

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

SCOPING AND INFORMATIONAL MEETING
CLEARBROOK - AUGUST 17, 2015 - 6:00 P.M.
BEFORE THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
AND DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

In the Matter of the Application of Enbridge Energy,
Limited Partnership for a Certificate of Need and a
Pipeline Routing Permit for the Line 3 Replacement
Project in Minnesota from the North Dakota Border to the
Wisconsin Border

MPUC DOCKET NOs. PL-9/CN-14-916
PL-9/PPL-15-137

Clear Waters Life Center
256 2nd Avenue SW
Clearbrook, Minnesota

August 17, 2015

1 I N D E X - CLEARBROOK - 6:00 P.M.

2	SPEAKER	PAGE
3	Tracy Smetana	4
4	Mitch Repka	13
5	Barry Simonson	20
6	John Glanzer	20
7	John McKay	20
8	Arshia Javaherian	21
9	John Pechin	21
10	Mark Willoughby	21
11	Paul Turner	21
12	Jamie Macalister	22
13	Robert Chastan	31
14	Dave Braford	34
15	Jeff Gurske	35
16	Tom Pahkala	36
17	David Barnett	37
18	William Johnson	40
19	Charles Holm	44
20	Ken Oraskovich	46
21	Doug Rasch	49
22	Gary Kroening	51
23	Cheryl Grover	52
24	Richard Moen	54
25	Dawn Bourdeaux	56

1	William Johnson	61
2	Richard Moen	66
3	Robert Greener	68
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 MS. TRACY SMETANA: Okay. Good evening,
2 everyone. Thank you for coming.

3 My name is Tracy Smetana, I'm the public
4 advisor with the Minnesota Public Utilities
5 Commission, and we're here for a public information
6 meeting for the Enbridge Line 3 Replacement Project.

7 You can see on this cover slide, I've got
8 the Public Utilities Commission docket numbers,
9 that's sort of the key to finding information with
10 the Commission regarding this project. Everything
11 that we do is filed by these docket numbers. You
12 can see there are two of them. One is called a
13 certificate of need, which answers the question is
14 the project needed. And the second is called a
15 route permit, which, as you might guess by the name,
16 answers the question where will it go.

17 So the purpose of tonight's meeting is to
18 first explain the Commission's review process for
19 this project. To provide some information about the
20 proposed project. To gather information for the
21 environmental review. And to answer general
22 questions that you might have about the process and
23 the project.

24 If you looked at the meeting notice you
25 saw this agenda, I just wanted to briefly run

1 through that. We do have some formal presentations
2 from Commission staff, the Enbridge staff, and the
3 Department of Commerce, and then we'll open it up
4 for your comments and questions. If there are
5 continued comments and questions up to 7:30, we will
6 need to break at that point.

7 So who is the Public Utilities
8 Commission? We're a state agency, we have five
9 commissioners appointed by the governor and about 50
10 staff in St. Paul. We regulate various aspects of
11 utility business in Minnesota, including routing and
12 permitting for pipelines.

13 So, again, this particular project
14 requires what we call a certificate of need from the
15 Commission before it can be built. And I've listed
16 here the statutes and rules that cover that process.
17 And, again, a route permit is also required before
18 it can be built, and the statutes and rules for that
19 are listed here as well.

20 As we work through this process there are
21 a number of folks, agencies, organizations, that get
22 involved in the process so I thought I'd give you a
23 little who's who.

24 First off we have the applicant. That's
25 what we call the company that's asking for the

1 certificate of need and the route permit. So in
2 this case that's Enbridge Energy.

3 The Department of Commerce is another
4 state agency that is involved in the process. And
5 there are two different arms, if you will, of the
6 Department of Commerce that are involved.

7 The first is the Energy Environmental
8 Review and Analysis team, you might see that
9 abbreviated as EERA. And their job is to conduct
10 the environmental review. And they'll be giving you
11 a little more information on what that looks like
12 and how that works in a few moments.

13 We also have the Energy Regulation and
14 Planning arm of the Department of Commerce. They
15 represent the public interest when utilities ask to
16 change their services and so on. In this particular
17 case, they're participating in the certificate of
18 need side of the project.

19 Later on in the process the Office of
20 Administrative Hearings will get involved. Again,
21 another state agency. Separate from the Commission,
22 separate from the Department of Commerce. They will
23 assign an administrative law judge who will conduct
24 hearings both out here along the project route and
25 also in St. Paul, what we call evidentiary hearings.

1 And then ultimately will summarize the facts in the
2 record and write a report for the Public Utilities
3 Commission.

4 At the Commission, there are two
5 different staff members assigned to this project.
6 The first is our energy facilities planner. I think
7 of that person as more on the technical side of
8 things, reviewing the record, dealing with facts in
9 the record, providing information to the
10 commissioners on the impacts of various options and
11 so on. And then the other is the public advisor,
12 and my job is to work with people to help you figure
13 out what does this process mean, what happens next,
14 how can I participate, when can I send in comments,
15 what should my comments be about, that type of
16 thing.

17 In each case, Commission staff, we're
18 neutral. We're not for one party or another or
19 we're not advocating for one position or another, we
20 don't give legal advice, but we are available to
21 provide information.

22 As the Commission reviews the question of
23 is the project needed, the statutes and rules go
24 through a number of criteria the Commission has to
25 consider in order to do that. I'm not going to read

1 through all of these, if you grabbed a folder at the
2 table when you came in over here you'll have that to
3 follow along with. But just to let you know,
4 there's a specific set of criteria the Commission
5 has to consider as they review this question on the
6 project. And then the route permit also has a list
7 of criteria the Commission has to consider.

8 What the statutes and rules do not do
9 with this list is rank them. So it doesn't say,
10 goodness, no matter what, human settlement is the
11 most important thing to consider, or the economy is
12 the most important thing to consider. So folks are
13 going to submit information about all of these
14 various aspects into the record and ultimately it's
15 up to the Commission to sort of balance that out and
16 figure out where is that route going to go if indeed
17 they do issue a route permit.

18 So this is the high level view of the
19 steps that need to happen. From application
20 accepted to a decision on the question of
21 certificate of need. And the main thing I want to
22 point out here is there's a long way to go yet. So
23 right now we're at this stage, the public
24 information meetings. And you can see there are a
25 number of steps along the way before we get to that

1 bottom box where there's a decision. The other
2 thing I want to point out is there are a number of
3 opportunities along the way for you to get involved,
4 either by attending meetings and speaking comments
5 or sending written comments to the Commission.

6 This one looks pretty similar for the
7 pipeline route permit process. And, again, we're at
8 this blue box here, the public information meeting.
9 And there are a number of steps before we get down
10 to the route permit decision. And, again, in this
11 process, there are a number of opportunities for you
12 to be involved.

13 Sort of the same information only in list
14 form and with some estimated dates added. So based
15 on what we know today, we're anticipating that the
16 certificate of need decision could come in June of
17 2016. And, likewise, an estimated timeline for the
18 route permit process. Our best guess today is a
19 decision on the route permit could be in August of
20 2016. So you can see there's a number of things and
21 quite a bit of time that will elapse before a
22 decision is made.

23 So, as I mentioned, there are
24 opportunities for you to get involved in the process
25 and submit comments and so forth along the way. And

1 when the Commission has what we call the comment
2 period open for folks to submit information, we
3 typically issue a notice to let you know this is
4 what's going on.

5 So a few key elements here. Again, the
6 docket number. Always want to make sure you attach
7 that to anything you submit to us. There will be a
8 comment period identified so there's going to be a
9 deadline. And the notice will also list the topics
10 open for comment. So as much as possible try and
11 stick to those topics that are listed so that your
12 comments can have the most impact.

13 So, again, the key to sending comments,
14 and this is whether you're speaking them or sending
15 them in writing, you want to include the docket
16 numbers and so the two docket numbers for this
17 particular case are 14-916 and 15-137. Stick to the
18 topics listed in the notice as much as possible.
19 You don't need to submit your comments more than
20 once. Once you've submitted them, they're part of
21 the record and we have them. You don't need to tell
22 us over and over, we've already got them.

23 Verbal and written carry the same weight,
24 so if you speak your comments you don't also need to
25 submit them in writing or vice versa. You certainly

1 can, but it's not like extra credit if you hand it
2 in twice.

