

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 18, 2016 11:24:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Margaret Levin
1355 Lafond Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55104-
margaret.levin@sierraclub.org
(612) 259-2446

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 12:38:48 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jane Hawes
7215 12th Ave So
Minneapolis, MN 55423-
hawesjane@yahoo.com
(612) 869-4813

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 12:43:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terrance Hyk
126 Hazelwood Ave
Cologne, MN 55322-
terryhyk@hotmail.com
(763) 537-2428

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 12:46:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Morris
3229 Colorado Avenue South
St Louis Park, MN 55416-
kittyguitar@gmail.com
111-111-1111

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 12:52:07 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John McGowan
301 Ryan Ave.
St. Paul, MN 55102-
mcgowanjohn225@gmail.com
(651) 227-1125

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 1:06:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Anderson
1150 N Elm Ave
Owatonna, MN 55060-
jscottgms@gmail.com
(444) 444-4444

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 1:10:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

s e
868 4th
faribault, MN 55021-
suzusme@yahoo.com
111-111-1111

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 1:11:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Norma Jean Falink
1996 Langton Lake Dr Unit 417
Saint Paul, MN 55113-
njf11651@hotmail.com
6122425837

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 1:32:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Richard Caswell
2670 Kelley Parkway
Orono, MN 55356-
r.caswell@mchsi.com
(952) 474-3677

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 1:41:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

k. Cash luck
6091 Fort Thunder Dr NE
Remer, MN 56672-
cash@means.net
(218) 566-2902

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 1:41:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

k. Cash luck
6091 Fort Thunder Dr NE
Remer, MN 56672-
cash@means.net
(218) 566-2902

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 1:41:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

k. Cash luck
6091 Fort Thunder Dr NE
Remer, MN 56672-
cash@means.net
(218) 566-2902

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 3:43:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Juliann Rule
35002 115th Ave.
Avon, MN 56310-
schugrule@aol.com
(320) 363-8760

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 5:00:23 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bob Haugen
5813 36th Ave N
Crystal, MN 55422-
crystalbobh@gmail.com
(763) 537-3542

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 5:12:38 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judi Poulson
1881 Knollwood Dr
Fairmont, MN 56031-
judpeace@gmail.com
5072355288

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 5:59:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Diane Michel
535 Summit Ave
Crookston, MN 56716-
wilby11@bigpond.com
(218) 281-1277

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 6:23:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Hinton
8324 Ewing rd
Bloomington, MN 55431-
carolynhot91@gmail.com
(612) 555-5555

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 7:38:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jon Hayenga
421 2nd St NW
Stewartville, MN 55976-
jdhayenga@gmail.com
(000) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 8:36:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shirley Espeland
2250 Luther Place
St. Paul, MN 55108-
slsesp84@gmail.com
(651) 646-8971

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 8:56:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

ordell vee
427 2nd st. n.e.
madelia, MN 56062-
otvee@hotmail.com
5073820893

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 9:03:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janice Hallman
5355 Anderlie Lane
Saint Paul, MN 55110-
jrhallman2@gmail.com
6514027562

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 10:49:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christopher O'Brien
1915 woodland ave
Duluth, MN 55803-
christopherobrien1915@gmail.com
(734) 489-3523

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Friday, May 20, 2016 12:37:05 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dianne Delaney
821 N 30th Ave
St Cloud, MN 56303-
dianne.delaney@lssmn.org
(320) 761-0598

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Saturday, May 21, 2016 6:11:27 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joan Odd
703 Hackerson Ct.
Northfield, MN 55057-
oddj@stolaf.edu
(507) 645-6196

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Saturday, May 21, 2016 10:22:36 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate. We need to move beyond fossil fuels and switch to renewable energy. Then, we don't need to worry about pipeline ruptures or leaks.

Sincerely,

Liza Eng
208 Alpine Ridge
Wabasha, MN 55981-
tillie81@hbc.com
(651) 565-4468

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Saturday, May 21, 2016 12:37:16 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William Nusbaum
2916 Gettysburg Avenue South
Saint Louis Park, MN 55426-
wfnusbaum@comcast.net
(612) 938-4517

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Saturday, May 21, 2016 7:09:42 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rosanna Walker
1551 Belsly Blvd Apt 315
Moorhead, MN 56560-
peppy43@cableone.net
(218) 766-9813

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Saturday, May 21, 2016 12:35:13 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Denise Marlowe
7406 Bolton Way
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-
denisemarlowe@yahoo.com
(651) 455-9938

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Sunday, May 22, 2016 11:05:36 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wade Johnson
4720 13th Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
yammiq@hotmail.com
(612) 824-4278

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Sunday, May 22, 2016 8:17:00 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Renee Valois
2014 Cleveland Ave N.
Roseville, MN 55113-
reenevalois@comcast.net
6122071098

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 12:01:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christine Popowski
2630 Pleasant Ave #101
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
cpopowski2009@gmail.com
6129879046

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:23:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Philip Rampi
2150 Jefferson Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
prgconsulting@prodigy.net
(651) 690-4138

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:23:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Martha Osterberg
586 Deer Ridge Ln S
Maplewood, MN 55119-
mosterberg50@comcast.net
(651) 233-5642

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:23:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ann Brady
1238 Thomas Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
yarrow48@gmail.com
(651) 646-8077

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:23:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Meyer
24275 W Typo Dr NE
Stacy, MN 55079-
rmeyer@gilletechildrens.com
(651) 462-9033

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:04 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Betty Smisek
1762 Oakdale Ave
West St Paul, MN 55118-
getpd2save@yahoo.com
(612) 986-7809

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Shimek
1263 Birch Ct
White Bear Lake, MN 55110-
cshimek@tecweigh.com
(651) 233-1980

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Stan Pride
10701 Wren St NW
Coon Rapids, MN 55433-
stan.pride@gmail.com
(763) 427-1431

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Donna Bloom
1208 9th St NE
Rochester, MN 55906-
anmllvr.1@netzero.net
(507) 884-5282

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Clayton
1866 Portland Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
tsc@umn.edu
(651) 644-8441

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Maureen Mccullough
4548 Winnetka Ave N
New Hope, MN 55428-
mclaremccullough@gmail.com
(701) 330-6871

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Greg Kapphahn
208 Birch Ave
Alexandria, MN 56308-
gkrevvv@gmail.com
(612) 978-2944

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathy Kormanik
8609 40th Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55427-
pomkak@aol.com
(763) 544-9034

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ryan Kenaga
200 E King St
Winona, MN 55987-
rkenaga@gmail.com
(507) 205-7088

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karl Hamann
213 Spring Creek Rd S
Red Wing, MN 55066-
erikster424@gmail.com
(651) 388-9639

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Frank Heller
421 E 8th St
Duluth, MN 55805-
frankheller@firehousemail.com
(218) 733-0433

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:24:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Craig Bryan
13160 Floral Ct
Saint Paul, MN 55124-
cebryan@stthomas.edu
(651) 962-5256

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:25:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Braun
15 Mid Oaks Ln
Saint Paul, MN 55113-
erdm0008@umn.edu
(651) 645-1513

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:25:11 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Craig Poorker
3711 York Ave N
Robbinsdale, MN 55422-
moosedoexist@hotmail.com
(763) 521-4609

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:25:15 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jen Bassett
12783 Parkwood Dr
Baxter, MN 56425-
jonesjen75@yahoo.com
(218) 829-0590

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:25:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laurie Duncan
9240 Woodhall Bay N
Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-
bewitchedmagic@yahoo.com
(612) 212-0611

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:25:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Charlie Engel
3812 Abbott Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
charlie.engel@yahoo.com
(612) 718-3570

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:25:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Parker Quammen
690 Warren Ave
Zumbrota, MN 55992-
parkerdq@gmail.com
(507) 732-7761

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:26:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Larry Bogolub
1424 Lincoln Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
lbogolub@comcast.net
(651) 290-7676

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:26:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Andrew
3920 16th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
andrew.david@medtronic.com
(763) 123-4567

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:26:17 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Doreen Kloehn
4036 Xerxes Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
doreen494@yahoo.com
(612) 926-9968

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:26:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Guy
165 E 4th St Apt 505
Winona, MN 55987-
silvercloud.ng@gmail.com
(507) 458-9698

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:26:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kristina Cumpston
444 Herschel St
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
krissac_2@hotmail.com
(651) 259-4264

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:26:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kevin Larson
2699 Evergreen Cir
White Bear Lake, MN 55110-
larsonkev@gmail.com
(651) 317-9896

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:26:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Elling
250 2nd Ave SW Apt 10
Aitkin, MN 56431-
maryelling1937@gmail.com
(218) 927-6025

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:26:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dian Lopez
5770 Burkeys Ln NW
Alexandria, MN 56308-
lopezdr@morris.umn.edu
(320) 846-3573

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:27:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jeff Stromgren
711 W Lake St
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
jeff@ricestromgren.com
(612) 827-7802

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:27:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Timothy Mullen
1272 Richland Ave
Saint Charles, MN 55972-
mullentim13@yahoo.co.uk
(622) 885-4474

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:27:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Emy Chapman
4215 Lee St
Red Wing, MN 55066-
emy_chapman72@yahoo.com
(712) 574-9565

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:27:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Carroll
792 Arlington Ave W
Saint Paul, MN 55117-
lawern@gmail.com
(123) 456-7890

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:27:42 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Neveaux
17010 Saddlewood Trl
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
neveaux.m@gmail.com
(612) 220-6532

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:27:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joanne Neihart
6751 Geneva Ave S
Cottage Grove, MN 55016-
joanne@serviceideas.com
(651) 459-2508

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:27:54 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathy Curtiss
3930 Williston Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
kmcurtiss@hotmail.com
(000) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:28:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gregory David
3956 Yosemite Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55416-
wideangle@mac.com
(630) 916-6737

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:28:23 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Wiese
2543 Nicollet Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
steve@creationaudio.comcastbiz.net
(612) 871-2121

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:28:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gerald Wambach
51871 169th Ave
Bemidji, MN 56601-
gwambach@paulbunyan.net
(218) 333-0891

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:28:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Edith Thorstensson
809 S 7th St
Saint Peter, MN 56082-
bubbles@gustavus.edu
(507) 934-2345

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:28:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Darlene Young
222 2nd St SE Apt 1005
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
dlyoung72@msn.com
(612) 269-6838

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:29:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patricia Halter
1531 Aspen Dr
Saint Peter, MN 56082-
phalter@scholarshipamerica.org
(507) 934-2137

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:29:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sally Allen
3523 Colfax Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55412-
sally.allen@target.com
(612) 522-7820

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:29:46 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Ellen Vetter
7715 York Ln N
Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-
mevetter@mninter.net
(763) 561-1761

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:29:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Thomsen
469 W Eagle Lake Dr
Maple Grove, MN 55369-
neubor@hotmail.com
(111) 222-3333

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:29:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Thomsen
469 W Eagle Lake Dr
Maple Grove, MN 55369-
neubor@hotmail.com
(111) 222-3333

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:30:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Thomsen
469 W Eagle Lake Dr
Maple Grove, MN 55369-
neubor@hotmail.com
(111) 222-3333

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:30:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Garance Aboubi
8025 Regent Ave N
Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-
garance@outlook.com
(952) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:31:34 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Debra Gerads-Brodie
365 Oak Hill Dr
Red Wing, MN 55066-
brods365@msn.com
(651) 388-2656

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:31:47 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

D Bolinger
1344 Briarwood Dr
Albert Lea, MN 56007-
markb10@q.com
(507) 320-5639

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:31:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jessica Tritsch
1489 Sargent Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
jessica.tritsch@sierraclub.org
(612) 963-9642

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:32:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Corinne Rockstad
700 Grand Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
corinnerockstad@edinarealty.com
(651) 225-3938

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:32:04 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Arielle Johnson
521 6th St SE Apt 2
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
arielle.s.johnson@gmail.com
(612) 803-8939

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:32:05 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ruthann Ovenshire
201 Bedford St SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
rovenshire@yahoo.com
(612) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:32:15 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Virginia Bieren
170 Good Counsel Dr
Mankato, MN 56001-
vbieren@ssndcp.org
(507) 389-4200

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:32:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Francine Tolf
621 2nd St NE Apt 103
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
tolf0001@umn.edu
(612) 926-8704

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:32:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Matt Norton
3305 47th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
mattnorton@mepartnership.org
(651) 789-0651

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:33:07 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Stop acting like fossil fuels are okay. They are not. They poison our air and water when we burn and extract them, and there are clear alternatives that are far more responsible. If you think fossil fuels are ok, then I think you are a big, selfish, lazy baby.

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Timothy Chapp
326 Monroe St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
tjchapp@gmail.com
(612) 619-2812

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:33:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Darnell Barsness
1618 Pine St
Hastings, MN 55033-
d.barsness@att.net
(651) 437-8123

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:34:48 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Peggy Phan
92 Maple Lane
Little Canada, MN 55117-
pphan@umn.edu
(612) 624-9369

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:34:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Katharine Winston
4634 France Ave S
Edina, MN 55410-
kswinston46@gmail.com
(612) 819-2887

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:34:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate. Where profit is the motive we need over site to protect the environment from wanton abuse and risk taking.

Sincerely,

Henry Padgett
503 Wilson Ave SE
Saint Cloud, MN 56304-
bjornesbror@hotmail.com
(320) 492-6899

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:35:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pamela Henjum
2935 Lindgren Ln
Independence, MN 55359-
phenjum@gmail.com
(763) 479-3552

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:35:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Betsey Porter
10040 Penn Ave S Apt 11
Bloomington, MN 55431-
betseyp@hotmail.com
(612) 618-3571

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:35:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Leslie Boudrot
5626 Clinton Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
lboudrot@usiwireless.com
(612) 869-2997

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:35:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jeff Sluiter
9222 198th St W
Lakeville, MN 55044-
jsluiter@yahoo.com
(952) 913-2692

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:35:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Richard Beach
1201 Yale Pl Apt 1505
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
rbeach@umn.edu
(612) 339-5195

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:36:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Please be strict on managing all the risks of these dangerous pipelines. Minnesotan's lives and healthiness are at stake and so is the agriculture industry.

Sincerely,

Jacob Herbers
901 2nd St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
herbe125@umn.edu
(507) 696-2530

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:36:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susan Wick
1436 Raymond Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
swick@umn.edu
(651) 488-0063

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:36:15 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judie Cushing
255 E 4th St
Red Wing, MN 55066-
judie@lnlmail.com
(651) 385-9211

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:36:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Buschena
186 3rd Ave SE
New Brighton, MN 55112-
cbuschena@gmail.com
1234567890

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:36:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kara Jimerson
13775 Chestnut Dr
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-
dropaheart24@yahoo.com
(612) 868-8468

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:37:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Michaels
6908 76th Ave N
Brooklyn Park, MN 55428-
wolfl45@yahoo.com
(612) 644-3690

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:37:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Nekola
2015 Central Ave NE Apt 207
Minneapolis, MN 55418-
bjnekola@gmail.com
(952) 210-9666

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:37:17 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Penelope Anderson
1097 McLean Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
penelfager@gmail.com
(952) 201-8742

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:37:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Maggie Brown
1022 University Ave SE Apt 15B
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
maggiebrown93@gmail.com
(651) 238-7400

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:37:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laurinda Porter
39205 Oak Dr
Browerville, MN 56438-
rporter@rea-alp.com
(320) 594-7067

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:38:11 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laurie Hardies
2082 Jade Ln
Eagan, MN 55122-
lhardies@wdlarson.com
(651) 450-8156

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:38:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

J'ulene LaQue
7400 Edinborough Way Apt 5205
Edina, MN 55435-
laquestateofbeing@gmail.com
(952) 500-9353

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:38:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terese Boeck
15940 Shadyview Ln N
Dayton, MN 55327-
boecks@msn.com
(920) 327-2940

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:38:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Margaret Cain
331 2nd Ave S Ste 895
Minneapolis, MN 55401-
mec@watsonlegal.com
(612) 333-2331

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:39:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sally Downing
622 8th St SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
mfordbroth@gmail.com
(612) 379-3306

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:39:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Krenn
200 Dakota Ave S
Golden Valley, MN 55416-
john.krenn@gpmlaw.com
(763) 593-1758

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:39:45 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jasmine Hippe
1016 Washington Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
jazzylouise22@yahoo.com
(612) 310-2812

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:39:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Heidi Kult
1031 Conway St
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
hkult@metroaging.org
(651) 340-6477

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:39:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Eric Paul Jacobsen
247 Winona St W
West Saint Paul, MN 55118-
ericpauljacobsen@gmail.com
(651) 228-1282

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:40:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alex Stone
1306 Jefferson Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
showersstone@gmail.com
(651) 699-9999

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:40:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nancy Paddock
417 E 4th St
Litchfield, MN 55355-
jep@hutchtel.net
(320) 593-7705

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:40:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Stacy Froemming
1240 Ida Pines Ln NW
Alexandria, MN 56308-
froemming@irby.com
(612) 819-0745

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:40:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Rasch
2060 Flanders Rd
North St Paul, MN 55109-
lindarasch@icloud.com
(612) 616-0216

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:40:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christine Popowski
2630 Pleasant Ave Apt 101
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
cpopowski2009@gmail.com
(612) 987-9046

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:41:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marcy Leussler
4456 5th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
mleussler@hotmail.com
(612) 824-3240

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:42:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dennis Johnson
37955 Bridge Rd
North Branch, MN 55056-
dennis@nsdomes.com
(651) 674-4292

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:42:16 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Allen Gibas
4239 Abbott Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
ahgibas@yahoo.com
(612) 929-6382

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:42:17 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Monsor
17625 11th Ave N
Plymouth, MN 55447-
mmonsor@gmail.com
(612) 770-2926

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:42:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michelle Sichak
3645 141st Ln NW
Andover, MN 55304-
msichak@comcast.net
(763) 576-6629

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:42:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Ericksen
911 22nd Ave S Apt 155
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
thomas.ericksen@yahoo.com
(612) 244-9167

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:43:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Moraski Kathleen
7611 Teal Bay
Woodbury, MN 55125-
kmoraski45@gmail.com
(651) 271-2590

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:43:48 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sue Boulton
4262 Bluebell Ct
Saint Paul, MN 55127-
sue.boulton@gmail.com
(651) 484-2991

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:43:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rodd Ringquist
9661 221st St N
Forest Lake, MN 55025-
ringquist.rod@gmail.com
(651) 233-3112

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:43:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sandra Johnson
383 Grand Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55102-
artemissj2@yahoo.com
(952) 693-5662

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:44:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Feiring
6297 Upper 35th St N Unit 7
Saint Paul, MN 55128-
carolfeiring@gmail.com
None

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:44:17 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jerry Fitzgerald
4181 Tall Timber Trl NW
Hackensack, MN 56452-
jldfitzger@att.net
(218) 682-2941

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:44:18 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alberta Arneson Hokenson
1916 S 8th St
Minneapolis, MN 55454-
albertamirais@gmail.com
(612) 991-1139

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:45:07 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marlene Johnshoy
395 Pascal St S
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
johnshoy@umn.edu
(651) 699-1808

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:45:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Stephen Streed
22520 Murray St
Excelsior, MN 55331-
sgstreed21165@yahoo.com
(217) 480-6818

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:45:27 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pierre Gingerich-Boberg
649 Lexington Pkwy N
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
gingerichbob@wisc.edu
(612) 200-3671

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:46:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Annah Gardner
3109 E 22nd St
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
ajgardner@stthomas.edu
(612) 298-8281

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:46:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Virnig
6017 Washburn Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
jvirnig@partnershipresources.org
(612) 735-9908

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:46:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jane McGovern
1245 Osceola Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
janemcg20@hotmail.com
(651) 955-4873

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:46:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lyn Yount
11001 Oregon Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55438-
lynyount@yahoo.com
(999) 999-9999

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:46:38 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Rude
2215 Tilsen Ave
St. Paul, MN 55119-
drude51@gmail.com
(651) 497-4339

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:46:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Larry Schug
35002 115th Ave
Avon, MN 56310-
schugrule@aol.com
(320) 363-8760

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:46:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

My body, and yours, are 70% water, as is the surface of the earth. Water is life and it does not come out of a faucet. I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susu Jeffrey
1063 Antoinette Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55405-
susujeffrey@msn.com
(612) 377-4455

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:47:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Deborah Walsh
1124 2nd St N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
kolorkraze@gmail.com
(651) 235-8341

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:47:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paul Densmore
1980 7th St W Apt 217
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
pmdensmore@gmail.com
(678) 381-3341

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:47:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alice O'Hara
4332 Fremont Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55409-
aeohara@lycos.com
(612) 822-1382

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:47:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brian Henning
2200 Dixon Dr
Bloomington, MN 55431-
bhenning2200@gmail.com
(612) 867-5814

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:47:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ann Hauer
717 Willard St W
Stillwater, MN 55082-
ahauer@salaarc.com
(651) 351-9444

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:47:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Les Stern
6124 45th St N
Oakdale, MN 55128-
263310les@gmail.com
(651) 238-1993

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:48:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brian Major
2726 E 26th St
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
briker8@gmail.com
(612) 729-7427

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:49:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Frei
6407 Camden Ave N Apt 303
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430-
kfrei6454@gmail.com
(612) 929-3689

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:49:48 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mike Ferguson
104 Thomas Dr Apt 307
Mankato, MN 56001-
draconiandruoid@gmail.com
(507) 351-4086

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:50:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Alford
18590 Von Rd
Hinckley, MN 55037-
saanywhere3@gmail.com
(320) 384-0398

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:50:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Turrentine
825 Summit Ave Apt 1103
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
bturrentine@sirentel.net
(612) 825-8723

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:51:01 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathy Dunn
8657 Maplebrook Pkwy N
Brooklyn Park, MN 55445-
lilbitdunn@yahoo.com
(763) 424-8072

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:51:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Burr
2025 Fairmount Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
elizabethgburr@gmail.com
(651) 699-6407

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:51:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lindholm
3724 W 22nd St
Minneapolis, MN 55416-
rlindholm@mac.com
(612) 285-9628

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:51:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gregory Kendall
10844 Jubilee Cir Apt A
Lakeville, MN 55044-
gregorykendall1@yahoo.com
(612) 578-7743

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:51:38 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Luke Barnard
2019 Conifer Ave. NW #207
Bemidji, MN 56601-
l.barn@hotmail.com
9526868227

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:51:47 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Agnew
1481 Scheffer Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
casagnew@gmail.com
(651) 698-7083

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:51:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Zoe Bird
4918 37th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
zozettebird@gmail.com
(612) 432-9196

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:52:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

steven alford
18590 von rd
hinckley, MN 55037-
saanywhere3@gmail.com
3203840398

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:52:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Hinners
20 S 55th Ave E
Duluth, MN 55804-
unclewalter@outlook.com
(218) 303-2773

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:53:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Kurtovich
6004 Birch Point Rd
Saginaw, MN 55779-
kb0lss@gmail.com
(218) 729-9726

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:53:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jessie Skumatz
723 Kenwood Ave
Duluth, MN 55811-
jskumatz@yahoo.com
(218) 590-2287

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:53:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Csargo
40470 Pequot Dr
Browerville, MN 56438-
csargopottery@hotmail.com
(608) 213-8586

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:53:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Grecia Glass
1266 Englewood Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
glass038@umn.edu
(651) 285-0710

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:54:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

L. Becker Grandle
5116 Irving Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
lbgrandle@gmail.com
(952) 831-3774

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:54:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Bement
825 Warner Ave S
Mahtomedi, MN 55115-
mbbement@comcast.net
(612) 617-6247

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:54:42 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Oehlerich
1778 Linden Cv
White Bear Lake, MN 55110-
sroehlerich@gmail.com
(651) 207-8580

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:55:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ian Radtke-Rosen
5332 35th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
ian.radtke@gmail.com
(952) 686-3879

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:55:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Larry Margolis
3916 Avondale St
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
margolislaurence@gmail.com
(952) 931-9606

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:55:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shawn Kakuk
4340 Clearwater Rd Apt 106
Saint Cloud, MN 56301-
kfunk3000@hotmail.com
(320) 308-5392

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:55:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Merryman
3660 37th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
elizabeth.merryman@target.com
(621) 722-1362

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:55:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susan Jordan
2361 Unity Ave N
Golden Valley, MN 55422-
honeygirl2361@gmail.com
(763) 588-7601

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:56:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Saign
1342 Maynard Dr W Apt 495
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
geoffreysaign@centurylink.net
(651) 698-5097

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:56:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Amy Spude
851 Cedar Ave N
Maple Lake, MN 55358-
amy.spude@gmail.com
(320) 230-1301

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:56:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Henry Homburger
2950 Fox Valley Dr SW
Rochester, MN 55902-
hhomburger@aol.com
(507) 289-0104

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:56:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Nissen
15380 Big Horn Pass NW
Prior Lake, MN 55372-
tnissen886@mac.com
(612) 516-1950

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:56:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Curtis Coffey
655 Sibley Memorial Hwy
Saint Paul, MN 55118-
ccoffey@umich.edu
(612) 203-2085

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:57:23 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Doreen Charest
9452 Dartford Rd
Woodbury, MN 55125-
dcharest@csjoseph.org
(651) 714-0771

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:57:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christine Pikala
4825 34th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
cpikala04@gmail.com
(612) 296-5074

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:57:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kurt Stein
2 Lilywood Ln
Saint Paul, MN 55118-
krstein47104@gmail.com
(218) 255-2105

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:57:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alana Willroth
1605 Birch Lake Ave
White Bear Lake, MN 55110-
alanawillroth@gmail.com
(651) 407-6461

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:58:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Knipe
1175 Minnehaha Ave W
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
mlknipe@hotmail.com
(651) 644-5493

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:58:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Schupp
95 Cascade Cir
Chanhassen, MN 55317-
kjhoenig@yahoo.com
(952) 401-9327

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:58:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Herbstrith
914 W 36th St
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
tim@hodder.tv
(612) 310-7875

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:59:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Richard Jantz Jr
5000 Bryant Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55430-
deafstartrek@gmail.com
(612) 424-4038

