Mississippi River Headwaters
Itasca State Park
Minnesota
Photo © D.J. Nordgren

Greetings from Lake Itasca

At the recent hearings of Sandpiper/Line 3 pipelines the vast majority of lake country residents voted NO to allowing it to be routed through the lakes, rivers, streams and aquifer of the area. Your EIS must include alternate routes that would move the pipeline corridor out of MN pristine waters. Do your job and protect our economy and our water resources. Nancy Terhaar - 8181 Wildland Rd

8-U

Photo © NMN, Inc., 68899 South Landing, Crosslake, MN 56442

POST CARD

Address

Jamie MacAllister
MN DOC
85 7th Place East
Suite 500
St. Paul, MN
55101

SPACE BELOW RESERVED FOR U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Comment Form: Scoping
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis

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

Name: Nancy Terhark Phone:

Street Address: 818 Woodland Ave

City: Park Rapids State: MN ZIP: 56470

Email: nancyterhark@gmail.com

My comments pertain to:

- ☐ Sandpiper Pipeline Project
- ☐ Line 3 Replacement Project
- ☒ Both Projects

- The Straight River Aquifer that provides water to the city of Park Rapids. It has been compromised by nitrates from neighboring farms and businesses already. As you do your scoping please give it a complete scientific and honest evaluation.
  Also consider what plans? Who would pay for a clean up if a spill should happen.

- Everyone involved in the EIS should read the diluted study.

  Spills of Diluted Bitumen from Pipelines (2016)
  A comparative study of Environmental Fate, Effects & Response
  National Academics Press

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

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Comment Form: Scoping
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis

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

Name: Chris Thacker Phone: 218-728-5151

Street Address: 8 Sunnyside ST

City: Duluth, State: MN ZIP: 55808

Email: Chris@Local1091.com

My comments pertain to:

- ☐ **Sandpiper Pipeline Project**
- ☐ **Line 3 Replacement Project**
- ☒ **Both Projects**

I have helped build many Pipelines Throughout MN + WI. Every pipeline was built safely and effiently! The pipelines are the safest way to move oil. The lands and field are restored to better than what they were to begin with

In 2009-2010 my house was close to going into foreclosure. Luckily I was able to work on Line 67. My self + my family were able to save our house.

1) Pipelines move oil safely and efficiently
2) Pipelines create Jobs
3) Pipelines free up the rail system to move other goods
4) Pipelines increase tax base for areas

Please aprove these pipelines

Thanks, Chris Thacker

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

From:	Ashley Nerhus
To:	*COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject:	Line3 Replacement and Sandpiper Projects
Date:	Tuesday, May 24, 2016 1:37:37 PM
Attachments:	Support of the Pipelines - TRF Chamber.docx

Jamie,

Please find attached a letter from Thief River Falls Chamber of Commerce that contains our thoughts on the Line3 Replacement and Sandpiper Pipeline Projects.

Sincerely,

Ashley Nerhus, Executive Director
Thief River Falls Chamber of Commerce
102 Main Ave N
Thief River Falls, MN 56701
218-681-3720

To Jamie MacAlister and the Department of Commerce,

The development of the Line 3 and Sandpiper Pipeline are major and important projects for the state of Minnesota. As director of the Thief River Falls Chamber of Commerce, I can verify that the benefits will be felt statewide – not simply along the route. Sandpiper and Line 3 will ensure the safe delivery of abundant, dependable energy that is vital to Minnesotans' homes, fueling cars and airplanes, and generating electricity for residential and industrial use.

A fair, timely, and final evaluation of this project has been delayed for far too long. Any entity attempting to do business in Minnesota relies on a predictable and timely regulatory process. I ask that the Department of Commerce adhere to the 280-day time limit to prepare the EIS to keep the project on track.

The scope of the EIS is vital. It needs to serve the public and private purpose of the Sandpiper project. It should not be so narrow that it would be inadequate, but it should also not be too broad. This balance must be met.

The economic benefit, safety of shipping oil through pipelines, and public support for this project should emphasize the importance of seeing this process through, in a timely and effective manner.
Thank you for the work you do for the state of Minnesota and thank you for your dedication in moving this project forward.

Sincerely,
Ashley Nerhus
Executive Director
Thief River Falls Chamber of Commerce

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Comment Form: Scoping
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis

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

Name: Linda Thompson Phone: 218 768 2846

Street Address: 20692 St Hwy 210

City: McGregor State: MN ZIP: 55760

Email:

My comments pertain to:

- ☐ **Sandpiper Pipeline Project**
- ☐ **Line 3 Replacement Project**
- ☒ **Both Projects**

I am very much FOR the Enbridge Projects. The pipeline going through Aitkin County will be beneficial to the taxpayers here.

I believe the pipeline will be much safer than transporting oil by rail or truck. And in the long run be SAFER and MORE Environmentally preferred than the rail or trucks on the highway.

After seeing how the pipeline is in Alaska I more understand the safety checks that can be employed to keep the pipeline safe.

I am a township supervisor & feel this project will be an asset to our area.

The biggest disappointment regarding this project is the LONG DELAY in getting it going !!!

Linda Thompson

If including additional pages please number them and tell us how many you are providing: 1 pages

13-473
13-474
15-137
14-916

Rice, Robin (PUC)

From: Kari Tomperi <ktomperi@wcta.net>
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 6:07 PM
To: staff, cao (PUC)
Subject: Sandpiper and Line 3 Menahga Conservation Club comments

My name is David Tomperi. I currently serve as President of the Menahga Conservation Club. As a club, we are committed to preserving our natural resources through education and hands on involvement.

This letter addresses Enbridge Oil's permit application to the Public Utilities Commission for the Sandpiper Pipeline Project PUC Docket NO. PL-6668/CN-13-473 and PUC Docket NO. PL-6668/PPL-13-474 and Line 3 Replacement Pipeline Project PUC Docket NO. PL-15--137/CN-14-916.

