line 3 Replacement. The current Line 3 is decades old, in need of constant repair and maintenance, and simply must be replaced. The federal government has mandated its replacement as part of the Kalamazoo settlement. Beyond the facts, common sense dictates that it will be far better for the state of Minnesota and the safety of local residents to have a new pipeline with the latest technology move the oil currently being moved through a pipeline built in the 1960's.

Thank you for thoughtfully considering our comments, and for the work of the analysts that are putting together this public record. Like the workers building pipelines and other infrastructure projects that are critically important to our state, the work of staff that prepare these reports and help guide the process is often thankless and increasingly filled with tension. We applaud the public servants that are dedicated to a fair permitting process. We are confident that after all the evidence is weighed, if the process remains fair, that our members will be building the Line 3 replacement project next year. We look forward to doing this safely, and delivering a great project for the state of Minnesota.

Sincerely, Jn J.

Jason George Legislative and Special Projects Director International Union of Operating Engineers Local 49