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:59:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gwin Pratt
2995 County Road 90
Maple Plain, MN 55359-
gwinpratt@gmail.com
(763) 479-6061

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:59:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Custard
279 Lexington Pkwy S
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
mjcustard@yahoo.com
(651) 224-8995

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:59:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Hoff
17844 Townline Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
mlouhoff@aol.com
(952) 920-1976

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 3:59:54 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Hoff
17844 Townline Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
mlouhoff@aol.com
(952) 920-1976

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:00:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Catherine Marble
6712 Limerick Ln
Minneapolis, MN 55439-
clm@info9.net
(952) 941-6970

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:00:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gina Wood
119 E 25th St
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
ginafrances@hotmail.com
1234567890

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:02:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sean Hardin
614 N 1st St Apt 301
Minneapolis, MN 55401-
hardinblack@netscape.net
(612) 333-9254

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:02:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Wohlberg
6739 11th Ave S
Richfield, MN 55423-
robertwohlberg@gmail.com
(612) 869-2190

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:02:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Theodore Trevor
9509 Yukon Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55438-
theomanzero@gmail.com
(952) 941-0468

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:02:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Pegg
1335 Minnesota Ave
Duluth, MN 55802-
jpeggduluth@yahoo.com
(218) 349-1786

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:03:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kris Roberts-Cornett
2755 6th St S
Sartell, MN 56377-
krisroberts@gmail.com
(320) 828-1121

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:03:42 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jean Greenwood
4515 Garfield Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
green104@umn.edu
(612) 825-4927

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:03:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Wilm
2919 45th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
walul3102@gmail.com
(612) 721-8809

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:03:54 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patty Vido
426 Warner Ave S
Willernie, MN 55090-
pattyvido@yahoo.com
(651) 485-1265

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:04:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Raccio
6400 Ranchview Ln N
Maple Grove, MN 55311-
kfraccio@aol.com
(763) 559-9415

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:04:47 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Larry Boatman
1059 Marie Ave W
Mendota Heights, MN 55118-
larry@larry-boatman.info
(877) 334-4897

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:05:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Troiber
11924 Norway St NW
Coon Rapids, MN 55448-
dimpledgoddess@yahoo.com
(612) 202-4875

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:06:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Schmitt
5101 Park Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
jsschmitt@stkate.edu
(612) 823-0876

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:06:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

W F and Karla M Forsyth
2212 Irving Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55405-
wforsyth@hensonefron.com
(612) 374-2827

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:06:52 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynda Harvey
3537 W 28th St
Minneapolis, MN 55416-
jmharvey@isd.net
(612) 929-2133

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:07:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jack Scharber
1727 4th St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
jackscharber@hotmail.com
(612) 240-9907

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:07:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Meinke
8807 Hastings Cir NE
Blaine, MN 55449-
twmein@centurylink.net
(763) 486-3305

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:09:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

EDWIN Wensman
5282 Portland Woods
White Bear Lake, MN 55110-
edwens@usfamily.net
(651) 429-3683

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:09:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Holly Hubing
10101 Bren Rd E
Hopkins, MN 55343-
hollyhubing@comcast.net
(925) 933-2136

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:10:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joe Aliotto
2631 Jersey Ave S
St Louis Park, MN 55426-
aliottoj@gmail.com
(608) 469-2538

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:10:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Lutz
518 Inverness Ln
Saint Peter, MN 56082-
pdlutz1900@gmail.com
(507) 934-2769

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:11:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steve Wentworth
3934 Denmark Ave
Eagan, MN 55123-
wents01@hotmail.com
(651) 249-1657

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:11:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Richard Lamb
4259 W Broadway Ave Apt 104
Robbinsdale, MN 55422-
rlamb2@outlook.com
(999) 999-9999

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:12:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Margaret Mogg
58138 State Highway 87
Menahga, MN 56464-
sheepdog1@wcta.net
(218) 564-4155

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:12:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Riskin
1117 3rd St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
rriskin@outlook.com
(612) 747-2852

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:12:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Andy Lopez
5770 Burkeys Ln NW
Alexandria, MN 56308-
alopez@morris.umn.edu
(320) 846-3573

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:12:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Soehl
65055 340th Ave
Lake City, MN 55041-
woodlandfaie@yahoo.com
(507) 923-1179

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:13:27 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kelly Morrison
3747 157th Ave NW
Andover, MN 55304-
kmmickelson@yahoo.com
(763) 754-0325

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:13:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dan Vojcak
1500 Saint Olaf Ave
Northfield, MN 55057-
vojcak1@stolaf.edu
(630) 470-1791

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:13:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dianne Delaney
821 30th Ave N
Saint Cloud, MN 56303-
dianne.delaney@lssmn.org
(320) 761-0598

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:14:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pamela Johnson
1501 US Highway 12 SW
Montrose, MN 55363-
pamjohnsongs@comcast.net
(763) 360-8435

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:14:17 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paul Ryals
74 375th Ave NW
Stanchfield, MN 55080-
pcryals@yahoo.com
(763) 689-4580

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:14:47 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Zeller
10255 Greenbrier Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55305-
zelleroni2@netscape.net
(952) 393-9544

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:15:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lea Foushee
PO Box 174
Lake Elmo, MN 55042-
lfoushee@nawo.org
(651) 770-3861

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:15:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susan Louis
4420 Chicago Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
albemarlescl@msn.com
(612) 824-4290

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:17:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Georgetta Richardson
7129 76th Ave N
Brooklyn Park, MN 55428-
hrvstmon@hotmail.com
(763) 424-3028

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:17:52 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dick Ruth
14030 140th Ct
Apple Valley, MN 55124-
dickr2@frontier.com
(952) 431-7884

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:18:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mark Fischer
980 Island Lake Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55126-
markandfidelina@hotmail.com
(651) 481-9842

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:18:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Neckermann
10996 Cedar Lake Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55305-
jenn.neckermann@edwardjones.com
(763) 773-1185

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:18:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

R A Fuller
976 Winterberry Dr
Woodbury, MN 55125-
raf.fuller@comcast.net
(651) 739-9160

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:18:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tanya Beyer
10431 Bachelor Square Rd
Meadowlands, MN 55765-
epiphaniesafield@gmail.com
(218) 260-6767

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:18:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melva Lacher
8062 Cleveland St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55432-
melval@q.com
(763) 780-3478

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:18:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nancy Hauer
1990 Ridgewood Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55110-
nancy@rookhouse.org
(651) 426-4917

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:18:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Candace Marx
47323 County 11 Blvd
Mazeppa, MN 55956-
wfmrx@juno.com
(507) 843-4320

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:19:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Andrews
623 3rd St NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
bkandrewsya@yahoo.com
(507) 271-4165

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:19:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bill Forbes
2565 Franklin Ave Apt 103
Saint Paul, MN 55114-
williamdforges@gmail.com
(999) 999-9999

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:21:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lisa Adams
5708 Upton Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
ljadams2014@yahoo.com
(612) 715-5972

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:21:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joe Eastman
25488 Loons Landing Trl
Bovey, MN 55709-
jeastman@windlogics.com
(410) 279-9702

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:21:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Dean
3258 Lindahl Rd
Duluth, MN 55810-
leenda.dean@gmail.com
None

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:22:27 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Cochran
1913 S 6th St
Minneapolis, MN 55454-
cj70cochran@yahoo.com
(612) 370-0867

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:23:18 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sean F
6500 14th Ave S
Richfield, MN 55423-
scandman@hotmail.com
(612) 345-7799

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:23:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William Hydukovich
423 Sterling St S
Saint Paul, MN 55119-
blhyduke@q.com
(651) 600-1112

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:24:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Franz Kitberger
1 1/2 S Minnesota St Apt 6
New Ulm, MN 56073-
franzjk@newulmtel.net
(507) 359-8944

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:24:38 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Keith Heaton
9380 Preston Pl
Eden Prairie, MN 55347-
bkheaton@earthlink.net
(952) 993-3180

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:24:46 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Johnson
924 N Union Ave
Fergus Falls, MN 56537-
tj56537@yahoo.com
(218) 736-7019

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:24:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terry Evans
110 Edgewood Ave S
Golden Valley, MN 55426-
terryl.evans@comcast.net
(763) 544-2834

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:26:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joan Nichols
2696 Horseshoe Ln
Woodbury, MN 55125-
joanenichols@msn.com
(651) 714-8314

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:26:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joel Barkley
2444 1st Ave S Apt 1
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
joelbarkley@mac.com
(612) 280-1663

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:26:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sam Cosentino
425 Portland Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55488-
4thpendina@gmail.com
(651) 717-7377

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:26:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Erin Strauss
3531 15th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
estrauss@smm.org
(612) 721-2688

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:27:16 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tina King
4140 James Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55412-
tinamicheleking@hotmail.com
(612) 529-9422

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:27:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marjorie Simon
2605 Fremont Ave S Apt 303
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
simonspr@aol.com
(612) 210-1789

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:28:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gregg Severson
3140 Bryant Ave S Apt 4
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
rainerd@gmail.com
(612) 716-6215

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:28:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Denise Kay Schowalter
1300 Yale Place | Apartment 106
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
d.k.schowalter@comcast.net
(612) 331-2727

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:28:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jason Millard
3217 Chicago Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
jason777@operamail.com
(612) 871-5800

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:29:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jesse Comstock
1001 School St NW Apt 119
Elk River, MN 55330-
jallencomstock@gmail.com
(763) 443-4251

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:29:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Schneider
10933 Chowen Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431-
bernejack@aol.com
(952) 884-7689

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:29:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Langin
2704 Kenneth Ct
Hopkins, MN 55305-
lindalangin@gmail.com
(612) 756-3685

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:29:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

George Johnson
3193 Strand Rd
Duluth, MN 55803-
gartj@usfamily.net
(218) 525-1811

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:29:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Chris Robbins
PO Box 321
Hallock, MN 56728-
grobbins001@gmail.com
435.6675

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:30:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alan Olander
25998 277th Ave
Nevis, MN 56467-
aolander@arvig.net
(218) 652-2850

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:31:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gina Marano
5300 Vernon Ave S
Edina, MN 55436-
eyeindesign@yahoo.com
(952) 831-0249

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:31:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jan Hayne
15535 100th St N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
bbowlz@msn.com
(651) 351-9506

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:31:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Peter Veits
641 E Burnsville Pkwy
Burnsville, MN 55337-
pveits@hotmail.com
(651) 699-1111

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:32:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Dennis Browne
2111 E 22nd St
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
mdb@umn.edu
(612) 729-1558

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:32:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Keren Jorde
460 Madison St
Tracy, MN 56175-
keren_jorde@hotmail.com
(507) 212-7381

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:32:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Heather Hundt
15686 141st Ave
Lake Park, MN 56554-
hhundt@earthlink.net
(218) 532-2670

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:32:42 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rod Faint
715 4th St S
Stillwater, MN 55082-
custodialman@hotmail.com
(651) 439-0298

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:33:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nora Hanson
811 Zumbro Dr NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
nordog4@yahoo.com
(507) 990-6651

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:34:01 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sue Halligan
1190 Schooner Way
Woodbury, MN 55125-
tokyosue@yahoo.com
(651) 111-1111

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:34:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carole Strelow
444 14th Ave N
South St Paul, MN 55075-
cstrelow@gmail.com
(612) 237-9971

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:34:42 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brendan Ashby
2601 3rd Ave W
Hibbing, MN 55746-
blashby3@gmail.com
(218) 262-5313

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:36:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bush
4941 Dupont Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55430-
lzbush407@gmail.com
(612) 203-5130

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:36:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Weber
2925 Monterey Ave
St Louis Park, MN 55416-
lindawm1951@gmail.com
(612) 598-3949

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:37:01 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kari Miller
626 3rd Ave NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
keithkari@msn.com
(612) 371-7272

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:37:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Ward
2121 Scudder St
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
familyjanet@yahoo.com
(651) 644-6449

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:37:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William Bracey
16600 Lehn U Trl NW
Brandon, MN 56315-
braceywilliam@hotmail.com
(555) 555-5555

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:37:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bob Bartlett
5080 Silver Lake Rd NW
Saint Paul, MN 55112-
lostbob52003@yahoo.com
(763) 784-2595

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:37:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gordon Kircher
1370 Quant Ave S
Lakeland, MN 55043-
gorkirch@aol.com
(651) 436-6333

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:38:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tracy Napp
4015 74th St SE
Clear Lake, MN 55319-
tenapp@mac.com
(320) 420-1339

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:38:54 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

Enbridge should have to establish an "escrow" account that would guarantee they would have to be 100% responsible for any cleanup costs associated with a spill--which everyone knows will eventually happen. After all, if they are getting all the profits from these pipelines, they should bear all the costs of the inevitable disaster(s). Taxpayers should not be on the hook for cleaning up their messes. And Enbridge should have to pay for all environmental damages, as well. No more free rides for these polluters of our natural resources.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jackie Holmbeck
17620 25th Ave N
Plymouth, MN 55447-
jholmbeck11@yahoo.com
(763) 449-0219

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:38:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nan Corliss
10300 Morris Rd
Bloomington, MN 55437-
ncorliss41@aol.com
(952) 835-6832

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:39:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terry Bragg
6803 Willow Rd
Virginia, MN 55792-
tbbsmn@yahoo.com
(218) 741-8096

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:39:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jerry Giefer
1252 2nd Ave N
Windom, MN 56101-
jrbergie@windomnet.com
(507) 831-1316

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:39:52 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynda Pauling
5812 Olene Ave N
Oak Park Heights, MN 55082-
Imp5812@comcast.net
(651) 351-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:41:54 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Actually this is stupid - a proverbial accident waiting to happen. The same amount of monies should be invested in clean energy. Oh I know, how about releasing from prison and psychiatric wards inventors of clean energy - that would be a good start. Scratch all pipelines and offshore drilling. Sticking with the summit meeting agreements on global warming, only alternative energy systems need to be investigated and put into place from here on out. Otherwise, go back to the planet you came from and get outa here. thx

Sincerely,

Siela Siela
1315 10th Ave SE
Saint Cloud, MN 56304-
siela@email.com
(320) 555-5555

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:41:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Thank you for reading my letter.

Sincerely,

Nancy Robinson
15720 Rockford Rd Apt 303
Minneapolis, MN 55446-
narobi@comcast.net
(763) 494-4606

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:42:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Missy Weldy
4631 Harriet Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
missy.weldy@gmail.com
(952) 451-3061

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:42:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sandra Sprattler
20450 Kensfield Trl
Lakeville, MN 55044-
sandysprattler@gmail.com
(612) 296-1851

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:44:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a totally transparent, rigorous and environmentally driven not just economically driven scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

R Limoges
701 Southwaite Ct
Redwood Falls, MN 56283-
robynne@pwa-cr.com
(507) 637-2641

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:44:54 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melvin Strand
13342 382nd Ave
Waseca, MN 56093-
mstrand1936@gmail.com
(507) 835-2207

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:46:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Denny Thorson
17230 Driscoll St NW
Ramsey, MN 55303-
dennythorson@msn.com
(763) 441-2439

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:47:05 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ellen Hoyt
5309 France Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
eh333@msn.com
(612) 922-2199

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:47:15 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Crowley
7275 165th St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
crowleyk1147@gmail.com
(651) 276-7442

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:47:34 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jon Lee
4604 W 39th St
Minneapolis, MN 55416-
jonlee4604@msn.com
(952) 929-2069

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:47:45 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Bell-Brugger
5207 Humboldt Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
buggipps@yahoo.com
(612) 822-4013

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:48:16 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bryan Winget
895 Howell St N
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
bwinget@scalesadvertising.com
(651) 592-3260

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:48:47 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Peterson
3715 Bass Lake Rd
Minneapolis, MN 55429-
stvnpeterson536@yahoo.com
(612) 309-5046

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:49:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paula Kwakenat
7301 W 101st St Apt 112
Bloomington, MN 55438-
pj.kwakenat@gmail.com
(952) 944-0638

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:49:34 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melissa Jarvis
10717 France Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431-
mare6red@yahoo.com
(952) 346-9503

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:50:16 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Myron Thornberry
1369 Spruce Pl Apt 1804
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
myronthornberry@gmail.com
(234) 567-8910

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:50:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

George Muellner
1304 W Medicine Lake Dr Apt 305
Minneapolis, MN 55441-
gmuellner@presenter.com
(763) 544-9372

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:52:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jo Ellen Davis
5436 Elliot Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
jedndrh@visi.com
(612) 825-9057

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:53:05 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Huber
4470 Whitetail Way
Eagan, MN 55123-
michaelhub@gmail.com
(612) 708-2937

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:53:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pamela Lyngen
26358 10th Street Cir
Zimmerman, MN 55398-
plyngen25@gmail.com
(612) 747-6223

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:54:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lewis Hotchkiss
10404 Xeon St NW
Coon Rapids, MN 55433-
my.lew.hotchkiss@gmail.com
(763) 354-4835

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:54:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Penny Brown
4819 Azelia Ave N
Brooklyn Center, MN 55429-
penelope.brown@comcast.net
(763) 537-4527

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:54:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mark Johnson
2707 113th Ave NW
Minneapolis, MN 55433-
m.johnson12@q.com
(763) 757-8060

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:55:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susan Imker
309 Elizabeth St SW
Isanti, MN 55040-
susieqsings@hotmail.com
(763) 444-4489

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:56:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Charles Wensman
2841 37th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
charliewensman@gmail.com
(651) 256-3006

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:56:47 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

September Steinolfson
6711 Canterbury Ln
Eden Prairie, MN 55346-
october@usfamily.net
(952) 934-7278

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:57:27 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Martha Baxter
3709 Grand Way Apt 218
St Louis Park, MN 55416-
mhauserbax@gmail.com
(952) 405-8105

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:57:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lori Erickson
1410 5th St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
lerickson@artsmia.org
(612) 870-3034

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:58:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lois Pfluger
1149 Pioneer Rd
Red Wing, MN 55066-
mamabeanface@me.com
(651) 388-5160

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:59:27 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brianna Frisch
395 Williams St
Lewiston, MN 55952-
bri_kruse@hotmail.com
(507) 459-4829

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 4:59:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patrick Divine
5948 Bren Circle
Minnetonka, MN 55343-
pwdivine@gmail.com
(952) 938-2492

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:00:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Thacker
21915 Fairview St
Greenwood, MN 55331-
thack002@umn.edu
(952) 474-5763

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:00:18 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Debbie Meister
1312 Portland Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
dmeister.mmc@gmail.com
(651) 647-6816

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:00:18 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Helen Trepanier
5409 Colfax Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
htrepanier@msn.com
(612) 822-8360

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:00:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Virginia Ruddy
2374 Bourne Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
ginnerruddy@gmail.com
(651) 645-0077

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:00:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Andrew Moritz
2825 Pennsylvania Ave S
Saint Louis Park, MN 55426-
moritz.andrewj@gmail.com
(507) 220-1301

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:01:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Albright
600 18th Ave N Apt 329W
Minneapolis, MN 55411-
lauraann4116@gmail.com
(612) 222-1262

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:01:17 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jim Marsden
1872 Howard St N
Maplewood, MN 55109-
jamesmarsden1130@gmail.com
(651) 777-2190

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:01:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Knuteson
1930 Oak Glen Trl
Stillwater, MN 55082-
emknuteson@gmail.com
(651) 414-1094

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:01:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Brockway
233 Nichols Ct
Shoreview, MN 55126-
bbrock432@comcast.net
(651) 999-9999

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:04:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Darlene Chiles
1437 Fairway Ct
Chaska, MN 55318-
darc10@aol.com
(952) 443-4042

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:04:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gus Kathmann
PO Box 997
Forest Lake, MN 55025-
redeagle999@yahoo.com
(651) 653-1188

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:04:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Hajicek
14824 Glendale Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
hajicek@skypoint.com
(952) 934-4166

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:04:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rachel Pickering
5227 W 139th St
Savage, MN 55378-
rspickeri@gmail.com
(952) 210-0511

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:04:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Amy Grace
722 Everett St S
Stillwater, MN 55082-
amy3grace@gmail.com
(444) 444-4444

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:06:52 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

How much risk to our ground water supplies should we accept to transport a climate-changing carbon energy source across our state? Wouldn't it make more sense to invest our limited resources into faster development of alternative energy sources and storage?

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Bardell
2333 Parkwoods Rd
Saint Louis Park, MN 55416-
tbardell@earthlink.net
(952) 807-6690

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:07:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kate Crowley
82119 Bennett Rd
Willow River, MN 55795-
ravenkate49@hotmail.com
(612) 703-2849

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:07:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cari Wright
1330 8th Ave
Two Harbors, MN 55616-
thehappyCrystalshop@gmail.com
(218) 834-0831

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:07:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Vivian Brown
2908 Southbrook Dr
Bloomington, MN 55431-
vbrown@monkeybridge.com
(952) 888-4139

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:07:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Pouliot
2157 Overlook Dr
Bloomington, MN 55431-
tmjpouliot@gmail.com
(952) 884-5785

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:10:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Stevens
2283 Amanisoti Dr
Carlton, MN 55718-
timstevens218@gmail.com
(218) 879-0227

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:10:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lorilea And Otmar Klimek
4145 137th St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
lorileakl@gmail.com
(651) 322-4902

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:10:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laurie Kittelson
6315 Paris Ave N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
norseaurora@yahoo.com
(651) 492-3626

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:13:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Amy Baker
210 Quill St NE
Kimball, MN 55353-
abaker@meltel.net
(320) 398-6113

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:13:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gregory Johnson
2089 Lake Hattie Dr SW
Backus, MN 56435-
gmjohns@tds.net
(218) 587-4014

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:14:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wendy McCormick
3212 Longfellow Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
mccor005270@me.com
(612) 724-4296

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:14:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Kahler
PO Box 326
Lonsdale, MN 55046-
kahlerkathleen@ymail.com
X

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:15:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Denise Thomas
100 Imperial Dr W #301
West St Paul, MN 55118-
denijthom2@gmail.com
6513401407

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:16:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen B.
133 34th Ave N
Saint Cloud, MN 56303-
keb133@hotmail.com
(320) 253-5974

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:17:11 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barb Wiebesick
24164 200th St
Nevis, MN 56467-
sunhands@arvig.net
(000) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:17:23 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kristina Anderson
5605 180th Ave NW
Ramsey, MN 55303-
kristinaanderson80@gmail.com
(763) 772-5784

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:17:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terri Reischl
1958 Florence St
White Bear Lake, MN 55110-
tarotbyterri@yahoo.com
(612) 715-7125

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:18:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathy Koch
3612 17th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
kchaz52@gmail.com
(612) 721-2327

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:18:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bernard Grisez
1063 Westcliff Curv
Shoreview, MN 55126-
bgzr42@mnmicro.net
(651) 766-2544

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:20:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shred Moyer
3310 69th St E
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-
shredbetty70@gmail.com
(651) 552-7148

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:22:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dan Dixon, Sr.
5055 Norman Dr
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
ddixon@invitationsforless.com
(952) 937-2893

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:23:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alan Phyllis
9301 Ryden Rd
Grand Portage, MN 55605-
abphyllis@yahoo.ca
(218) 475-6301

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:23:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

T Mo
3310 69th St E
IGH, MN 55076-
shredbetty70@gmail.com
(651) 552-7148

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:23:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

T Mo
3310 69th St E
IGH, MN 55076-
shredbetty70@gmail.com
(651) 552-7148

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:23:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Randall Lyken
1736 Southbrook Ln
Wadena, MN 56482-
hummingbirdrandy@gmail.com
(218) 639-3888

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:24:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomasin Ringler
196 Page St W
Saint Paul, MN 55107-
tamsie@spiritone.com
(651) 699-2756

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:24:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Bahr
5234 Girard Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
mbahr54@hotmail.com
(651) 329-1785

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:24:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Bangerter
4481 Churchill St
St. Paul, MN 55126-
gabangerter@gmail.com
(651) 483-8990

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:26:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Norma Halvorson
2875 26th Street Cir S
Moorhead, MN 56560-
halvorson.norma@mygait.com
(218) 236-5601

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:27:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scot Kindschi
110 E Redwood St
Marshall, MN 56258-
scotkindschi@scotkindschi.com
(507) 401-0530

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:29:54 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

How is it we're losing light rail, which we need, but are getting an oil pipeline that we don't need and don't want?