3 The Commission's decision is based on the
4 facts in the record, so it's not sort of a
5 popularity contest of how many people like this
6 option versus that option, it's really based on the
7 facts in the record. So when you submit comments
8 it's helpful to stick to the facts as much as
9 possible, that's what the Commission is looking for.

10 I also want to let you know that the
11 comments you submit are public information. Once we
12 receive them our record is online and so anyone who
13 reviews the record in this case will be able to read
14 your comments, whether you speak them and the court
15 reporter has taken them down, or whether you submit
16 written comments or use our website or whatever the
17 case might be, all of those comments will be public
18 information. And, once again, we need to have them
19 to us before the deadline so that we can consider
20 them.

21 If you want to stay in tune with this
22 project and follow what's happening, we do have, as
23 I mentioned, our online system, we call it eDockets,
24 where everything that happens in this case is
25 recorded. And you can go onto our site and look

1 that up if you're interested. So these are the
2 steps that you would follow to go ahead and look at
3 that information for both the certificate of need
4 and the route permit.

5 We also have a project mailing list where
6 you can receive information about project milestones
7 and opportunities to participate. There's an orange
8 card at the table when you came in over on that side
9 and you can pick that up and return that to that
10 table to be added to the mailing list. And you can
11 choose to receive information by mail or e-mail.

12 Now, if you want to receive everything
13 and you're a fan of e-mail, we have an e-mail
14 subscription service where you can sign up to
15 receive a notification every time something new
16 happens in the case. And so these are the steps
17 that you would follow to sign up for that
18 subscription service.

19 I do want to point out that it can result
20 in a lot of e-mail, so if you're not a big e-mail
21 fan, you don't like to get a lot of e-mail, you
22 might want to think about the project mailing list
23 instead with that orange card.

24 This is just a picture of what the screen
25 looks like when you do that subscription service. A

1 lot of times people say it's not very user-friendly,
2 so I always like to show you a picture so you know
3 you've gotten to the right place when you get there.

4 And, again, at the Commission there are
5 two different folks assigned to this case. The
6 first, again, I'm Tracy, the public advisor. And my
7 counterpart, Mr. Scott Ek, is the energy facilities
8 planner on this case. If you have questions or
9 concerns that you'd like to address with us, we'd be
10 happy to help you in any way possible.

11 And, with that, I will turn it over to
12 Enbridge.

13 MR. MITCH REPKA: Good evening.

14 My name is Mitch Repka, I'm the manager
15 of engineering and construction for the U.S. portion
16 of the Line 3 Replacement Project.

17 I want to start by first thanking the
18 Minnesota Public Utilities Commission and also the
19 Department of Commerce for inviting us here today to
20 speak on behalf of the project. It's an opportunity
21 for us to share additional information regarding the
22 project as well as to answer any questions and
23 listen to your comments that you may have on the
24 project.

25 I'd like to start today with a safety

1 moment. We typically like to start our meetings
2 with just a quick note about safety. So today I'm
3 going to just mention the exits for the building.
4 There is an exit to your right as you sit, there's a
5 parking lot out front that we can muster in, and
6 there's also an exit in the back by the entrance
7 desk and out to the parking lot there. So those are
8 your two evacuation routes in case of a fire or some
9 other emergency.

10 As for the presentation today, we'll talk
11 about who Enbridge is, give some history of Line 3,
12 and then we'll get into the project-specific details
13 as well as finish up with benefits related to the
14 project.

15 So who is Enbridge? Enbridge operates
16 the world's longest crude oil pipeline
17 transportation system. It delivers approximately
18 2.2 million barrels per day of crude and liquid
19 petroleum and satisfies approximately 70 percent of
20 the refinery needs here in the Great Lakes region.

21 As you can see on the map -- or maybe you
22 can't see very well, but Enbridge has a variety of
23 assets across North America. It includes the
24 liquids transportation system, which is shown in
25 blue, as well as natural gas joint venture assets

1 integrity- and maintenance-driven project, therefore
2 it will result in the permanent deactivation of the
3 existing Line 3. The new project will span from
4 Hardesty to Superior, Wisconsin. It is
5 approximately 1,031 miles in length and a 36-inch
6 diameter line.

7 We're currently seeking regulatory
8 approvals in both Canada and the U.S. Overall cost
9 of the project is anticipated to be \$7.5 billion,
10 which makes it one of North America's largest
11 infrastructure projects. Of that total, about 2.6
12 billion is for the U.S. portion of the project.

13 As for the U.S. portion, again, it is an
14 integrity- and maintenance-driven project.
15 Therefore, as mentioned earlier, it will result in a
16 permanent deactivation of the existing facilities.
17 So this will decrease the need for ongoing integrity
18 digs and maintenance activities along our existing
19 corridor, and so that will decrease landowner and
20 environmental impact as a result.

21 The overall project in the U.S. is about
22 364 miles in length. 13 of those miles are in North
23 Dakota, 337 are in Minnesota, and 14 are in
24 Wisconsin.

25 The certificate of need and the pipeline

1 routing permit were filed in April of 2015, and
2 pending regulatory approvals, we expect to start
3 construction in 2016 and continue through '17.

4 As for the Minnesota portion of the
5 project, you'll see that the project enters -- has
6 to enter in Kittson County, Minnesota and that's to
7 allow it to tie into our North Dakota segment, as
8 well as it travels through Clearbrook here to allow
9 delivery to the Minnesota Pipe Line system that's
10 here as well as the terminal facilities. And then
11 it must exit at Carlton, Minnesota to allow it to be
12 tied into the Wisconsin segment which feeds into
13 Superior.

14 So the northwest portion of the project
15 is shown here in purple. The existing facilities
16 are in green. That route is 98 percent collocated
17 with existing utility facilities. And along this
18 route, north and west of Clearbrook there are four
19 pump stations shown in the square boxes here, the
20 yellow boxes, at Donaldson, Viking, Plummer, and
21 Clearbrook.

22 South from Clearbrook and east into
23 Superior there are an additional four pump stations
24 located near Two Inlets, Backus, Palisade, and
25 Cromwell. And this route is approximately 75

1 percent collocated with existing utility facilities.

2 Again, back to the overview map, the
3 project is designed to flow 760,000 barrels per day
4 of crude. The typical construction footprint is 120
5 feet in width in uplands and 95 feet in wetlands.
6 Fifty feet of that construction width is permanent
7 easement and will be maintained on an ongoing basis.
8 At locations where we're parallel to adjacent
9 Enbridge facilities, rather than 50 feet we'll
10 purchase an additional 25 feet and share that other
11 25 feet with the adjacent facilities. There are 27
12 mainline valves located along the corridor. And the
13 overall investment here in Minnesota is estimated to
14 be \$2.1 billion.

15 As for the benefits of the project.
16 Again, it is an integrity- and maintenance-driven
17 project. Therefore, it will result, as mentioned
18 earlier, in reduced activity along the existing
19 corridor for integrity digs and maintenance
20 activities, as well as the project will restore the
21 historical operating capabilities of Line 3, which
22 will allow the current apportionment to be reduced
23 that our customers are currently seeing on the
24 mainline system.

25 As for jobs. We expect 1,500

1 construction jobs to be created as a result of the
2 project. About 50 percent of those will come from
3 local union halls here in Minnesota. We also
4 anticipate additional long-term full-time
5 opportunities at Enbridge as a result of the new
6 facilities going into service.

7 Local businesses will see a direct
8 benefit from the project as well. As construction
9 ramps up there will be additional laborers and
10 contractors coming into the area that will require
11 housing, they'll shop at our grocery stores, they
12 will fill their vehicles up with fuel from our gas
13 stations, purchase supplies, et cetera, from the
14 local businesses here, so we'll definitely see a
15 definite impact there as well.

16 On a long-term basis, additional tax
17 revenue is also expected in the amount of about 19
18 and a half million dollars. This revenue will go to
19 each of the counties that the new line will operate
20 in. And, again, those funds can be used for a
21 variety of things at the county's discretion,
22 whether it's infrastructure improvements or a
23 reduction in the tax burden for the county
24 residents.

25 So, again, thank you for your time here

1 services for U.S. projects. And I provide oversight
2 for the planning components related to land,
3 acquisition of land rights, and construction support
4 and restoration activities.

5 MR. ARSHIA JAVAHERIAN: Thank you.

6 My name is Arshia Javaherian, and I'm
7 lead counsel for Enbridge's Line 3 project, and I'm
8 responsible for the regulatory permitting as well as
9 the land acquisition legal matters.

