

* A few more comments I would have made
(+ questions for data)



Comment Form
Line 3 Project Draft EIS Public Meeting

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

Name: Rose Rogore (also current President, Twin Lakes Association)
Street Address: 39754 Twin Lakes Road (SEASONAL)
City: Menasha State: MN Zip Code: 56464
Phone or Email: (402) 475-6109

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

FOR REPORT:

- * Please provide information on a barrel = approximately gallons (I've heard 42 gallons referenced) for readers.
- * (Page ES-11) "since 1990" "Line 3 has experienced 15 failures that released more than 50 barrels of oil during each incident" with "7 in Minnesota" (incidents) What are the specific amounts per spill? (+List)
- * How many rail oil spills have occurred in MN since 1990? (FYI)

0241-1

EMPHASIS * Page ES-14 "The Applicant's Proposed Project" would have construction impacts + introduce new risk of spills in northern MN where the watersheds are in general very healthy + water quality is very good."

> so, why with 2008 Legacy Amendment, would this route be considered ???

Minnesota passed Hallmark Legislation for Responsible practices in thinking about cherished resources for future generations !!! The people spoke.

* What is Minnesota's Need for this pipeline?

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

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Ellis Rausch <ellis.rausch@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 02, 2017 2:09 PM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137

CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137

Enbridge wants to abandon their crumbling Line 3 pipeline in our lands and build a new one in a new corridor through our lake, wild rice beds, and treaty territories. The Draft Environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the new Line 3 pipeline found every single option for the project would have long term detrimental effects on tribal communities. Most of the issues specific to tribal communities are regulated to a separate chapter that attempts to provide "an American Indian Perspective." siloed and excluded from the main chapters that assess potential impacts. The 5000+ page document attempts to justify why the oil industry's need to profit is greater than the need of the Anishinaabeg people to survive.

These are just 8 ways Line 3 DEIS has failed to serve tribal and all communities of Minnesota:

1. No free, prior, and informed consent of tribal nations:

The route alternatives compared in the DEIS include two routes, RA-07 and RA-08. Both would cross the Leech Lake and Fond du Lac Reservations. Despite the fact that Tribes clearly will not consent to a new pipeline. Enbridge's preferred route would skirt reservations boundaries while still crossing the watersheds and lands of 1855 Treaty Territory.

2. Disregard for health of tribal communities.

Chapter 9 of the DEIS acknowledges the impacts on tribal communities "are part of a larger pattern of structural racism" that tribal people face in Minnesota. The DEIS also states that "the impacts associated with the proposed project(new Line 3) and its alternatives would be an additional health stressor on tribal communities that already face overwhelming health disparities and inequities" but claims this is an insufficient reason to stop the project.

3. No consultation or plan for protecting sacred sites.

Enbridge admits 63 sacred sites are slated for destruction. Pipeline corporations cannot be trusted to understand and implement protections for our numerous sacred sites.

4. No protection for Wild Rice lakes and surrounding environment.

The DEIS acknowledges "that traditional resources are essential to the maintenance and realization of tribal life ways, and their destruction or damage could have profound cultural consequences." It also shows that Enbridge's preferred route would "impact more 1855 Treaty Territory wild rice lakes and areas rich in biodiversity than any of the other proposed alternative routes." These sensitive environments would be the worst place for a tar sands oil spill.

5. Line 3 is guaranteed to spill.

The DEIS estimates the annual probability of different kinds of spills on the proposed route: The analysis predicts that in a 50 year time span there will be 14 "pinhole" leaks, 54 small spills, 4 medium spills, 3 large spills, and 1 catastrophic spill!

The DEIS also contains no analysis of tributaries of the St. Louis River, where a spill could decimate Lake Superior.

6. No plan to stop sex trafficking in pipeline man-camps.

The doc assumes "all workers would relocate the area" and **zero construction jobs would go to Minnesotans**. We are too familiar how the addition of temporary workers, cash-rich workforce increases the likelihood that sex trafficking or sexual abuse will occur. But the DEIS dismisses this saying, "Enbridge can prepare and implement an education plan or awareness campaign around this issue"(11.4.1) That is in no way an assurance that women and children will be safer once construction starts.