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jerry Kahlert
900 Robert St S Apt 110
West Saint Paul, MN 55118-
jerrykmn@gmail.com
(612) 839-0725

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:30:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Candyce Stout
981 Winterberry Dr
Woodbury, MN 55125-
csstout@comcast.net
(651) 731-9153

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:31:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lystig
1741 Sartell Ave
Eagan, MN 55122-
markbeckylystig@comcast.net
(651) 452-1133

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:31:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steve Elvester
7785 214th St N
Forest Lake, MN 55025-
steve@elvester.com
1114512346

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:32:47 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Harriet McCleary
2440 Stevens Ave Apt 2
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
mccleary@stolaf.edu
(612) 870-7332

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:36:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shannon Kielblock
9021 Portland Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55420-
shannonkielblock@gmail.com
(507) 360-4384

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:37:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Abbott
715 Liberty Ct
Stillwater, MN 55082-
johnkabbott@comcast.net
(651) 439-2097

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:39:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William Faber
501 W College Dr
Brainerd, MN 56401-
wfaber@clcmn.edu
(218) 855-8000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:40:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kay Randall
520 32nd Ave S Apt 109
Moorhead, MN 56560-
kmandall64@gmail.com
(218) 331-8793

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:41:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

We need to move toward clean energy and away from fossil fuels.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Mccolley
10615 Grey Cloud Island Dr S
St Paul Park, MN 55071-
cmccolley@comcast.net
(651) 592-1189

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:41:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christopher Kornmann
1735 Van Buren Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
chris@spitandimage.net
(718) 798-2862

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:44:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mina Blyly-Strauss
3425 Blaisdell Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
digitalmyths@aol.com
(612) 827-6706

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:45:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Bartell
3204 18th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
scottbartellsw@earthlink.net
(612) 721-6495

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:45:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barry Peterson
1700 W 84th St
Bloomington, MN 55431-
bpete1225@yahoo.com
(952) 884-1264

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:45:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.
Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Jobe
12991 32nd St S
Afton, MN 55001-
susanjobe@comcast.net
(651) 436-5387

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:47:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ruth Maples
4390 Brook Ave S
Edina, MN 55424-
ruthkm44@hotmail.com
(612) 555-1212

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:47:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christopher Kornmann
1735 Van Buren Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
chris@spitandimage.net
(718) 798-2862

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:48:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bryan Kaufmann
19020 Ironriver Trl
Lakeville, MN 55044-
kaufmann.bryans@gmail.com
999999999

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:49:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Neville
11742 Mount Curve Rd
Eden Prairie, MN 55347-
janeville@comcast.net
(952) 903-9682

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:49:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marcia Jacobs
1520 Koester Ct Apt 56
Northfield, MN 55057-
mjacobs1939@gmail.com
(507) 301-3160

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:49:48 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terri Henry
30817 County 2 Blvd
Red Wing, MN 55066-
territude001@gmail.com
(651) 388-2089

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:51:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

Additionally, my wife and I own a year-round vacation home on Big Sandy Lake, one of five Headwaters reservoirs of the Mississippi, whose watershed Enbridge's Sandpiper pipeline will cross. That watershed encompasses upwards of 260 square miles, most of which are very remote wetlands. Should that pipeline leak while crossing those wetlands, irreparable harm would be done to the watershed well before that leak would be detected; let alone stopped. In that event, our property, as well as every other vacation property on the lake would be worthless. Such a disaster would decimate the economy and all property tax based social services of all of Aitkin County, already one of the poorest counties in Minnesota. This decimation would include all the local school districts, which already serve a very low income population. So the stakes are not just Enbridge vs. a bunch of tree huggers. By the way, our equity in our vacation property is also our Assisted Living/Nursing Home annuity, so such an environmental disaster would be an economic disaster for us, as well.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bruce Watson
1683 120th Ln NE
Minneapolis, MN 55449-
selinwat@yahoo.com
(763) 755-6526

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:51:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

Additionally, my wife and I own a year-round vacation home on Big Sandy Lake, one of five Headwaters reservoirs of the Mississippi, whose watershed Enbridge's Sandpiper pipeline will cross. That watershed encompasses upwards of 260 square miles, most of which are very remote wetlands. Should that pipeline leak while crossing those wetlands, irreparable harm would be done to the watershed well before that leak would be detected; let alone stopped. In that event, our property, as well as every other vacation property on the lake would be worthless. Such a disaster would decimate the economy and all property tax based social services of all of Aitkin County, already one of the poorest counties in Minnesota. This decimation would include all the local school districts, which already serve a very low income population. So the stakes are not just Enbridge vs. a bunch of tree huggers. By the way, our equity in our vacation property is also our Assisted Living/Nursing Home annuity, so such an environmental disaster would be an economic disaster for us, as well.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bruce Watson
1683 120th Ln NE
Minneapolis, MN 55449-
selinwat@yahoo.com
(763) 755-6526

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:52:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ivan Zenker
5698 King Arthur Rd NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
iczenker@hotmail.com
(651) 485-2492

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:52:48 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Brown
1389 Goodrich Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
tomaso0308@gmail.com
(651) 402-0495

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:52:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Landherr
7740 W Highway 61
Schroeder, MN 55613-
ljl71504@gmail.com
(218) 235-8205

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:54:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marylyn Irrgang
170 Good Counsel Dr
Mankato, MN 56001-
mirrgang@juno.com
(507) 389-4200

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:55:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jean Ross
3624 Bryant Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55409-
jfross@umn.edu
(612) 824-2080

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:56:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate. The thought of the thought of an oil spill in Minnesota is stomach turning. These multi-national corporations are not to be trusted. We've seen their duplicity around the country and their lack of transparency and responsibility for clean-up. In fact, they often declare bankruptcy leaving tax-payers to foot the bill. I am also concerned that these pipelines are deliberately built to fail with inferior materials, and run through particularly sensitive environmental areas affecting aquifers, ground water, wetlands and drinking water. Why would we sacrifice the irreplaceable, for some corporation's bottom line at the expense of our own citizens? I feel the same way about the Poly-Met mining proposal, spearheaded by the illustrious Tony Hayward of the BP oil spill in the gulf. I resoundingly support Gov. Dayton's efforts to safeguard the water of Minnesota for future generations. Thank you for accepting my comment.

Sincerely,

Donna Anderson
10211 Cedar Lake Rd Apt 209
Hopkins, MN 55305-
doeanders@yahoo.com
(952) 593-0528

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:58:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Maggi
18755 Cassie Ln
Pine City, MN 55063-
jandkmaggi@gmail.com
(763) 280-9483

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:58:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Maggi
18755 Cassie Ln
Pine City, MN 55063-
jandkmaggi@gmail.com
(763) 280-9483

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:58:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Darcel Kashmark
2215 6th St S
Moorhead, MN 56560-
catnipkash@midco.net
(218) 284-6278

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 5:58:52 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Darcy Bergh
1121 Hallam Ave N
Saint Paul, MN 55115-
darcybergh@gmail.com
(651) 111-1111

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:00:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sarah Seufert
2015 24th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
sssarhh@yahoo.com
(612) 338-0951

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:01:05 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Katherine Loban
4772 Oak Dr
Moose Lake, MN 55767-
kgtloban@mediacombb.net
(218) 485-8777

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:02:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Viacrucis
3002 17th St S Apt 206
Moorhead, MN 56560-
catchaway@yahoo.com
(218) 233-9266

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:03:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gary Patton
3408 Staghorn Dr
Fort Ripley, MN 56449-
patt4797@go.clcmn.edu
(218) 831-2333

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:05:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Deborah Webster
2298 Snowshoe Ln E
Maplewood, MN 55119-
harobed01@hotmail.com
(651) 231-1134

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:08:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Annette Grossmann
1504 127th Ln NE
Blaine, MN 55449-
amgjasper@yahoo.com
(612) 670-4358

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:08:47 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Dokken
4201 Parklawn Ave Apt 301
Edina, MN 55435-
bettydokken@msn.com
(952) 897-1122

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:09:23 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Lundgren
4107 Abbott Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
tom55410@gmail.com
(612) 929-7607

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:10:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I live a mile downstream of an Enbridge pipeline within the Headwaters State Forest. I know these wetlands very well, having traversed them by canoe and ski for thirty years. And I am certain that even a relatively minor spill will do them irreparable damage, as well as destroying my life here. The proposed Sandpiper line poses an even greater risk. It is criminally irresponsible to allow any of these to be maintained, much less expanded.

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kyle Crocker
806 Balsam Ridge Rd NW
Bemidji, MN 56601-
kcrocker@paulbunyan.net
(218) 444-2589

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:12:54 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Art Wilkinson
830 Winthrop St S
Saint Paul, MN 55119-
aawilkinson@prodigy.net
(111) 111-1111

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:13:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Faith Williamson
8464 Cortland Rd
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-
fswilliamson@comcast.net
(612) 644-8533

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:13:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Doris Bandel
1574 Cohansey St Apt 101
Saint Paul, MN 55117-
debandel39@comcast.net
(651) 206-1794

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:14:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jerry Larson
1246 McAndrews Rd E
Burnsville, MN 55337-
greydeck@yahoo.com
(952) 303-4869

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:20:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lisa Goodlander
2323 Windsor Ln
Woodbury, MN 55125-
lisa.goodlander@comcast.net
(651) 224-3348

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:21:05 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Arlene Kelly
1532 Christensen Ave
West Saint Paul, MN 55118-
akelly1532@gmail.com
(651) 253-2638

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:21:45 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John and Barbara Mccashin
224 Kings Pointe Dr
Delano, MN 55328-
johnnybj40@aol.com
(763) 972-6680

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:22:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Court
1216 Powderhorn Ter Apt 13
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
janet_court@hotmail.com
(612) 721-9284

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:23:15 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Spencer
315 N Lake Ave Apt 229
Duluth, MN 55806-
kaspencer2@yahoo.com
(218) 722-3889

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:23:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Bishop
807 Lake Ridge Dr
Woodbury, MN 55129-
czybishop@gmail.com
(651) 337-8177

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:24:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Matthew Butler
133 E Chapman St
Ely, MN 55731-
mbutler0007@gmail.com
(307) 200-9494

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:24:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Javinsky
2319 Flag Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55426-
bethkie@juno.com
(952) 545-0488

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:24:46 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynn Levine
1941 Ewing Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55416-
lynnlevine4parks@yahoo.com
(612) 920-8991

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:26:46 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Lambert
2708 Gerald Ave
North Saint Paul, MN 55109-
lambrt_1@yahoo.com
(651) 777-5288

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:26:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynn Fuller
3100 43rd Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
lynmkent@yahoo.com
(612) 722-1882

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:26:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christine Higgins
3700 38th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
christine3724@gmail.com
(612) 721-7127

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:27:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dawn Baker
4708 Oakland Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
baker072@umn.edu
(612) 824-4755

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:28:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gary Barum
563 Hamilton St
Winona, MN 55987-
gvbarum@hbc.com
(558) 452-5242

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:28:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ginger Koerner
611 27th St NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
kgjkhkoerner@hotmail.com
(507) 282-9180

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:29:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

We better start looking at what makes Minnesota so great: our woods and waters. We enjoy fishing, hunting, camping, boating, etc. Let's not forget our greatest assets, our beautiful lakes and woods, assets that we can't replace if they are contaminated for the sake of money!

Sincerely,

Nancy Root
35 SW 4th St
Grand Rapids, MN 55744-
nancy@danroot.com
(000) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:29:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Hayes
5631 Emerson Ave N
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430-
lindahayes92@yahoo.com
(763) 503-3494

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:30:07 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jerry Klemm
4905 217th St N
Forest Lake, MN 55025-
kbzeroohi@usfamily.net
(651) 464-8426

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:30:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michelle Van Engen
46 Walden St
Burnsville, MN 55337-
michelle.vanengen@gmail.com
(555) 555-5555

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:31:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jinger Pulkrabek
6035 Candace Ave
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-
jnpul@hotmail.com
000000000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:32:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jodi Peterson
9508 Russell Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431-
jodip@q.com
(651) 334-3857

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:32:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pamela Kae Novotny
4401 Dodge St
Duluth, MN 55804-
hypatiarocks@gmail.com
(218) 310-2643

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:33:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John And Jean Fleming
21364 Hytrail Cir
Lakeville, MN 55044-
johnandjeanfleming@msn.com
(952) 236-8594

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:37:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Natalie Graham
8123 Cleveland St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55432-
natalierae@gmail.com
(651) 644-8675

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:38:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Roue
35252 260th Ave
Erhard, MN 56534-
daveroue48@gmail.com
(218) 842-5122

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:38:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Monte Gomke
2914 Greysolon Rd
Duluth, MN 55812-
duluthian@hotmail.com
(218) 343-4593

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:40:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

June Stuhr
3033 46th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
jstuhr@mac.com
(612) 788-5322

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:41:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kate Bohn
7000 149th Ln NW
Ramsey, MN 55303-
seressia@hotmail.com
(763) 843-2646

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:44:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

The headwaters of the Mississippi, as well as some inaccessible peat lands, would be at risk if the Enbridge pipeline were allowed to proceed. All pipelines leak eventually, and this is fragile land and water. For these reasons, I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Milton Ulmer
7244 Eldorado Way
Cannon Falls, MN 55009-
aulmer@carleton.edu
(507) 263-5718

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:45:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William And Carol Steele
21950 County Road 445
Bovey, MN 55709-
bill.steele@isp.com
(218) 247-0245

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:45:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Bennett
3544 4th St NW
Backus, MN 56435-
camelot@uslink.net
(218) 947-3632

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:49:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patricia Thielman
5561 Fairhill Dr SE
Buffalo, MN 55313-
fairhilldesigns@msn.com
(763) 477-6575

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:51:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Teyannie Gill
1600 Pullman Ave
St Paul Park, MN 55071-
makeupgoddess76@gmail.com
(651) 204-6495

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:51:23 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wendy Peardot
4500 Southmore Dr
Minneapolis, MN 55437-
wendypeardot@earthlink.net
(952) 922-2021

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:51:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Oil spills in Minnesota would be disastrous for our beautiful state parks, thousands of lakes, rivers, and waterways. Keep Minnesota beautiful. No pipelines

Sincerely,

Kathryn Null
6125 4th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
kathryn.null@gmail.com
(612) 910-6399

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:51:42 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Roberta Haskin
9641 Vincent Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55431-
roberta.haskin@gmail.com
(952) 836-6586

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:53:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Faith Bremmer
728 W Maple Ave
Fergus Falls, MN 56537-
fbremmer@live.com
(218) 739-4322

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:54:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jo Ann Brunner
2219 15th Ave NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
joannb72@gmail.com
(507) 529-7910

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:55:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bob Walker
6109 9th St N
Oakdale, MN 55128-
breezly@hotmail.com
(651) 233-7584

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:56:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gail Frethem
5241 10th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
gailywaily.frethem@gmail.com
(612) 823-6633

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:57:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bob Munneke
PO Box 197
Aitkin, MN 56431-
dmunneke@embarqmail.com
(218) 927-3615

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 6:58:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Catherine Harrison
12800 Marion Ln W
Hopkins, MN 55305-
cncharrison@hotmail.com
(000) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:00:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Becker
2000 County Road B2 W Unit 130655
Roseville, MN 55113-
ja.becker@comcast.net
(122) 345-6789

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:02:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cecilia Fogarty
4211 156th St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
cgmfogarty@gmail.com
(612) 387-7186

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:05:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jon Bradley Hochalter
820 4th St N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
bradhochalter@comcast.net
(651) 323-0876

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:05:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynda Haemig
7161 Riverview Ter NE
Minneapolis, MN 55432-
lyndaandy@centurylink.net
(763) 572-8955

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:06:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lois Kennel
211 2nd St NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
loiskennel@gmail.com
(507) 288-0984

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:08:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marcia Allard
9243 Narcissus Rd
Saint Joseph, MN 56374-
marciaallard@aol.com
(320) 363-7287

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:10:15 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Vicki Andrews
31135 Sunny Beach Rd
Grand Rapids, MN 55744-
vicandr@mchsi.com
(218) 259-4254

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:10:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Clayton Sankey
6484 Kings Dr
Oakdale, MN 55128-
clay.sankey@gmail.com
(651) 770-0355

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:10:34 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Misty Schmidt
508 7th St SE
Royalton, MN 56373-
schidtm83@gmail.com
(612) 353-7653

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:10:56 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kristie Mandel
10705 40th Ave N
Plymouth, MN 55441-
riskri@hotmail.com
(310) 484-6299

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:11:07 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mick Dhein
7233 Oak Grove Blvd
Richfield, MN 55423-
mickdhein@comcast.net
(612) 597-9956

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:11:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susan Clark
5898 N Pike Lake Rd
Duluth, MN 55811-
moosecookies85@gmail.com
(218) 428-7632

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:13:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

J Schwendeman
1414 Linden St W
Stillwater, MN 55082-
schwendemn@aol.com
(651) 342-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:14:12 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Aaron Tank
2319 W 10th St
Duluth, MN 55806-
newleaf586@yahoo.com
(218) 760-1599

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:14:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Theresa Terhark
2227 German St
Maplewood, MN 55109-
tterhark@msn.com
(651) 337-0189

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:14:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alva Pingel
13894 Birchwood Ave
Rosemount, MN 55068-
afping3@charter.net
(651) 332-2138

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:18:46 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jo-Ann Sramek
4882 Woodridge Dr
Hermantown, MN 55811-
jjp7766@gmail.com
(218) 729-5865

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:19:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Erik And Dee Voldal
3409 Woodstone Dr SW
Rochester, MN 55902-
evoldal@msn.com
(507) 285-1658

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:22:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rita Caruso Santamaria
1645 Hazelwood St
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
rcwhitgr@smumn.edu
(651) 771-2942

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:24:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Ondich
3137 Emerson Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
david.ondich@gmail.com
(612) 824-9812

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:24:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Doris Petrie
18007 Saint Croix Trl N
Marine On Saint Croix, MN 55047-
dorispetrie@gmail.com
(651) 433-3565

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:25:01 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kristi Kort
939 Juno Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55102-
peace_reaper@hotmail.com
(612) 245-2222

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:25:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alec Hendrickson
3219 W 44th St
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
godzillavkk@mac.com
6212-377-5760

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:29:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Medbery
1313 Owens St N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
jmedbery@comcast.net
(651) 342-8999

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:29:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Mittelstaedt
110945 Von Herten Cir
Chaska, MN 55318-
tommvinyl@yahoo.com
(952) 368-6065

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:31:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Don Hon
3135 Arthur St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55418-
dphon4@aol.com
(612) 782-9255

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:31:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Emily Leisenheimer
13151 Hillview Ln
Little Falls, MN 56345-
emleisen@yahoo.com
(320) 360-1122

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:33:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Thomborson
3199 Humboldt Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
bt@bt.gen.nz
(649) 817-1234

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:33:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Russell Hankins
4445 Banbury Ln
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
rhankins@earthlink.net
(952) 933-2195

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:34:18 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brett Smith
5300 Irving Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
smithb55419@yahoo.com
(612) 920-9569

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:35:01 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Beth Olson
5664 Sanibel Dr
Minnetonka, MN 55343-
bolson11@comcast.net
(952) 938-1604

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:36:34 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Johnson
1131 Lecuyer Ct
Stillwater, MN 55082-
bajcjohnson@comcast.net
(651) 430-1155

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:37:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Pipelines leak, are dirty and they are the part of the technology that we need to shut down in order to save our planet from climate change. We know that carbon pollution is threatening the survival of our species so why can't we bite the bullet and invest in solar and wind energy instead? I expect leaders to lead--not just rubber stamp what the fossil fuel industry wants. Let's advocate for ourselves instead of corporate profits and SAY NO to these dirty pipelines. This is Minnesota and we shouldn't have to risk our environment for dirty tar sands oil from Canada. Vote against these pipeline to keep Northern Minnesota from being the next catastrophic oil spill location. Keep Minnesota Pristine! Say NO to Sandpiper Line 3 and ALL Pipelines!

Sincerely,

Linda Rolf
1900 1st Ave S Apt 26
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
lindarolf@hotmail.com
(612) 419-3716

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:38:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Daniel Hulse
16206 Creekwood Cir
Prior Lake, MN 55372-
dhulse@integraonline.com
(952) 913-3712

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:40:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shirley Espeland
2250 Luther Place
St. Paul, MN 55108-
slsesp84@gmail.com
(651) 646-8971

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:41:11 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Stu Farnsworth
1646 Donald Ct
Eagan, MN 55121-
yukostu@gmail.com
(045) 507-6027

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:41:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Thompson
1370 White Lake Dr
Duluth, MN 55803-
thomasthompson@frontier.com
(218) 848-8031

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:41:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Andrea Norusis
466 Preserve Path
Saint Paul, MN 55118-
anorusis@yahoo.com
(651) 457-6777

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:42:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Margie Schmidt
23319 Lofton Ave N
Scandia, MN 55073-
madierschmidt@comcast.net
(651) 323-8651

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:42:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jo Sanders
2662 Scotland Ct Apt 305
Mounds View, MN 55112-
jo.sanders03@gmail.com
(763) 780-6057

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:44:42 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Klea Brewton
627 S 7th St
Saint Peter, MN 56082-
kleabf@hickorytech.net
(507) 243-3022

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:48:01 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Assata Brown
1659 Sheridan Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411-
her1@hotmail.com
(612) 522-4534

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:52:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Simmonds
1455 Almond Ave Apt 324
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
barbarasimmonds@bmsreiki.com
(651) 236-0012

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:53:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brittany Nelson
8731 Woodlawn Dr
Rockford, MN 55373-
brlnelson1987@aol.com
(763) 438-6544

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 7:58:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Beth Muetzel
17816 602nd Ave
Mankato, MN 56001-
dian@hickorytech.net
1111111111

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:00:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Erika Eberhardt
420 Leicester Ave
Duluth, MN 55803-
erikaeb@earthlink.net
(218) 724-2958

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:01:16 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim King
15261 County 38
Long Prairie, MN 56347-
tyjking49@centurylink.net
(320) 732-4500

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:04:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joanne Sieck
5877 River Ridge Ct NE
Rochester, MN 55906-
jpsieck@gmail.com
(507) 280-7507

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:04:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate. After signing the Paris Agreement, we need to end fossil fuels and do renewables.

Sincerely,

Bruce Eng
208 Alpine Rdg
Wabasha, MN 55981-
tillie81@hbc.com
(651) 565-4468

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:06:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judith Moore
1430 Independence Ave S
Saint Louis Park, MN 55426-
moore.judith@uwalumni.com
(952) 541-9482

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:06:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judy Peterson
581 Atlantic Hill Dr
Eagan, MN 55123-
judyp@excelcov.org
(651) 454-8035

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:09:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Abby Dahlquist
545 Lynn Rd SW
Hutchinson, MN 55350-
asd@mchsi.com
(320) 587-9610

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:12:04 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Martin
7144 10th Ave S
Richfield, MN 55423-
pzambert@gmail.com
(000) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:12:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bright Dornblaser
4630 Drexel Ave
Edina, MN 55424-
dornb001@umn.edu
(952) 920-1281

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:15:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Paul Roy
3235 40th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
jpack9@usewireless.com
(612) 729-3436

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:16:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Carlson
45403 150th St
Roseau, MN 56751-
carolc@wikel.com
111-111-1111

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:18:01 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Hartman
2116 16th St SE
Austin, MN 55912-
tombirdmanusa@q.com
(507) 206-9169

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:19:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ed Marek
5676 Upper 136th Street Ct W
Saint Paul, MN 55124-
khangee1@yahoo.com
(952) 432-2489

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:19:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wendy Haan
3824 47th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
wenderful73@yahoo.com
(612) 709-8223

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:20:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dan Ireland
1975 Selby Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
danireland46@gmail.com
(651) 647-0074

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:20:46 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Spitzer
6129 Morgan Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
callmebwana@gmail.com
(612) 226-2866

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:23:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Matthew McDonough
3109 Columbus Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
mttmcdonough@gmail.com
(612) 298-5131

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:25:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alyssa Hall
829 Stewart St
North Mankato, MN 56003-
albrown31@hotmail.com
(507) 381-7563

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:30:07 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Mills
9 N Yukon Dr
Ely, MN 55731-
scottwmills@frontiernet.net
(218) 365-4322

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:34:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Liisa Welch
10155 Greenbrier Rd Apt 306
Hopkins, MN 55305-
irisluk12@gmail.com
No phone

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:37:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Eileen Levin
5379 Beachside Dr
Minnetonka, MN 55343-
leenlev@q.com
(952) 933-7526

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:40:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Wissinger
951 Nason Hill Rd N
Marine on Saint Croix, MN 55047-
julieww951@gmail.com
(651) 433-4324

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:41:04 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Hello and Hashtag,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brian Wilferson
3215 Harbor Ln N
Plymouth, MN 55447-
stinkerbw@hotmail.com
(952) 154-7896

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:43:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paula Crown
1191 California Dr Apt 201
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
panncorona@gmail.com
(651) 262-3101

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:44:52 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Elko, MS, PA-C
267 Roma Ave
Roseville, MN 55113-
stephanie.elko@gmail.com
(612) 236-7396

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:47:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pierre Piper
4301 Park Glen Rd Apt 325
St Louis Park, MN 55416-
piperpierre@yahoo.com
(612) 462-3461

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:47:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susanne Wollman
2847 Zarthan Ave S
St Louis Park, MN 55416-
sjw2847@gmail.com
(952) 915-1779

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:49:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judi Toftner
5137 44th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
jbtoft1@msn.com
(612) 824-6799

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:49:15 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terry Ford
3404 Aldrich Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
tahomes@comcast.net
(612) 803-1559

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:49:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Andrew Larson
3072 River Falls Ct NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
andrew_larson125@email.com
(507) 202-0372

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:50:34 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Rue
15230 Buchanan Ct
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-
catcaroldog@gmail.com
(952) 934-9945

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:52:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lyn Pegg
1335 Minnesota Ave
Duluth, MN 55802-
carolynpegg@yahoo.com
(218) 348-3048

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:52:45 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Roxana Allen
2384 Highway 83
Zim, MN 55738-
roxanaallen@gmail.com
(218) 744-0591

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:53:45 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kate Havelin
2028 Ashland Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
katehavelin@gmail.com
(651) 642-1242

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:57:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Postance
7398 Highway 29
Meadowlands, MN 55765-
postance@frontiernet.net
(218) 427-2564

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 8:57:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wendy Paul
779 County 5 NW
Hackensack, MN 56452-
wlpwomanlake@yahoo.com
(218) 682-3124

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:01:38 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alyssa Filipkowski
8108 242nd Ave NE
Stacy, MN 55079-
alyssafilipkowski@yahoo.com
1234567890

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:02:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Johnson
28311 County 93
Laporte, MN 56461-
karndave@paulbunyan.net
(218) 224-2710

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:04:17 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Martin Bisek
27865 Lavonne Ave
New Prague, MN 56071-
martintbisek@gmail.com
(952) 913-4087

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:06:48 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Impila
15 9 1/2 St NE
Chisholm, MN 55719-
telltale_tim@yahoo.com
(218) 969-8559

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:09:46 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gary Fifield
1893 Berkeley Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
garyfifield@comcast.net
(600) 695-1065

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:09:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michele Granse
462 Brainerd Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55130-
mlgranse@msn.com
(251) 654-7932

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:11:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pat Mcpeak
1008 Goodrich Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
pmcpeak@hotmail.com
(651) 792-5316

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:16:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tara Mcnaughton
2025 30th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
taramcn@mninter.net
(612) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:17:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mark Thompson
4782 Sycamore Trl
Maple Plain, MN 55359-
hybridmcgee@hotmail.com
(612) 910-2566

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:18:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Devriendt
1016 Macarthur Ave
West St Paul, MN 55118-
ldevriendt@comcast.net
(651) 451-1741

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:19:05 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dianne Hudson
93 E 4th St Apt 308
Zumbrota, MN 55992-
dianne.hudson01@gmail.com
(320) 291-8645

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:19:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Selz
220 Northland Ave
Stillwater, MN 55082-
kselz@comcast.net
(612) 743-8705

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:19:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Stottlemyer
1455 Arden View Dr
Arden Hills, MN 55112-
stott003@live.com
(222) 222-2222

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:22:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Daniel Bembenek
748 36 1/2 Ave NE
Minneapolis, MN 55418-
dbk3@live.com
(612) 788-8274

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:22:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brian Krysinski
302 Cedar Lake Rd S # 1
Minneapolis, MN 55405-
briankrys@gmail.com
(612) 374-4269

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:23:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Hilgemann
676 Ashland Ave Apt 12
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
jameshilgemann@msn.com
(651) 298-1396

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:25:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate. P.S. Enbridge is owned at least in part by the Koch Brothers:(

Sincerely,

LK Woodruff
2884 138th St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
lkw777@charter.net
(651) 295-0935

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:25:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Ross
11840 Falls Trl
Lonsdale, MN 55046-
suzanne.ross2006@hotmail.com
(612) 756-0232

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:26:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Molly Rosa
3616 18th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
mollysrosa@gmail.com
(952) 465-6306

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:32:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Zachary Pera Cole
3522 Newton Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55412-
zachary-peracole@pkt.qsi.org
(612) 588-7042

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:32:27 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gilbert Woods
3301 14th St S Apt 108
Moorhead, MN 56560-
woods2.gbert@yahoo.com
(218) 443-0584

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:33:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marianne Thiry
824 Fairfield Pl NW
Isanti, MN 55040-
mthiry@live.com
(320) 396-3528

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:35:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elanne Palcich
29 5th St SE
Chisholm, MN 55719-
epalcich@cpinternet.com
(218) 254-3754

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:41:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tamara Rakow
14231 Azalea Path
Rosemount, MN 55068-
tamararakow@hotmail.com
(651) 423-0267

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:45:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce;

Please reject the pipeline in favor of renewables. Let nature do it!!!