10 MR. JOHN PECHIN: Good evening. My name
11 is John Pechin, and I'm the Bemidji area operations
12 manager, and I am responsible for electrical and
13 project maintenance after the project goes into
14 service.

15 MR. MARK WILLOUGHBY: Good evening,
16 everyone, and welcome.

17 I'm Mark Willoughby, director of project
18 integration with Enbridge. I'm assisting with the
19 project. And prior to my current role, I was the
20 director of operations for the Superior region,
21 which includes all of Minnesota.

22 MR. PAUL TURNER: Hello.

23 My name is Paul Turner, I'm the
24 supervisor of our environmental permitting team.
25 And in that role I manage and oversee the

1 preparation and submittal of all environmental
2 permit applications for construction of the project.

3 Thank you.

4 MR. MITCH REPKA: Thanks again.

5 We'll turn it over to the Department of
6 Commerce. Thanks.

7 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Hello, everyone.

8 I'm Jamie MacAlister with the Department
9 of Commerce, Energy Environmental Review and
10 Analysis unit. And with me this evening is Larry
11 Hartman. Many of you may know Larry from working on
12 other pipeline projects in the area.

13 I just wanted to go over a couple things
14 quickly before we get started. The first is I hope
15 everyone grabbed a folder. And in your folder you
16 should have a number of items, one of them being a
17 copy of this presentation which will have some
18 useful information for you to use later. You should
19 also have a comment form and a guidance document, so
20 to speak, to help you develop comments or route
21 alternatives if you should choose to do so. You can
22 leave that comment form here with us this evening or
23 you can send it in to us later, if you like. And
24 lastly in there you should have a draft scoping
25 document. And that document is not yet finalized,

1 but that is going to be the basis for how we will
2 structure the comparative environmental analysis.
3 And there should also be some maps, which we'll talk
4 about later.

5 If you haven't filled out a green speaker
6 card and you would like to speak, this would be a
7 good time to do so. I also will take questions and
8 answers at the end of our presentations.

9 So just briefly, the pipeline routing
10 process is guided by Minnesota Statute 216G and
11 Minnesota Rule 7852. The Line 3 placement project
12 is a full review process, and that includes
13 preparation of an environmental document. And as
14 you heard in an earlier presentation, there will be
15 hearings in the spring presided over by an
16 administrative law judge.

17 I want to quickly go through the process
18 here. As you just heard also, the application was
19 submitted in April of this year, it was recently
20 approved by the Commission. We're currently at the
21 public information and scoping phase. We will be
22 taking your route and segment alternatives during
23 the comment period. And we will then be preparing a
24 package for the Public Utilities Commission to
25 determine which route and segment alternatives will

1 be carried forward for analysis in the comparative
2 environmental review. And then contested case
3 hearings in the spring.

4 So let's talk a little bit about the
5 scoping process. These meetings really are to
6 provide the public agencies, local governments, and
7 tribal governments an opportunity to participate in
8 this process, to help us identify issues and
9 impacts, which can be human or environmental for
10 analysis in the comparative environmental analysis.

11 It allows people an opportunity to
12 participate in the development of the route segment
13 alternatives. And, again, I want to reiterate that
14 it is the Public Utilities Commission that
15 ultimately approves which alternatives get
16 considered for further analysis in the comparative
17 environmental analysis document.

18 So what is this comparative environmental
19 analysis? Well, it's really the environmental
20 document for pipelines. It is an alternative form
21 of environmental review that was approved by the
22 Minnesota Environmental Quality Board and it does
23 meet the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act
24 requirements.

25 The document is intended to be an

1 objective analysis of the project, the preferred
2 route as well as the alternatives. So we'll be
3 looking at impacts of the preferred and the
4 alternatives and mitigation measures. The document
5 does not advocate for any particular route or
6 alternative. And it's meant to be objective and
7 help people and decision-makers.

8 When developing your comments and
9 alternatives, if you choose to do so, we recommend
10 that you include a map. The map can be a photo, a
11 USGS county map, a highway map, something for us to
12 be able to place where your alternative is. A brief
13 description of the existing environment, and as much
14 supporting documentation as you can so that we don't
15 have to guess as to your intention with your
16 alternative. We want to be able to fully send the
17 alternative forward as you envisioned it.

18 As noted already, the alternatives to the
19 project really need to mitigate specific impacts.
20 Those can be aesthetic impacts, it could be a land
21 use impact, it could be a natural resource impact,
22 it could be an agricultural impact. And within each
23 of those, for example, a natural resource impact,
24 typically a water resource impact, agriculture, it
25 could be drain tiles, so there's lots of things that

1 go under these broad headings.

2 And your alternative must meet the needs
3 for the project. So it really has to come in at
4 Kittson County and it has to come through Clearbrook
5 and it has to end up in Superior.

6 I just want to run through some examples
7 quickly from a transmission project and how the
8 alternatives were proposed to mitigate specific
9 impacts. This first example is to avoid a historic
10 property. The second example is keeping the project
11 within an existing corridor and within the existing
12 road right-of-way. And in this case they're looking
13 to avoid a memorial site, so this the alternative to
14 avoid that.

15 And then I would like to talk about these
16 maps that you have in your folder. You should have
17 a map that has two sides, a front and a back. This
18 first side shows an overview of the route
19 alternatives that were proposed in the Sandpiper
20 project. So all of the routes that are on this map
21 are being carried forward for consideration for
22 Line 3. And the opposite side of your map should
23 show more details of these route alternatives. So
24 there are roughly 31 route alternatives currently
25 that will be put forward for further analysis in the

1 CEA. These are alternatives that were approved by
2 the PUC for the Sandpiper project last August.

3 And I know we've talked about the
4 permitting schedule, but again quickly, our comment
5 period ends September 30th. We anticipate that the
6 routes will be recommended for consideration in
7 November. We expect the comparative environmental
8 analysis to be released in the spring, sometime in
9 March, and contested case hearings in April, with
10 the final decision potentially in July or August of
11 next year.

12 So to move into the next phase of our
13 meeting here, we're taking your comments. I would
14 just like to remind everyone, one speaker at a time,
15 please, and to also state and spell your name for
16 our court reporter, Janet. She will ask you to do
17 so if you do not. Please try and limit your
18 comments to a few minutes so everyone has an
19 opportunity to speak that would like one. And
20 direct your comments and questions to the scope of
21 the CEA.

22 Again, comments, if you choose to speak
23 this evening, will be entered in the record, you can
24 send them in, you can send them to me by mail,
25 e-mail, fax.

1 And I would also like to let everyone
2 know that an additional public meeting has been
3 added for August 27th from 11:00 to 2:00 at the East
4 Lake Community Center in McGregor. So that's
5 currently not on the schedule that you have.

6 I guess I'd like to start off with these
7 questions that are being submitted by Robert
8 Greener, G-R-E-E-N-E-R, first name, Robert.

9 All right. So I'll go ahead and read
10 through his questions first and then I will provide
11 some answers to them.

12 The first question, is it correct that
13 the present pipeline has reached its useful life,
14 obsolete, in danger of failing? Second question,
15 will the present pipeline have to be shut down?
16 Third, what is the plan for shutting the line down
17 and ensuring it is not a danger to the environment?
18 Fourth, why can't you shut the present line down and
19 remove it and drop the new line in the same hole?
20 Fifth, if the only reason is economic, I don't think
21 that is a very valid argument. Six, don't be
22 deceived by the media claims, quoting county
23 officials and business and special interests, that
24 all the people in Clearwater County are in favor of
25 this project. And seven, there are some people that

1 have more concern for the mighty dollar than they do
2 for protecting some of the dwindling pristine
3 country in the U.S. Thank you kindly, one of the
4 muzzled majority.

5 So I'd like to go back to this first
6 question. Is it correct that the present pipeline
7 has reached its useful life and is it obsolete and
8 in danger of failing? Based on the application that
9 was submitted to us, the pipeline is not yet
10 failing. However, there are regulations, federal
11 regulations that dictate pipeline replacement as
12 well as the company to use its integrity management
13 plan to determine the life of the line.

14 Will the present pipeline have to be shut
15 down? I'm not sure exactly what the reference is,
16 if this is whether or not the existing line as it is
17 needs to be shut down because it is not safe or once
18 the new line is in place. I would say that
19 currently the line is not in danger of needing to be
20 shut down.