7. Inadequate assessment of abandonment

Enbridge's current plan is to cap off the crumbling old Line 3 pipe in sections and leave it in the ground for landowners to take care of, setting a dangerous precedent for future pipelines in Minnesota including the new Line 3. The risks of abandoning pipelines are not adequately addressed in the DEIS. These rusting pipes are conduits and could one day leak into water sheds and dump toxic waters into surrounding agriculture.

8. The "No Build" option is not genuinely considered.

When will "shut the line down because it's falling apart and poisoning our communities" option be considered!

| 1065-2

These are my comments to be considered for the **CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137**

Ellis Rausch

1722 Mississippi River Blvd

Saint Paul, MN 55116

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

Name: Pat Renner
 Street Address: 4236 Wooddale Ave S.
 City: St Louis Park State: MN Zip Code: 55416
 Phone or Email: preinner.renner@gmail.com

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

- Factors not considered in Draft EIS
- Environment impacts beyond 30 year should be considered. Who says for damage of Endridge goes
 - No spill estimate in St Louis River
 - EIS Chapter 11 - Structural racism - impacts of deaths stress on indigenous people of MN. Cut off access to water or negative impacts. Pipeline violates Anishinaabe treaties
 - Herbicides used around pipeline - effect on pollinators already in the life.
 - High pressure because of more set through pipeline - risk not assessed by EIS
 - Line 3 - Spills threaten Wild Rice Crops - Sacred Food
 - Global impacts of Climate Change - greenhouse gas transported through pipelines are vented. Luv Tar Sands oils burns chlorine - more CO₂ in atmosphere which causing damage in our ecological system.
 - My opinion strongly supports using the money to produce energy from wind - solar - geothermal. With the price of oil going down & the cost of installing solar, wind renewables going down this pipeline make no sense.
 - Northstar and Tar Sands are the most expensive type of oil to produce & the most toxic. Let's transition to a new cleaner, renewable energy future.
 - MN is worth it, and we must protect environmental justice, and protect our state for future generations.

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

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 MR. ALLEN RICHARDSON: My name

19 is Allen Richardson, A-L-L-E-N,

20 R-I-C-H-A-R-D-S-O-N.

21 Let's see, there's some polling

22 data recently released about if people asked

23 about what do they think about an oil pipeline

24 going through rural oil territory, and they

25 rephrased the question, "What do you think

1 about a tar sands pipeline going through oil
2 territory?" People had a much more negative
3 visceral reaction to tar sands mining, and
4 rightly so.

5 I think there should be a big
6 graphic of a tar sands mine up there. It
7 looks like Dante's Inferno to me. It looks
8 like hell on earth. Tar sands mining is an
9 abomination. It's not a casual thing. We
10 need to be responsible and say, "That's not
11 good enough."

12 We're not going to endorse
13 people on the other end being a sacrifice zone
14 just so we can have our lights and boaters,
15 because it's wrong. Are we going to kick that
16 can down the road?

17 So that's my personal opinion
18 that tar sands mining is abominable, and
19 therefore, we should not embrace it.

20 I was talking with some of my
21 labor union brothers and sisters over the last
22 couple of meetings, and I will say that as
23 someone who's worked with organized labor --
24 but I'm a clean water guy. I really don't
25 like being in opposition to pipeline workers,

1 you know, union members. It's one of my least
2 favorite things, but sometimes it's just what
3 you have to do.

4 And you know, they used to use
5 the term solidarity a lot more often. I don't
6 know if it's still in vogue in organized labor
7 circles.

8 But you know, I think we should
9 all think about the idea of solidarity. I
10 want to express solidarity with the people on
11 the other end of this pipeline, and I would
12 encourage pipeline workers, regardless of your
13 background, to give that some thought and to
14 express solidarity with those people for real.
15 What are they going through?

16 Let's see, regarding jobs,
17 though, right, we know that there's a fair
18 amount about this project that we, that there
19 is disagreement about.

20 But there is one area where
21 there should be wide agreement, and I think we
22 should focus on what common ground we can
23 find, and I'm referring to the jobs that would
24 be created by removing abandoned pipeline.