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Katha Ricciardi
22529 Henderson Rd
Cohasset, MN 55721-
mail4katha@yahoo.com
(340) 201-4440

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:46:45 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Keith Thompson
1544 Minnehaha Ave E
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
kaminsp@usgo.net
(651) 699-3939

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:49:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Dulas
5311 Greenwood Rd
Duluth, MN 55804-
goodbubba@icloud.com
(218) 624-1351

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:50:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ewa Bukaj
1640 Randolph Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
tangodaze@yahoo.com
(805) 669-8075

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:50:34 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Vande Vusse
13960 Kentucky Ave
Savage, MN 55378-
mavandevusse@aol.com
(952) 440-2191

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:51:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Lempp
PO Box 647
Moose Lake, MN 55767-
wallebiz@arcor.de
(711) 887-4845

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:51:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Lempp
PO Box 647
Moose Lake, MN 55767-
wallebiz@arcor.de
(711) 887-4845

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:52:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bailey Bear
7717 Chicago Ave
Richfield, MN 55423-
baileybear008@gmail.com
(612) 824-0150

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:56:18 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Meredith Kathryn
20430 Everton Trl N
Forest Lake, MN 55025-
kury0003@umn.edu
(612) 210-0198

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:57:15 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Miller
4106 57th Street Ln NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
millersmj@charter.net
(507) 206-0332

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 9:59:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Norma Roberts-Hakizimana
411 Charles Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55103-
nrrn53@yahoo.com
(651) 224-1039

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:02:46 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Maurer
606 2nd St SE
Little Falls, MN 56345-
robertlawmaurer@gmail.com
(320) 293-7411

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:04:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Clarence Juelich
601 1st Ave S
Wheaton, MN 56296-
cjuelich@frontiernet.net
(320) 563-8520

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:04:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judie Carlson
12521 74th Ave N
Maple Grove, MN 55369-
judiecar@comcast.net
(763) 315-0535

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:05:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dimitris Lappas
6408 Cherokee Trl
Edina, MN 55439-
lappas196100@gmail.com
(952) 486-7806

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:06:18 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jason Husby
3531 N 3rd St
Minneapolis, MN 55412-
jacobainfan@aol.com
(612) 529-0463

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:15:27 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gayle Bidne
1755 Thury Ct
White Bear Lake, MN 55110-
gbidne06@comcast.net
(651) 493-8944

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:15:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Pl
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:18:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:18:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:18:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:18:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:18:22 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:18:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:19:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Crazy Woman
Po Box 813
Rochester, MN 55903-
bretts.woman1974@gmail.com
(507) 269-4592

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:27:42 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joan and Hane Carlson
14216 Woodhaven Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
mail4jmwc@yahoo.com
(952) 938-0088

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:30:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Theresa Del Rosario
881 Otto Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55102-
tdr63@hotmail.com
(651) 229-0560

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:32:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Tripp
5150 Logan Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
janet.tripp@hcmcd.org
(612) 926-7952

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:33:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Peters
868 Margaret St Apt 3
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
ydpeters2003@yahoo.com
(612) 306-2049

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:34:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Mills
6318 Pillsbury Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55423-
mindsey2010@comcast.net
(612) 869-2782

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:34:50 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Seymour Gross
1941 Drew Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55416-
sy_gross@msn.com
(612) 926-5961

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:38:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Uphaus
2650 N Pine Creek Rd
La Crescent, MN 55947-
tuphaus@acegroup.cc
(507) 895-2152

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:38:27 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Uphaus
2650 N Pine Creek Rd
La Crescent, MN 55947-
tuphaus@acegroup.cc
(507) 895-2152

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:39:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Jenkins
42704 Lisa Ln
Winona, MN 55987-
julieraejenkins@hotmail.com
(507) 643-5029

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:41:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melissa Soleta
26974 197th St
Reading, MN 56165-
mattmel84@hotmail.com
(605) 217-3107

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:42:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Tezla
1876 Yorkshire Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
mtezla@mac.com
(651) 699-0361

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:51:45 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sarah Johnson
1000 Cannon Valley Dr Apt 120
Northfield, MN 55057-
johnsonbergen@gmail.com
(970) 692-1356

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:53:15 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William And Janice Kimes
12002 Vermillion St NE Unit B
Blaine, MN 55449-
jbkimes@msn.com
(763) 862-3130

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:53:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol And Al Frechette
1511 6th Ave W
Shakopee, MN 55379-
frech001@tc.umn.edu
(952) 496-3244

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:57:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Gilkinson
812 29th St NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
jlgilkinson@gmail.com
(507) 289-2762

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:58:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wanda Ballentine
1181 Edgcumbe Rd Apt 314
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
wsb70@comcast.net
(651) 200-3093

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 10:59:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I live on the Pine River and would definitely be impacted by any leaks or spills up stream from my home. All the fishing, paddling, tubing, etc that brings economic activity to this area would end if there is an oil spill. All this needs to be accounted for in the scoping.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Kaufman
1295 32nd St SW
Pine River, MN 56474-
bkaufman@tds.net
(218) 587-2326

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:03:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cathi Koenig
902 10th Ave S
Moorhead, MN 56560-
wildwindnd@yahoo.com
(218) 443-3456

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:03:11 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cathi Koenig
902 10th Ave S
Moorhead, MN 56560-
wildwindnd@yahoo.com
(218) 443-3456

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:05:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas More Hynes
38531 Highway 109
Winnebago, MN 56098-
jchrist101@gmail.com
(507) 893-3403

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:08:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Delores Van Steenwyk
11349 Easy St
Brainerd, MN 56401-
deegilvan@charter.net
(218) 829-5084

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:18:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joshua Wiley
1283 Van Buren Ave Apt 3
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
wileyjoshua1@gmail.com
(715) 977-7286

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:18:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paul Heffron
4389 Hodgson Rd
Shoreview, MN 55126-
paul-peg-heffron@comcast.net
(651) 483-9222

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:19:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paul Heffron
4389 Hodgson Rd
Shoreview, MN 55126-
paul-peg-heffron@comcast.net
(651) 483-9222

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:22:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Blanchard And Doris Krogstad
25894 430th St SE
Winger, MN 56592-
krogs003@gvtel.com
(218) 563-4800

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:24:30 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Diane Sands
9270 Talus Cir
Eden Prairie, MN 55347-
talusgirl@gmail.com
(612) 710-0333

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:29:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Wetzler
3221 47th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
sinenom32@gmail.com
(612) 729-4485

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:38:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Abbey
128 W 27th St
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
sweeter612@yahoo.com
(612) 824-6800

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:51:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Please conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project, taking into account the cumulative impact of these two projects on communities, tribal lands, lakes and rivers, and our climate.

The DOC needs to scrutinize how oil spills would be cleaned up, potential permanent damage to waterways, and possible impacts to Minnesota's economy and Ojibwe culture.

Sincerely,

Todd Eddy
PO Box 17300
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
teddy20@earthlink.net
(612) 805-1699

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:52:05 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Molly Pikala
6715 Penn Ave S Apt 1
Minneapolis, MN 55423-
mollyp28@yahoo.com
(612) 418-1438

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 11:54:16 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wai Wong-Lai
3552 Tiffany Ln
Shoreview, MN 55126-
wwjc4@msn.com
(651) 482-7706

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Monday, May 23, 2016 12:49:34 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Birch
16015 Elgin Court
Faribault, MN 55021-
s-jbirch@q.com
5073343023

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:36:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Randy Nies
3407 Harriet Ave Apt 2
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
rnies99@earthlink.net
(612) 823-5638

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:32:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathy and Christopher Zerby
1500 15th St NW
New Brighton, MN 55112-
chriszerby1@msn.com
(651) 628-0074

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:14:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jan Jude
6182 112th St NW
Maple Lake, MN 55358-
daylilies9@hotmail.com
(320) 963-8026

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:12:11 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Donald Pederson
4325 Tioga St
Duluth, MN 55804-
donpederson@juno.com
(218) 525-3046

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:57:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gregory Hanson
9904 Yosemite Rd
Bloomington, MN 55437-
drgbhanson@gmail.com
(952) 270-2430

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:51:47 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michelle Gobely
1581 Wheelock Ln Apt 202
Saint Paul, MN 55117-
michellegobely@yahoo.com
(651) 489-4393

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:37:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

marguerite geier
7190 robinwood draw
woodbury, MN 55125-
maggiemusic@comcast.net
6515782667

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:23:19 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Smalley
16 Red Fox Rd
North Oaks, MN 55127-
juliesmalley601@yahoo.com
(651) 490-1879

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:19:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patricia Kounkel
25333 196th St
Staples, MN 56479-
pkounkel@gmail.com
(218) 296-1654

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:18:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mallory Malecek
1720 N Payne St
New Ulm, MN 56073-
mallory.malecek@jacks.sdstate.edu
(507) 341-4600

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:40:35 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janice Hoeschler
31018 Old Mill Rd
La Crescent, MN 55947-
jhriver@mac.com
(507) 643-6900

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:18:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christine Pruvot
332 Main St
Lakefield, MN 56150-
chrispruvot@hotmail.com
(202) 886-7464

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:14:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Koors
833 20th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
tomkoorstrk@gmail.com
(612) 331-2411

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:14:07 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Koors
833 20th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
tomkoorstrk@gmail.com
(612) 331-2411

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:14:05 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Koors
833 20th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
tomkoorstrk@gmail.com
(612) 331-2411

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:14:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Koors
833 20th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
tomkoorstrk@gmail.com
(612) 331-2411

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:46:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ramiro Herrera
49200 State Highway 48 Unit 79
Hinckley, MN 55037-
herreraramiro63@yahoo.com
(763) 258-9742

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:40:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Thone
1212 Washington Memorial Dr
Saint Cloud, MN 56301-
peaceofmind4ever@live.com
(320) 491-2075

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:40:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Jacobson
4860 Bryant Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
liz.jacobson7@gmail.com
(612) 470-7970

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:38:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William 'Skip' Dykoski
890 9th Ave NW
New Brighton, MN 55112-
skipdykoski@usfamily.net
(651) 636-2980

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:02:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Because the risks and the expenses to the communities are astronomical, and the oil profits are not rewarded to the community but to the corporation, this places an unnecessary, unnatural and unfair burden on the communities and the natural environment while they are already under enormous stress to preserve their way of life. Fossil fuels are unsustainable and ferociously destructive, making them an existential threat and real liability to the communities.

Sincerely,

Karen Boyd
493 Marshland Trl
Chanhassen, MN 55317-
web.oyd888@yahoo.com
(952) 937-2543

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:55:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Krista Munster
313 7th Ave NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
kristamunster@gmail.com
(952) 412-5277

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:38:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Chris Spanier
800 8th St N
Sartell, MN 56377-
cspanier@charter.net
(320) 656-3701

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:20:06 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wolfgang Bruce-Peralta
4456 Nokomis Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
95wolfgang@gmail.com
(612) 644-8908

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:54:01 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Havir
6108 Tracy Ave
Edina, MN 55436-
hhavir@nbs-inc.com
(952) 929-8725

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:53:14 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Guillotel
15799 Village Woods Dr
Eden Prairie, MN 55347-
guillojagr@yahoo.com
(612) 866-6759

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:51:55 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Kalbler
7269 Clay Ave
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-
lkalbler@yahoo.com
651455010

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:39:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alva Crom
1343 Blair Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
acrom13@aol.com
(612) 963-4766

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:36:59 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jessica Wardlaw
8263 Grange Blvd
Cottage Grove, MN 55016-
jssylynn94@msn.com
(612) 310-0914

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:06:23 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kay Cohen
1425 W 28th St Apt 210
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
cohen018@umn.edu
(612) 875-6171

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:01:16 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cathy Swanson
8660 Alvarado Ct
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077-
cathy.swanson@comcast.net
(651) 454-1550

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 4:41:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Rudser
111211 Village Rd
Chaska, MN 55318-
laura.rudser@gmail.com
(952) 857-9233

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 4:41:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Peter Frank
401 Sibley St, Apt C125
Saint Paul, MN 55101-
pgerardfrank@gmail.com
(605) 521-8879

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 4:23:45 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Catherine Larson
2750 Century Trl
Chanhassen, MN 55317-
alarson@mchsi.com
(612) 554-5687

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 4:02:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mike Chutich
1283 Sargent Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
susangmikec@q.com
(651) 698-8953

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 4:01:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Councilman
8801 Westmoreland Ln
St Louis Park, MN 55426-
dlcouncilman@hotmail.com
(612) 873-8069

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:52:11 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tony Tschida
6824 Mesabi Ct NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
ttschida@msn.com
(507) 280-7541

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:45:32 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Richard Smollen
11091 187th Ave NW
Elk River, MN 55330-
dicksmo1@q.com
(763) 274-0328

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:43:40 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ellen Ruffin
1916 S 6th St
Minneapolis, MN 55454-
epruffin@gmail.com
(612) 339-8086

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:25:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mercy Myers
1880 Grand Ave Apt 206
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
aylantisioi@yahoo.com
(612) 363-5346

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:57:03 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pamela Revier
917 Welter Rd SE
Saint Michael, MN 55376-
mysticmtnrose@aol.com
(612) 964-8015

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:51:07 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Stennes-Rogness
6443 Fawn Ln
Lino Lakes, MN 55014-
sstennes@flaschools.org
(651) 483-0667

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:48:20 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alice Bowron
5401 51st Ave N Apt 334
Minneapolis, MN 55429-
lupinsgalore@gmail.com
(612) 508-9976

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:44:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our environment. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and environment.

Sincerely,

Dan Wicht
941 Overton Dr NE
Fridley, MN 55432-
wicht_dan@yahoo.com
(763) 571-8635

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:07:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

George Riter
3511 Jerry St
White Bear Lk, MN 55110-
griter@msn.com
(651) 770-7611

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:45:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Lawrow
5015 Fremont Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
doclawrow@yahoo.com
(612) 825-7377

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:39:33 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sheila Schally
1104 Creekside Cir
Stillwater, MN 55082-
shlschly@aol.com
(651) 439-6756

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:34:48 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Margaret Brennan
18180 Kelly Lake Rd
Carver, MN 55315-
celticthorn49@aol.com
(612) 805-8876

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:19:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Herther
1585 Cohansey St Apt 201
Saint Paul, MN 55117-
jnherther48@yahoo.com
(651) 489-4123

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:10:21 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mark Snyder
2302 Johnson St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55418-
snyde043@gmail.com
(651) 398-9880

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:07:36 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Beth Brombach
2214 Goodrich Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
bbrombach@comcast.net
(651) 699-8466

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:56:10 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Viken
1964 Prior Ave N
Roseville, MN 55113-
julie_viken@yahoo.com
(612) 625-1109

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:52:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marianna Como
212 Newton Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55405-
marianna.marcelle@gmail.com
(612) 210-2862

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:51:57 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Erin Daly
2524 Clinton Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
eerin.daly@gmail.com
(315) 246-3825

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:51:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

I ATTENDED A RECENT HEARING IN SAINT PAUL ON THE ENBRIDGE PIPELINE AND IT BECAME WORRISOME TO ME THAT THE HAZARDS OF THE ROUTE CLEAR ACROSS THE NORTHERN PART OF MINNESOTA HAVE NOT BEEN LOOKED AT AS THOROUGHLY AS SHOULD HAVE BEEN.

RIGHT NOW TO ALLOW THE PIPELINE WITHOUT MUCH MORE REVIEW WOULD BE A DISSERVICE TO THE RESIDENTS OF MINNESOTA

Sincerely,

Karl Meller
1806 3rd Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
krlmeller@yahoo.com
(612) 325-1134

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:46:46 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shelly Peddicord
3435 Colfax Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55412-
s_pedicord@msn.com
(651) 216-4066

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:32:18 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jan Karon
1112 S Lake Ave
Duluth, MN 55802-
wmhowe@chartermi.net
(218) 722-7200

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:31:48 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bj Tesch
219 E Vine St
Mankato, MN 56001-
teschbj@gmail.com
(507) 720-0773

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:28:37 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Anita Johnson
1243 Cherokee Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55118-
anitalouisejohnson@gmail.com
(651) 493-8928

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:01:09 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Becky Nelson
2001 Flag Ave N
Golden Valley, MN 55427-
beckykay9@gmail.com
(612) 670-2524

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:58:46 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Heidi Lynn Ahlstrand
1580 State Ave NW
Owatonna, MN 55060-
ironrancher@yahoo.com
(507) 214-3204

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:57:17 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Sothern
1903 Selby Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
sothe001@umn.edu
(651) 644-5438

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:46:03 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Billy Curmano
27979 County Road 17
Winona, MN 55987-
billyx.net@gmail.com
(507) 452-1598

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:45:12 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Virginia Huber
1516 W 61st St
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
coco1005@msn.com
(612) 869-0410

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:42:25 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Graden West
PO Box 422
New London, MN 56273-
graden@tds.net
(320) 354-5373

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:25:55 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Zimney
7110 Excelsior Way
St Louis Park, MN 55426-
dzimney@mac.com
(612) 501-0968

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:13:43 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Brennhofer
305 High Dr
Sartell, MN 56377-
jkbhawaii@msn.com
(320) 202-0871

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:10:40 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tyler Owens
21720 Flint Rd
Mankato, MN 56001-
skoomamonster@gmail.com
(507) 947-3080

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:09:08 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Daniel Biittner
4212 County Road 6
Barnum, MN 55707-
shankybe@gmail.com
(218) 389-3411

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:02:02 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Ceder
4950 170th Ln NE
Ham Lake, MN 55304-
daceder114@gmail.com
(612) 755-5611

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:54:41 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

We need to move away from oil and fund clean energy such as wind and solar. Stop destroying the planet with oil pipelines.

Sincerely,

Kathy Magne
1989 Wellesley Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
magn0042@umn.edu
(000) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:54:30 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

We need to move away from oil and fund clean energy such as wind and solar. Stop destroying the planet with oil pipelines.

Sincerely,

Kathy Magne
1989 Wellesley Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
magn0042@umn.edu
(000) 000-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:45:04 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Penny and Rodger Cragun
927 N 8th Ave E
Duluth, MN 55805-
pcragun@d.umn.edu
(218) 727-2972

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:34:55 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynn Ouren
518 E Bancroft Ave
Fergus Falls, MN 56537-
louren@fergusotters.org
(218) 736-3095

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:30:07 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Warren Vogt
17495 W 263rd St
belle plaine, MN 56011-
wllvogt@gmail.com
(507) 665-2010

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:25:30 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Smisek
1762 Oakdale Ave
West St Paul, MN 55118-
grc4us@comcast.net
(612) 986-7809

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:59:28 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lani Greenway
43300 315th Ave
Laporte, MN 56461-
lanigreenway@yahoo.com
(218) 255-5212

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:53:56 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sean O'Brien
6028 10th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
smdobrien@gmail.com
(612) 597-9515

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:53:20 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melanie Ewald
2310 Valley Dr
Northfield, MN 55057-
ewaldmel@gmail.com
(952) 887-8971

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:52:20 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I'm writing to urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it very clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terry J. Williams
4170 Brigadoon Drive
Shoreview, MN 55126-
tjwilli333@gmail.com
(651) 484-6877

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:50:58 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jay Springer
6171 Linda Ln
Lino Lakes, MN 55014-
jayjspringer@outlook.com
(651) 917-2585

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:50:19 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cathy Swenson
10940 Morris Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55437-
cswenson2@comcast.net
(952) 884-2343

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:48:22 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Chad Martin
7144 10th Ave S
Richfield, MN 55423-
chad.e.martin@gmail.com
(612) 208-7379

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:47:03 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Donovan
2190 Pinehurst Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
timtdai@hotmail.com
(651) 699-1170

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:46:43 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Asa Adams-Phipps
1200 27th Ave NE
Minneapolis, MN 55418-
lavatraxzz@gmail.com
(612) 781-7379

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:45:52 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terrence Naves
9133 Preserve Blvd
Eden Prairie, MN 55347-
navest2@asme.org
(952) 829-7652

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:45:49 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Schmidt
10275 County Road 27 SW
Farwell, MN 56327-
auntie.ladybug2012@gmail.com
(320) 886-5457

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:43:33 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Emi Ito
2366 Chilcombe Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
emi3ito@gmail.com
(612) 306-2956

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:41:19 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I ask you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Debra Evon
1760 Hennepin Ave Apt 34
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
daevon@stkate.edu
(651) 690-7832

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:40:21 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kevin Stueven
11 McKinley Pl N
Saint Cloud, MN 56303-
housestudio@msn.com
(123) 456-7890

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:39:29 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joanna Winship
2909 E 22nd St
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
josiewinship@gmail.com
(612) 720-2929

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:38:43 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ben Zimmerman
2225 Folwell Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
zimme003@umn.edu
(651) 645-1662

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:38:54 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Erickson
2515 S 9th St
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
ohmakwa69@hotmail.com
(651) 221-1016

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:38:29 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Meg Lee
22210 Jasmine Way
Rogers, MN 55374-
megnbyron@hotmail.com
(763) 496-1322

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:36:06 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gail Amundson
665 Fairmount Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
gailamundsonllc@gmail.com
(651) 245-1925

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:30:27 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Stark
304 3rd St SE
Stewartville, MN 55976-
sacsac@charter.net
(507) 533-8403

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:29:26 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Steinhauser
6320 163rd Ln NW
Ramsey, MN 55303-
steinhauser6320@comcast.net
(763) 753-4105

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:27:18 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a sincere and thorough scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

Please do your important work of protecting the environment and acting in the true interest of Minnesota citizens by ensuring a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

P Buck
8215 Kelsey Whiteface Rd
Cotton, MN 55724-
perigee51@ymail.com
(218) 481-2557

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:25:41 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Denise Stime
4079 153rd St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
stimedog@charter.net
(612) 558-6118

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:16:20 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christine Tendle
2435 Brenner St
Roseville, MN 55113-
tine@ineye.com
(651) 697-1260

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:11:22 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Please do not allow this pipeline to go through Minnesota. We cannot afford highly potential spills to happen here as it did in Deer River and previous spills in Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and North Dakota. It seems quite obvious what happens when Enbridge is involved!

Sincerely,

Diana Dale-Hargraves
1121 Summit Way
Sauk Rapids, MN 56379-
blizzard1983@charter.net
(320) 217-3651

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:10:01 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jordan Morgan
213 14th St. NW
Bemidji, MN 56601-
jordan.morgan@live.bemidjistate.edu
(507) 995-3795

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:09:42 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Owen Gustafson
1106 Innsbrook Ln
Buffalo, MN 55313-
owen362@hotmail.com
(612) 720-2315

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:05:38 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kevin Koschak
2384 151st Ave NW
Andover, MN 55304-
kjkoschak@hotmail.com
(612) 750-9769

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:05:16 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary K Bacon
4117 Grand Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55409-
marybaconinteriors@earthlink.net
(612) 210-1599

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:00:59 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Howard Lambert
35495 Riverwood Ct Unit 1623
Crosslake, MN 56442-
howard@crosslake.net
(218) 692-5521

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 9:00:57 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ann Marie Sunderland
15555 Flight Way
Apple Valley, MN 55124-
annie.sunderland@co.dakota.mn.us
(952) 891-0000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:59:16 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Madeline Seveland
14418 Wildcrest Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
bansc002@umn.edu
(507) 304-2417

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:53:29 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Allan Bouley
PO Box 2015
Collegeville, MN 56321-
abouley@csbsju.edu
(320) 363-3976

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:53:00 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steve and Kathryn Law
451 Jayne St
Saint Paul, MN 55119-
lawsafety@aol.com
(651) 210-7727

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:50:47 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Leigh Johnson
6408 31st Ave N
Golden Valley, MN 55427-
designs@arcink.com
(763) 545-4980

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:47:11 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Our water supply is priceless-and we need to do everything we can to protect it.