21 The third question, what is the plan for
22 shutting the line down and ensuring it's not a
23 danger to the environment? Well, as Enbridge
24 already noted, they plan on decommissioning the
25 existing line, which means it will be cleaned out,

1 and as I understand it, the cathodic protection will
2 remain around the existing line so that that pipe is
3 not rusting, and it will be shut off when the new
4 line is approved.

5 And why can't you shut the present line
6 down and remove it and drop the new line in the same
7 hole? My understanding is that that can be done;
8 however, it would be challenging from a construction
9 and safety standpoint based on where the existing
10 Line 3 rests amongst the other lines that are in the
11 main line corridor, that would be challenging. In
12 addition, that line would also need to be shut off
13 for the replacement to occur and thereby reducing
14 shipments that are needed elsewhere in the line.

15 And the fifth question is whether or not
16 the only reason is economic. Again, based on the
17 application I would say that the reasoning is not
18 purely economic. That Enbridge has actually
19 voluntarily reduced capacity to deal with some of
20 the integrity issues currently to address the safety
21 concerns.

22 Six and seven are statements, I guess
23 there's nothing to respond to there.

24 And I'm not sure if Mr. Greener is in
25 the audience and if he has any further questions or

1 would like any clarifications?

2 So I think now we will move on to the
3 speaker cards that we have received.

4 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: So far I have seven
5 speaker cards, and the first one I received is
6 Robert Chasten.

7 MR. ROBERT CHASTAN: Hello. Thank you.
8 My name is Robert Chasten, C-H-A-S-T-A-N.
9 I'm the pipeline director for the
10 operating engineers, Local 49, covering Minnesota,
11 North and South Dakota. Our local represents
12 approximately 13,000 members. And I would like to
13 go on record and say that we are in full support of
14 Enbridge in their decision to apply for a
15 certificate of need for the Line 3 replacement and a
16 route permit.

17 Now, I've heard you refer to the statutes
18 that govern this process and all these hearings.
19 And could you tell me what is the regulatory
20 timeline in the statute for the route permit and
21 certificate of need to get approval to build a
22 pipeline?

23 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: I can't give you
24 exact dates, but again, we're looking at sometime at
25 the end of next summer, for the state permits. I

1 don't know the status of the federal, if there are
2 any federal permits that are required for this line.

3 MR. ROBERT CHASTAN: Okay. From our
4 perspective and many others, we depend on
5 consistent, predictable, regulatory time frames so
6 we can plan on these projects accordingly. This has
7 not been the case with the Sandpiper project. So we
8 would urge the Commission to stick to the regulatory
9 timelines when considering the Line 3 Replacement
10 Project.

11 Our pipeline companies depend on these
12 projects, and when projects of this size are in the
13 regulatory process, we start to plan our work
14 calendars. If they are delayed it causes hardships
15 to not only businesses, it makes it challenging to
16 schedule work. Contractors are held to the
17 schedules and timelines with consequences if
18 projects are not completed on time. Government
19 should be held to the same standard, especially when
20 statutes lay out their timelines.

21 I have close to 30 years experience in
22 the pipeline industry and I have seen firsthand what
23 40-plus-year-old pipe buried can look like and the
24 damage that can be done from the elements. I worked
25 directly on oil spills and have witnessed the damage

1 that can be done to our environment and can attest
2 to the tremendous cost to the companies and the
3 local communities.

4 As a Minnesota resident myself, I would
5 not want to see a disaster such as an oil spill
6 happen when we have the opportunity and resources to
7 clearly prevent these types of catastrophes from
8 happening in the future.

9 Our members of Local 49 are among the
10 most highly trained, experienced heavy equipment
11 operators for pipeline construction in the world.
12 Our training center is a state-of-the-art facility
13 with classroom and hands-on operations. Local 49
14 training center not only teaches pipeline specific,
15 but many other tasks such as competent person, CPR,
16 first aid, hazardous materials, OSHA standards, Pro
17 10 training, which includes safety, professionalism,
18 communication, and mutual respect.

19 The training center also employs the
20 University of Minnesota to instruct our members in
21 environmental compliance courses, both initial and
22 refresher courses. Our signatory contractors with
23 Local 49 are using operating engineers who are among
24 the most competent, qualified, safest, environmental
25 conscious operating engineers anywhere in the world.

1 So, again, I would urge this Commission
2 to approve this project with a certificate of need
3 and a route permit approval.

4 Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

5 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
6 I have is Dave Braford.

7 MR. DAVE BRAFORD: My name is Dave
8 Braford, B-R-A-F-O-R-D. And I'm here representing
9 Local 49 and UPI.

10 And the replacement of Line 3 is probably
11 not a real hard decision. It's like anything else,
12 pipelines wear out. And if you take a 47-year-old
13 car, there aren't very many of them left anymore.
14 So to prevent spills and harm to the environment,
15 Enbridge wants to replace a line, and I don't see
16 why anyone would be objecting to that.

17 Enbridge cares a great deal about the
18 environment. If they do have a spill, it's very
19 costly. And it's just money that they can't spend
20 elsewhere on wind farms, on aqua power, other things
21 that they're involved with. And any time there's a
22 spill it would cost millions of dollars if not
23 billions of dollars and no one wants to see that,
24 including Enbridge.

25 So I'd like to see the replacement happen

1 as soon as possible.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
4 I have is Jeff Gurske.

5 MR. JEFF GURSKE: My name is Jeff Gurske,
6 G-U-R-S-K-E. And I'm supporting the Line 3
7 replacement.

8 And I keep hearing about integrity
9 maintenance. I was just wondering, I have a pretty
10 good idea what that is, if somebody could explain
11 exactly what that is, the integrity maintenance,
12 give me a couple of examples.

13 MR. MARK WILLOUGHBY: Mark Willoughby.
14 In terms of our integrity maintenance program, what
15 that consists of is generally we run in-line
16 inspection tools throughout our active operating
17 pipelines that let us know the condition of that
18 pipe. And based on that information and our team of
19 engineers and experts in that area, they determine
20 where that pipe needs to be looked at. So we'll
21 send out what they call dig crews of pipeline
22 maintenance technicians that will go out onto the
23 right-of-way, dig up the pipe, inspect it, and
24 repair it if needed. And as the case that's been
25 mentioned here for the Line 3, we're having to do an

1 awful lot of those integrity maintenance digs.

2 MR. JEFF GURSKE: So to understand,
3 there's multiple integrity maintenance issues and
4 every time that pipeline sees, you know, through
5 studies and engineering that there is a problem on
6 the pipeline they go and fix it, so basically every
7 time you step into whether it's a wetland, a forest,
8 farm crop, whatever, you're going through there and
9 damaging the property or the environment at the same
10 time. Then in layman's terms, to me, if you got a
11 problem with your body, you could do multiple
12 surgeries or have one big surgery and get it all
13 done. So just that alone is enough to tell me that
14 the system needs to be replaced.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
17 I have is Tom Pahkala.

18 MR. TOM PAHKALA: Good evening.

19 My name is Tom Pahkala, P-A-H-K-A-L-A.

20 I just want to go on the record in
21 support of the Line 3 replacement.

22 As an avid hunter and fisherman, the more
23 I think about the right-of-ways that they maintain
24 for the wildlife, I realize that they're not
25 maintaining it for the wildlife, but the grasses in

1 the spring are very important food sources for deer
2 and other animals. Especially in the springtime.
3 Because they are some of the first things to start
4 greening up and they have a higher protein content
5 at that time of year. And what happens is the deer
6 and the bear and a lot of other animals need that
7 extra protein to recover from the wintertime. So I
8 think that the right-of-ways are a really nice
9 feature to have going through our Minnesota forests.
10 Just simply because of the open area that it gives
11 and that extra food source to the game and wildlife.

12 Thank you.

13 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: David Barnett.

14 MR. DAVID BARNETT: Thank you.

15 My name is David Barnett, B-A-R-N-E-T-T.

16 I am the national representative of the
17 United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters. We
18 have over 350,000 members across the United States
19 in all forms of the piping that we do.