The route proposed by Enbridge, a foreign owned company, crosses through own backyard and crosses the Shell River three times. As a club, we adopted the Shell River in 2002 to help maintain its clear water and natural beauty. We perform yearly mussel surveys on the Shell River with assistance from the MN DNR. We are the first known citizen's group anywhere in the state to do so. Mussels are our canary in the coal mine to alert us when our water quality suffers. As a club we also conduct a river clean up through the MN DNR Adopt-A-River program and have collected many pounds of garbage but each year it is getting less garbage each year as educate and promote protection of our rivers.

The Shell River is an important tributary to the Crow Wing which then empties into the Mississippi River. The river runs through critical wetlands. These wetlands would be next to impossible to access in the event of a spill hampering any clean-up efforts not to mention the impact of the installation of two 30" diameter pipes. The river is part of the headwaters feeds the Mississippi River which in turn provides drinking water for millions of people downstream. A spill would introduce many harmful toxins that would contaminate and compromise the river not to mention the surficial aquifer that provides drinking water to many private wells in the region.

These issues in our area, along with many others along the complete route should warrant an Environmental Impact Study that is completed by state agencies who are obligated to look professionally and scientifically at the impacts these pipelines in tandem would have on are area. Enbridge has neatly sidestepped an EIS due to inherent flaws in the permitting process. Permitting which includes the PUC, who has a conflict of interest when they are made responsible for energy development as their highest priority as well as the Department of Commerce. They are not trained or vested in protecting our environment like the MPCA and the DNR, who have not been utilized or have been excluded. The DOC is committed to economic development in the state and with seemingly no regard for the environment. The DOC appears only concerned with how many jobs the pipeline will create. These jobs are short term and most will be performed by out of state workers. Only 20-30 permanent jobs will remain after all is said and done.

So it is important that a full EIS is completed by full participation of state agencies charged with protecting and conserving our natural resources. On both these projects before they are allowed to build.

I can be reached at 218.564.4826

Virus-free. www.avast.com

13-473
13-474
14-916
15-137

cc PUC

RECEIVED
APR 14 2016
MINNESOTA PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

TO: Commissioner Fredrickson
FROM: Jim Reents & Mary Ackerman
4561 Alder Lane NW
Hackensack, MN 56452
RE: EIS Responsibility
April 12, 2016

The proposed Sandpiper and Line 3 Replacement route has the potential to impact my watershed and property on Ten Mile Lake.

We need a full Environmental Impact Statement. **Please relieve the DOC from the responsibility of an Environmental Impact Statement and replace it with a joint 'Responsible Governmental Responsibility Unit' made up of the DNR and MPCA.**

From:	Sue Tomte
To:	*COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject:	Public comment Sandpiper & L3
Date:	Tuesday, May 24, 2016 10:07:28 AM

Ms MacAlister --

In regards to the following PUC docket numbers
PL:6668/CN-13-473; PPL-13-474
PL-9/CN-14-916; PPL-15-137

Every single contractor, sub-contractor and consultant doing business with Enbridge must go through significant Safety training annually – even those who may never set foot on any construction site.

Doing business with Enbridge demands a higher level of safety awareness and standards on all aspects of conduct. This isn't just a 'check the box' activity, there is a culture of safety within this organization --***every person***, ***every day***. With conscious and consistent efforts to stress personnel (and personal) safety, environmental safety, sound procedural processes, plus detailed accountability and reporting, the Company is demonstrating the seriousness of doing business the right way.

Enbridge's people [employees and contractors] are trained, prepared, aware and concerned about all aspects of safety. The proposed routes are selected because they represent paths of least disturbance on a human, environment and economic impact, based on tens-of-thousands of man-hours of study and evaluation. As you proceed with the EIS please take into consideration Enbridge's significant emphasis on safety and the amount of work that has been done to carefully study route options. Please keep the EIS scope focused and complete the review in a timely manner.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Susan Tomte
Park Rapids Community Ambassador for Sandpiper & Line 3
218-255-5776
stomte@gmail.com

MN Public Utilities Commission - Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS Comment

Name Dan Trepanier Email

Street Address 2352 radar road

City Bemidji State MN Zip 56601

Jobs / Tax revenue

Comment Ideas:

✓ - No pipeline has ever been studied more, stop the delays

✓ - The environmental review plan is good enough, let's get it going

✓ - Look at jobs and other benefits to communities, not just natural resources

✓ - Pipelines are safe, just ask people who build and live next to them

✓ - Don't forget to look at the danger of moving oil by rail

(Please print legibly)

Our staff will electronically file your comments on the MN PUC website. Thank you for your time!

MN Public Utilities Commission - Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS Comment

Name Joe Trepanier Email

Street Address 5810 Blueberry Ln. N.W

City Deming State MN Zip 56601

Hundreds of Jobs!

Comment Ideas:

✓ - No pipeline has ever been studied more, stop the delays

✓ - The environmental review plan is good enough, let's get it going

✓ - Look at jobs and other benefits to communities, not just natural resources

✓ - Pipelines are safe, just ask people who build and live next to them

✓ - Don't forget to look at the danger of moving oil by rail

(Please print legibly)

Our staff will electronically file your comments on the MN PUC website. Thank you for your time!

MN Public Utilities Commission - Sandpiper/Line 3 EIS Comment

Name Steve Trepanier Email Treps@paulbunyan.net

Street Address 5810 Blueberry Lane N.W

City Bemidji State MN Zip 56601

Jobs, Jobs, Jobs, Tax Revenue, Huge Economic impact,

Comment Ideas:

- No pipeline has ever been studied more, stop the delays
- The environmental review plan is good enough, let's get it going
- Look at jobs and other benefits to communities, not just natural resources
- Pipelines are safe, just ask people who build and live next to them
- Don't forget to look at the danger of moving oil by rail

(Please print legibly)

Our staff will electronically file your comments on the MN PUC website. Thank you for your time!