Thank you,

-Pat Pardun
Marine on St. Croix, MN

Sincerely,

Pat Pardun
PO Box 146
Marine on Saint Croix, MN 55047-
pat@soundmindnow.com
(651) 214-6689

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:42:38 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jenni Charrier
1910 Heritage Dr
Wayzata, MN 55391-
jcharrier21@gmail.com
(555) 555-5555

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:30:12 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lucy Duroche
3542 4th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
laduroche@yahoo.com
(612) 827-7869

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:20:50 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dawn Skinner
1745 Sheridan Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
daskinner@landolakes.com
(612) 267-5260

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:20:18 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

J Mcdavitt
21125 Christmas Ln
Excelsior, MN 55331-
mcdpam@mchsi.com
(952) 474-3197

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:08:10 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patrick Keiser
197 Balsam Ridge Rd SW
Bemidji, MN 56601-
jagodoggo@yahoo.com
(218) 444-4642

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 8:00:28 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sherilyn Moe
4920 W Upland Crst
Minneapolis, MN 55421-
sherilynmoegmail.com
(651) 431-2551

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:59:03 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Raush
2211 40th Ave NE
Columbia Heights, MN 55421-
scott@pixel8.net
(763) 789-4310

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:56:52 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Ring
17389 Deerfield Dr SE
Prior Lake, MN 55372-
slshbb@yahoo.com
(612) 499-9986

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:51:22 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jean Liss
2295 Helmo Ct N
Oakdale, MN 55128-
liss.jean5@gmail.com
(651) 210-7294

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:51:18 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patrick O'Boyle
1849 Narvik Ct
Eagan, MN 55122-
patrick_oboyle_1@hotmail.com
(651) 270-1503

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:45:04 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Mockler
3091 Evelyn St
Roseville, MN 55113-
linda61moke@gmail.com
(651) 621-8946

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:45:02 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Mockler
3091 Evelyn St
Roseville, MN 55113-
linda61moke@gmail.com
(651) 621-8946

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:40:22 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Shedd
4554 Wentworth Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
beckysmpls@yahoo.com
(612) 825-0522

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:40:22 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William Hunter
PO Box 2015
Collegeville, MN 56321-
wm.a.hunter@gmail.com
(320) 363-3079

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:35:55 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Chase
2558 Beacon St
Roseville, MN 55113-
roverrob@comcast.net
(651) 340-7599

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:34:26 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Anne Kaphingst
5109 Beacon Hill Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
amkaphingst@hotmail.com
(952) 935-1566

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:30:18 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jean Marie Lindquist
1666 Coffman St
Falcon Heights, MN 55108-
lindq011@umn.edu
(651) 646-0081

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:27:20 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Our OWN Grand Rapids had an oil spill and the wetlands NE in our community will never be what they were ~ near the Community College area.

Thank you for listening

Sincerely,

Yvette Schultenover
31167 Cimarron Trail
Grand Rapids, MN 55744-
oncimarron@gmail.com
(218) 326-4828

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:26:36 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steve Wiley
229 Cedar Lake Rd N
Minneapolis, MN 55405-
srwiley46@hotmail.com
(612) 377-3017

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:17:16 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jackie Richens
14501 Atrium Way
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
sheenajlr@gmail.com
(123) 456-7890

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:15:17 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Ward
14011 Excelsior Blvd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
jwardhealingarts@gmail.com
(612) 308-7529

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:15:05 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Edward Shields
PO Box 165
Grand Portage, MN 55605-
shields.ed11@gmail.com
(888) 888-8888

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:13:49 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Gibson
38075 270th St
Peterson, MN 55962-
bongibson50@gmail.com
(612) 237-4802

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:05:58 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terry Hangartner
52 Field Ave SW
Byron, MN 55920-
t_hangart@yahoo.com
(507) 775-6518

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 7:00:28 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Amy Kvalseth
4980 Shady Island Cir
Mound, MN 55364-
avkvalseth@yahoo.com
(952) 470-1170

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:55:08 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Al Larson
3408 Beauty Lake Rd SW
Pillager, MN 56473-
alarson@brainerd.net
(218) 746-3512

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:44:48 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Holden
4924 Oakley St
Duluth, MN 55804-
kbhkbh.holden@gmail.com
(218) 525-1588

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:44:38 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mariam Vandellen
600 4th St SW Apt 306
Rochester, MN 55902-
marianvd07@charter.net
(507) 282-4565

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:43:47 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Chuck Nelson
2694 Apache Rd N
Saint Paul, MN 55109-
bkcmnelson@comcast.net
(651) 777-1831

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:41:50 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Steele
7451 Dallas Ct N
Maple Grove, MN 55311-
tempou812@hotmail.com
(763) 555-5555

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:29:37 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ann Gustafson
29 Myra Ave
Carlton, MN 55718-
anniegust@gmail.com
(218) 349-7696

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:18:46 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Donna Seabloom
1206 Pacific St
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
hartl008@umn.edu
(651) 771-5147

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:16:41 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Greg Thompson
501 Warner Ave N
Mahtomedi, MN 55115-
gregtrack@hotmail.com
(651) 431-1979

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 6:16:06 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Clapper
5301 Broadwing Dr
Duluth, MN 55804-
dlclapper@charter.net
(218) 464-1328

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:53:54 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathy Harvey
1322 Alton St Apt 321
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
medalist_01@hotmail.com
(651) 295-5309

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:47:22 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michele Phillips
1121 Linden St W
Stillwater, MN 55082-
mermaidspurseco@yahoo.com
(612) 816-5011

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 5:06:50 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Ingalls
56213 Grant St
Park Rapids, MN 56470-
jeannecnb@yahoo.com
(218) 573-2058

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 4:19:14 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Diane Brown Berthiaume
1718 McKnight Ln
Maplewood, MN 55109-
dianebrown619@gmail.com
(651) 404-0748

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 4:12:43 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Callanan
3828 Garfield Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55409-
cynthia.callanan@gmail.com
(612) 210-4691

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 4:06:02 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dan Englund
PO Box 128
Harris, MN 55032-
danenglund69@outlook.com
(651) 248-3435

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:56:48 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Larry Anderson
953 Goodrich Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
larscoyote@yahoo.com
(651) 308-3530

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:44:39 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Heyward Nash
1425 10th Ave S Apt 656
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
hlnash2006@yahoo.com
(612) 871-1115

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:45:40 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

N Brian Winchester
27881 Far North Dr
Nevis, MN 56467-
winchest@indiana.edu
(812) 606-0532

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:43:52 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sarah Mason
PO Box 5446
Hopkins, MN 55343-
morgan.mason@btinternet.com
(815) 908-1319

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 3:13:30 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melissa Paepke
9540 23rd Ave N
Plymouth, MN 55441-
mamhbn291@yahoo.com
(612) 968-0070

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:55:25 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ibrahim Ali
3501 27th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
ibrahimjali@icloud.com
(952) 356-2581

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:06:33 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jane Norling
5450 Ridgewood Cv
Mound, MN 55364-
kmtcomm@gmail.com
(952) 472-7155

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 2:01:01 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ea Beck
38 Restless Ct
North Mankato, MN 56003-
theshift33@aol.com
(507) 380-5907

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:57:18 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patricia Makowski
5245 Neal Ave N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
pat@patmakowski.com
(555) 888-4444

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:23:27 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gaye Sorenson
247 Kennard St
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
fertileground13@gmail.com
(612) 774-6578

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:10:15 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Landers
1275 Silverwood Rd
Woodbury, MN 55125-
mikel7_8@msn.com
(651) 739-0303

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:31:26 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nat LeI
1152 Crosstown Blvd.
Chaska, MN 55318-
nat_leI@yahoo.com
(952) 233-1316

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:25:40 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kevin Mackin
5236 47th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
kujawake@msn.com
(651) 235-1580

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:15:57 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Aubrianna Schlottman
601 Airport Rd N
Dodge Center, MN 55927-
aub_schlot@hotmail.com
(507) 363-2736

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:05:16 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Please conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

As you may know, a recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to consider how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

The Minnesota Department of Commerce must ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and the potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gwen Myers
12009 Hilloway Rd W
Minnetonka, MN 55305-
salmyers@comcast.net
(952) 545-8696

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:02:29 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jessica Blagen
10386 Rich Rd
Minneapolis, MN 55437-
jblagen@yahoo.com
(555) 555-5555

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:01:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Amanda Jones
PO Box 425
Sauk Rapids, MN 56379-
alj324@gmail.com
(320) 761-0128

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 2:04:43 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Please take a close look at all of these eminent dangers and give the project the thumbs down.

Sincerely,

Judy Layzell
7420 Vincent Ave S
Richfield, MN 55423-
jlayzell1@gmail.com
(612) 239-2026

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 2:27:11 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Nordlund
General Delivery
Moorhead, MN 56560-
jamesmnordlund@yahoo.com
(701) 850-0059

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 3:04:31 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terje Ness
901 2nd St W
Hastings, MN 55033-
nesstj@gmail.com
(651) 442-6427

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 3:30:11 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Frances Bell
1830 Laurel Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
franny.me@hotmail.com
(651) 210-8567

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 5:56:52 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Ruffaner
4053 42nd Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
gran@usiwireless.com
(612) 222-2222

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 6:29:11 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kelli Williams
7318 Landau Dr
Bloomington, MN 55438-
kayblogs@gmail.com
(267) 776-5150

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 7:46:12 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Liz Dahl M.D.
2057 Lindsey Rd
Cook, MN 55723-
erdahlmd@aol.com
(218) 666-9806

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 8:34:04 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mandy Powell
10208 129th Ave N
Champlin, MN 55316-
mandybrite@gmail.com
(612) 666-2831

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 8:50:54 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Sauve
7554 Laverne Ave S
Cottage Grove, MN 55016-
bsauve31@comcast.net
(651) 458-3480

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 9:23:13 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Leslie Dee
14725 Natchez Ave
Savage, MN 55378-
leslie1@mediacombb.net
1231234123

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 9:24:23 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Eltgroth
36399 Burr Oak Blvd
Cohasset, MN 55721-
eltgroth@paulbunyan.net
2189995053

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 10:31:48 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paula Fischer
3406 E 40th St
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
pfischer@comcast.net
(651) 206-0649

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 10:38:01 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Roberta Baker
1288 Sargent Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
rdbaker12@gmail.com
(507) 645-9109

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 10:54:15 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dale Hadler
1723 W Broadway St Apt C
Winona, MN 55987-
dale_hadler@hotmail.com
(763) 218-3265

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 12:25:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rich Femling
1946 Tatum St
Saint Paul, MN 55113-
rich@rose-creek.com
(651) 647-1860

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 12:26:29 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laurinda Porter
39205 Oak Dr
Browerville, MN 56438-
rporter@rea-alp.com
(320) 555-1234

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 2:22:23 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ryan Sabol
4721 Lyndale Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
ryelliot71@hotmail.com
(612) 227-1174

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 2:52:18 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cindy Collins
5309 Woodlawn Blvd
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
redfash53@yahoo.com
(612) 722-7251

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 3:08:23 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carrie Eberhardt
1528 Praha St SE
New Prague, MN 56071-
smiley_face68@hotmail.com
(612) 618-7733

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 3:41:08 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

J Isabelle Dyck
933 11th St SW
Rochester, MN 55902-
pjdyck@centurylink.net
(507) 289-1120

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 4:13:24 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Audrey Fairchild-Ehm
1837 Fernwood St
Roseville, MN 55113-
aafairchild@gmail.com
(651) 644-6059

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 4:22:44 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pat Sykes
4524 Casco Ave
Edina, MN 55424-
seibelsykes@aol.com
(952) 925-0167

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 4:38:58 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

K Cruit
5241 Chowen Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
k@sixbones.com
(612) 392-2000

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 4:42:25 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elaine Ososki
6367 Saint Johns Dr
Eden Prairie, MN 55346-
eomarie@q.com
(952) 250-7201

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 5:26:39 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Merrill
5912 Hidden Oaks Circle S.E.
Prior Lake, MN 55372-
kittymerrill43@gmail.com
(952) 447-5676

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 5:40:02 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alice Sather
22464 130th Ave NW
Newfolden, MN 56738-
aep.sather@gmail.com
(218) 523-4507

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 7:10:53 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lee Mensinger
161 Cannon Bottom Rd
Red Wing, MN 55066-
lee.mensinger@gmail.com
(651) 388-6504

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 7:37:43 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Garibaldi
9161 Archer Ln N
Maple Grove, MN 55311-
dgar77@aol.com
(763) 494-8851

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 8:53:28 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Last summer I became concerned about all the trains carrying various quality oils across different bodies of water in our state. I read the reports about the percent safety ratings and knew that it was only a matter time before we'd see water contaminated. It was two weeks after a train derailed as it was going into Wisconsin. The oil spilled on the Wisconsin side, so we weren't supposed to be worried about it. Then the wreck in northern MN and then the accident where a semi slammed into a train.

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laurie Ollhoff
16588 Fieldcrest Ave
Farmington, MN 55024-
lollhoff@charter.net
(651) 295-2519

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 9:07:49 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michelle Anderson
2301 Cypress Dr
Saint Paul, MN 55125-
llanelli_1@hotmail.com
(651) 702-5489

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 9:31:26 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janell Osborn
14510 Eagle Pointe Dr
Park Rapids, MN 56470-
josdvm@yahoo.com
(218) 237-7302

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 9:40:13 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ericka Bjorngaard
414 Nicollet Ave Apt 4
North Mankato, MN 56003-
blitz.chan@gmail.com
(555) 555-5555

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 10:00:41 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Katherine Doyle
2232 Vermilion Rd
Duluth, MN 55803-
kaymattdoyle@hotmail.com
(218) 724-0589

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 10:38:51 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Gockowski
1427 Cliff Ave
Duluth, MN 55811-
hombre1@charter.net
(218) 728-4198

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 11:27:00 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Davis
6674 Boyd Ave
Eden Prairie, MN 55346-
marydavis@pobox.com
(952) 934-5692

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 11:37:31 PM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Knoll
10081 103rd St N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
cjknoll1@comcast.net
(651) 426-4144

From: [KnowWho Services](#)
To: [*COMM Pipeline Comments](#)
Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)
Date: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 1:27:43 AM

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Anne Franklin
9914 Penn Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431-
labradoritesky@gmail.com
(952) 884-7209

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/30/2016 9:40:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steve Pecsénye
415 Grand St
Winona, MN 55987-
sjpecsenye@gmail.com
(419) 392-4950

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/30/2016 5:34:47 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Hugh Curtler III
4516 North 89th Crescent
Brooklyn Park, MN 55443-
curtler3@aol.com
(222) 222-2222

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/30/2016 2:55:50 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Katherine Weesner
5087 147th St W
Apple Valley, MN 55124-
kweesner@charter.net
(952) 423-5919

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/30/2016 9:41:41 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joel Schmidt
12430 County Road 1 NW
Pennock, MN 56279-
granja12430@yahoo.com
(320) 599-8067

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/30/2016 8:39:49 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steve Dziuk
6043 Kalland Dr NE
Albertville, MN 55301-
ssdziuk@outlook.com
(763) 497-3482

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/30/2016 5:42:33 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laira Allera
1116 Dakota St S
Shakopee, MN 55379-
laira@soulfuljourney.com
(612) 735-1540

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/30/2016 1:04:51 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Merz
111 W Lincoln Ave
Fergus Falls, MN 56537-
merz@prtcl.com
(218) 998-3145

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/30/2016 12:58:06 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Anca Zamfirescu
10830 Falling Water Ln Unit C
Woodbury, MN 55129-
vivmn74@gmail.com
(203) 512-0621

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/29/2016 10:58:19 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joyce Blomquist
1980 Skillman Ave W
Roseville, MN 55113-
cjblomquist@comcast.net
(651) 631-0688

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/29/2016 10:31:34 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Vicki Denissen
11200 Louisiana Ct W
Champlin, MN 55316-
vdenissen@aol.com
(763) 424-6631

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/29/2016 9:05:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Andrea Isaacson
710 Kelsey Ave Apt 308
Clearwater, MN 55320-
isaacson.andrea@gmail.com
(763) 639-7717

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/29/2016 8:47:03 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

April Nygaard
5996 5th St SW
Howard Lake, MN 55349-
aprilnygaard13@gmail.com
(612) 741-9761

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/28/2016 6:20:19 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Diane Tessari
5375 Eureka Rd
Excelsior, MN 55331-
dctessa@gmail.com
(952) 474-2386

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/28/2016 4:38:09 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Erik Roth
225 W 15th St Apt 412
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
erik.roth@earthlink.net
(612) 874-9831

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/28/2016 4:18:41 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Mosher
4316 Clemson Cir
Eagan, MN 55122-
kmosher3@yahoo.com
(651) 592-4082

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/28/2016 2:39:04 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Martha Krikava
9696 101st St N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
krikava.family@me.com
(651) 756-1171

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/28/2016 2:29:33 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Doherty
1001 14th St NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
lorraine.doherty@rochesterfranciscan.org
(507) 282-7441

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/28/2016 4:27:33 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rita Caruso Santamaria
1645 Hazelwood st
St Paul, MN 55106-
rcwhitgr@smumn.edu
(651) 771-2942

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/27/2016 11:52:40 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Beverly Laclair
1551 Cedar Ln
Newport, MN 55055-
beverlyla@comcast.net
(651) 458-0377

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/27/2016 7:55:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shelly Chermack
11521 Round Lake Blvd NW
Coon Rapids, MN 55433-
schermack01@hamline.edu
(612) 802-5291

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/27/2016 6:39:35 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susan Stahr
14617 Idylwood Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
sjstahr@gmail.com
(952) 939-1108

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/27/2016 5:50:18 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marta Novotny
504 4th St E
Erskine, MN 56535-
marta-001@hotmail.com
(218) 687-3610

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/27/2016 5:50:03 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Taylor
8815 River Heights Way
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-
jt9663@comcast.net
(651) 450-9306

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/27/2016 3:10:38 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sharon Hess
105 N Ciro Ave
Ogilvie, MN 56358-
sharon.67lea@hotmail.com
(320) 272-4819

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/27/2016 1:09:13 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cathy Curtis
PO Box 421
Buffalo, MN 55313-
vishousfan@hushmail.com
(763) 682-9482

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 7:08:50 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Clapper
5301 Broadwing Dr
Duluth, MN 55804-
dlclapper@charter.net
(218) 464-1328

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 6:58:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dari Best
15554 Round Lakw Blvd NW
Andover, MN 55304-
daribest18@yahoo.com
(763) 323-9971

From: "[KnowWho Services](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)" <noreply@knowwho.services>

To: "[*COMM Pipeline Comments](mailto:COMM_Pipeline_Comments@state.mn.us)" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>

Date: 5/26/2016 6:32:45 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

The proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 replacement project are a significant threat to the health and wellbeing of Minnesotans. I had the opportunity to harvest wild rice on a lake in central Minnesota last fall and noticed the susceptibility of these watery environments to degradation through pollution. Given the high risk of a spill (looking at the previous record of Enbridge as well as other oil pipelines), the threat to Ojibwe culture and treaty rights must be given strong consideration. They have been on this land for hundreds of years, and have treaty rights allowing them to gather from the land. Their legal treaty rights, as well as their human right to continue this part of their cultural heritage, would be disrupted and degraded by the proposed pipeline projects.

I am a young adult and hope to have a livable climate, clean air, and clean water as I grow older. In addition to the immediate threat of a spill, there are un-debatable climate effects of burning tar sands oil. In the EIS process it's imperative to consider the widespread effects of our state's actions to our human community around the country and world. It should take into account the health burden caused by the fossil fuel economy (for example rampant kidney disease among refining communities in Michigan) as well as the health impacts from water pollution from potential spills. The economic and quality-of-life burden placed on society from tar sands pipelines should be investigated and compared to its short-term economic benefits for just a few people. Also, a spill would represent a massive undeserved impact on our state's taxpayers and economy. Finally, the economic impacts of climate change on our state (for example, an increase in the frequency and severity of droughts and storms) need to be taken into account since the tar sands oil that the pipelines would carry is a direct contributor to these negative effects on the citizens of our state.

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julia Kloehn
4036 Xerxes Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
kloeh007@umn.edu
(612) 926-9968

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 6:24:35 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Krinke
339 Wilder St N
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
jenkrinke@comcast.net
(651) 645-4328

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 5:18:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Johannsen
2418 Aldrich Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411-
moonrubytuesday@yahoo.com
(612) 636-7917

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 4:33:15 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Mc Kimpson
4862 Opal Ln NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
skylight0214@hotmail.com
(507) 285-9492

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 2:52:11 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Songalia
649 Waseca St
Saint Paul, MN 55107-
reinsong@q.com
(651) 224-3718

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 2:51:39 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dawn Demaske
1776 Maryland Ave E Apt 106
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
djdemaske@yahoo.com
(608) 548-6704

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 2:49:56 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Eunice Eckerly
2015 Riverside Ave Apt 210
Minneapolis, MN 55454-
euniceeckerly@gmail.com
(612) 376-0053

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 1:24:34 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Powell
771 Neville Ct SE
Rochester, MN 55904-
barbpowell@charter.net
(507) 206-3498

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 8:36:47 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Miguel Lozada
8659 Thorsonveien Rd
Bemidji, MN 56601-
malozadar@bt.unal.edu.co
(218) 760-4114

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 7:47:38 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brent Bateman
3948 24th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
bateman_brent@yahoo.com
(925) 586-6434

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 6:29:38 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Heidi Sandmeier
7500 Cahill Rd Apt 108C
Edina, MN 55439-
adelheid1@msn.com
(612) 327-0975

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 1:02:34 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patrick Holt
407 15th Ave SW
Rochester, MN 55902-
pholt11@winona.edu
(507) 202-1007

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 12:50:24 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nancy Partin
1504 Archibald St
Northfield, MN 55057-
nancypartin@charter.net
(507) 645-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/26/2016 12:23:49 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gian Dodge
214 S 19th Ave E
Duluth, MN 55812-
dcbnumber25@yahoo.com
(218) 428-9039

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 11:37:13 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Knoll
10081 103rd St N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
cjknoll1@comcast.net
(651) 426-4144

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 11:26:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Davis
6674 Boyd Ave
Eden Prairie, MN 55346-
marydavis@pobox.com
(952) 934-5692

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 10:38:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Gockowski
1427 Cliff Ave
Duluth, MN 55811-
hombre1@charter.net
(218) 728-4198

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 10:00:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Katherine Doyle
2232 Vermilion Rd
Duluth, MN 55803-
kaymattdoyle@hotmail.com
(218) 724-0589

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 9:39:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ericka Bjorngaard
414 Nicollet Ave Apt 4
North Mankato, MN 56003-
blitz.chan@gmail.com
(555) 555-5555

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 9:31:04 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janell Osborn
14510 Eagle Pointe Dr
Park Rapids, MN 56470-
josdvm@yahoo.com
(218) 237-7302

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 9:07:35 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michelle Anderson
2301 Cypress Dr
Saint Paul, MN 55125-
llanelli_1@hotmail.com
(651) 702-5489

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 8:53:08 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Last summer I became concerned about all the trains carrying various quality oils across different bodies of water in our state. I read the reports about the percent safety ratings and knew that it was only a matter time before we'd see water contaminated. It was two weeks after a train derailed as it was going into Wisconsin. The oil spilled on the Wisconsin side, so we weren't supposed to be worried about it. Then the wreck in northern MN and then the accident where a semi slammed into a train.

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laurie Ollhoff
16588 Fieldcrest Ave
Farmington, MN 55024-
lollhoff@charter.net
(651) 295-2519

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 7:37:17 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Garibaldi
9161 Archer Ln N
Maple Grove, MN 55311-
dgar77@aol.com
(763) 494-8851

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 7:10:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lee Mensinger
161 Cannon Bottom Rd
Red Wing, MN 55066-
lee.mensinger@gmail.com
(651) 388-6504

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 5:39:50 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alice Sather
22464 130th Ave NW
Newfolden, MN 56738-
aep.sather@gmail.com
(218) 523-4507

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 5:26:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Merrill
5912 Hidden Oaks Circle S.E.
Prior Lake, MN 55372-
kittymerrill43@gmail.com
(952) 447-5676

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 4:42:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elaine Ososki
6367 Saint Johns Dr
Eden Prairie, MN 55346-
eomarie@q.com
(952) 250-7201

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 4:38:40 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

K Cruit
5241 Chowen Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
k@sixbones.com
(612) 392-2000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 4:22:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pat Sykes
4524 Casco Ave
Edina, MN 55424-
seibelsykes@aol.com
(952) 925-0167

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 4:13:04 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Audrey Fairchild-Ehm
1837 Fernwood St
Roseville, MN 55113-
aafairchild@gmail.com
(651) 644-6059

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 3:40:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

J Isabelle Dyck
933 11th St SW
Rochester, MN 55902-
pjdyck@centurylink.net
(507) 289-1120

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 3:08:04 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carrie Eberhardt
1528 Praha St SE
New Prague, MN 56071-
smiley_face68@hotmail.com
(612) 618-7733

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 2:52:04 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cindy Collins
5309 Woodlawn Blvd
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
redfash53@yahoo.com
(612) 722-7251

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 2:22:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ryan Sabol
4721 Lyndale Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
ryelliot71@hotmail.com
(612) 227-1174

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 12:25:45 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laurinda Porter
39205 Oak Dr
Browerville, MN 56438-
rporter@rea-alp.com
(320) 555-1234

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 12:24:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rich Femling
1946 Tatum St
Saint Paul, MN 55113-
rich@rose-creek.com
(651) 647-1860

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 10:53:58 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dale Hadler
1723 W Broadway St Apt C
Winona, MN 55987-
dale_hadler@hotmail.com
(763) 218-3265

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 10:37:41 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Roberta Baker
1288 Sargent Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
rdbaker12@gmail.com
(507) 645-9109

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 10:31:20 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paula Fischer
3406 E 40th St
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
pfischer@comcast.net
(651) 206-0649

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 9:24:06 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Eltgroth
36399 Burr Oak Blvd
Cohasset, MN 55721-
eltgroth@paulbunyan.net
2189995053

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 9:22:48 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Leslie Dee
14725 Natchez Ave
Savage, MN 55378-
leslie1@mediacombb.net
1231234123

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 8:50:36 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Beatrice Sauve
7554 Laverne Ave S
Cottage Grove, MN 55016-
bsauve31@comcast.net
(651) 458-3480

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 8:33:47 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mandy Powell
10208 129th Ave N
Champlin, MN 55316-
mandybrite@gmail.com
(612) 666-2831

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 7:45:51 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Liz Dahl M.D.
2057 Lindsey Rd
Cook, MN 55723-
erdahlmd@aol.com
(218) 666-9806

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 6:28:50 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kelli Williams
7318 Landau Dr
Bloomington, MN 55438-
kayblogs@gmail.com
(267) 776-5150

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 5:56:35 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Ruffaner
4053 42nd Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
gran@usewireless.com
(612) 222-2222

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 3:29:51 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Frances Bell
1830 Laurel Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
franny.me@hotmail.com
(651) 210-8567

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 3:04:06 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terje Ness
901 2nd St W
Hastings, MN 55033-
nesstj@gmail.com
(651) 442-6427

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 2:27:00 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Nordlund
General Delivery
Moorhead, MN 56560-
jamesmnordlund@yahoo.com
(701) 850-0059

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 2:04:25 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Please take a close look at all of these eminent dangers and give the project the thumbs down.