20 More specifically, I represent the
21 pipeliners, welders, pipefitters, and helpers across
22 the United States for projects just like this one.
23 Projects like this bring thousands of man-hours to
24 my members. They train every day to do just exactly
25 the kind of project this is. There are a thousand

1 man-hours to be had by our members, as I stated.
2 Our welders who, of course, are the people who weld
3 the pipelines, they're tested on every project, they
4 train when they're off work to make sure they're
5 ready for those projects for the various types of
6 welding that they require.

7 In this instance, more than likely, I'm
8 almost positive that this is going to be an
9 automated welding process with wire, which is a low
10 hydrogen process. That process has only been around
11 the last eight or ten years. It's the highest
12 quality weld that we can put in the pipeline to
13 match this type of project that they're wanting to
14 build. So we have to constantly stay up to date on
15 the welding process. As well, the pipefitters line
16 up the pipe, handle the pipe for the joining
17 process. And the helpers do the grinding and the
18 buffing and the other projects that go along the
19 line.

20 To speak specifically about the old line
21 that's in place right now, it was pre-1970. I have
22 to assume that it has electronic radiance welding,
23 which was identified by PHMSA and the National
24 Transportation Board as being an issue with the way
25 that that seam was welded in those pipelines

1 pre-'70, and the new pipe that goes in would be the
2 seam weld process that I've seen in the industry
3 that hasn't changed in the last 35 years. It was an
4 accepted process and it was a very good and strong
5 process.

6 As well, the old pipe would be -- I'm not
7 positive about the hardness of it, but I would have
8 to assume that in the era that it was built it would
9 have to be about X42 or X52 pipe. What this means
10 is that this pipe will withstand 42,000 pounds of
11 strength per square inch. The new pipeline will
12 exceed X70. What this means is that steel will
13 exceed 70,000 pounds per square inch and above
14 because that will be the minimum yield strength. To
15 qualify for X70 it would have to withstand over
16 72,000 pounds per square inch. Much of it will be
17 up in the 75, 76,000 pounds. So it's much harder
18 steel, it's a different welding process, the welders
19 will be tested before they install any welds on the
20 pipeline. Every weld will be either x-rayed or
21 ultrasonic tested, and nothing will go in the ground
22 without being documented.

23 So, simply, the process difference and
24 the material being used is enough to tell me that we
25 need state-of-the-art pipelines like this project to

1 move our oil and our natural resources across this
2 country to protect the environment and the public.

3 We stand strongly in support of this
4 project.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker
7 card, William Johnson.

8 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: William Johnson,
9 J-O-H-N-S-O-N. I'm a landowner, I'm about two miles
10 upstream from Clearbrook. The pipe probably goes
11 maybe 100 yards on my property. If there's a spill
12 in that area, the water will go into the wetland and
13 into Silver Creek and the boundary of my property.

14 I'd like some details on this
15 decommissioning process. How you clean the pipe,
16 how much residue is going be left in there after
17 you're done? That's one question. How many years
18 is it going to take for the thing to rust through
19 from inside out now that there's no oil in it? Do
20 you assure the salinity or the pH levels of whatever
21 is in there, whether it's air or water or whatever,
22 so it doesn't deteriorate more quickly? How long is
23 it going to take to decommission the pipe once the
24 new line is running, assuming this all goes through?
25 And then another question is how often do you send

1 the smart pigs through Line 3 now versus a newer
2 pipe?

3 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: I'm going to turn
4 the technical questions over to Enbridge.

5 MR. MITCH REPKA: Thank you, Mr. Johnson,
6 for your questions regarding decommissioning and the
7 other topics.

8 First, I'll give just an outline of our
9 process as to how we plan to decommission the pipe.
10 So the pipe will be permanently deactivated. What
11 that means is that the products that are in the line
12 will be purged out using an inert gas, and we use a
13 variety of pigs to remove the oil. Once that's
14 completed, there will be a cleaning regime that will
15 take place. And that'll consist of, again, a type
16 of a solvent and some pigs that will also run
17 through the line to allow the internal diameter of
18 the line to be cleaned.

19 Once that's completed, again, those pigs
20 are pushed with an inert gas. Once that is
21 completed, we will, I guess, in concurrence with
22 that the cathodic protection system will be
23 maintained as it is today. The line will be -- will
24 have the same cathodic protection on it post
25 permanent deactivation as it does pre-permanent

1 deactivation. We also, prior to running the pigs
2 we'll isolate the pipeline from all sources of crude
3 so the pumping stations will be capped and
4 permanently isolated.

5 So generally that's the process for
6 decommissioning. It will take anywhere from -- I
7 think in our application we stated 12 to 18 months
8 to complete all the work associated with permanently
9 decommissioning the line. The right-of-way will be
10 monitored as it is today for any encroachments or
11 any activities along the line, pipeline markers will
12 be maintained. We will also respond to 811 calls or
13 locate requests for the facilities as we would today
14 as if we were operating the line. So that's the
15 general process. Did you have other questions?

16 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: How often do you
17 run the smart pigs through Line 3 now?

18 MR. MARK WILLOUGHBY: Mark Willoughby
19 again.

20 The smart tools are run, at a minimum,
21 once every five years. Line 3, because of its
22 integrity concerns, we've been doing it much more
23 frequently than that, as well as using different
24 types of tools. So we'll use ultrasonic tools as
25 well as magnetic tools, so Line 3 has kind of

1 received a lot of attention and much more frequently
2 than once every five years.

3 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: Thank you.

4 Will there be much residue left in the
5 pipe when you get done and what would the residue
6 be?

7 MR. MITCH REPKA: The cleaning process
8 will -- the intent is to pull the products out of
9 the line and work through the cleaning process. As
10 for, you know, the amount of residue, I don't
11 know if I can quantify that here today. I can tell
12 you that we've got a process in place that we've
13 done in the past and it is an accepted process for
14 that cleaning process, so.

15 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: Will you be
16 breaching the pipe in the low spots and draining oil
17 in those spots, or solvents, or whatever, or will it
18 all be taken out at places like Clearbrook and put
19 into the system?

20 MR. MITCH REPKA: Our intent is to purge
21 all the product out with pigs.

22 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: So it won't be
23 breaking the pipe anyplace between pump stations?

24 MR. MITCH REPKA: Correct. There will be
25 activity along the line to allow for injection

1 points of the inert gas that we're purging with,
2 it's kind of a continuous operation along the line,
3 but we're intending to move the product with pigs
4 through the line.

5 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: Thank you.

6 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
7 I have is for Charles Holm.

8 MR. CHARLES HOLM: My name is Charles
9 Holm, H-O-L-M.

10 I'm a landowner on the east end of Deep
11 Lake on the east side of Clearbrook, and the current
12 proposed Line 3 replacement route shows a line going
13 through the wetland on the east end of Deep Lake for
14 about 200 yards on the same side of the road. The
15 University of Minnesota sent study groups to Deep
16 Lake three times in the '90s, I believe, and pretty
17 much determined that it is directly on top of the
18 aquifer, the Clearbrook aquifer.

19 And I submitted an ultimate route to you
20 and I'm wondering why it wouldn't be followed, just
21 go back west out the Enbridge pumping station, go
22 about 200 yards, head south, and if the pipe ever
23 did for some unknown reason ever leak or rupture, it
24 would have no chance of going in Deep Lake. I'm
25 wondering why that's not considered.

1 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes. As you and I
2 have talked previously, I have received your
3 alternative, and as we have stated here, until
4 September 30th, until the PUC has a chance to look
5 at all of the route and segment alternatives, we
6 don't look at any of them at this point. We need to
7 wait until the Public Utilities Commission approves
8 which ones we can move forward for further analysis.
9 But all of them get moved to the PUC. So we
10 recommend that all of the route and route segments
11 that are submitted to us and that are not
12 duplicative get carried forward for further
13 analysis.

14 MR. CHARLES HOLM: Okay. And once that's
15 approved, it's a done deal, right?

16 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Which alternatives
17 get --

18 MR. CHARLES HOLM: Well, the proposed
19 route, you can't see the proposed route unless you
20 dig deep and find a detailed map. All the paperwork
21 says they're following Sandpiper, but it doesn't at
22 Deep Lake. You have to dig deep to find that map
23 and as soon as that's approved, work will start,
24 right?

25 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Well, I think at

1 this point we have the applicant's preferred route
2 and we are currently accepting route alternatives
3 and segment alternatives to the preferred route. I
4 don't think that any -- nothing has been approved at
5 this point.