From: Audrey Tsinnie
To: *COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: Scoping EIS comment for Sandpiper (13-473 & 13-474) and Line 3 Replacement (14-916 & 15-137)
Date: Saturday, May 07, 2016 3:40:05 PM

Dear Ms. MacAlister,

Dear Ms. Jamie MacAlister,

I am in support of the pipeline but would like to see old abandoned pipe be totally unearthed and removed to avoid any accidental fatalities in the future. I believe newer pipelines are the most efficient and cost effective way to transport much needed fuels. In my personal professional experience I have been a part of projects in which soils that were contaminated decades ago from other non-related situations were hauled out and replaced with cleaner more appropriate fill dirt. There are many many years combined of experienced engineers and field managers that deal with best practices in leaving areas crossed while installing pipeline or rehabbing worn pipe with a much better workable tact of land. We need these fuels and are more self sufficient freeing us from importing from other countries.

Thank you for your time,
Audrey A. Tsinnie
Minnesota Resident

Sincerely,

Audrey A. Tsinnie
807 SE 14th St
Brainerd, MN 56401

From: F.H. Tucker
To: *COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: Scoping EIS comment for Sandpiper (13-473 & 13-474) and Line 3 Replacement (14-916 & 15-137)
Date: Friday, May 06, 2016 10:50:05 PM

Dear Ms. MacAlister,

In the 40 years that I have been in the arena of pipeline work as a welder , I do strongly feel that most of the work that all the larger gas companies plan , they plan extensively , using a good deal of time & money researching all the aspects beforehand ..... on a large scale , thoroughly researched years before approaching any governing body with a request to build a pipeline . The industries & economies that help to employ so many of the families in the local areas of construction as well as maintaining fuel supplies and employing people in other places as well , quite possibly out of state . Americans all need clean safe utilities at reasonable prices and for daily use . I can remember in the 70's the waiting lines created due to shortages of gas and oil . In some areas gas is still not an option for homes - fuel oils & coal burning power plants for electricity are used . Hurry up 280 days left to build that pipeline & help us all . Thank you

Sincerely,

F.H.Tucker
907 Oakhollow Rd
Eastland, TX 76448
f_tucker13@yahoo.com

From: Alex Ugalde
To: *COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: Scoping EIS comment for Sandpiper (13-473 & 13-474) and Line 3 Replacement (14-916 & 15-137)
Date: Thursday, May 12, 2016 8:40:58 AM

Dear Ms. MacAlister,

Ms. Jamie MacAlister
Environment Review Manager
Minnesota Department of Commerce
87 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101-2198

Ms. MacAlister,

We are writing another letter in regard to Sandpiper (13-473 & 13-474) and Line 3 Replacement (14-916 & 15-137). We as a company are in support of this line and after attending another public meeting this past week, we felt compelled as a group of proud Minnesotans, to comment on additional impacts. We understand that there are good people in our great state that are concerned about the slight chance that there would be a failure to the new line (environmental impact), but I think these same people fail to understand how low these percentages are with a new line. Especially when compared to a line that was built in the 1960's. A new line to replace Line 3 would be much more cost effective and safer for Minnesotans in the long run.

We at Innovative are a diverse group of people and personalities. We and our extended families primarily live all across western and eastern portions of northern Minnesota. Many here are Veterans or reserve military. We have many outdoor enthusiasts from hunters to marathon runners. We are a proud group of Minnesotans that live near or have family that live near the proposed line, we are passionate about our outdoor recreation and have no environmental concerns about this pipeline.

Personally speaking, my wife and I spend a good amount of time in northwestern Minnesota visiting family. For many years, we have seen the local businesses in these areas and understand their day to day struggles to keep their doors open. The economic benefits of pipeline construction and operation are so impactful to the creation of jobs, increase in tax revenue, and increase to local economic activity for local businesses. We fully support a company like Enbridge, who has proven over many years, that they will incorporate the best in materials and latest in technology to build the safest product for the people of this great state.

Thank you,

Alex Ugalde
Commercial Account Specialist
Foundation Supportworks
1100 Holstein Drive NE
Pine City, MN 55063

Sincerely,

Alex Ugalde
1100 Holstein Dr NE
Pine City, MN 55063
alex@innovativefsw.com

My name is Thor Underdahl with Minnesota Power and I am here to speak in favor of the Sandpiper and Line 3 projects proposed by Enbridge.

To ensure regional communities continue to thrive throughout Minnesota, it is essential that we invest in infrastructure for transportation of goods and services. It is incumbent upon both the public and private sector to contribute to these investments.

Sandpiper and Line 3 are projects that demonstrate responsible investment in transportation infrastructure and Minnesota Power supports these two vitally important projects.

Minnesota Power aligns with Enbridge's demonstrated commitment to the environment. Our company understands and embodies a philosophy that industrial projects can be accomplished safely while preserving the local environment. We also recognize the benefits of transporting he~~avy crude~~ oil by pipeline rather than by rail or truck, as pipeline transportation not only requires less energy and emits much less carbon, but also relieves road and rail congestion, improving public safety.

We support and have confidence in the regulatory process and our regulators' ability to make informed decisions. Minnesota policymakers have demonstrated a history of providing appropriate oversight and regulation to ensure protection and preservation of the environment, while supporting responsible private sector growth. Minnesota Power trusts that Enbridge's commitment to the regional communities it impacts and environmental stewardship prove the company is a responsible corporate citizen and that the ~~expansion~~ project ~~should receive approval.~~ move forward in a timely manner

Our region, state and nation depend on Enbridge's ability to deliver energy resources in a safe, environmentally responsible and cost-effective manner in order meet consumer demand and to move our country closer toward energy independence. Enbridge's responsible approach will provide a substantial return on investment to both the communities that are impacted by the projects and the State of Minnesota. I urge your support of the Sandpiper and Line 3 projects. Thank you.

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Comment Form: Scoping
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis

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

Name: Robert Walker Phone: 651-233-7584

Street Address: 6109 9th St. No.