Sincerely,

Judy Layzell
7420 Vincent Ave S
Richfield, MN 55423-
jlayzell1@gmail.com
(612) 239-2026

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/25/2016 1:27:25 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Anne Franklin
9914 Penn Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431-
labradoritesky@gmail.com
(952) 884-7209

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:01:12 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Amanda Jones
PO Box 425
Sauk Rapids, MN 56379-
alj324@gmail.com
(320) 761-0128

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:36:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Randy Nies
3407 Harriet Ave Apt 2
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
rnies99@earthlink.net
(612) 823-5638

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:32:35 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathy and Christopher Zerby
1500 15th St NW
New Brighton, MN 55112-
chriszerby1@msn.com
(651) 628-0074

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:14:17 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jan Jude
6182 112th St NW
Maple Lake, MN 55358-
daylilies9@hotmail.com
(320) 963-8026

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:11:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Donald Pederson
4325 Tioga St
Duluth, MN 55804-
donpederson@juno.com
(218) 525-3046

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:57:32 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gregory Hanson
9904 Yosemite Rd
Bloomington, MN 55437-
drgbhanson@gmail.com
(952) 270-2430

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:51:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michelle Gobely
1581 Wheelock Ln Apt 202
Saint Paul, MN 55117-
michellegobely@yahoo.com
(651) 489-4393

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:36:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

marguerite geier
7190 robinwood draw
woodbury, MN 55125-
maggiemusic@comcast.net
6515782667

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:22:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Smalley
16 Red Fox Rd
North Oaks, MN 55127-
juliesmalley601@yahoo.com
(651) 490-1879

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:19:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patricia Kounkel
25333 196th St
Staples, MN 56479-
pkounkel@gmail.com
(218) 296-1654

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:18:19 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mallory Malecek
1720 N Payne St
New Ulm, MN 56073-
mallory.malecek@jacks.sdstate.edu
(507) 341-4600

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:40:20 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janice Hoeschler
31018 Old Mill Rd
La Crescent, MN 55947-
jhriver@mac.com
(507) 643-6900

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:18:21 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christine Pruvot
332 Main St
Lakefield, MN 56150-
chrispruvot@hotmail.com
(202) 886-7464

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:13:45 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Koors
833 20th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
tomkoorstrk@gmail.com
(612) 331-2411

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:13:39 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Koors
833 20th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
tomkoorstrk@gmail.com
(612) 331-2411

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:13:47 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Koors
833 20th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
tomkoorstrk@gmail.com
(612) 331-2411

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:13:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Koors
833 20th Ave SE
Minneapolis, MN 55414-
tomkoorstrk@gmail.com
(612) 331-2411

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:46:24 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ramiro Herrera
49200 State Highway 48 Unit 79
Hinckley, MN 55037-
herreraramiro63@yahoo.com
(763) 258-9742

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:40:17 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Thone
1212 Washington Memorial Dr
Saint Cloud, MN 56301-
peaceofmind4ever@live.com
(320) 491-2075

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:40:08 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Jacobson
4860 Bryant Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
liz.jacobson7@gmail.com
(612) 470-7970

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:37:41 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William 'Skip' Dykoski
890 9th Ave NW
New Brighton, MN 55112-
skipdykoski@usfamily.net
(651) 636-2980

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:02:23 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Because the risks and the expenses to the communities are astronomical, and the oil profits are not rewarded to the community but to the corporation, this places an unnecessary, unnatural and unfair burden on the communities and the natural environment while they are already under enormous stress to preserve their way of life. Fossil fuels are unsustainable and ferociously destructive, making them an existential threat and real liability to the communities.

Sincerely,

Karen Boyd
493 Marshland Trl
Chanhassen, MN 55317-
web.oyd888@yahoo.com
(952) 937-2543

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:55:00 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Krista Munster
313 7th Ave NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
kristamunster@gmail.com
(952) 412-5277

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:37:51 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Chris Spanier
800 8th St N
Sartell, MN 56377-
cspanier@charter.net
(320) 656-3701

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:19:53 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wolfgang Bruce-Peralta
4456 Nokomis Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
95wolfgang@gmail.com
(612) 644-8908

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:53:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Havir
6108 Tracy Ave
Edina, MN 55436-
hhavir@nbs-inc.com
(952) 929-8725

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:52:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Guillotel
15799 Village Woods Dr
Eden Prairie, MN 55347-
guillojagr@yahoo.com
(612) 866-6759

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:51:39 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Kalbler
7269 Clay Ave
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-
lkalbler@yahoo.com
651455010

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:39:21 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alva Crom
1343 Blair Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
acrom13@aol.com
(612) 963-4766

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:36:44 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jessica Wardlaw
8263 Grange Blvd
Cottage Grove, MN 55016-
jssylynn94@msn.com
(612) 310-0914

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:06:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kay Cohen
1425 W 28th St Apt 210
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
cohen018@umn.edu
(612) 875-6171

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:00:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cathy Swanson
8660 Alvarado Ct
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077-
cathy.swanson@comcast.net
(651) 454-1550

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 4:41:32 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Rudser
111211 Village Rd
Chaska, MN 55318-
laura.rudser@gmail.com
(952) 857-9233

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 4:41:23 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Peter Frank
401 Sibley St, Apt C125
Saint Paul, MN 55101-
pgerardfrank@gmail.com
(605) 521-8879

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 4:23:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Catherine Larson
2750 Century Trl
Chanhassen, MN 55317-
alarson@mchsi.com
(612) 554-5687

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 4:02:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mike Chutich
1283 Sargent Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
susangmikec@q.com
(651) 698-8953

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 4:01:15 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Councilman
8801 Westmoreland Ln
St Louis Park, MN 55426-
dlcouncilman@hotmail.com
(612) 873-8069

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 3:51:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tony Tschida
6824 Mesabi Ct NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
ttschida@msn.com
(507) 280-7541

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 3:45:11 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Richard Smollen
11091 187th Ave NW
Elk River, MN 55330-
dicksmo1@q.com
(763) 274-0328

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 3:43:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ellen Ruffin
1916 S 6th St
Minneapolis, MN 55454-
epruffin@gmail.com
(612) 339-8086

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 3:25:19 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mercy Myers
1880 Grand Ave Apt 206
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
aylantisioi@yahoo.com
(612) 363-5346

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 2:56:51 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pamela Revier
917 Welter Rd SE
Saint Michael, MN 55376-
mysticmtnrose@aol.com
(612) 964-8015

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 2:50:37 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Stennes-Rogness
6443 Fawn Ln
Lino Lakes, MN 55014-
sstennes@flaschools.org
(651) 483-0667

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 2:48:10 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alice Bowron
5401 51st Ave N Apt 334
Minneapolis, MN 55429-
lupinsgalore@gmail.com
(612) 508-9976

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 2:44:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our environment. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and environment.

Sincerely,

Dan Wicht
941 Overton Dr NE
Fridley, MN 55432-
wicht_dan@yahoo.com
(763) 571-8635

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 2:07:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

George Riter
3511 Jerry St
White Bear Lk, MN 55110-
griter@msn.com
(651) 770-7611

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 1:45:06 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Lawrow
5015 Fremont Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
doclawrow@yahoo.com
(612) 825-7377

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 1:38:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sheila Schally
1104 Creekside Cir
Stillwater, MN 55082-
shlschllly@aol.com
(651) 439-6756

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 1:34:30 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Margaret Brennan
18180 Kelly Lake Rd
Carver, MN 55315-
celticthorn49@aol.com
(612) 805-8876

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 1:18:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Herther
1585 Cohansey St Apt 201
Saint Paul, MN 55117-
jnherther48@yahoo.com
(651) 489-4123

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 1:10:10 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mark Snyder
2302 Johnson St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55418-
snyde043@gmail.com
(651) 398-9880

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 1:07:10 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Beth Brombach
2214 Goodrich Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
bbrombach@comcast.net
(651) 699-8466

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:55:51 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Viken
1964 Prior Ave N
Roseville, MN 55113-
julie_viken@yahoo.com
(612) 625-1109

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:52:13 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marianna Como
212 Newton Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55405-
marianna.marcelle@gmail.com
(612) 210-2862

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:51:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Erin Daly
2524 Clinton Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
eerin.daly@gmail.com
(315) 246-3825

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:51:12 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

I ATTENDED A RECENT HEARING IN SAINT PAUL ON THE ENBRIDGE PIPELINE AND IT BECAME WORRISOME TO ME THAT THE HAZARDS OF THE ROUTE CLEAR ACROSS THE NORTHERN PART OF MINNESOTA HAVE NOT BEEN LOOKED AT AS THOROUGHLY AS SHOULD HAVE BEEN.

RIGHT NOW TO ALLOW THE PIPELINE WITHOUT MUCH MORE REVIEW WOULD BE A DISSERVICE TO THE RESIDENTS OF MINNESOTA

Sincerely,

Karl Meller
1806 3rd Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
krlmeller@yahoo.com
(612) 325-1134

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:46:30 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shelly Peddicord
3435 Colfax Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55412-
s_peddicord@msn.com
(651) 216-4066

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:31:56 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jan Karon
1112 S Lake Ave
Duluth, MN 55802-
wmhowe@chartermi.net
(218) 722-7200

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:31:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bj Tesch
219 E Vine St
Mankato, MN 56001-
teschbj@gmail.com
(507) 720-0773

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:28:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Anita Johnson
1243 Cherokee Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55118-
anitalouisejohnson@gmail.com
(651) 493-8928

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:00:46 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Becky Nelson
2001 Flag Ave N
Golden Valley, MN 55427-
beckykay9@gmail.com
(612) 670-2524

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:58:26 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Heidi Lynn Ahlstrand
1580 State Ave NW
Owatonna, MN 55060-
ironrancher@yahoo.com
(507) 214-3204

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:56:56 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Sothern
1903 Selby Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
sothe001@umn.edu
(651) 644-5438

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:45:35 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Billy Curmano
27979 County Road 17
Winona, MN 55987-
billyx.net@gmail.com
(507) 452-1598

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:44:49 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Virginia Huber
1516 W 61st St
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
coco1005@msn.com
(612) 869-0410

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:42:05 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Graden West
PO Box 422
New London, MN 56273-
graden@tds.net
(320) 354-5373

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:25:39 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Zimney
7110 Excelsior Way
St Louis Park, MN 55426-
dzimney@mac.com
(612) 501-0968

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:13:23 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Brennhofer
305 High Dr
Sartell, MN 56377-
jkbhawaii@msn.com
(320) 202-0871

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:10:09 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tyler Owens
21720 Flint Rd
Mankato, MN 56001-
skoomamonster@gmail.com
(507) 947-3080

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:08:39 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Daniel Biittner
4212 County Road 6
Barnum, MN 55707-
shankybe@gmail.com
(218) 389-3411

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 11:01:11 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Ceder
4950 170th Ln NE
Ham Lake, MN 55304-
daceder114@gmail.com
(612) 755-5611

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:54:21 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

We need to move away from oil and fund clean energy such as wind and solar. Stop destroying the planet with oil pipelines.

Sincerely,

Kathy Magne
1989 Wellesley Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
magn0042@umn.edu
(000) 000-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:54:07 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

We need to move away from oil and fund clean energy such as wind and solar. Stop destroying the planet with oil pipelines.

Sincerely,

Kathy Magne
1989 Wellesley Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
magn0042@umn.edu
(000) 000-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:44:27 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Penny and Rodger Cragun
927 N 8th Ave E
Duluth, MN 55805-
pcragun@d.umn.edu
(218) 727-2972

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:33:55 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynn Ouren
518 E Bancroft Ave
Fergus Falls, MN 56537-
louren@fergusotters.org
(218) 736-3095

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:29:45 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Warren Vogt
17495 W 263rd St
belle plaine, MN 56011-
wllvogt@gmail.com
(507) 665-2010

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 10:25:08 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Smisek
1762 Oakdale Ave
West St Paul, MN 55118-
grc4us@comcast.net
(612) 986-7809

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:59:13 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lani Greenway
43300 315th Ave
Laporte, MN 56461-
lanigreenway@yahoo.com
(218) 255-5212

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:53:45 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sean O'Brien
6028 10th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
smdobrien@gmail.com
(612) 597-9515

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:53:00 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melanie Ewald
2310 Valley Dr
Northfield, MN 55057-
ewaldmel@gmail.com
(952) 887-8971

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:52:02 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I'm writing to urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it very clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terry J. Williams
4170 Brigadoon Drive
Shoreview, MN 55126-
tjwilli333@gmail.com
(651) 484-6877

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:50:44 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jay Springer
6171 Linda Ln
Lino Lakes, MN 55014-
jayjspringer@outlook.com
(651) 917-2585

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:49:59 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cathy Swenson
10940 Morris Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55437-
cswenson2@comcast.net
(952) 884-2343

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:47:57 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Chad Martin
7144 10th Ave S
Richfield, MN 55423-
chad.e.martin@gmail.com
(612) 208-7379

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:46:35 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Donovan
2190 Pinehurst Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
timdtdai@hotmail.com
(651) 699-1170

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:46:12 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Asa Adams-Phipps
1200 27th Ave NE
Minneapolis, MN 55418-
lavatrazzz@gmail.com
(612) 781-7379

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:45:33 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terrence Nayas
9133 Preserve Blvd
Eden Prairie, MN 55347-
nayest2@asme.org
(952) 829-7652

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:45:33 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Schmidt
10275 County Road 27 SW
Farwell, MN 56327-
auntie.ladybug2012@gmail.com
(320) 886-5457

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:43:14 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Emi Ito
2366 Chilcombe Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
emi3ito@gmail.com
(612) 306-2956

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:40:26 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I ask you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Debra Evon
1760 Hennepin Ave Apt 34
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
daevon@stkate.edu
(651) 690-7832

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:40:00 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kevin Stueven
11 McKinley PI N
Saint Cloud, MN 56303-
housestudio@msn.com
(123) 456-7890

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:39:08 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joanna Winship
2909 E 22nd St
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
josiewinship@gmail.com
(612) 720-2929

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:38:43 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Erickson
2515 S 9th St
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
ohmakwa69@hotmail.com
(651) 221-1016

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:38:27 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ben Zimmerman
2225 Folwell Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
zimme003@umn.edu
(651) 645-1662

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:38:07 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Meg Lee
22210 Jasmine Way
Rogers, MN 55374-
megnbyron@hotmail.com
(763) 496-1322

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:35:35 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gail Amundson
665 Fairmount Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
gailamundsonllc@gmail.com
(651) 245-1925

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:30:09 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Stark
304 3rd St SE
Stewartville, MN 55976-
sacsac@charter.net
(507) 533-8403

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:29:07 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Steinhauser
6320 163rd Ln NW
Ramsey, MN 55303-
steinhauser6320@comcast.net
(763) 753-4105

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:26:54 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a sincere and thorough scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

Please do your important work of protecting the environment and acting in the true interest of Minnesota citizens by ensuring a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

P Buck
8215 Kelsey Whiteface Rd
Cotton, MN 55724-
perigee51@ymail.com
(218) 481-2557

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:25:22 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Denise Stime
4079 153rd St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
stimedog@charter.net
(612) 558-6118

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:30:09 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Stark
304 3rd St SE
Stewartville, MN 55976-
sacsac@charter.net
(507) 533-8403

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:11:00 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Please do not allow this pipeline to go through Minnesota. We cannot afford highly potential spills to happen here as it did in Deer River and previous spills in Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and North Dakota. It seems quite obvious what happens when Enbridge is involved!

Sincerely,

Diana Dale-Hargraves
1121 Summit Way
Sauk Rapids, MN 56379-
blizzard1983@charter.net
(320) 217-3651

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:09:37 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jordan Morgan
213 14th St. NW
Bemidji, MN 56601-
jordan.morgan@live.bemidjistate.edu
(507) 995-3795

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:09:11 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Owen Gustafson
1106 Innsbrook Ln
Buffalo, MN 55313-
owen362@hotmail.com
(612) 720-2315

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:05:09 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kevin Koschak
2384 151st Ave NW
Andover, MN 55304-
kjkoschak@hotmail.com
(612) 750-9769

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:05:02 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary K Bacon
4117 Grand Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55409-
marybaconinteriors@earthlink.net
(612) 210-1599

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:00:11 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Howard Lambert
35495 Riverwood Ct Unit 1623
Crosslake, MN 56442-
howard@crosslake.net
(218) 692-5521

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:00:20 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ann Marie Sunderland
15555 Flight Way
Apple Valley, MN 55124-
annie.sunderland@co.dakota.mn.us
(952) 891-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 9:29:07 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Steinhauser
6320 163rd Ln NW
Ramsey, MN 55303-
steinhauser6320@comcast.net
(763) 753-4105

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:53:09 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Allan Bouley
PO Box 2015
Collegeville, MN 56321-
abouley@csbsju.edu
(320) 363-3976

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:52:42 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steve and Kathryn Law
451 Jayne St
Saint Paul, MN 55119-
lawsafety@aol.com
(651) 210-7727

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:50:27 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Leigh Johnson
6408 31st Ave N
Golden Valley, MN 55427-
designs@arcink.com
(763) 545-4980

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:46:47 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Our water supply is priceless-and we need to do everything we can to protect it.

Thank you,

-Pat Pardun
Marine on St. Croix, MN

Sincerely,

Pat Pardun
PO Box 146
Marine on Saint Croix, MN 55047-
pat@soundmindnow.com
(651) 214-6689

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:42:12 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jenni Charrier
1910 Heritage Dr
Wayzata, MN 55391-
jcharrier21@gmail.com
(555) 555-5555

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:29:56 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lucy Duroche
3542 4th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
laduroche@yahoo.com
(612) 827-7869

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:20:34 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dawn Skinner
1745 Sheridan Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
daskinner@landolakes.com
(612) 267-5260

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:20:05 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

J Mcdavitt
21125 Christmas Ln
Excelsior, MN 55331-
mcdpam@mchsi.com
(952) 474-3197

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 8:07:25 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patrick Keiser
197 Balsam Ridge Rd SW
Bemidji, MN 56601-
jagodoggo@yahoo.com
(218) 444-4642

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:59:56 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sherilyn Moe
4920 W Upland Crst
Minneapolis, MN 55421-
sherilynmoe@gmail.com
(651) 431-2551

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:58:53 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Raush
2211 40th Ave NE
Columbia Heights, MN 55421-
scott@pixel8.net
(763) 789-4310

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:56:38 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Ring
17389 Deerfield Dr SE
Prior Lake, MN 55372-
slshbb@yahoo.com
(612) 499-9986

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:51:11 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jean Liss
2295 Helmo Ct N
Oakdale, MN 55128-
liss.jean5@gmail.com
(651) 210-7294

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:50:59 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patrick O'Boyle
1849 Narvik Ct
Eagan, MN 55122-
patrick_o Boyle_1@hotmail.com
(651) 270-1503

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:44:43 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Mockler
3091 Evelyn St
Roseville, MN 55113-
linda61moke@gmail.com
(651) 621-8946

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:44:44 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Mockler
3091 Evelyn St
Roseville, MN 55113-
linda61moke@gmail.com
(651) 621-8946

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:40:04 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Shedd
4554 Wentworth Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
beckysmpls@yahoo.com
(612) 825-0522

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:39:53 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William Hunter
PO Box 2015
Collegeville, MN 56321-
wm.a.hunter@gmail.com
(320) 363-3079

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:35:34 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Chase
2558 Beacon St
Roseville, MN 55113-
roverrob@comcast.net
(651) 340-7599

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:34:07 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Anne Kaphingst
5109 Beacon Hill Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
amkaphingst@hotmail.com
(952) 935-1566

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:29:57 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jean Marie Lindquist
1666 Coffman St
Falcon Heights, MN 55108-
lindq011@umn.edu
(651) 646-0081

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:26:58 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Our OWN Grand Rapids had an oil spill and the wetlands NE in our community will never be what they were ~ near the Community College area.

Thank you for listening

Sincerely,

Yvette Schultenover
31167 Cimarron Trail
Grand Rapids, MN 55744-
oncimarron@gmail.com
(218) 326-4828

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:26:22 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steve Wiley
229 Cedar Lake Rd N
Minneapolis, MN 55405-
srwiley46@hotmail.com
(612) 377-3017

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:17:04 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jackie Richens
14501 Atrium Way
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
sheenajlr@gmail.com
(123) 456-7890

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:14:54 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Ward
14011 Excelsior Blvd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
jwardhealingarts@gmail.com
(612) 308-7529

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:14:51 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Edward Shields
PO Box 165
Grand Portage, MN 55605-
shields.ed11@gmail.com
(888) 888-8888

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:13:28 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Gibson
38075 270th St
Peterson, MN 55962-
bongibson50@gmail.com
(612) 237-4802

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 7:05:35 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terry Hangartner
52 Field Ave SW
Byron, MN 55920-
t_hangart@yahoo.com
(507) 775-6518

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:59:56 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Amy Kvalseth
4980 Shady Island Cir
Mound, MN 55364-
avkvalseth@yahoo.com
(952) 470-1170

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:54:59 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Al Larson
3408 Beauty Lake Rd SW
Pillager, MN 56473-
alarson@brainerd.net
(218) 746-3512

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:44:33 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Holden
4924 Oakley St
Duluth, MN 55804-
kbhkbh.holden@gmail.com
(218) 525-1588

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:44:25 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mariam Vandellen
600 4th St SW Apt 306
Rochester, MN 55902-
marianvd07@charter.net
(507) 282-4565

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:43:28 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Chuck Nelson
2694 Apache Rd N
Saint Paul, MN 55109-
bkcmnelson@comcast.net
(651) 777-1831

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:41:35 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Steele
7451 Dallas Ct N
Maple Grove, MN 55311-
tempou812@hotmail.com
(763) 555-5555

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:29:18 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ann Gustafson
29 Myra Ave
Carlton, MN 55718-
anniegust@gmail.com
(218) 349-7696

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:18:32 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Donna Seabloom
1206 Pacific St
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
hartl008@umn.edu
(651) 771-5147

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:16:17 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Greg Thompson
501 Warner Ave N
Mahtomedi, MN 55115-
gregtrack@hotmail.com
(651) 431-1979

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 6:15:49 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Clapper
5301 Broadwing Dr
Duluth, MN 55804-
dlclapper@charter.net
(218) 464-1328

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:53:30 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathy Harvey
1322 Alton St Apt 321
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
medalist_01@hotmail.com
(651) 295-5309

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:46:18 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michele Phillips
1121 Linden St W
Stillwater, MN 55082-
mermaidspurseco@yahoo.com
(612) 816-5011

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 5:06:33 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Ingalls
56213 Grant St
Park Rapids, MN 56470-
jeannecnb@yahoo.com
(218) 573-2058

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 4:18:57 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Diane Brown Berthiaume
1718 McKnight Ln
Maplewood, MN 55109-
dianebrown619@gmail.com
(651) 404-0748

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 4:12:24 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Callanan
3828 Garfield Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55409-
cynthia.callanan@gmail.com
(612) 210-4691

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 4:05:47 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dan Englund
PO Box 128
Harris, MN 55032-
danenglund69@outlook.com
(651) 248-3435

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 3:56:26 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Larry Anderson
953 Goodrich Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
larscoyote@yahoo.com
(651) 308-3530

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 3:45:21 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

N Brian Winchester
27881 Far North Dr
Nevis, MN 56467-
winchest@indiana.edu
(812) 606-0532

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 3:44:29 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Heyward Nash
1425 10th Ave S Apt 656
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
hlnash2006@yahoo.com
(612) 871-1115

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 3:43:31 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sarah Mason
PO Box 5446
Hopkins, MN 55343-
morgan.mason@btinternet.com
(815) 908-1319

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 3:13:03 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melissa Paepke
9540 23rd Ave N
Plymouth, MN 55441-
mamhbn291@yahoo.com
(612) 968-0070

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 2:55:06 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ibrahim Ali
3501 27th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
ibrahimjali@icloud.com
(952) 356-2581

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 2:06:06 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jane Norling
5450 Ridgewood Cv
Mound, MN 55364-
kmtcomm@gmail.com
(952) 472-7155

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 2:00:47 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ea Beck
38 Restless Ct
North Mankato, MN 56003-
theshift33@aol.com
(507) 380-5907

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 1:56:59 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patricia Makowski
5245 Neal Ave N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
pat@patmakowski.com
(555) 888-4444

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 1:23:11 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gaye Sorenson
247 Kennard St
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
fertileground13@gmail.com
(612) 774-6578

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 1:09:55 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Landers
1275 Silverwood Rd
Woodbury, MN 55125-
mikel7_8@msn.com
(651) 739-0303

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:31:08 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Nat Lel
1152 Crosstown Blvd.
Chaska, MN 55318-
nat_lel@yahoo.com
(952) 233-1316

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:25:20 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kevin Mackin
5236 47th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
kujawake@msn.com
(651) 235-1580

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:15:40 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Aubrianna Schlottman
601 Airport Rd N
Dodge Center, MN 55927-
aub_schlot@hotmail.com
(507) 363-2736

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:05:06 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Please conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

As you may know, a recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to consider how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

The Minnesota Department of Commerce must ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and the potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gwen Myers
12009 Hilloway Rd W
Minnetonka, MN 55305-
salmyers@comcast.net
(952) 545-8696

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/24/2016 12:02:15 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jessica Blagen
10386 Rich Rd
Minneapolis, MN 55437-
jblagen@yahoo.com
(555) 555-5555

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:53:58 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wai Wong-Lai
3552 Tiffany Ln
Shoreview, MN 55126-
wwjc4@msn.com
(651) 482-7706

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:51:49 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Molly Pikala
6715 Penn Ave S Apt 1
Minneapolis, MN 55423-
mollyp28@yahoo.com
(612) 418-1438

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](#)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](#)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:51:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Please conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project, taking into account the cumulative impact of these two projects on communities, tribal lands, lakes and rivers, and our climate.