6 MR. CHARLES HOLM: Okay.

7 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: All that has
8 occurred is that their application has been
9 accepted. We have not done any analysis on any of
10 the other route alternatives or segment alternatives
11 that were provided for Line 3, which are included on
12 the map, as well as any of the route alternatives
13 and segment alternatives that we receive throughout
14 the scoping process.

15 MR. CHARLES HOLM: Okay.

16 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
17 I have is Ken Oraskovich.

18 MR. KEN ORASKOVICH: My name is Ken
19 Oraskovich, O-R-A-S-K-O-V-I-C-H.

20 Okay. I'm a landowner on the west -- or
21 east side of the Enbridge station, and you could say
22 I live in pipeline alley, I've got six Enbridge
23 lines running through my property and three Koch
24 lines. The pipelines have provided good income to
25 Clearwater County, but, once again, they do

1 depreciate fairly rapidly, their infrastructure, you
2 know, so there's a minimum effect that goes to all
3 of us that are here.

4 I was approached a while ago, and I guess
5 I have signed a right-of-way for the Sandpiper line
6 and Line 3. But, you know, it's a window where you
7 have to sign that agreement otherwise you miss out
8 on the supposed bonus, and the contract is a
9 one-sided contract, there's no negotiations.

10 I have a question where it comes to my
11 property. It transverses my property at multiple
12 angles and it makes it very difficult on the farming
13 aspect. Very difficult. I've talked to Mr. Greg
14 Olson and Tray Goldman, land agents, and multiple
15 times. And I've tried calling Superior and haven't
16 gotten any more answers. It is pushed off to
17 somebody else and no response really.

18 We do need pipelines to move crude. But
19 my question is the same as Mr. Holm, is you can move
20 the line into Clearbrook about 90-some acres behind
21 the Enbridge station, is there not a reason you
22 can't move that oil back and follow the Sandpiper
23 route instead of creating a whole new right-of-way
24 across individuals' lands? And I guess, John, you
25 and I can speak later on this. So, but, I mean, I

1 just want to know why we don't get a response very
2 well. 'Cause I have called multiple times.

3 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Well, as a state
4 employee, I cannot help you with any grievances that
5 you may have regarding any agreements that you may
6 have signed with Enbridge. However, they are here
7 this evening and I think this would be a good
8 opportunity for you to corral with them to get some
9 answers to your questions. Yes, we cannot assist
10 with landowner issues of that nature.

11 MR. KEN ORASKOVICH: Yeah, because I know
12 I've had problems. Again, my land reclaimed since
13 '08, I just got a field back in shape. So, you
14 know. And yes, we do need oil to be transported, I
15 have no disagreement about that.

16 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: If you have
17 specific suggestions regarding where you think the
18 pipeline segment across your land should go, that is
19 something that I would encourage you to submit to us
20 using the criteria that we have provided. And make
21 sure that that gets into the record so that we can
22 look at that.

23 MR. KEN ORASKOVICH: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
25 I have is Doug Rasch, R-A-S-C-H.

1 MR. DOUG RASCH: Hello. I'm Doug Rasch,
2 R-A-S-C-H.

3 I guess I just have one question with a
4 couple little comments about it. I'm wondering if
5 an alternative route is chosen for the Sandpiper in
6 late September, if that would change the preferred
7 route for this line?

8 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Ideally these two
9 pipelines go together east of Clearbrook. And as
10 you know, both of these lines enter at different
11 places and come into Clearbrook at different places.
12 My understanding is that it does not alter where a
13 preferred route for Line 3 would go due to the
14 construction and safety constraints identified by
15 Enbridge in their application.

16 MR. DOUG RASCH: So if I understand what
17 you said, the proposed route for this line would
18 remain the same and this process would go forward
19 even if the Sandpiper's route was changed through an
20 alternative?

21 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Well, I think that
22 would depend on where the alternative occurs. That
23 would be the first thing to look at. You know, at
24 this point, from Clearbrook to Superior, yes, the
25 intention would be for the alternatives to go

1 together for the construction of the line.

2 Does Enbridge have anything to add to
3 that?

4 MR. BARRY SIMONSON: I'll try to take a
5 stab at that question.

6 In terms of what Jamie had looked at
7 earlier with route alternatives that were proposed
8 for Sandpiper, Clearbrook south, there were -- did
9 you say 31?

10 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: 31 total.

11 MR. BARRY SIMONSON: Plus or minus.

12 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes.

13 MR. BARRY SIMONSON: But those are going
14 to be explored for Line 3 also and placed into the
15 PUC record as part of the comparative environmental
16 analysis. Which may, if Sandpiper is chosen for one
17 of those route alternatives, it could be the same
18 for Line 3.

19 MR. DOUG RASCH: So this process could be
20 amended at that point, or the proposed route would
21 be amended for this line, it wouldn't follow the
22 schedule through August of next year, but you would
23 change this schedule with the administrative law
24 judge and everything to follow that new alternative?

25 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: No. And maybe I'm

1 not understanding your question, quite. But I think
2 what happens at this point is for the comparative
3 environmental analysis to look at both of the lines
4 at the same time.

5 MR. DOUG RASCH: Um-hum.

6 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: So ideally
7 Enbridge has requested that the right-of-way, the
8 corridor for those two lines would remain the same.
9 If there are adjustments for Sandpiper, those
10 adjustments will also be looked at for Line 3. But
11 that won't be determined until the PUC makes a final
12 decision. Does that make sense?

13 MR. DOUG RASCH: It does.

14 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: So once a final
15 decision is made, whatever the Commission decides
16 for that route permit, that is where Sandpiper and
17 Line 3 will have to be built.

18 MR. DOUG RASCH: Okay. Great. Thank you
19 very much.

20 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The next speaker card
21 I have is Gary Kroening.

22 MR. GARY KROENING: My name is Gary
23 Kroening, K-R-O-E-N-I-N-G. I'm a member of the IBEW
24 Local 294, the Electrical Workers. Our hall is
25 based out of Hibbing, Minnesota. This new Line 3

1 replacement would also impact Local 1426, a local
2 out of Grand Forks.

3 I started working on the pipeline in 1991
4 in Clearbrook. I've got to say that Enbridge is
5 probably one of the most safest pipelines, working
6 on multiple different pipelines through the years.
7 They can monitor their system probably better than
8 any other pipeline I've seen in the past. And
9 they're continuing to make improvements on
10 monitoring. Just an unbelievable company.

11 So that's about it.

12 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: The last speaker card
13 I have so far is Cheryl Grover.

14 MS. CHERYL GROVER: Cheryl Grover, Cheryl
15 with a C, G-R-O-V-E-R.

16 My husband and I own a farm south of
17 Shevlin and we currently have a Koch pipeline
18 crossing our property and the proposed Line 3 will
19 probably cross our property, too.

20 And I just want to say that the gentleman
21 that mentioned integrity, safety, and respect, my
22 husband and I feel that Enbridge has treated us very
23 fairly. As a retired county assessor, I know all
24 about market values and fair market prices for land
25 and we feel that the easement process went very

1 smoothly and that the gentleman that we worked with
2 was so respectful and is very concerned about the
3 safety of the animals on our farm and the road
4 right-of-ways and all of the work that they have to
5 do to come in and then what they're going to do when
6 they leave our property.

7 And I just want to say that the Koch
8 pipeline, we get the little cards all the time about
9 the integrity and the smart pig that's going to come
10 across our property, we get notified well in advance
11 that they're going to be there, or that it's at
12 least coming through the ground.

13 And I also have to say that the work
14 that's been going on in the last few months, we've
15 gotten phone calls, and the gentleman or the people
16 that we work with have treated us, like I said, with
17 a lot of respect, and the safety and the integrity
18 of the pipeline is the main concern. And the
19 environment. And I just wanted to let everybody
20 know that we're very pleased with Enbridge and the
21 way they've treated us.

22 And then as a retired county assessor, I
23 have to say that in Clearwater County, currently 54
24 percent of the tax capacity for the county is
25 pipeline, and so that burden shifts from us

1 landowners because Enbridge pays the bigger chunk.
2 It shifts and so we pay less taxes. So I can't help
3 but realize that if both of these pipelines do get
4 built, it's going to make a huge impact on all of
5 our property taxes, and that impact is to lower
6 them.

7 So thank you for your time.

8 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: I have another
9 speaker card, a Richard Moen, M-O-E-N.