25 I would like to see the

0897-1

1 Environmental Impact Statement include more
2 detailed information about how many jobs would
3 be created if we went that way.

4 I would say that I want to
5 encourage the workers to be a little less
6 timid on this question, which is to say
7 they'll tell you that they want the jobs, but
8 it's -- really, it's not at all clear that the
9 workers would do anything. If Enbridge gets
10 their way, they're going to leave that
11 pipeline in the ground.

12 I guess my question is, would
13 the workers who would be doing that work of
14 removal, would you just take that line down?
15 You're just going to shrug your shoulders and
16 look at your shoes?

17 You know, because there's a
18 whole mountain of jobs to be had. And we know
19 that we're setting a precedent here on the
20 question of pipeline abandonment, so we can
21 also establish a precedent for digging those
22 pipelines up where it's safe.

23 We want to be a science-based
24 people. We don't have a science-based
25 administration in Washington, D.C. right now,

1 which is a shame, but perhaps we can fix that
2 by -- at least at the local level and state
3 level we can take pride in not being afraid of
4 the science.

5 To that end, the Draft
6 Environmental Impact Statement makes some
7 pretty sweeping statements about how close the
8 pipelines are to each other in the context of
9 whether or not it's safe to take -- you know,
10 to remove them. You know, would it be
11 possible to remove an abandoned pipeline
12 relative to its proximity to hot lines.

13 Well, John Munter over there
14 took it upon himself to measure some of the
15 distances between the pipelines in the Grand
16 Rapids area, and there's quite a bit more
17 space there than we've been led to believe
18 from the Draft Environmental Impact Statement,
19 which is to say that there is certainly ample
20 room to remove large sections of pipeline.

21 So maybe the complete -- the
22 final Environmental Impact Statement could
23 have more detail. You know, let's measure the
24 whole thing. Let's get some soil samples
25 going in there, right.

1 You know, again, back to the
2 workers, some people will tell you Enbridge is
3 a great neighbor. Well, I've spoken to a lot
4 of landowners out there, working with this
5 organization, Minnesotans for Pipeline
6 Cleanup, and most of the folks that I have
7 spoken to do not want to be left with a
8 section of abandoned pipeline on their private
9 property.

10 You know, sometimes it's a mixed
11 bag. Sometimes there's one section where they
12 definitely want it up, and there's another
13 section where maybe it would be better to
14 leave it there because of what the process of
15 removing it would do to an already delicate
16 ecosystem.

17 But the point there is to
18 embrace, for everyone to embrace this idea of
19 landowner choice.

20 You know, there's so much common
21 sense embedded in this idea, that I'm
22 confident that we can find a whole lot of
23 common ground on this question.

24 So that's basically it. I just
25 want to reaffirm that, you know, pipeline

1 workers, people who stand to benefit from
2 those jobs, you're going to have to publicly
3 assert your solidarity with the landowners who
4 are saying we want landowner choice. Don't
5 let Enbridge just walk away from this and say
6 it's all good.

7 So we need those workers to
8 support the landowners, and then society at
9 large, I think we need to take a good long
10 look at tar sands mining and extreme
11 extraction and realize it's time to take
12 things in another direction.

13 Thank you very much for your
14 time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ALLEN RICHARDSON: It's Allen Richardson. A-L-L-E-N. R-I-C-H-A-R-D-S-O-N. Afternoon, folks. I'm with the organization called Minnesotans for Pipeline Cleanup. I just want to again speak to the abandonment issue.

We're taking exception to the DEIS's sort of blithe assertions that most of the pipelines in the mainline corridor are, in general, 10 or 15 feet apart. We took it upon ourselves -- Mr. John Munter over there took it upon himself to walk some of these lines to measure the distances between them. And we'd love it if the PUC and Friends, DOC, or whoever, would confirm that we're correct, basically that there is ample room to remove abandoned pipeline.

So basically we're here to advocate for landowner choice. And I think this really

1 speaks to what I'm going to call Minnesotan common
2 sense. There is a lot of common ground to be had on
3 this question of abandonment. And so we should look
4 at it strongly. I think we should embrace it.