The DOC needs to scrutinize how oil spills would be cleaned up, potential permanent damage to waterways, and possible impacts to Minnesota's economy and Ojibwe culture.

Sincerely,

Todd Eddy
PO Box 17300
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
teddy20@earthlink.net
(612) 805-1699

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:38:40 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Abbey
128 W 27th St
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
sweeter612@yahoo.com
(612) 824-6800

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:29:08 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Wetzler
3221 47th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
sinenom32@gmail.com
(612) 729-4485

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:24:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Diane Sands
9270 Talus Cir
Eden Prairie, MN 55347-
talusgirl@gmail.com
(612) 710-0333

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:21:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Blanchard And Doris Krogstad
25894 430th St SE
Winger, MN 56592-
krogs003@gvtel.com
(218) 563-4800

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:18:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paul Heffron
4389 Hodgson Rd
Shoreview, MN 55126-
paul-peg-heffron@comcast.net
(651) 483-9222

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:18:01 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joshua Wiley
1283 Van Buren Ave Apt 3
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
wileyjoshua1@gmail.com
(715) 977-7286

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:08:44 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Delores Van Steenwyk
11349 Easy St
Brainerd, MN 56401-
deegilvan@charter.net
(218) 829-5084

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:04:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas More Hynes
38531 Highway 109
Winnebago, MN 56098-
jchrist101@gmail.com
(507) 893-3403

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:02:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cathi Koenig
902 10th Ave S
Moorhead, MN 56560-
wildwindnd@yahoo.com
(218) 443-3456

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 11:02:55 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cathi Koenig
902 10th Ave S
Moorhead, MN 56560-
wildwindnd@yahoo.com
(218) 443-3456

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:58:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I live on the Pine River and would definitely be impacted by any leaks or spills up stream from my home. All the fishing, paddling, tubing, etc that brings economic activity to this area would end if there is an oil spill. All this needs to be accounted for in the scoping.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Kaufman
1295 32nd St SW
Pine River, MN 56474-
bkaufman@tds.net
(218) 587-2326

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:58:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wanda Ballentine
1181 Edgcumbe Rd Apt 314
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
wsb70@comcast.net
(651) 200-3093

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:57:46 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Gilkinson
812 29th St NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
jlgilkinson@gmail.com
(507) 289-2762

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:53:33 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol And Al Frechette
1511 6th Ave W
Shakopee, MN 55379-
frech001@tc.umn.edu
(952) 496-3244

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:53:00 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William And Janice Kimes
12002 Vermillion St NE Unit B
Blaine, MN 55449-
jbkimes@msn.com
(763) 862-3130

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:51:30 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sarah Johnson
1000 Cannon Valley Dr Apt 120
Northfield, MN 55057-
johnsonbergen@gmail.com
(970) 692-1356

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:42:22 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Tezla
1876 Yorkshire Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55116-
mtezla@mac.com
(651) 699-0361

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:41:20 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melissa Soleta
26974 197th St
Reading, MN 56165-
mattnmel84@hotmail.com
(605) 217-3107

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:39:33 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Jenkins
42704 Lisa Ln
Winona, MN 55987-
julieraejenkins@hotmail.com
(507) 643-5029

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:38:11 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Uphaus
2650 N Pine Creek Rd
La Crescent, MN 55947-
tuphaus@acegroup.cc
(507) 895-2152

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:38:11 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Uphaus
2650 N Pine Creek Rd
La Crescent, MN 55947-
tuphaus@acegroup.cc
(507) 895-2152

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:34:24 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Seymour Gross
1941 Drew Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55416-
sy_gross@msn.com
(612) 926-5961

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:33:50 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Mills
6318 Pillsbury Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55423-
mindseye2010@comcast.net
(612) 869-2782

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:33:17 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Peters
868 Margaret St Apt 3
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
ydpeters2003@yahoo.com
(612) 306-2049

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:32:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Tripp
5150 Logan Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
janet.tripp@hcmed.org
(612) 926-7952

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:30:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Theresa Del Rosario
881 Otto Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55102-
tdr63@hotmail.com
(651) 229-0560

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:27:24 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joan and Hane Carlson
14216 Woodhaven Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
mail4jmwc@yahoo.com
(952) 938-0088

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:19:30 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Crazy Woman
Po Box 813
Rochester, MN 55903-
bretts.woman1974@gmail.com
(507) 269-4592

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:18:12 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:18:06 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:18:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:18:08 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:18:10 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:18:09 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day Place
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:15:18 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Christoferson
15801 Day PI
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
phchristoferson@yahoo.com
(952) 933-3866

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:15:03 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gayle Bidne
1755 Thury Ct
White Bear Lake, MN 55110-
gbidne06@comcast.net
(651) 493-8944

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:06:03 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jason Husby
3531 N 3rd St
Minneapolis, MN 55412-
jcobainfan@aol.com
(612) 529-0463

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:05:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dimitris Lappas
6408 Cherokee Trl
Edina, MN 55439-
lappas196100@gmail.com
(952) 486-7806

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:04:18 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judie Carlson
12521 74th Ave N
Maple Grove, MN 55369-
judiecar@comcast.net
(763) 315-0535

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:04:14 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Clarence Juelich
601 1st Ave S
Wheaton, MN 56296-
cjuelich@frontiernet.net
(320) 563-8520

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 10:02:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Maurer
606 2nd St SE
Little Falls, MN 56345-
robertlawmaurer@gmail.com
(320) 293-7411

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:59:03 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Norma Roberts-Hakizimana
411 Charles Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55103-
nrrn53@yahoo.com
(651) 224-1039

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:56:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Miller
4106 57th Street Ln NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
millersmj@charter.net
(507) 206-0332

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:55:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Meredith Kathryn
20430 Everton Trl N
Forest Lake, MN 55025-
kury0003@umn.edu
(612) 210-0198

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:52:14 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bailey Bear
7717 Chicago Ave
Richfield, MN 55423-
baileybear008@gmail.com
(612) 824-0150

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:51:08 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Lempp
PO Box 647
Moose Lake, MN 55767-
wallebiz@arcor.de
(711) 887-4845

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:51:08 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Lempp
PO Box 647
Moose Lake, MN 55767-
wallebiz@arcor.de
(711) 887-4845

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:50:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Vande Vusse
13960 Kentucky Ave
Savage, MN 55378-
mavandevusse@aol.com
(952) 440-2191

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:50:00 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ewa Bukaj
1640 Randolph Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
tangodaze@yahoo.com
(805) 669-8075

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:48:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Dulas
5311 Greenwood Rd
Duluth, MN 55804-
goodbubba@icloud.com
(218) 624-1351

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:46:29 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Keith Thompson
1544 Minnehaha Ave E
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
kaminsp@usgo.net
(651) 699-3939

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:45:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce;

Please reject the pipeline in favor of renewables. Let nature do it!!!

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Katha Ricciardi
22529 Henderson Rd
Cohasset, MN 55721-
mail4katha@yahoo.com
(340) 201-4440

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:41:13 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tamara Rakow
14231 Azalea Path
Rosemount, MN 55068-
tamararakow@hotmail.com
(651) 423-0267

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:35:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elanne Palcich
29 5th St SE
Chisholm, MN 55719-
epalcich@cpinternet.com
(218) 254-3754

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:33:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marianne Thiry
824 Fairfield PI NW
Isanti, MN 55040-
mthiry@live.com
(320) 396-3528

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:32:11 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gilbert Woods
3301 14th St S Apt 108
Moorhead, MN 56560-
woods2.gbert@yahoo.com
(218) 443-0584

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:32:00 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Zachary Pera Cole
3522 Newton Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55412-
zachary-peracole@pkt.qsi.org
(612) 588-7042

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:26:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Molly Rosa
3616 18th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
mollysrosa@gmail.com
(952) 465-6306

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:25:32 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Ross
11840 Falls Trl
Lonsdale, MN 55046-
suzanne.ross2006@hotmail.com
(612) 756-0232

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:25:17 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate. P.S. Enbridge is owned at least in part by the Koch Brothers:(

Sincerely,

LK Woodruff
2884 138th St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
lkw777@charter.net
(651) 295-0935

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:23:03 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Hilgemann
676 Ashland Ave Apt 12
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
jameshilgemann@msn.com
(651) 298-1396

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:22:35 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brian Krysinski
302 Cedar Lake Rd S # 1
Minneapolis, MN 55405-
briankrys@gmail.com
(612) 374-4269

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:22:09 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Daniel Bembenek
748 36 1/2 Ave NE
Minneapolis, MN 55418-
dbk3@live.com
(612) 788-8274

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:19:17 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Stottlemyer
1455 Arden View Dr
Arden Hills, MN 55112-
stott003@live.com
(222) 222-2222

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:19:11 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Selz
220 Northland Ave
Stillwater, MN 55082-
kselz@comcast.net
(612) 743-8705

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:18:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dianne Hudson
93 E 4th St Apt 308
Zumbrota, MN 55992-
dianne.hudson01@gmail.com
(320) 291-8645

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:18:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Devriendt
1016 Macarthur Ave
West St Paul, MN 55118-
ldevriendt@comcast.net
(651) 451-1741

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:17:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mark Thompson
4782 Sycamore Trl
Maple Plain, MN 55359-
hybridmcgee@hotmail.com
(612) 910-2566

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:16:44 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tara Mcnaughton
2025 30th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
taramcn@mninter.net
(612) 000-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:11:02 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pat Mcpeak
1008 Goodrich Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
pmcpeak@hotmail.com
(651) 792-5316

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:09:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michele Granse
462 Brainerd Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55130-
mlgranse@msn.com
(251) 654-7932

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:09:30 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gary Fifield
1893 Berkeley Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55105-
garyfifield@comcast.net
(600) 695-1065

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:06:32 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Impila
15 9 1/2 St NE
Chisholm, MN 55719-
telltale_tim@yahoo.com
(218) 969-8559

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:04:01 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Martin Bisek
27865 Lavonne Ave
New Prague, MN 56071-
martintbisek@gmail.com
(952) 913-4087

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:02:41 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Johnson
28311 County 93
Laporte, MN 56461-
karndave@paulbunyan.net
(218) 224-2710

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 9:01:18 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alyssa Filipkowski
8108 242nd Ave NE
Stacy, MN 55079-
alyssafilipkowski@yahoo.com
1234567890

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:57:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wendy Paul
779 County 5 NW
Hackensack, MN 56452-
wlpwomanlake@yahoo.com
(218) 682-3124

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:56:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Postance
7398 Highway 29
Meadowlands, MN 55765-
postance@frontiernet.net
(218) 427-2564

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:53:35 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kate Havelin
2028 Ashland Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
katehavelin@gmail.com
(651) 642-1242

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:52:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Roxana Allen
2384 Highway 83
Zim, MN 55738-
roxanaallen@gmail.com
(218) 744-0591

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:52:15 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lyn Pegg
1335 Minnesota Ave
Duluth, MN 55802-
carolynpegg@yahoo.com
(218) 348-3048

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:50:18 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Rue
15230 Buchanan Ct
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-
catcaroldog@gmail.com
(952) 934-9945

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:49:04 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Andrew Larson
3072 River Falls Ct NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
andrew_larson125@email.com
(507) 202-0372

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:48:56 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terry Ford
3404 Aldrich Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
tahomes@comcast.net
(612) 803-1559

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:49:03 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judi Toftner
5137 44th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
jbtft1@msn.com
(612) 824-6799

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:47:23 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susanne Wollman
2847 Zarthan Ave S
St Louis Park, MN 55416-
sjw2847@gmail.com
(952) 915-1779

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:47:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pierre Piper
4301 Park Glen Rd Apt 325
St Louis Park, MN 55416-
piperpierre@yahoo.com
(612) 462-3461

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:44:44 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Elko, MS, PA-C
267 Roma Ave
Roseville, MN 55113-
stephanie.elko@gmail.com
(612) 236-7396

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:43:32 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paula Crown
1191 California Dr Apt 201
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
panncorona@gmail.com
(651) 262-3101

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:40:44 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

Hello and Hashtag,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brian Wilferson
3215 Harbor Ln N
Plymouth, MN 55447-
stinkerbw@hotmail.com
(952) 154-7896

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:40:40 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Wissinger
951 Nason Hill Rd N
Marine on Saint Croix, MN 55047-
julieww951@gmail.com
(651) 433-4324

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:36:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Eileen Levin
5379 Beachside Dr
Minnetonka, MN 55343-
leenlev@q.com
(952) 933-7526

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:34:20 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Liisa Welch
10155 Greenbrier Rd Apt 306
Hopkins, MN 55305-
irisluk12@gmail.com
No phone

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:29:51 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Mills
9 N Yukon Dr
Ely, MN 55731-
scottwmills@frontiernet.net
(218) 365-4322

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:25:21 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alyssa Hall
829 Stewart St
North Mankato, MN 56003-
albrown31@hotmail.com
(507) 381-7563

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:23:21 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Matthew Mcdonough
3109 Columbus Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
mttmcdonough@gmail.com
(612) 298-5131

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:20:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Robert Spitzer
6129 Morgan Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
callmebwana@gmail.com
(612) 226-2866

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:20:04 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dan Ireland
1975 Selby Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
danireland46@gmail.com
(651) 647-0074

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:19:14 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wendy Haan
3824 47th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
wenderful73@yahoo.com
(612) 709-8223

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:19:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ed Marek
5676 Upper 136th Street Ct W
Saint Paul, MN 55124-
khangee1@yahoo.com
(952) 432-2489

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:17:47 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Hartman
2116 16th St SE
Austin, MN 55912-
tombirdmanusa@q.com
(507) 206-9169

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:15:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Carlson
45403 150th St
Roseau, MN 56751-
carolc@wikel.com
111-111-1111

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:15:10 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Paul Roy
3235 40th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
jpack9@usewireless.com
(612) 729-3436

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:12:11 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bright Dornblaser
4630 Drexel Ave
Edina, MN 55424-
dornb001@umn.edu
(952) 920-1281

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:11:46 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pam Martin
7144 10th Ave S
Richfield, MN 55423-
pzambert@gmail.com
(000) 000-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:09:30 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Abby Dahlquist
545 Lynn Rd SW
Hutchinson, MN 55350-
asd@mchsi.com
(320) 587-9610

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:06:40 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judy Peterson
581 Atlantic Hill Dr
Eagan, MN 55123-
judyp@excelcov.org
(651) 454-8035

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:06:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judith Moore
1430 Independence Ave S
Saint Louis Park, MN 55426-
moore.judith@uwalumni.com
(952) 541-9482

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:04:04 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

After signing the Paris Agreement, we need to end fossil fuels and do renewables.

Sincerely,

Bruce Eng
208 Alpine Rdg
Wabasha, MN 55981-
tillie81@hbc.com
(651) 565-4468

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:03:59 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Joanne Sieck
5877 River Ridge Ct NE
Rochester, MN 55906-
jpsieck@gmail.com
(507) 280-7507

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:01:06 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim King
15261 County 38
Long Prairie, MN 56347-
tyjking49@centurylink.net
(320) 732-4500

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 8:00:20 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Erika Eberhardt
420 Leicester Ave
Duluth, MN 55803-
erikaeb@earthlink.net
(218) 724-2958

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:58:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Beth Muetzel
17816 602nd Ave
Mankato, MN 56001-
dian@hickorytech.net
1111111111

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:52:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brittany Nelson
8731 Woodlawn Dr
Rockford, MN 55373-
brlnelson1987@aol.com
(763) 438-6544

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:51:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Simmonds
1455 Almond Ave Apt 324
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
barbarasimmonds@bmsreiki.com
(651) 236-0012

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:47:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Assata Brown
1659 Sheridan Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411-
her1@hotmail.com
(612) 522-4534

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:44:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Klea Brewton
627 S 7th St
Saint Peter, MN 56082-
kleabf@hickorytech.net
(507) 243-3022

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:42:14 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jo Sanders
2662 Scotland Ct Apt 305
Mounds View, MN 55112-
jo.sanders03@gmail.com
(763) 780-6057

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:41:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Margie Schmidt
23319 Lofton Ave N
Scandia, MN 55073-
madierschmidt@comcast.net
(651) 323-8651

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:41:22 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Andrea Norusis
466 Preserve Path
Saint Paul, MN 55118-
anorusis@yahoo.com
(651) 457-6777

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:41:02 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tom Thompson
1370 White Lake Dr
Duluth, MN 55803-
thomasthompson@frontier.com
(218) 848-8031

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:41:00 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Stu Farnsworth
1646 Donald Ct
Eagan, MN 55121-
yukostu@gmail.com
(045) 507-6027

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:39:59 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shirley Espeland
2250 Luther Place
St. Paul, MN 55108-
slesp84@gmail.com
(651) 646-8971

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:37:44 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Daniel Hulse
16206 Creekwood Cir
Prior Lake, MN 55372-
dhulse@integraonline.com
(952) 913-3712

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:37:20 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Pipelines leak, are dirty and they are the part of the technology that we need to shut down in order to save our planet from climate change. We know that carbon pollution is threatening the survival of our species so why can't we bite the bullet and invest in solar and wind energy instead? I expect leaders to lead--not just rubber stamp what the fossil fuel industry wants. Let's advocate for ourselves instead of corporate profits and SAY NO to these dirty pipelines. This is Minnesota and we shouldn't have to risk our environment for dirty tar sands oil from Canada. Vote against these pipeline to keep Northern Minnesota from being the next catastrophic oil spill location. Keep Minnesota Pristine! Say NO to Sandpiper Line 3 and ALL Pipelines!

Sincerely,

Linda Rolf
1900 1st Ave S Apt 26
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
lindarolf@hotmail.com
(612) 419-3716

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:36:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Johnson
1131 Lecuyer Ct
Stillwater, MN 55082-
bajcjohnson@comcast.net
(651) 430-1155

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:34:41 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Beth Olson
5664 Sanibel Dr
Minnetonka, MN 55343-
bolson11@comcast.net
(952) 938-1604

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:33:58 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brett Smith
5300 Irving Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
smithb55419@yahoo.com
(612) 920-9569

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:33:33 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Russell Hankins
4445 Banbury Ln
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
rhankins@earthlink.net
(952) 933-2195

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:33:21 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Thomborson
3199 Humboldt Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
bt@bt.gen.nz
(649) 817-1234

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:31:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Emily Leisenheimer
13151 Hillview Ln
Little Falls, MN 56345-
emleisen@yahoo.com
(320) 360-1122

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:31:21 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Don Hon
3135 Arthur St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55418-
dphon4@aol.com
(612) 782-9255

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:29:41 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Mittelstaedt
110945 Von Herten Cir
Chaska, MN 55318-
tommvinyl@yahoo.com
(952) 368-6065

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:29:18 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Julie Medbery
1313 Owens St N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
jmedbery@comcast.net
(651) 342-8999

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:24:50 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alec Hendrickson
3219 W 44th St
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
godzillavkk@mac.com
6212-377-5760

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:24:46 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kristi Kort
939 Juno Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55102-
peace_reaper@hotmail.com
(612) 245-2222

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:23:58 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Doris Petrie
18007 Saint Croix Trl N
Marine On Saint Croix, MN 55047-
dorispetrie@gmail.com
(651) 433-3565

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:23:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Ondich
3137 Emerson Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
david.ondich@gmail.com
(612) 824-9812

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:22:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rita Caruso Santamaria
1645 Hazelwood St
Saint Paul, MN 55106-
rcwhitgr@smumn.edu
(651) 771-2942

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:18:40 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Erik And Dee Voldal
3409 Woodstone Dr SW
Rochester, MN 55902-
evoldal@msn.com
(507) 285-1658

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:18:34 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jo-Ann Sramek
4882 Woodridge Dr
Hermantown, MN 55811-
jip7766@gmail.com
(218) 729-5865

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:14:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alva Pingel
13894 Birchwood Ave
Rosemount, MN 55068-
afping3@charter.net
(651) 332-2138

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:14:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Theresa Terhark
2227 German St
Maplewood, MN 55109-
tterhark@msn.com
(651) 337-0189

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:13:47 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Aaron Tank
2319 W 10th St
Duluth, MN 55806-
newleaf586@yahoo.com
(218) 760-1599

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:13:18 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

J Schwendeman
1414 Linden St W
Stillwater, MN 55082-
schwendemn@aol.com
(651) 342-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:11:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susan Clark
5898 N Pike Lake Rd
Duluth, MN 55811-
moosecookies85@gmail.com
(218) 428-7632

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:10:55 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mick Dhein
7233 Oak Grove Blvd
Richfield, MN 55423-
mickdhein@comcast.net
(612) 597-9956

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:10:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kristie Mandel
10705 40th Ave N
Plymouth, MN 55441-
riskri@hotmail.com
(310) 484-6299

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:10:18 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Misty Schmidt
508 7th St SE
Royalton, MN 56373-
schmidtm83@gmail.com
(612) 353-7653

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:10:13 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Clayton Sankey
6484 Kings Dr
Oakdale, MN 55128-
clay.sankey@gmail.com
(651) 770-0355

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:09:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Vicki Andrews
31135 Sunny Beach Rd
Grand Rapids, MN 55744-
vicandr@mchsi.com
(218) 259-4254

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:08:31 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marcia Allard
9243 Narcissus Rd
Saint Joseph, MN 56374-
marciaallard@aol.com
(320) 363-7287

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:06:12 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lois Kennel
211 2nd St NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
loiskennel@gmail.com
(507) 288-0984

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:05:11 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynda Haemig
7161 Riverview Ter NE
Minneapolis, MN 55432-
lyndaandy@centurylink.net
(763) 572-8955

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:04:49 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jon Bradley Hochalter
820 4th St N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
bradhochalter@comcast.net
(651) 323-0876

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:01:44 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cecilia Fogarty
4211 156th St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
cgmfogarty@gmail.com
(612) 387-7186

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 7:00:21 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Becker
2000 County Road B2 W Unit 130655
Roseville, MN 55113-
ja.becker@comcast.net
(122) 345-6789

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:58:12 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Catherine Harrison
12800 Marion Ln W
Hopkins, MN 55305-
cncharrison@hotmail.com
(000) 000-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:57:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bob Munneke
PO Box 197
Aitkin, MN 56431-
dmunneke@embarqmail.com
(218) 927-3615

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:56:41 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gail Frethem
5241 10th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
gailywaily.frethem@gmail.com
(612) 823-6633

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:55:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bob Walker
6109 9th St N
Oakdale, MN 55128-
breezly@hotmail.com
(651) 233-7584

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:53:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jo Ann Brunner
2219 15th Ave NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
joannb72@gmail.com
(507) 529-7910

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:53:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Faith Bremmer
728 W Maple Ave
Fergus Falls, MN 56537-
fbremmer@live.com
(218) 739-4322

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:51:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Roberta Haskin
9641 Vincent Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55431-
roberta.haskin@gmail.com
(952) 836-6586

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:51:19 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Oil spills in Minnesota would be disastrous for our beautiful state parks, thousands of lakes, rivers, and waterways. Keep Minnesota beautiful. No pipelines

Sincerely,

Kathryn Null
6125 4th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
kathryn.null@gmail.com
(612) 910-6399

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:51:00 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wendy Peardot
4500 Southmore Dr
Minneapolis, MN 55437-
wendypeardot@earthlink.net
(952) 922-2021

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:50:50 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Teyannie Gill
1600 Pullman Ave
St Paul Park, MN 55071-
makeupgoddess76@gmail.com
(651) 204-6495

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:48:53 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patricia Thielman
5561 Fairhill Dr SE
Buffalo, MN 55313-
fairhilldesigns@msn.com
(763) 477-6575

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:45:19 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Bennett
3544 4th St NW
Backus, MN 56435-
camelot@uslink.net
(218) 947-3632

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:44:44 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William And Carol Steele
21950 County Road 445
Bovey, MN 55709-
bill.steele@isp.com
(218) 247-0245

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:43:55 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

The headwaters of the Mississippi, as well as some inaccessible peat lands, would be at risk if the Enbridge pipeline were allowed to proceed. All pipelines leak eventually, and this is fragile land and water. For these reasons,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Milton Ulmer
7244 Eldorado Way
Cannon Falls, MN 55009-
aulmer@carleton.edu
(507) 263-5718

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:40:58 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kate Bohn
7000 149th Ln NW
Ramsey, MN 55303-
seressia@hotmail.com
(763) 843-2646

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:40:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

June Stuhr
3033 46th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
jstuhr@mac.com
(612) 788-5322

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:38:45 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Monte Gomke
2914 Greysolon Rd
Duluth, MN 55812-
duluthian@hotmail.com
(218) 343-4593

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:37:45 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Roue
35252 260th Ave
Erhard, MN 56534-
daveroue48@gmail.com
(218) 842-5122

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:36:59 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Natalie Graham
8123 Cleveland St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55432-
natalieraee@gmail.com
(651) 644-8675

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:32:50 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John And Jean Fleming
21364 Hytrail Cir
Lakeville, MN 55044-
johnandjeanfleming@msn.com
(952) 236-8594

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:32:19 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pamela Kae Novotny
4401 Dodge St
Duluth, MN 55804-
hypatiarocks@gmail.com
(218) 310-2643

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:31:45 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jodi Peterson
9508 Russell Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431-
jodip@q.com
(651) 334-3857

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:31:47 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jinger Pulkrabek
6035 Candace Ave
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-
jnpul@hotmail.com
000000000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:29:55 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michelle Van Engen
46 Walden St
Burnsville, MN 55337-
michelle.vanengen@gmail.com
(555) 555-5555

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:29:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jerry Klemm
4905 217th St N
Forest Lake, MN 55025-
kbzeroohi@usfamily.net
(651) 464-8426

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:29:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Linda Hayes
5631 Emerson Ave N
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430-
lindahayes92@yahoo.com
(763) 503-3494

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:28:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

We better start looking at what makes Minnesota so great: our woods and waters. We enjoy fishing, hunting, camping, boating, etc. Let's not forget our greatest assets, our beautiful lakes and woods, assets that we can't replace if they are contaminated for the sake of money!