10 MR. RICHARD MOEN: My name is Richard
11 Moen, M-O-E-N.

12 And I hope you understand me, I do have a
13 speech impediment. However, I'll do my best.

14 And I'd like to thank everybody, and I'm
15 proud of the politeness and the common courtesy
16 everybody has extended. However, it's somewhat
17 bothering me, I own land in Leon and Holst Township,
18 and the pipeline is scheduled to come across a good
19 part of my land.

20 And I realize the pipeline is necessary.
21 However, I live right close to Deep Lake, I know the
22 lake, there are five Deep Lakes. Unfortunately, the
23 Lakehead decided to put their pipeline there because
24 it's the lowest place around. My grandpa came up
25 here in 1896 and his comment is that's a hell of a

1 shoreline, it's all wetland and springs. Some
2 people say don't worry about your oil spill, there's
3 springs, you can just pump the oil away.

4 So many employees, people, you know, that
5 work on those, that it's almost as if it's rigged.
6 And I'm a regular employee and I pay tax base and so
7 on. However, in my lifetime I've seen three oil
8 spills in Leon and Holst Township that I'm aware of,
9 maybe there are more. So it isn't as if we need a
10 pipe that carries it to sustain nature.

11 One question I would like to have
12 answered, and that is from which country will the
13 steel for this pipeline come from? I've heard
14 China. But would anybody know that right now?

15 MR. MITCH REPKA: Thank you for your
16 question regarding the steel source. The steel will
17 be made from recycled North American steel.

18 MR. RICHARD MOEN: Good, very good.
19 Thank you.

20 So I think another thing, the landowners,
21 to get the bonus for signing, I think it's a 30-day
22 limit, and it would be nice if it could be a little
23 bit longer. Because there's so many decisions and
24 there's so many pros and cons to having the pipeline
25 come across your land. It's very permanent.

1 And I'm just a little upset with the --
2 with so many comments about emulating nature,
3 employment taxation, national security, integrity.
4 But there's also another side, so I thought I would
5 give the opposite side.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Another speaker card,
8 Dawn Bourdeaux.

9 MS. DAWN BOURDEAUX: Good evening. Dawn
10 Bordeaux, B-O-U-R-D-E-A-U-X.

11 And I'm here representing Harvey Erie,
12 the Erie/Bartel (phonetic) Trust. And we have lots
13 of concerns. I spent about two and a half hours
14 this morning meeting with Enbridge.

15 All the pipelines run between my dad's
16 properties, all the lines that Enbridge has. The 7
17 line and then the other south line. So the
18 Sandpiper will be coming through. But the piece
19 that is really concerning us is the new proposed
20 substation that's being put in over by Gonvick. In
21 order for that to get done, the Sandpiper Pipeline,
22 you got to bring the oil over from a gas field to go
23 over to the Sandpiper, go onto their property, come
24 back down, catch back into the line and go back
25 down.

1 The old farm that my dad was born on will
2 be a Century Farm here very shortly. We have great
3 concerns that, with all the different pipelines and
4 utilities, 'cause there's two different utilities
5 coming through, that it's making it very difficult
6 to farm. We're still dealing with and being paid
7 for damage done back in 2013. We were pointing out
8 today where digs have been done where the lines have
9 gone through. The topsoil is all clay, it's no
10 longer dirt, it's no longer topsoil that's there,
11 which costs us a lot of money to reclaim that ground
12 to make it agricultural.

13 Enbridge pays four years out, it's not
14 paid within four years. We are still trying to
15 reclaim land from many years ago to get it back into
16 the production of where else it is. But our concern
17 is, you know, you want this new tank farm to go up,
18 but how much is one farmer supposed to take?
19 Besides having lines run through, now we want the
20 electric to come through to power your farm, you
21 want an easement of 50 feet for the utilities to go
22 on our property. Besides all the wildlife that is
23 down there.

24 At what point do we get some say on where
25 can this go? Because that homestead should be

1 protected. That's my family's heritage. That will
2 be a Century Farm very shortly and, you know, they
3 want to tear down all the trees that go through that
4 grove and everything will be gone. Why should we
5 have to have our heritage taken away for all these
6 other things to happen?

7 I understand growth and economics, I
8 understand it very well. But there comes a time
9 when a farmer's land is a farmer's land and if he
10 can't make his living off of it because you have
11 people going in all the time and gates being left
12 open, cattle getting out, and you can't make a
13 living like you used to because the soil is no
14 longer there because it's replaced with clay.

15 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: What I would like
16 to suggest to you now is that this is the
17 opportunity to make the comments that you've made
18 early and to put down a route or segment alternative
19 for your property and submit that into the record.
20 That is the type of information that we need because
21 there is no way to suggest avoidances for your
22 property without you submitting that information to
23 us.

24 MS. DAWN BOURDEAUX: Yes, because there
25 is no alternative routes like for the public

1 utilities, like on the county roads versus going
2 across country. There's a lot of swamps down there
3 that go through, and Enbridge always gets
4 right-of-ways because they got not only dad's
5 property in order to go through the swamps down
6 there. There is also, if somebody were to get hurt
7 down there with the electric or on the pipeline, how
8 are you going to access those to get emergency crews
9 down there when you're going through swamps and
10 everything else.

11 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Again, what I
12 would suggest is that you provide us a map and a
13 detailed description and any information that we
14 will need to look at your specific situation.

15 MS. DAWN BOURDEAUX: And I will do that.
16 But also addressing is, you know, why is it clay and
17 not the topsoil that's supposed to be there? You
18 know, we were looking at that today, where the clay
19 is, where there's no black dirt where they've done
20 lines before.

21 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: And I sympathize
22 with this issue and, unfortunately, I am unable to
23 manage that aspect of your mitigation from previous
24 projects. But what we can do is make sure that
25 we're addressing these issues in these upcoming

1 projects, if they're approved, and if one of them
2 goes on your property specifically. Again, at this
3 point, for your previous projects, you will need to
4 work with Enbridge on that.

5 MS. DAWN BOURDEAUX: Yeah. But, you
6 know, I just want to be on the record that, you
7 know, I understand economic growth and the need for
8 this, but also you got to have respect for the
9 farmers and all the heart and soul that they have
10 put into their land to make a living, and that is
11 affected every time you come through with a
12 pipeline.

13 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Again, I
14 sympathize.

15 MS. DAWN BOURDEAUX: I'm just wanting it
16 on the record.

17 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Dawn, could you
18 mention what township and what section number?

19 MS. DAWN BOURDEAUX: This is Pine Lake
20 Township. Basically where the new substation is, my
21 dad owns the property all -- on three sides of it.
22 So --

23 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: What section?
24 Section number?

25 MS. DAWN BOURDEAUX: There's three

1 different section numbers, I don't have that.

2 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: Could you get that to
3 me?

4 MS. DAWN BOURDEAUX: Yeah, I'll get that
5 to you.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. LARRY HARTMAN: I don't have any
8 other speaker cards.

9 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: I have one
10 additional question. William Johnson again.

11 I've kind of lost track of the timing of
12 Line 3 versus Sandpiper. In the areas where those
13 pipes will be collocated, I assume they're pretty
14 much in the same right-of-way. Will they be put in
15 at about the same time to minimize destruction to
16 landowners in that area as opposed to go dig up the
17 land once and instead of having to come through once
18 or a year later and do it again?

19 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: My understanding
20 is that would be the case. Whether it would be
21 collocated, the construction will be sequential to
22 minimize the landowners --

23 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: When you say
24 sequential, how far apart? Sequential to me means
25 one after another. So is it a month later or is it

1 days later or is it a year later?

2 MR. MITCH REPKA: Yeah, thanks again.
3 And we do have a pictorial in the back, that I can
4 help and walk you through the actual process, the
5 construction process in a collocated scenario.
6 Generally one line is built, you know, the ditch is
7 dug, the pipe is welded, backfilled -- laid in the
8 trench, backfilled, and then the next line then will
9 be built, in this case, 25 feet offset of that new
10 line. So we will utilize that same work space for
11 the first line and for the second line. Therefore,
12 you know, that's the way that we can minimize our
13 environmental impact, is to use that same work
14 space. So it is a sequential process, but they do
15 follow one after the other.

16 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: Yeah. So, I mean,
17 I've watched, I'm right next door to Gary's property
18 there, and I've watched them go through and pile up
19 the topsoil and dig and bury it and all of that, so
20 you are going to do the topsoil removal once, put
21 the two pipes in and then cover it back up?

