
From: masonjb80@gmail.com [mailto:masonjb80@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2014 9:29 AM
To: Hartman, Larry (COMM)
Subject: Sandpiper pipeline

Mr. Larry Hartman,

As a landowner effected by this pipeline being built, I would request that ALL residents,seasonal and otherwise have an opportunity to understand the environmental impact.By extending the deadline to August 1 instead of ramrodding it thru on April 4.This whole process has been rushed.Why?

This is a formal request asking for a full and complete environmental impact investigation.
This is a formal request asking for an extension on public comment's being heard from April 4, 2014 to August 1, 2014.

Thank you for your time.

Brenda Mason
Park Rapids,Mn

-----Original Message-----

From: Carol Masters [<mailto:cmasters@bitstream.net>]

Sent: Friday, March 28, 2014 8:37 AM

To: Hartman, Larry (COMM)

Subject: Sandpiper

Dear Mr. Hartman,

Minnesota is a beautiful state, blessed by a boreal ecosystem and watershed that are increasingly threatened by our dependence on oil. Such dependence can be mitigated through sustainable energy systems and conservation. Some other facts from the indigenous group Honor the Earth:

The Sandpiper line would carry up to 300,000 barrels per day of fracked oil from the Bakken Fields of North Dakota. This oil is highly volatile, and has already caused two deadly explosions.

The Enbridge Corporation is the company that caused the largest pipeline spill in US history, in Kalamazoo Michigan, with a 1.5 million gallon spill into the Kalamazoo River system.

By 2016, when the proposed line is complete, only around 40 employees may be working permanently on the 610 mile line. That's a lot of risk for a few jobs, when 240,000 plus people are employed in the tourism industry.

I urge you to use your influence to stop any further development of this dangerous technology.

Carol Masters, Minneapolis

From: Dan M McCorry [mailto:eroldmil@live.com]
Sent: Saturday, March 29, 2014 10:39 AM
To: Hartman, Larry (COMM)
Subject: PUC Docket Number PL-6668/PPL-13-474

Please find attached a letter in opposition to the proposed Sandpiper pipeline. Please enter into the official register

Dan & Betty McCorry
eroldmil@live.com
erpacker@live.com

23641 County 109
Menahga, MN 56464
28 March 2014

Larry Hartman, Environmental Review Manager
Energy Environment Review and Analysis
Minnesota Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101

Re: Enbridge Pipeline Route, Docket Number 13-474

Dear Mr. Hartman,

We write in opposition to the Enbridge Corporation's proposed southern route through Hubbard County for the North Dakota [aka Sandpiper] pipeline. This proposal violates in several ways the criteria that MN PUC has set for routing such pipelines. That recent reports reveal that Enbridge will seek additional pipelines through this region makes essential a thorough and critical review of this case.

The segment that crosses the southern part of the county invades good agricultural land on the Hubbard Prairie and, south and east of there, clean lakes, woodlands and the headwaters of the Crow Wing River. The route claims to follow a utility corridor, but the powerline in that corridor has no direct impact other than the reduction of forest for the 60' wide zone. The loss of forest in that zone, to be sure, has had some impact on groundwater quality, but the doubling of the width of that deforestation and the insertion of a 30" pipeline in a trench 6' deep dramatically expands the risks. We live on Palmer Lake, a spring-fed Natural Environment lake, within 300' to 400' of the proposed route. Even a small leak, undetectable by Enbridge technology, would pollute the groundwater springs that feed this high quality body of water. Agricultural uses would also suffer. An actual rupture would have devastating impact. This segment, therefore, is in conflict with criteria A ["existing and future land use"] and D [economies within the route] as it threatens the viability of the agricultural, residential, and recreational uses of the area.

The entire proposed route, while some segments parallel existing pipelines, raise new environmental threats [Criteria B]. It brings a pipeline of unprecedented size and transmitting unusually volatile material through an ecosystem of exceptional value: the Mississippi, Crow Wing, and Leech Lake watersheds provide clean water to the heartland of the United States, far beyond the borders of Hubbard County. Should this route be followed, given past experience with pipelines and especially managed by Enbridge, the question is not if but when and how damaging pipeline failure will be. The nature of Hubbard County's environment demands that MN PUC require a full

Environmental Impact Study to inform its siting decision.

If the pipeline must be built, the best route would be the one that Enbridge currently uses from Clearbrook to Superior, WI. That route is shorter and currently contains similar pipelines, unlike much of the proposed southern route.

Pipelines are not the only choice for bringing Bakken oil to refineries. Railways are already providing transportation. Would it not be better to invest in improved railcars, railbeds and highway crossings? Such improvements will serve the nation's economy long beyond the decade or so that the Bakken field will be viable and they are compatible with a more sustainable energy approach. The absence of federal regulations for adequate pipeline inspection or bonding of pipeline companies at a level consistent with environmental damages that might ensue make pipelines a poor choice.

In closing, we urge you to demand a full Environmental Impact Study and are confident that such a study will support our argument that the proposed southern route is inconsistent with your siting criteria. Moreover, we challenge the necessity of the pipeline, arguing that rail transmission offers a better long-term solution

Sincerely,
Daniel and Betty McCorry
23641 County 109
Menahga MN 56464

13-474

RECEIVED
MAR 19 2014
MINNESOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

March 15, 2014

Dr. Burl Haar, Executive Secretary
Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

Re: Docket number 13-474

Honorable Commissioners:

We are a family who have enjoyed the fresh produce from the Fisher Merritt Food Farm since its beginning many years ago. Northern Minnesota can't afford to lose scarce farmland to pipeline construction.

Organic farms are vulnerable to loss of certification, soil destruction and ecosystem damage. Whenever possible, routes should avoid organic farms. Wild, natural, and forested areas not only provide essential ecosystem services to support sustainable farming, they are also valuable natural resources in themselves that provide critical wildlife habitat and protect the health of impaired rivers such as the Nemadji River in the Lake Superior Watershed.

This isn't just about money. This is about preserving sustainable agriculture and the health of the ecosystems surrounding Lake Superior.

Co-locating new pipelines with existing crude oil pipelines is most consistent with the principle of non-proliferation and minimizes damage to farms, the environment and landowner rights.

Do not allow this valuable land to be destroyed.

From:
Phil and Janet Meany
5672 North Shore Drive
Duluth, MN 55804
jmeany@weaversfriend.com

*Phil & Janet
Meany*

From: Mike Melberg [mailto:mike.melberg@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2014 12:09 PM
To: Hartman, Larry (COMM)
Subject: North Dakota Pipeline

Like any project there will be a lot of opinions on this one. My take is that if you use energy you should support responsible growth to the energy infrastructure. The oil is going to move out of North Dakota one way or another, this seems to be much safer than sending train after train across the state. That in itself is a risk. People will not want anything in "their backyard" but then where should it run? As long as procedures are put in place to protect the area that the pipeline travels, most people I talk to would support this. I can only voice my opinion however, I think that the loudest voice is not always the majority.

Thank You,

Mike Melberg