City: Oakdale State: MN ZIP: 55128

Email: breezly@hotmail.com

5/09/16

My comments pertain to:

- ☐ Sandpiper Pipeline Project
- ☐ Line 3 Replacement Project
- ☑ Both Projects

My comments with regard to these 2 projects pertain to the risks to the water, in particular to the headwater area of the Mississippi & the lakes of the area. This area is culturally & economically significant to the Ojibway people for very healthy production of wild rice & fish. These are of perpetual value. These risks are geographically greatest along the preferred routes.

The line 3 project, which would introduce more capacity for tar sands, which inherently are less free flowing & corrosive have already shown that they are very hard to impossible to clean up once they start to solidify. There is a larger question of if we want to facilitate more use of this dirtier and riskier form of oil.

All of the increasing transport & production will also bring risks to Lake Superior, which may well have greater value for water in this century than as a conduit for oil transport.

As these issues are considered I study the results of hasty extractive industries and their supporting systems. The real question here is the long term human & non economic costs. As we look into the future how much & what kind of world do we want? I oppose these projects in general but particularly the tar sands oil transport.

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

Robert Walker

Walker
City on the Bay

City Administration
205 Minnesota Ave
PO Box 207
Walker, MN 56484
Phone: (218) 547-5501 Fax: (218) 547-5513

May 25, 2016

Department of Commerce Staff,

As you know, the Sandpiper and Line 3 Replacement projects are both vital to the state of Minnesota. The development of these projects will create thousands of jobs, will ensure critical crude oil is distributed safely underground, and will provide a boost for our local economy.

As the Mayor of Walker, and a member of our local business community, I personally understand how important these projects are to the state of Minnesota. Our economy will benefit on a state-wide basis, not simply along the line. There are critical jobs in the balance, and property tax dollars needed by local governments all across the state.

A fair, timely, and final evaluation of these two projects has been delayed for far too long. The State of Minnesota needs to maintain a predictable and timely regulatory process in order to keep attracting job creators to our state. We ask that the Department of Commerce adhere to the 280-day time limit to prepare the EIS in order to keep these projects on track.

The scope of the EIS should not be overly broad, but it should also not be too narrow as to be inadequate. The scope should serve both the public and private purpose of the two projects. This important balance must be met.

Thank you for the work you do for the state of Minnesota and for your dedication to moving these projects forward.

Sincerely,

Jed Shaw
Mayor – Walker MN

From:	Justin Wallace
To:	*COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject:	Scoping EIS comment for Sandpiper (13-473 & 13-474) and Line 3 Replacement (14-916 & 15-137)
Date:	Thursday, May 05, 2016 10:20:09 AM

Dear Ms. MacAlister,

Please consider the economic benefits that this project will bring to the local communities. Pipelines are, by far, the safest mode of transporting crude oil. Please do not delay in approving this project. Thank you

Sincerely,

Justin Wallace
16150 E Pueblo Rd
Claremore, OK 74017

Sandpiper Pipeline
PPL-13-473
CN-13-474

Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project
PPL-15-137
CN-14-916

Phillip Wallace, business Agent for Pipeliners Local Union 798. I represent the pipeline welders, welder helpers, and pipefitters in the state of Minnesota that will help build the Enbridge Sandpiper Pipeline and the Line 3 Replacement if the permits are issued.

Enbridge's environmental program is second to none in the pipeline industry. The state of Minnesota, is what I call their home base in the United States. Enbridge spares no expense in choosing the contractors to do their work in Minnesota with trained workers from all the 4 union crafts. My craft of Pipeline Welders do all the welding with the latest technology in the welding field. While the Operating Engineers, International Laborers, And the

Teamsters do the dirt work and all the environmental work from the very start of the job to the final restoration where they leave the land and streams as good as or better than when they started. These workers have extensive training in the environmental field where they specialize in that type of work.

The environment and public safety is at risk when this Crude Oil is transported by rail or truck. The safest way to transport any liquid product in by a new state of the art pipeline built with the best materials, best craftsmanship, and a maintenance program to monitor its performance 7-24. Enbridge's pipelines are engineered and designed with emergency shutdown systems and back up emergency plans. Put

the liquid product in a steel pipe and take it out hundreds of miles away without any exposure to the environment or the public. The Sandpiper Pipeline will bring American Crude from the Bakkun oil Field of North Dakota to be marketed in Superior Wisconsin.

Enbridge is also wanting to replace an old out dated pipeline, the Line 3 Replacement Project that runs across Minnesota. This pipeline will be taken out of service and replaced with a new pipeline to move Crude to market so the US can keep prices cheaper at the pump for us all.

The issue here is what can be done to help the Minnesota Department of Commerce have new ideas to draft an ESI.

I think the best idea for the Environment and public safety, is to put it in a pipeline and keep it off the rail and road.

I ask for the decision to be made within The 280 day Clock.

Phillip Wallace

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Comment Form: Scoping
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis

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

Name: Phillip Wallace Phone: 918-606-9459

Street Address: 724 Honeysuckle Rd.

City: Bald Knob State: Arkansas ZIP: 72010

Email: phillip@local798.org

My comments pertain to:

- ☐ Sandpiper Pipeline Project
- ☐ Line 3 Replacement Project
- ☑ Both Projects

I support Both Projects for many reasons.

1. This Country can't Survive without Energy. Crude Oil is a product in every human being's every day Needs from Gasoline for our Cars To diesel fuel to Move products such as food To medical Supply's. Our farmers have to have fuel to feed this Country.
2. Generate electricity, heat our homes, build homes.
3. Public Safety and Protect the enviroment by putting this Crude in a Pipeline and get it off The railroads and our hiways. Railroad derailments hauling crude has Killed many Citizens that live on ~~the~~ or close To Railroads.