22 MR. MITCH REPKA: If we end up in a
23 scenario where we're collocated and co-constructed,
24 yeah, the intent would be to clear and strip the
25 right-of-way and work as efficiently as we can.

1 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: Do it once?

2 MR. MITCH REPKA: Again, we do have -- I
3 think we can bring that up here.

4 It may be difficult for those in the
5 crowd to see, but this is just a pictorial
6 describing the process. You can see the -- we also
7 have dimensions here, you know, in the bottom part
8 of the graph showing the work space.

9 So, as I said, the first line would go in
10 and then, you know, you can see where the topsoil
11 storage is here, and our subsoil or the ditch soil
12 would be on what we call the nonworking side, the
13 short side of the work space, and that would be used
14 again to backfill. And then the same process would
15 take place for the second line over the top of that
16 first line. So if you'd like I can describe any one
17 of these scenarios.

18 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: So really it isn't
19 like a year apart, six months apart, you're talking
20 a couple months or something like that? I mean, I
21 can understand where you have to dig and bury and
22 cover up, and you're not going to do that twice.

23 MR. MITCH REPKA: Right. Construction is
24 an ongoing thing. It's kind of like an assembly
25 line. Your clearing crews will come through,

1 drainage crews will come through, you know, we'll
2 string the pipe, weld the pipe. So there will be
3 ongoing activity throughout construction at various
4 parcels throughout the process. So, you know, our
5 in-service date is December of '17. Pending
6 regulatory approvals, we hope to get started in
7 2016.

8 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: And the Sandpiper
9 is the same time?

10 MR. BARRY SIMONSON: Hi. I wanted to
11 interject real quick. One thing that -- you know,
12 we're here talking about the Line 3 replacement for
13 a certificate of need. Line 3 is a different need.
14 Line 3 is an integrity-, maintenance-driven project,
15 as you're aware, and Sandpiper is an expansion
16 project and so they are totally different projects.
17 And as many of you are aware, we were here in 2013
18 to discuss the certificate of need and route permit
19 before it was bifurcated by the PUC. So our
20 schedule for Sandpiper originally was construction
21 for 2015. And Line 3, as Mitch alluded to and which
22 the Commission and the Department of Commerce has
23 proposed in their schedule, have somewhat perhaps
24 created an aura of these two projects being similar
25 in nature based on schedule, but I just want to make

1 a note that these are two different projects. Our
2 intension was to build Sandpiper in 2015. We did
3 see a delay, obviously, in the regulatory process.
4 But we're following through with the Line 3
5 replacement certificate of need tonight and the
6 remainder of the next two weeks with the public.
7 Now, it's up to the Commission to decide on what is
8 going to happen from a permitting timeline for both
9 projects.

10 MR. WILLIAM JOHNSON: I understand that.
11 That the permitting is up in the air at this point
12 as far as timing. I know there's nothing final.

13 So thank you.

14 MR. RICHARD MOEN: Could I have --

15 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes, Mr. Moen.
16 One moment, please. It is 7:30, and as noted in the
17 notice, we do need to take a break at 7:30, we need
18 to give our court reporter a break. So what I would
19 like to do is take a break here, a 10-minute break,
20 and we will reconvene.

21 Do we have any more questions or comments
22 besides Mr. Moen?

23 All right. Let's take a break.

24 (Break taken from 7:31 to 7:48.)

25 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: All right. Let's

1 go ahead and start the second half with Mr. Moen.

2 MR. RICHARD MOEN: Richard Moen.

3 Okay. There's a saying about everybody
4 should donate so much, and the pig and the beef
5 cows, but the rooster said that that would be a
6 total commitment if I gave two pounds. And I think
7 it'll help the rest of the audience understand the
8 difference between the ones who are really affected
9 as opposed to the ones who see the benefits of a new
10 pipeline.

11 And I just have one short point of
12 information. And I feel it's unfortunate that the
13 pipeline can't stay on some of the older, former
14 right-of-ways. Because what's happening now is that
15 we're boxing in Deep Lake. The pipeline comes from
16 the west and within a few hundred yards it goes on
17 the north side of Deep Lake, it goes in a few
18 hundred yards, it goes on the east side of Deep
19 Lake, the proposal, takes a right angle and then it
20 goes on the south side of Deep Lake. We're boxing
21 in Deep Lake. But Deep Lake is plenty deep, from
22 the shore it goes down, I think the depth is, what,
23 a hundred and some feet, a drop-off, the water is
24 potable, we have nature, it's quite the gem for
25 nature. And it's unfortunate that the pipeline is

1 so close by it, and why there's high land everywhere
2 else around it.

3 And one more thing on the rooster and the
4 beef cow, is I have one question, why must the
5 landowner sign an easement before the PUC makes
6 their decision? Is that a proper question?

7 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: The PUC -- neither
8 the PUC nor the Department of Commerce are involved
9 in the easements at all. That is purely a function
10 of Enbridge and what they need to do to secure --

11 MR. RICHARD MOEN: Yes, but the PUC is
12 going to make a decision on it, yes or no, thumbs up
13 or down.

14 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: That's correct.
15 And Enbridge takes these easements on and it's a
16 risk for them, actually, because if the line is not
17 approved, that they have to assume that risk.

18 MR. RICHARD MOEN: Excuse me?

19 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: They must assume
20 the risk. If the line is not approved, they have to
21 assume the risk if they're going to go out and get
22 easements at this point.

23 MR. RICHARD MOEN: Okay. Thank you.

24 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: All right. We had
25 another taker over here.

1 MR. ROBERT GREENER: Robert Greener,
2 G-R-E-E-N-E-R.

3 I was wondering if anybody from Enbridge
4 could state why the idea of shutting that old
5 pipeline down, pulling it out, and going in the same
6 hole is not feasible?

7 MR. MITCH REPKA: Thanks for your
8 question on the route. We did evaluate that in our
9 application. We looked at it as an option and
10 ultimately determined it's not feasible as an
11 option.

12 MR. ROBERT GREENER: My question is why.

13 MR. MITCH REPKA: There's a couple
14 things. As was mentioned earlier, in order to do
15 that, Line 3 is a place kind of generally in the
16 middle of the corridor. So from a safety
17 perspective we would have to work over the existing
18 lines there, which makes it difficult to do.

19 Also, we would need additional work space
20 outside of that corridor, a greater work space than
21 what we have for the new installation, because the
22 logistics of hauling that soil and welding pipe and
23 the ability for us to work safely there would
24 require additional environmental and landowner
25 impacts as opposed to the new line. So those are

1 some of the things we looked at. And, you know,
2 also it would require the existing line to be shut
3 down for that duration of time.

4 MR. ROBERT GREENER: So we're talking
5 economics. Is that the big factor, economics?

6 MR. MITCH REPKA: Multiple factors.
7 Environment, landowner, safety.

8 MR. ROBERT GREENER: Okay. Economics of
9 the scale, is that kind of the way it goes?

10 MR. MITCH REPKA: We looked at a number,
11 it's environment driven, safety, landowner, and --

12 MR. ROBERT GREENER: Is the Utilities
13 Commission weighing all these factors also, the
14 feasibility?

15 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Yes, they are.
16 And if you notice the map in your folder there, you
17 will see that the existing pipeline corridor is
18 still under consideration. That alternative is
19 still under consideration and will be looked at. So
20 it has not been ruled out as an option. It is
21 simply that the applicant's preferred route is the
22 one that goes -- the new route from Clearbrook to
23 Superior.

24 MR. ROBERT GREENER: An additional
25 question. You said the pipe was from recycled

1 American steel. Where is it milled?

2 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Enbridge?

3 MR. MITCH REPKA: So the mainline pipe
4 is, like I said, coming from recycled North American
5 sources. The pipe is being manufactured in
6 Portland, Oregon.

7 MR. ROBERT GREENER: Thank you.

8 MS. JAMIE MACALISTER: Are there any
9 other questions or comments?

10 All right. With that, I thank you for
11 your time in coming here this evening and giving us
12 your comments and asking us questions. Hopefully
13 you have some answers to those questions.

14 And, again, I encourage you to submit
15 additional comments, route alternatives, segment
16 alternatives, to us by September 30th.

17 Thank you.

18 (Proceedings concluded at 7:52 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25