5 I've said this a few times over these
6 meetings, and I'll say it again to my brothers and
7 sisters in the labor movement, that if -- if you
8 want to benefit from the jobs that would come from
9 digging up abandoned pipeline, it's my opinion that
10 you're going to have to publicly assert your
11 solidarity with landowners who have made it clear
12 that they don't want to be stuck with abandoned
13 pipeline on their land.

14 And I'll take it a step further; that,
15 you know, regardless of what happens with the
16 proposed new route, that this project should not
17 move forward in any way, shape or form until this
18 question of abandonment is conclusively settled.

19 Would love it for the final
20 Environmental Impact Statement to have some really
21 solid data about the distance between these
22 pipelines, about how many jobs would be created
23 pulling out those pipelines. We know that a
24 precedent is being established on this question.

25 We know that Enbridge has every

0899-1

1 intention of abandoning this line. They do not want
2 to dig it up. So they're, you know -- may have to
3 apply some pressure to them and the PUC on this
4 point.

5 They are likely to abandon the rest of
6 those pipelines in the mainline corridor eventually.
7 So to take the long view, if we can, you know,
8 continue to look for common ground on this question.
9 There are long-term economic benefits to be had to
10 the pipeline workers, who are definitely the ones
11 who are qualified to do that work.

12 So thank you for your time.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25



Comment Form

Line 3 Project Draft EIS Public Meeting

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

Name: Dean Rietmann
 Street Address: 1401 Knoll Drive.
 City: Shoreview State: MN Zip Code: 55126
 Phone or Email: d.d.rietmann@gmail.com

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

0748-1

The EIS should have calculate monetary
values for the contaminated land, water, air,
and the human health effects of the inevitable
spills, leaks, abandoned lines, disposal of
equipment after useful life cycle, as well
the burning of the oil. After all it
 is an ~~EIS~~ EIS, correct? How can the
 impact be determined if we do not
 calculate, or even understand the true
 costs of the project?

The review/^{approval} process/^{cost} alone should also
 be considered, and documented, and paid
 for by the applicant.
 What about the opportunity cost of
~~devoting~~ not devoting the resources above
 to Line 3, instead of a
 comparable renewable energy
 project such as wind or solar?

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Wachtler, John (COMM)
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2017 9:26 AM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: FW: Sandpiper and Line 3 Stress design.xlsx
Attachments: Sandpiper and Line 3 Stress design.xlsx; Steve Roe.vcf

From: Steve Roe [mailto:roetreat@crosslake.net]
Sent: Monday, June 26, 2017 9:23 AM
To: Wachtler, John (COMM) <john.wachtler@state.mn.us>
Subject: Sandpiper and Line 3 Stress design.xlsx

John,

Thank you for your patience. Attached is my calculation of the pipeline stresses as accepted by those who teach and the professional societies such as ASME and ASCE. This follows what I previously sent to you.

1069-1

Thanks,
Steve Roe



CFR 192.105 Design Formula Hoop Stress Only

| | | |
|---------------------------|------------|---|
| Pipe Wall Thickness | 0.515 Inch | t |
| Pipe Outside Diameter | 36 Inches | D |
| Yield Strength | 70000 psig | S |
| Design Factor | 0.8 | |
| Longitudinal Joint Factor | 1 | |
| Temperature Derating | 1 | |
| Operating Pressure | 1480 | |

Additional Considerations

Longitudinal Stress
 Material Strength Deviation
 Fluid Hammer
Design Factor is not a **Safety Factor**
 Need for Safety Factor
 Handling Stresses
 Harmonics from Pump
 Economics Dictate Cheapest Design

Conventional Pipe Longitudinal Stress as taught

| | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|--|
| Area | 1017.8784 | |
| Force | 1506460.032 | |
| Pipe Circum Area | 58.25 | |
| Long Pipe Stress | 25864 psi | |
| Pipe Hoop Stress | 51755.6 psi | |
| Total operating stress | 3347592645 | |
| Total w/Circum and | 57858 psi total | |
| Steel Yield Stress | 70000 | |
| Steel Design Stress | 56000 | |
| Safety Factor | 44800 | This should be the design stress they operate to |
| Water Hammer | 127288 | This is the maximum operating stress anticipated |
| The safe operating pressure | 521 psi | |
| Enbridge Operating Pressure | 1480 psi | |