If including additional pages please number them and tell us how many you are providing: 1 of 2 pages

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Comment Form: Scoping
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis

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

Name: Phillip Wallace Phone: 918-606-9459

Street Address: 726 Honeysackle Rd

City: Bald Knob State: ArKansas ZIP: 72012

Email: phillip@local 798.org

My comments pertain to:

- ☐ **Sandpiper Pipeline Project**
- ☐ **Line 3 Replacement Project**
- ☑ **Both Projects**

One Small Town in ~~Quebec~~ Canada was burned to the grown and 47 Life's were lost in one Runaway Train wreck.

That Should be enough to stop this Madness of Crude ~~and~~ Truck and Trains hauling This Ligaid product.

It has been 2½ years of Trying to Permit These pipelines. Today sounds Like it will be another year and a half.

Thats To Long to Let Warren Buffett get richer hauling crude on his Railroad.

With many Train wreck's To Come

Phillip Wallace

If including additional pages please number them and tell us how many you are providing: 2 of 2 pages

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Comment Form: Scoping

Energy Environmental Review and Analysis

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

Name: Mike Warner Phone: 612-840-4552

Street Address: 40589 Golden Ave.

City: North Branch State: MN ZIP: 55056

Email: mwarner@linnagroc.com

My comments pertain to:

- ☐ **Sandpiper Pipeline Project**
- ☐ **Line 3 Replacement Project**
- ☒ **Both Projects**

I think the proposed route is fine. Most of the route already has pipe in the ground.

The oil is going to move one way or another. This pipe line will be placed by skilled trades men & women and be the safest way to move it.

Don't forget the damage and congestion transport by truck will further do to our already in need of repair roads & bridges.

Thank you to the MPCA, MN DNR and all other agencies involved. This project has been studied enough already let's move it forward.

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

- looking at carbon emissions from whole process, not just the construction - from extraction to when it is burned
- Expanding the possible oil spill scenarios to all major rivers and lakes that would be affected. All of these should be looked at and the effects of spills on each of them should be analyzed. What impact will they have on our water and how will they financially impact the communities surrounding them

Isabel Watson

* I am concerned about pipelines because of their effects on water and the communities that surround them. I am currently in 11th grade, and this is specially concerning to me because I know that if these pipelines are put in place it will be my generation that will feel the impacts most and have to clean them up.

robust & scientifically accurate

I think when doing the EIS for the Sandpiper and line 3 we need to expand the possible oil spill scenarios to study all the major rivers, lakes, + watersheds that will be impacted, not just seven. These should all be analyzed to see the effects a spill will have on our water and how they will financially impact the communities living around them.

Additionally, it is good climate change is included, but it must be included in a robust and scientifically accurate way. Specifically, when looking at carbon emissions, we must look at the whole process from extraction to when it is burned. Just looking at the emissions from construction is not enough, and would not be an accurate representation of the oil pipeline effect on climate change. These should be compared to the effects of the no build option.

TOM WATSON [redacted]

The ABC's of
The Environmental Review Process

A Fact Sheet for Citizens with Instructions for Filing a Citizens' Petition

The Minnesota Environmental Policy Act of 1973 established a formal process for reviewing the environmental impacts of major developmental projects. The purpose of the review is to provide information to units of government on the environmental impacts of a project before approvals or necessary permits are issued. After projects are completed, unanticipated environmental consequences can be very costly to undo, and environmentally sensitive areas can be impossible to restore. Environmental review creates the opportunity to anticipate and correct these problems before projects are built. The process operates according to rules (legally binding regulations) adopted by the Environmental Quality Board, but it is carried out by a local governmental unit or state agency (which is termed the RGU, for Responsible Governmental Unit). The primary role of the EQB is to advise local units and state agencies on the proper procedures for environmental review and to monitor the effectiveness of the process in general.

SHOULD BE A "WIN-WIN"

The EIS and EAW

Prior to any governmental approval of a project with potential for significant environmental effects, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared. An EIS identifies the likely environmental impacts of the project along with ways to lessen or avoid significant impacts either through alternative means of accomplishing the project or by redesigning aspects of the project.

There are two routes to an EIS -- it may be mandatory or it may be ordered by a unit of government upon the determination that a project has potential for significant environmental effects EISs are mandatory for projects whose nature, size, or location makes it inevitable that there is the potential for significant environmental effects. When not mandatory, case-by-case decisions on the need for an EIS are based on a six-page questionnaire about the project and its potential environmental effects called an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW).

An Environmental Assessment Worksheet may be prepared for two reasons. Most are required by mandatory categories in the rules, which cover projects of a nature, size, or location which may have the potential for significant environmental effects Other EAWs are ordered by governmental units either on their own initiative or as a result of a citizen petition when the facts indicate the project may have the potential for significant environmental effects.

The EAW process contains the following steps. The process typically requires 3-4 months to complete.

1. The RGU determines if an EAW is needed.
2. The RGU obtains data needed for the completion of the EAW form from the projects proposer.
3. The RGU completes the EAW form and distributes it to reviewing agencies. The member agencies of the EQB receive and review all EAWs as do other local, state, and federal agencies.
4. Notice of the EAW is published in the EQB Monitor and a press release is given to a local newspaper.
5. Any interested person can review the EAW and submit written comments to the RGU for 30 days following the Monitor notice. Comments may address the accuracy and completeness of information, additional environmental effects or corrective actions that should be considered and the potential for significant environmental effects due to the project.
6. The RGU considers the EAW information and the comments received and officially decides if the project has the potential for significant environmental effects. If not, the environmental review process is over. (Any appeal of this decision must be made in district court within 30 days.)

The EIS process contains the following steps.