Sincerely,

Nancy Root
35 SW 4th St
Grand Rapids, MN 55744-
nancy@danroot.com
(000) 000-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:28:41 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ginger Koerner
611 27th St NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
kgjkhkoerner@hotmail.com
(507) 282-9180

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:27:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gary Barum
563 Hamilton St
Winona, MN 55987-
gvbarum@hbcj.com
(558) 452-5242

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:26:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dawn Baker
4708 Oakland Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
baker072@umn.edu
(612) 824-4755

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:26:32 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christine Higgins
3700 38th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
christine3724@gmail.com
(612) 721-7127

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:26:41 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynn Fuller
3100 43rd Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
lynnmkent@yahoo.com
(612) 722-1882

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:26:22 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Lambert
2708 Gerald Ave
North Saint Paul, MN 55109-
lambrt_l@yahoo.com
(651) 777-5288

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:24:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lynn Levine
1941 Ewing Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55416-
lynnlevine4parks@yahoo.com
(612) 920-8991

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:24:15 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Javinsky
2319 Flag Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55426-
bethkie@juno.com
(952) 545-0488

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:24:20 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Matthew Butler
133 E Chapman St
Ely, MN 55731-
mbutler0007@gmail.com
(307) 200-9494

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:23:17 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Carol Bishop
807 Lake Ridge Dr
Woodbury, MN 55129-
czybishop@gmail.com
(651) 337-8177

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:22:58 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Spencer
315 N Lake Ave Apt 229
Duluth, MN 55806-
kaspencer2@yahoo.com
(218) 722-3889

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:22:32 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Court
1216 Powderhorn Ter Apt 13
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
janet_court@hotmail.com
(612) 721-9284

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:21:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John and Barbara Mccashin
224 Kings Pointe Dr
Delano, MN 55328-
johnnybj40@aol.com
(763) 972-6680

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:20:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Arlene Kelly
1532 Christensen Ave
West Saint Paul, MN 55118-
akelly1532@gmail.com
(651) 253-2638

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:19:46 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lisa Goodlander
2323 Windsor Ln
Woodbury, MN 55125-
lisa.goodlander@comcast.net
(651) 224-3348

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:13:39 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jerry Larson
1246 McAndrews Rd E
Burnsville, MN 55337-
greydeck@yahoo.com
(952) 303-4869

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:13:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Doris Bandel
1574 Cohansey St Apt 101
Saint Paul, MN 55117-
debandel39@comcast.net
(651) 206-1794

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:12:37 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Faith Williamson
8464 Cortland Rd
Eden Prairie, MN 55344-
fswilliamson@comcast.net
(612) 644-8533

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:12:34 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Art Wilkinson
830 Winthrop St S
Saint Paul, MN 55119-
aawilkinson@prodigy.net
(111) 111-1111

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:10:09 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I live a mile downstream of an Enbridge pipeline within the Headwaters State Forest. I know these wetlands very well, having traversed them by canoe and ski for thirty years. And I am certain that even a relatively minor spill will do them irreparable damage, as well as destroying my life here. The proposed Sandpiper line poses an even greater risk. It is criminally irresponsible to allow any of these to be maintained, much less expanded.

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kyle Crocker
806 Balsam Ridge Rd NW
Bemidji, MN 56601-
kcrocker@paulbunyan.net
(218) 444-2589

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:09:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomas Lundgren
4107 Abbott Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
tom55410@gmail.com
(612) 929-7607

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:08:29 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Dokken
4201 Parklawn Ave Apt 301
Edina, MN 55435-
bettydokken@msn.com
(952) 897-1122

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:08:14 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Annette Grossmann
1504 127th Ln NE
Blaine, MN 55449-
amgjasper@yahoo.com
(612) 670-4358

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:05:41 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Deborah Webster
2298 Snowshoe Ln E
Maplewood, MN 55119-
harobed01@hotmail.com
(651) 231-1134

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:02:51 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gary Patton
3408 Staghorn Dr
Fort Ripley, MN 56449-
patt4797@go.clcmn.edu
(218) 831-2333

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:02:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Viacrucis
3002 17th St S Apt 206
Moorhead, MN 56560-
catchaway@yahoo.com
(218) 233-9266

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:00:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Katherine Loban
4772 Oak Dr
Moose Lake, MN 55767-
kgtloban@mediacombb.net
(218) 485-8777

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 6:00:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sarah Seufert
2015 24th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
sssarhh@yahoo.com
(612) 338-0951

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:58:40 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Darcy Bergh
1121 Hallam Ave N
Saint Paul, MN 55115-
darcybergh@gmail.com
(651) 111-1111

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:58:35 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Darcel Kashmark
2215 6th St S
Moorhead, MN 56560-
catnipkash@midco.net
(218) 284-6278

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:57:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Maggi
18755 Cassie Ln
Pine City, MN 55063-
jandkmaggi@gmail.com
(763) 280-9483

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:57:53 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

James Maggi
18755 Cassie Ln
Pine City, MN 55063-
jandkmaggi@gmail.com
(763) 280-9483

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:56:49 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate. The thought of the thought of an oil spill in Minnesota is stomach turning. These multi-national corporations are not to be trusted. We've seen their duplicity around the country and their lack of transparency and responsibility for clean-up. In fact, they often declare bankruptcy leaving tax-payers to foot the bill. I am also concerned that these pipelines are deliberately built to fail with inferior materials, and run through particularly sensitive environmental areas affecting aquifers, ground water, wetlands and drinking water. Why would we sacrifice the irreplaceable, for some corporation's bottom line at the expense of our own citizens? I feel the same way about the Poly-Met mining proposal, spearheaded by the illustrious Tony Hayward of the BP oil spill in the gulf. I resoundingly support Gov. Dayton's efforts to safeguard the water of Minnesota for future generations. Thank you for accepting my comment.

Sincerely,

Donna Anderson
10211 Cedar Lake Rd Apt 209
Hopkins, MN 55305-
doeanders@yahoo.com
(952) 593-0528

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:55:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jean Ross
3624 Bryant Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55409-
jfross@umn.edu
(612) 824-2080

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:54:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marylyn Irrgang
170 Good Counsel Dr
Mankato, MN 56001-
mirrgang@juno.com
(507) 389-4200

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:52:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Landherr
7740 W Highway 61
Schroeder, MN 55613-
ljl71504@gmail.com
(218) 235-8205

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:54:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marylyn Irrgang
170 Good Counsel Dr
Mankato, MN 56001-
mirrgang@juno.com
(507) 389-4200

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:52:23 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ivan Zenker
5698 King Arthur Rd NW
Rochester, MN 55901-
iczenker@hotmail.com
(651) 485-2492

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:51:15 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

Additionally, my wife and I own a year-round vacation home on Big Sandy Lake, one of five Headwaters reservoirs of the Mississippi, whose watershed Enbridge's Sandpiper pipeline will cross. That watershed encompasses upwards of 260 square miles, most of which are very remote wetlands. Should that pipeline leak while crossing those wetlands, irreparable harm would be done to the watershed well before that leak would be detected; let alone stopped. In that event, our property, as well as every other vacation property on the lake would be worthless. Such a disaster would decimate the economy and all property tax based social services of all of Aitkin County, already one of the poorest counties in Minnesota. This decimation would include all the local school districts, which already serve a very low income population. So the stakes are not just Enbridge vs. a bunch of tree huggers. By the way, our equity in our vacation property is also our Assisted Living/Nursing Home annuity, so such an environmental disaster would be an economic disaster for us, as well.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bruce Watson
1683 120th Ln NE
Minneapolis, MN 55449-

selinwat@yahoo.com
(763) 755-6526

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:51:14 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

Additionally, my wife and I own a year-round vacation home on Big Sandy Lake, one of five Headwaters reservoirs of the Mississippi, whose watershed Enbridge's Sandpiper pipeline will cross. That watershed encompasses upwards of 260 square miles, most of which are very remote wetlands. Should that pipeline leak while crossing those wetlands, irreparable harm would be done to the watershed well before that leak would be detected; let alone stopped. In that event, our property, as well as every other vacation property on the lake would be worthless. Such a disaster would decimate the economy and all property tax based social services of all of Aitkin County, already one of the poorest counties in Minnesota. This decimation would include all the local school districts, which already serve a very low income population. So the stakes are not just Enbridge vs. a bunch of tree huggers. By the way, our equity in our vacation property is also our Assisted Living/Nursing Home annuity, so such an environmental disaster would be an economic disaster for us, as well.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bruce Watson
1683 120th Ln NE
Minneapolis, MN 55449-

selinwat@yahoo.com
(763) 755-6526

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:49:37 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terri Henry
30817 County 2 Blvd
Red Wing, MN 55066-
territude001@gmail.com
(651) 388-2089

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:49:08 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Marcia Jacobs
1520 Koester Ct Apt 56
Northfield, MN 55057-
mjacobs1939@gmail.com
(507) 301-3160

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:48:46 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Janet Neville
11742 Mount Curve Rd
Eden Prairie, MN 55347-
janeville@comcast.net
(952) 903-9682

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:47:58 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bryan Kaufmann
19020 Ironriver Trl
Lakeville, MN 55044-
kaufmann.bryans@gmail.com
999999999

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:47:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christopher Kornmann
1735 Van Buren Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
chris@spitandimage.net
(718) 798-2862

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:47:14 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ruth Maples
4390 Brook Ave S
Edina, MN 55424-
ruthkm44@hotmail.com
(612) 555-1212

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:45:45 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Susan Jobe
12991 32nd St S
Afton, MN 55001-
susanjobe@comcast.net
(651) 436-5387

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:45:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barry Peterson
1700 W 84th St
Bloomington, MN 55431-
bpete1225@yahoo.com
(952) 884-1264

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:45:06 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scott Bartell
3204 18th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
scottbartellsw@earthlink.net
(612) 721-6495

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:44:31 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mina Blyly-Strauss
3425 Blaisdell Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55408-
digitalmyths@aol.com
(612) 827-6706

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:41:21 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Christopher Kornmann
1735 Van Buren Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
chris@spitandimage.net
(718) 798-2862

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:40:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

We need to move toward clean energy and away from fossil fuels.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Mccolley
10615 Grey Cloud Island Dr S
St Paul Park, MN 55071-
cmccolley@comcast.net
(651) 592-1189

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:40:39 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kay Randall
520 32nd Ave S Apt 109
Moorhead, MN 56560-
kmandall64@gmail.com
(218) 331-8793

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:38:50 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

William Faber
501 W College Dr
Brainerd, MN 56401-
wfaber@clcmn.edu
(218) 855-8000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:37:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

John Abbott
715 Liberty Ct
Stillwater, MN 55082-
johnkabbott@comcast.net
(651) 439-2097

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:35:32 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shannon Kielblock
9021 Portland Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55420-
shannonkielblock@gmail.com
(507) 360-4384

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:32:33 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Harriet McCleary
2440 Stevens Ave Apt 2
Minneapolis, MN 55404-
mccleary@stolaf.edu
(612) 870-7332

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:31:10 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steve Elvester
7785 214th St N
Forest Lake, MN 55025-
steve@elvester.com
1114512346

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:31:10 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lystig
1741 Sartell Ave
Eagan, MN 55122-
markbeckylystig@comcast.net
(651) 452-1133

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:30:06 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Candyce Stout
981 Winterberry Dr
Woodbury, MN 55125-
csstout@comcast.net
(651) 731-9153

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:29:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

How is it we're losing light rail, which we need, but are getting an oil pipeline that we don't need and don't want?

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jerry Kahlert
900 Robert St S Apt 110
West Saint Paul, MN 55118-
jerrykmn@gmail.com
(612) 839-0725

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:27:20 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Scot Kindschi
110 E Redwood St
Marshall, MN 56258-
scotkindschi@scotkindschi.com
(507) 401-0530

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:25:33 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Norma Halvorson
2875 26th Street Cir S
Moorhead, MN 56560-
halvorson.norma@mygait.com
(218) 236-5601

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:24:37 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Bangerter
4481 Churchill St
St. Paul, MN 55126-
gabangerter@gmail.com
(651) 483-8990

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:24:28 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Bahr
5234 Girard Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
mbahr54@hotmail.com
(651) 329-1785

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:24:13 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Thomasin Ringler
196 Page St W
Saint Paul, MN 55107-
tamsie@spiritone.com
(651) 699-2756

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:23:37 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Randall Lyken
1736 Southbrook Ln
Wadena, MN 56482-
hummingbirdrandy@gmail.com
(218) 639-3888

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:23:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

T Mo
3310 69th St E
IGH, MN 55076-
shredbetty70@gmail.com
(651) 552-7148

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:23:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

T Mo
3310 69th St E
IGH, MN 55076-
shredbetty70@gmail.com
(651) 552-7148

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:22:58 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Alan Phyllis
9301 Ryden Rd
Grand Portage, MN 55605-
abphyllis@yahoo.ca
(218) 475-6301

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:21:45 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Dan Dixon, Sr.
5055 Norman Dr
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
ddixon@invitationsforless.com
(952) 937-2893

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:20:33 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Shred Moye
3310 69th St E
Inver Grove Heights, MN 55076-
shredbetty70@gmail.com
(651) 552-7148

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:18:01 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bernard Grisez
1063 Westcliff Curv
Shoreview, MN 55126-
bgzr42@mnmicro.net
(651) 766-2544

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:17:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathy Koch
3612 17th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
kchaz52@gmail.com
(612) 721-2327

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:17:15 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Terri Reischl
1958 Florence St
White Bear Lake, MN 55110-
tarotbyterri@yahoo.com
(612) 715-7125

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:17:01 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kristina Anderson
5605 180th Ave NW
Ramsey, MN 55303-
kristinaanderson80@gmail.com
(763) 772-5784

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:16:58 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barb Wiebesick
24164 200th St
Nevis, MN 56467-
sunhands@arvig.net
(000) 000-0000

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:16:06 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen B.
133 34th Ave N
Saint Cloud, MN 56303-
keb133@hotmail.com
(320) 253-5974

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:15:03 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Denise Thomas
100 Imperial Dr W #301
West St Paul, MN 55118-
denijthom2@gmail.com
6513401407

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:14:26 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Kahler
PO Box 326
Lonsdale, MN 55046-
kahlerkathleen@ymail.com
X

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:14:08 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Wendy McCormick
3212 Longfellow Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55407-
mccor005270@me.com
(612) 724-4296

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:12:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gregory Johnson
2089 Lake Hattie Dr SW
Backus, MN 56435-
gmjohns@tds.net
(218) 587-4014

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:12:53 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Amy Baker
210 Quill St NE
Kimball, MN 55353-
abaker@meltel.net
(320) 398-6113

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:10:34 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laurie Kittelson
6315 Paris Ave N
Stillwater, MN 55082-
norseaurora@yahoo.com
(651) 492-3626

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:10:14 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lorilea And Otmar Klimek
4145 137th St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
lorileakl@gmail.com
(651) 322-4902

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:09:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Stevens
2283 Amanisoti Dr
Carlton, MN 55718-
timstevens218@gmail.com
(218) 879-0227

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:07:30 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Pouliot
2157 Overlook Dr
Bloomington, MN 55431-
tmjpouliot@gmail.com
(952) 884-5785

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:07:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Vivian Brown
2908 Southbrook Dr
Bloomington, MN 55431-
vbrown@monkeybridge.com
(952) 888-4139

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:07:19 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Cari Wright
1330 8th Ave
Two Harbors, MN 55616-
thehappyCrystalshop@gmail.com
(218) 834-0831

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:07:03 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Kate Crowley
82119 Bennett Rd
Willow River, MN 55795-
ravenkate49@hotmail.com
(612) 703-2849

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:06:37 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

How much risk to our ground water supplies should we accept to transport a climate-changing carbon energy source across our state? Wouldn't it make more sense to invest our limited resources into faster development of alternative energy sources and storage?

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Tim Bardell
2333 Parkwoods Rd
Saint Louis Park, MN 55416-
tbardell@earthlink.net
(952) 807-6690

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:04:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Amy Grace
722 Everett St S
Stillwater, MN 55082-
amy3grace@gmail.com
(444) 444-4444

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:04:12 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Rachel Pickering
5227 W 139th St
Savage, MN 55378-
rspicker@gmail.com
(952) 210-0511

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:04:19 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

David Hajicek
14824 Glendale Rd
Minnetonka, MN 55345-
hajicek@skypoint.com
(952) 934-4166

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:03:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Gus Kathmann
PO Box 997
Forest Lake, MN 55025-
[redeagle999@yahoo.com](mailto:red eagle999@yahoo.com)
(651) 653-1188

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:03:53 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Darlene Chiles
1437 Fairway Ct
Chaska, MN 55318-
darc10@aol.com
(952) 443-4042

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:01:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Barbara Brockway
233 Nichols Ct
Shoreview, MN 55126-
bbrock432@comcast.net
(651) 999-9999

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:01:00 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Knuteson
1930 Oak Glen Trl
Stillwater, MN 55082-
emknuteson@gmail.com
(651) 414-1094

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:01:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jim Marsden
1872 Howard St N
Maplewood, MN 55109-
jamesmarsden1130@gmail.com
(651) 777-2190

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:00:42 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Laura Albright
600 18th Ave N Apt 329W
Minneapolis, MN 55411-
lauraann4116@gmail.com
(612) 222-1262

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:00:22 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Andrew Moritz
2825 Pennsylvania Ave S
Saint Louis Park, MN 55426-
moritz.andrewj@gmail.com
(507) 220-1301

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:00:05 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Virginia Ruddy
2374 Bourne Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55108-
ginnerruddy@gmail.com
(651) 645-0077

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:00:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Helen Trepanier
5409 Colfax Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
htrepanier@msn.com
(612) 822-8360

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 5:00:02 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Debbie Meister
1312 Portland Ave
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
dmeister.mmc@gmail.com
(651) 647-6816

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:59:37 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mary Thacker
21915 Fairview St
Greenwood, MN 55331-
thack002@umn.edu
(952) 474-5763

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:59:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Patrick Divine
5948 Bren Circle
Minnetonka, MN 55343-
pwdivine@gmail.com
(952) 938-2492

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:59:08 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Brianna Frisch
395 Williams St
Lewiston, MN 55952-
bri_kruse@hotmail.com
(507) 459-4829

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:57:44 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lois Pfluger
1149 Pioneer Rd
Red Wing, MN 55066-
mamabeanface@me.com
(651) 388-5160

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:57:25 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lori Erickson
1410 5th St NE
Minneapolis, MN 55413-
lerickson@artsmia.org
(612) 870-3034

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:57:16 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Martha Baxter
3709 Grand Way Apt 218
St Louis Park, MN 55416-
mhauserbax@gmail.com
(952) 405-8105

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:56:32 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

September Steinolfson
6711 Canterbury Ln
Eden Prairie, MN 55346-
october@usfamily.net
(952) 934-7278

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:56:06 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Charles Wensman
2841 37th Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55406-
charliewensman@gmail.com
(651) 256-3006

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:54:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Susan Imker
309 Elizabeth St SW
Isanti, MN 55040-
susieqsings@hotmail.com
(763) 444-4489

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:54:23 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Mark Johnson
2707 113th Ave NW
Minneapolis, MN 55433-
m.johnson12@q.com
(763) 757-8060

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:54:13 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Penny Brown
4819 Azelia Ave N
Brooklyn Center, MN 55429-
penelope.brown@comcast.net
(763) 537-4527

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:53:49 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Lewis Hotchkiss
10404 Xeon St NW
Coon Rapids, MN 55433-
my.lew.hotchkiss@gmail.com
(763) 354-4835

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:53:33 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Pamela Lyngen
26358 10th Street Cir
Zimmerman, MN 55398-
plyngen25@gmail.com
(612) 747-6223

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:52:52 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Michael Huber
4470 Whitetail Way
Eagan, MN 55123-
michaelhub@gmail.com
(612) 708-2937

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:52:07 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jo Ellen Davis
5436 Elliot Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55417-
jedndrh@visi.com
(612) 825-9057

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:50:36 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

George Muellner
1304 W Medicine Lake Dr Apt 305
Minneapolis, MN 55441-
gmuellner@presenter.com
(763) 544-9372

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:50:03 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Myron Thornberry
1369 Spruce Pl Apt 1804
Minneapolis, MN 55403-
myronthornberry@gmail.com
(234) 567-8910

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:49:18 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melissa Jarvis
10717 France Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431-
mare6red@yahoo.com
(952) 346-9503

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:49:13 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Paula Kwakenat
7301 W 101st St Apt 112
Bloomington, MN 55438-
pj.kwakenat@gmail.com
(952) 944-0638

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:48:27 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Steven Peterson
3715 Bass Lake Rd
Minneapolis, MN 55429-
stvnpeterson536@yahoo.com
(612) 309-5046

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:48:04 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Bryan Winget
895 Howell St N
Saint Paul, MN 55104-
bwinget@scalesadvertising.com
(651) 592-3260

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:47:15 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Bell-Brugger
5207 Humboldt Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
bugglipps@yahoo.com
(612) 822-4013

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:47:24 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Jon Lee
4604 W 39th St
Minneapolis, MN 55416-
jonlee4604@msn.com
(952) 929-2069

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:46:57 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Karen Crowley
7275 165th St W
Rosemount, MN 55068-
crowleyk1147@gmail.com
(651) 276-7442

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:46:54 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Ellen Hoyt
5309 France Ave S
Minneapolis, MN 55410-
eh333@msn.com
(612) 922-2199

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:46:17 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Denny Thorson
17230 Driscoll St NW
Ramsey, MN 55303-
dennythorson@msn.com
(763) 441-2439

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:44:45 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Melvin Strand
13342 382nd Ave
Waseca, MN 56093-
mstrand1936@gmail.com
(507) 835-2207

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:44:43 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a totally transparent, rigorous and environmentally driven not just economically driven scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

R Limoges
701 Southwaite Ct
Redwood Falls, MN 56283-
robyne@pwa-cr.com
(507) 637-2641

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:42:15 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Sandra Sprattler
20450 Kensfield Trl
Lakeville, MN 55044-
sandysprattler@gmail.com
(612) 296-1851

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:41:48 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Missy Weldy
4631 Harriet Ave
Minneapolis, MN 55419-
missy.weldy@gmail.com
(952) 451-3061

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:41:38 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Thank you for reading my letter.

Sincerely,

Nancy Robinson
15720 Rockford Rd Apt 303
Minneapolis, MN 55446-
narobi@comcast.net
(763) 494-4606

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/23/2016 4:41:38 PM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Actually this is stupid - a proverbial accident waiting to happen. The same amount of monies should be invested in clean energy. Oh I know, how about releasing from prison and psychiatric wards inventors of clean energy - that would be a good start. Scratch all pipelines and offshore drilling. Sticking with the summit meeting agreements on global warming, only alternative energy systems need to be investigated and put into place from here on out. Otherwise, go back to the planet you came from and get outa here. thx

Sincerely,

Siela Siela
1315 10th Ave SE
Saint Cloud, MN 56304-
siela@email.com
(320) 555-5555

From: ["KnowWho Services" <noreply@knowwho.services>](mailto:noreply@knowwho.services)

To: ["*COMM Pipeline Comments" <Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us>](mailto:Pipeline.Comments@state.mn.us)

Date: 5/31/2016 7:26:23 AM

Subject: Public comment on the Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS (Dockets PPL-15-137 and PL6668/PPL-13-474)

Dear Minnesota Sandpiper and Line 3 Comments,

Dear Minnesota Department of Commerce,

I urge you to conduct a robust scoping process for Enbridge's proposed Sandpiper pipeline and Line 3 'replacement' project. This scoping process should take into account the cumulative impacts of approving these two projects on communities, tribal lands, our lakes and rivers, and our climate. The Sandpiper pipeline and the 'replacement' of Line 3 (which is in fact a new pipeline) would carry a maximum of 1.4 million barrels of oil per day (bpd) across Minnesota. An increase in oil transported through our state carries an increase in risk, and these risks must be comprehensively evaluated along with the need for this pollutant through the scoping period.

A recent report from the National Academy of Sciences found that cleaning up a tar sands spill in a waterway is significantly more difficult and potentially up to 14.5 times more expensive than cleaning up a non-tar sands oil spill. The disastrous 2010 Enbridge Line 6B tar sands spill in Michigan made it clear that even a smaller rupture with a quicker response time in the Mississippi River could be devastating. The DOC needs to scrutinize how spills would be cleaned up, the permanent damage to waterways, the impacts to Minnesota's economy, and its threat to the Ojibwe culture and wild rice rights.

I call on the Minnesota Department of Commerce to ensure a robust scoping process is conducted that takes into account the risks and potential impact of these pipeline expansions on water, communities, and climate.

Sincerely,

Judith Warner
3127 Sumter Ave S
St Louis Park, MN 55426-
judithwarnerart@msn.com
(952) 928-0075