Enbridge Operating pressure must be reduced for this pipe design

Allowances

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| Fluid hammer | 2.2 Factor |
| Safety Factor | 1.25 |
| Design Factor | 0.8 |

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

Full Name: Steve Roe
Last Name: Roe
First Name: Steve
Company: S & B Investments

Home Address: 11663 Whitefish Ave.
Crosslake, MN 56442

Home: (218) 692-3331
Mobile: (218) 232-3554

E-mail: roetreat@crosslake.net
E-mail Display As: Steve Roe (roetreat@crosslake.net)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

MS. ANGELA RONAYNE: Hi, my name is

18

Angela Ronayne. A-N-G-E-L-A. R-O-N-A-Y-N-E. I'm a

19

shareholder with --

20

FACILITATOR: Could you hold the mic a

21

little bit closer?

22

MS. ANGELA RONAYNE: I'm a shareholder

23

with Merjent, an environmental consulting firm based

24

in Minneapolis that works with both public and

25

private entities and mainly within the energy

1 industry. I'm also a registered professional
2 engineer in the state of Minnesota.

3 Enbridge retained Merjent early in the
4 project planning process to conduct environmental
5 and cultural resource surveys, advise on resource
6 avoidance and minimization strategies, participate
7 in the development of permit applications, and
8 engage in discussions with federal, state, and local
9 permitting agencies.

10 My role on this project is the
11 engineering interface and data management lead. I
12 work with Enbridge environment department staff and
13 Enbridge staff from other departments in data
14 management and environmental permitting and analysis
15 efforts.

16 My work on the project began in 2014.
17 Since May of 2013 Merjent has coordinated several
18 types of environmental and cultural surveys for
19 Enbridge within the environmental survey area, which
20 completely contains the route considered in the
21 DEIS, referred to as the Applicant's preferred
22 route.

23 I have reviewed portions of the DEIS
24 and read in several sections about how DOC used
25 Enbridge's survey data to inform certain analyses

2049-1

1 when comparing route -- the route to alternatives.

2 I would like to emphasize the survey
3 information that our scientists have gathered
4 regarding Enbridge's route is much more specific
5 than the information presented on any alternatives;
6 and I would like for the DEIS to make this
7 clarification, when necessary, so the public is
8 informed of the extensive work that has gone into
9 studying the proposed route.

10 And while I appreciate our survey
11 information is represented in some places, I would
12 like to speak to the completeness of the
13 environmental information that our scientists, as
14 well as those of several specialized firms that we
15 have subcontracted, have gathered on the preferred
16 route and how it has informed the route that
17 Enbridge is proposing.

18 Over the past five survey seasons, our
19 team of scientists have gathered information on over
20 29,600 acres of land covering 430 miles in Minnesota
21 alone. We surveyed 99 percent of wetland and water
22 bodies; 98 percent of geomorphic stream surveys have
23 been completed; 95 percent of protected flora
24 surveys have been completed; 100 percent of northern
25 long-eared bat surveys have been completed;

1 98 percent of cultural resources surveys have been
2 completed.

3 These are just a few examples of the
4 extensive information we have gathered on the
5 proposed route. We have also gathered information
6 on bald eagle and osprey nests, grassland habitat
7 and butterflies, protected mussels and invasive
8 species.

Levi, Andrew (COMM)

From: Maggie Rozycki <rozymaggie@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 23, 2017 6:13 PM
To: MN_COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: Line 3 comments, docket numbers CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137

To Jamie MacAlister, Environmental Review Manager,

Concerning line 3 pipeline, **docket numbers CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137. These comments focus on the current DEIS and how it falls short of including all the negative impacts of Line 3.**

I am completely against building Line 3 Pipeline or transporting oil through existing pipelines. Shut down Canadian tar sands oil entirely!!!