1. The RGU determines if an EIS is needed.
2. An EAW form is completed by the RGU and the projects proposer as an aid in scoping the EIS. The EAW is distributed to reviewing agencies and noticed in the EQB Monitor. A press release is provided to a local newspaper.
3. A 30-day scoping period follows the notice allowing for public review of the EAW and input into a decision on the issues to be analyzed. A public meeting is held during this period to receive verbal comments. The purpose of the scoping is to focus the EIS analysis on the pertinent issues and to determine what reasonable alternatives will be compared to the project.
4. The RGU makes an official scoping decision which outlines the contents of the EIS.
5. A summary of the scoping decision is published in the EQB Monitor and a press release is supplied to a local newspaper. (The Monitor notice is termed an EIS Preparation Notice.)
6. The scoped issues are analyzed with economic and sociological impacts being considered in addition to environmental impacts. The results of the analysis are compiled into a draft EIS document. Frequently, a consulting firm is hired to assist the RGU with the analysis and the document.
7. Any person can review and comment on the draft EIS for a period of at least 25 working days after a notice of the draft EIS is published in the EQB Monitor. A press release is sent to a local newspaper. A public meeting

RECEIVED
MAY 19 2016
MAILROOM

Philip and Audrey Watt
24755 Co. 2
Shevlin, MN 56676
May 13, 2016

Jamie MacAlister
Environmental Review Manager
Minnesota Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101

Dear Mr. MacAlister:

The following are our comments regarding the Sandpiper and Line 3 pipeline projects proposed by Enbridge energy.

These proposed lines will pass through our property in Clearwater County, amounting to about ½ mile of right of way. We have already been paid for this easment, so we have no vested interest in completion of these projects.

What we do have is a strong opinion that these pipeline are the best and safest means of transporting crude oil across Minnesota. It seems from recent news reports that Governor Dayton believes rail transport is safer, despite the fact it can be proven there is much less potential risk to the environment from pipelines than any of the alternatives. Witness the number of derailments in Minnesota which resulted in spills of hazardous material

including propane and ethyl alcohol. Since the Governor visited the propane fire site at Calloway, we would think it is obvious that rail transport is not all that safe.

Our farm home is within 200 yard of 4 existing Koch pipelines, alongside which the proposed Enbridge lines will run. We have been very much impressed with the safety measures taken by Koch, including weekly patrol flights and periodic tests by running electronic sensors, called "pigs" through the pipes to detect any weakness or other potential problems.

We are confident Enbridge would be every bit as diligent as Koch, plus there would be at least twice as much surveillance of the combined area of 6 separate pipelines. Any departure from this existing corridor would create new risks and much more costly surveillance.

In a better world, perhaps the United States would not be dependent upon foreign oil, including some from the barbarian guilty of horrible atrocities and crimes against humanity, such as beheading captives and destroying innocent villages and their inhabitants.

We truly believe these proposed pipeline projects are the best means of meeting the petroleum needs of this country at the least risk to the environment.

Virtually no enterprise is without risk. In this case, we believe it is minimal and justified.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Philip G. Watt
Philip G. WATT

Audrey A. Watt
Audrey Watt

P.S. I inadvertently omitted any mention of the tremendous benefits of large scale employment, taxes paid to the county, and payments to land owners for easements.

RECEIVED

MAY 26 2016

MAILROOM

May 24, 2016

Jamie MacAlister
Minnesota Department of Commerce
85 7th Place East, Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101

Jamie MacAlister:

Please add the following to the comments received for DSDD Sandpiper/Line 3 Replacement as the process moves from draft to final scoping for EIS:

o Pipe dimensions and pipe metal thickness: Contrary to section 3.6 they should be evaluated such as double-hulling both 1) for during operational life and 2) for the far-longer abandoned death.

o 4.3: Troubling that "no field-level data collection will be performed for any of the route alternatives." What proof can or will be provided that the deck has not been unfairly stacked in favor the the Applicant's preferred route?

Applicant-provided data and analysis should be identified. Then substitute independent data and analysis.

Again, independent sources should be used to determine "general pipeline construction and pump station spacing" for system and major route alternatives rather than Applicant's preferred route configuration. Is this another example of the deck unduly stacked in favor of Applicant's preferred route rather than letting alternatives stand or fall on their own merits/demerits?

o Determine how many additional pipelines could be squeezed in the proposed 750-foot corridor. Would additional pipelines ever be removed or be abandoned in place? And what is the expected fate of Sandpiper/Line 3R, if built, a) removal or b) abandoned in place?

o EIS should examine "public good" vs. "private greed" of the Applicants.

O Invasive species: With such massive earth-moving during construction, how can introduction of aquatic and terresterial invasive plants and animals be avoided? What will be the "cost" if they can not?

o Impact on pollinators: existing pipelines in the area utilize extensive, excessive spraying and mowing in these corridors that "at best" create a no-man's land for pollinators; at worst a death trap. How will proposed pipeline corridors be any different?

o Impact of abandoning, rather than removing existing L3.

o Cultural/socioeconomic:
oo Impact on tourism in Itasca S.P./Park Rapids areas if preferred route chosen both during construction, operational phase and post-operational.

oo Impact on Native American cultural sites.

o Straight River Groundwater Mgnt. Area Plan and recently-adopted Hubbard County Local Water Plan did not address pipelines, but should have. How will an EIS handle this void?

O A few economic considerations:
oo Tax court: Already Enbridge establishing a track record of seeking and obtaining property tax relief. Negative impact of future efforts (why stop now!) should be addressed.

ooBakken: Production already reduced. What is long-term sustainability of fracking shale there (water availability, etc.)? Has the Dakota Access pipeline, which circumvents Minnesota entirely, already trumped the need for Sandpiper?

ooFactor in lesser overall demand for petroleum.

ooConseqences of a "carbon tax" should be addressed.

ooLikewise, consequences of a sooner, rather than later shift to renewable energy sources.

oo Bankrupties and subsequent contraction of petroleum companies that's already happening now that the bubble of "cheap borrowing" is bursting.

ooNDPC LLC: will it be around 1) if there's a major spill or leak or 2) to decommission Sandpiper? What sort of bond or other protection should be put in place to reduce individual or taxpayer exposure over the long haul?

oo "Domestic vs. export" end-purposes for both of these pipelines. Why is Superior, WI so critical for Applicants, if not as a jumping off point for a water route via Great Lakes?

o Ambititious EIS timeline: To have a final EIS issued in May 2017 for two massive projects suggests that a number of shortcuts, etc. will be taken. What assurances do 1) the public of Minnesota and 2) its environment have that the rush to completion will not steam-roll over important elements that should be considered?

o Expert panel: To date, it seems that Applicant Enbridge has had a heavy-handed influence on the application process. Regardless, the scoping process could greatly benefit from an independent, expert panel consisting of energy economist, hydrologist, dilbit (for L3R), cultural (including Native American point of view, for example.