It makes no sense to build it in terms of: the social costs of carbon, damage to water, wildlife, and all living beings, damage to already struggling Native Communities because of exploitation by the dominant culture, and there is no need for the pipeline because of the economics of dirty tar sands oil.

The social costs of carbon, the financial burden on society due to increased climate change impacts -- of building the pipeline were underestimated at \$287 Billion!! over 30 years. I cannot even imagine how much this is. This is an underestimate because many pipelines operate over 60 years. The more accurate cost is twice as much. Half of this is shocking.

0563-1

Damage to damage to water, wildlife, and all living beings through OIL Spills. The DEIS does not look at spills over the entire lifetime of the pipe. Over time, as pipelines become exposed, there is no analysis of increased spill potential. Deis 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 worst case scenario is secret so the public has no chance to review it. This is ridiculous. the public has every right to know how this will affect us.

Damage to Native Communities is not fully looked at because of the methodology of using census tracts which does not take into account the movement of water to multiple census tracts. Thus, again, underestimation the amount of space and numbers of people impacted. 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.

No need for pipeline because 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)

sincerely,

Margaret Rozycki, Minneapolis

1

2

MR. SCOTT RUSSELL. Thank you.

3

Scott Russell, S-C-O-T-T, R-U-S-S-E-L-L.

4

5

6

7

8

9

The most important thing for me to comment on today is treaty rights. If you look in sections 9 and 11, there is language that says that, "The pipeline," quote, unquote, "crosses treaty lands, or," quote, unquote, "has impacts on treaty lands."

10

11

12

13

It is not explicit as to whether in the view of the Department of Commerce Line 3 proposal violates treaty rights, and you need to be explicit about that.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In section 11, page 7, the Draft EIS appears to leave wiggle room. It says, "All routes, including the Applicant's preferred route, would cross treaty lands that are off-reservation; these lands may be used for traditional tribal uses such as fishing, hunting and trapping, and/or agricultural activities."

22

23

24

25

And then it goes on to say that, "These treaty rights and tribal resources are important to the Indian tribes as both natural and cultural resources."

1 So my commentary is if the EIS
2 says treaty rights are, quote, unquote,
3 important to Indian tribes and that kind of
4 phrasing trivializes really what treaty rights
5 are and gives an inadequate assessment for what
6 is required.

7 Treaties are not just important
8 to Indian tribes, they're important to me,
9 they're important to the state of Minnesota,
10 and they are the law of the land.

11 This makes it sound like treaty
12 rights are optional, something that's important
13 but not required by federal law. So either the
14 state of Minnesota nor Enbridge can
15 unilaterally break treaty rights by offering
16 some form of mitigation if they deem
17 appropriate.

18 So the EIS does not -- what the
19 EIS really needs is a leak look-in and a clear
20 answer on what your view is on how Line 3
21 impacts treaty rights.

22 If you're not clear on that,
23 you're, again, putting the burden on the
24 Anishinaabe people to go to court to defend
25 their rights, a cost they should not have to

1 bear.

2 If your conclusion is that Line 3
3 violates treaty rights, that should be the end
4 of the story.

5 Second, I'd like to say that I
6 would like to ask the EIS include direct quotes
7 from Anishinaabe people, not just summaries of
8 what has been gleaned from interviews. It's
9 really important how this narrative style
10 works. If there are no personal stories, no
11 direct quotes, it really robs people of the
12 power of their voice.

13 And I'll give one example, this
14 is from section 11, page 11 of the EIS:
15 "American Indian communities and individuals
16 have unique health issues associated with
17 historical trauma and structural racism. Data
18 from the Minnesota Department of Health
19 indicate that American Indians in Minnesota
20 have greater health disparities and poorer
21 health outcomes compared to other racial and
22 ethnic groups.

23 "The impacts associated with the
24 proposed Line 3 and its alternatives would be
25 an additional health stressor on tribal

2100-1

1 communities that already face overwhelming
2 health disparities and inequalities."

3 So my common sense is words like
4 historical trauma and health stressors are kind
5 of bureaucratic terms that really don't get to
6 the point of the pain that's been suffered. So
7 please add the voice of the Anishinaabe people
8 to your report.

9 Thank you very much.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25