Sincerely,

John Weber
22382 Glacial Ridge Trl.
Nevis, MN 56467-4018

May 25, 2016
Regarding PUC docket items:

SANDPIPER PIPELINE

PPL-13-473

CN-13-474

Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project

PPL-15-137

CN-14-916

Comments submitted by:

Darril Wegscheid

20231 Roosevelt Ridge – PO 251

Emily, MN 56447

Point Covered: **Cited preference for using a Power Line ROW for a new Oil Pipeline ROW.**

In the documents reviewed on these Enbridge pipelines, much seems to be made of the Enbridge 'preference' for using an existing Power Line ROW. That is (quite bluntly) a silly position for the PUC or anyone to accept – on face value, or with any thoughtful reflection.

By contrast, if I had a ROW for fiber cable, would that have been routed with concerns for anything BUT the process of installing, operation, repairing and other aspects of a fiber cable?

The environmental considerations for a power line may include some of the same issues, but MAJOR additional concerns need to be evaluated (EIS) for any other commodity using that ROW.

Consider a "leak" of oil, versus a "leak" of an electric line? Or consider restoring a power line to operation versus fixing an oil pipeline back to its operational levels. Imagine the amount of soil disrupted when digging pole / anchors for a power line tower, versus trenching deep and wide (and setting aside the soils) when creating an oil pipeline. If one looks at power towers going OVER a stream, versus a pipeline dug in or suspended over a stream there is very little similarity in construction, risks or damage. Therefore, that aspect needs to be dismissed as an innate preference.

While an existing ROW might simplify 'gaining control' to proceed with the owner of the ROW, and likely there is little existing construction of anything else in that ROW, there is virtually NO logic nor environmental 'free ride' that should be granted for any subsequent consideration for ANY other commodity to be moved in that ROW.

Submitted,
/ /
Darril Wegscheid

May 25, 2016
Regarding PUC docket items:
SANDPIPER PIPELINE
PPL-13-473
CN-13-474
Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project
PPL-15-137
CN-14-916

Comments submitted by:
Darril Wegscheid
20231 Roosevelt Ridge – PO 251
Emily, MN 56447

Point Covered: **The correct and only defensible Scope needs to be from the commodities' "Source" in the oil fields to their "Sink" at the refineries in Chicago, IL; Gary, IN; Detroit, MI, or more broadly to OK, and to the primary USA refining areas along, in and around the gulf of Mexico.**

There is no current, nor forecasted, excess refinery **capacity** in Superior WI, nor any where in the north of the Great Lakes states of MN, WI, and MI. In fact, the Superior WI capacity (which is presently fulfilled) is at most about 5% of this pipeline's delivery capacity.

The various Enbridge corporate and industry-coalition stations along various 'routes' are either corporate relay / switching stations or simply store-and-forward positions built to control their share of the market distribution – those locations are not necessary to MN in order to provide the most direct path nor safest route from Source to Sink.

As a professional logistical modeler, and career student of distribution, I point-out that the "in-between" points that various industry investors choose / have chosen are to their relative advantage to control the market place. The USA needs to be served by siting the best route (now and through their economic life) from Western North Dakota and/or northern Alberta Canada to the refineries that are virtually ALL south of the Wisconsin border. Since these sources are expected to reduce the dependence on suppliers from outside of North America, then this must get to the refinery infrastructure that currently exists. No new refineries are anticipated in that process – just getting this oil to the existing refineries.

Therefore, since this effort by the PUC is meant to be a 'go back and get it right' directive from the Supreme Court, then the SYSTEM alternatives (that were shredded and disrespected under the erroneous Enbridge-directed false start) must now be included in the scope for the combined EIS. Many of those routes to Chicago and other refineries were discarded without the proper EIS-caliber scrutiny.

Therefore, they need to be included now.

Those early route considerations were NOT in the proper scoping. The studies' scoping now needs to be corrected, since the flows of Line 3 (sourced in Alberta) were never included - as the Sandpiper (coming our of Western N Dakota) was the 'stalking horse' to get a new corridor 'considered' and hopefully authorized.

These are TWO dramatically different flows, of drastically different commodities (Alberta tar sands versus Bakken-shale oils), from those two widely separate sources (Western Dakota and Northern Albert) and flowing to different refineries (whose capabilities differ) in terms of which products they can handle.

Thus, the scope has to include the entirety of BOTH system flows, since the impacts are cumulative, the projects are staged, they are both intrastate and quite simply part of one system.

That early 'assessment' of the Sandpiper route not only failed to consider that this was in fact an effort to open an entirely NEW CORRIDOR (not just simply to route a new single pipeline), but failed to establish / recognize the correct understanding that this is / was / will be PHASED, INTERSTATE, CONNECTED and SEQUENTIAL stages of ONE strategy to flow oils to refineries.

In addition, initially there was no focus on the true origin of the commodities, nor the true destinations at the refineries - but rather the focus was on Enbridge's conjured / contrived corporate "intermediate" points. The arguments tried vigorously to "demand" that their contracted oil shipments MUST be considered ONLY from Clearbrooke, MN (since they had it contracted to that point), and ONLY to Superior, WI (with no unsatisfied product demand there). Those are failures that cannot be repeated.

A reflection, that if they (Enbridge) had promoted their business to potential clients, and then signed contracts to deliver oil to a location at which (at the time of the contract) they had no capability to forward or process it, that seems to be a business practice that sounds like fraud and / or felonious mis-representation. Folks whom are more knowledgeable than I need to address that practice.

The State of MN should be paying no attention to that demand, as any definition of a key point from which oil needs to be moved. The oil is out in Dakota and up in Alberta – NOT in Clearbrooke, MN.

As a further reflection, how do those contracts stand today, since they are not being honored under the present configuration at a time point that was advocated by Enbridge as 'cannot wait'?

Clearly, under any reasonable view of the flows, the interconnectedness of the stages and projects as well as the cumulative effects of these diverse flows, the PUC study scope HAS to be recognized as the entire span from the SOURCES (the oil fields themselves) to the SINKS (the refineries) in Chicago, Detroit, Oklahoma, and the Gulf region.

This must be done, since this is truly a new and fresh corridor for oil transport, that is intended to allow Enbridge to leave leaked oil under and around Line 3, while using more geography for their corporate good as they strive to lock-in their distribution options, at the potential environmental expense of the lakes region of MN, WI, and MI.

Submitted,
/ /
Darril Wegscheid

May 25, 2016
Regarding PUC docket items:

SANDPIPER PIPELINE

PPL-13-473

CN-13-474

Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project

PPL-15-137

CN-14-916

Comments submitted by:

Darril Wegscheid
20231 Roosevelt Ridge – PO 251
Emily, MN 56447

Point Covered: **The proposed environmental assessment and proposed environmental modeling must consider many things, including:**

a) **The real (not hoped-for) frequency of leaks, spills, ruptures, and similar flow interruptions;**
b) **The size / quantity of the specific commodity spilled (tar sands versus shale oil) and the configuration of the site where the spill occurs;**
c) **The location of the spill, in terms of 'underground', in wetlands, in a river, in a / the lake shed, in a farm field, over or near farm wells, over or near city water sources, etc.**
d) **The cleanup / mitigation duration, costs of all aspects of the breach, quantity and costs of all damaged materials, and the final "end-state" of the spill site over time;**
e) **"Routine" leaks – frequency and consequence of the kind that have impacted the current Line 3 to the point that the land under and around it are impaired - as well as have led to reducing the capacity of the line (what is that process timeline for each of these pipes);**
f) **Impact of High Power Electrical lines on the structure of the pipeline and its operational performance;**
g) **The construction impacts, and post-construction restoration of the flora and fauna of key areas of the route;**
h) **Intervention process timelines, timeliness and impacts of responses to any pipeline or related failures, or to any electric power line failures (if sited with Power Lines).**

The spill in the Kalamzoo River has reportedly left serious deposits of tar sands in the affected areas – to the point that the EPA indicates that we (society) do NOT have a protocol for certain tar sands cleanups.

If that be the case, then extra caution must be exercised in the siting process, and the specifications for all aspects of the system when near water – standing, running, saturated, or underground.

Submitted,
/ /
Darril Wegscheid

May 25, 2016
Regarding PUC docket items:
SANDPIPER PIPELINE
PPL-13-473
CN-13-474
Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project
PPL-15-137
CN-14-916

Comments submitted by:
Darril Wegscheid
20231 Roosevelt Ridge – PO 251
Emily, MN 56447

Point Covered: **Spire Valley, in SE Cass County, MN is an environmentally significant site for the state of MN, the MN DNR, the trout streams of MN and elsewhere, and the fishermen whom enjoy trout fishing – this routing process must pose zero additional threats to the trout hatchery there. That hatchery relies on significant natural springs of clear, fresh, flowing water to enable trout (fish) eggs to hatch (as they would in a stream). If the aquifer pressure, flow, or the quality of its water is damaged then the hatchery is lost – period. If any part of any of these pipelines come in any proximity to these critical dimensions of the hatchery, the State of MN via the PUC and DOC must require a multi-billion dollar bond and an additional cash reserve of at least half of that amount as assurances that they will never impact the site. Even that presumes a comparable site might be found somewhere else – which is currently not a known option.**

Submitted,
/ /
Darril Wegscheid

From:	Tami Wenthold
To:	*COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject:	Sandpiper Pipeline and Line 3 Pipeline Projects
Date:	Wednesday, May 25, 2016 4:40:01 PM

Re: Sandpiper Pipeline Project
Docket Nos. PL-6668/CN-13-473,PPL-13-474
Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project
Docket Nos. PL-9/CN-14-916, PPL-14-137

Public Comment regarding both of these projects. We have attended the meetings in our area and are well aware of the maneuvers that have been made by Enbridge regarding the certificate of need and now the EIS. It is in the public best interest, the State of Minnesota and our waters that flow from the Headwaters of the Mississippi down through the United States to the Gulf of Mexico that you being charged with to ensure that the Environmental Impact Statement is honest, independent, and competent. There are alternative routes that have been suggested that would serve the purpose and avoid the Headwaters and the northern Minnesota lake country. We advocate for alternative route SA-04 as a top consideration. The MPCA alternative route SA-03 would be a viable second option. There are millions of people counting on the right decision to be made.

Regards,
Tami & Randy Wenthold
Menahga, MN

Ingrid Kimball

From: mccoop@invisimax.com
Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 1:03 PM
To: *COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject: Gordon Wetterlund

Dear Sirs,

I am writing in favor of the ruling for the Line 3 that crosses Minnesota I have three pieces of land in Foldahl Township of Marshalll County that the pipeline goes across. They put a new line in 2009. They did what they said they would so and went the extra mile to be safe. They make every attempt to work with the landowners. I am in favor of the pipeline both for moving oil in a Economical way and a safe way to get oil from our neighbors in Canada, rather than buy crude from the Arab Countries that aren't friends to us.

Thank you for your consideration,

Gordon Wetterlund Jr.
23819-280th Ave NW
Warren, Mn 56762

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Comment Form: Scoping

Energy Environmental Review and Analysis

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

Name: ROGER WIEBESICK Phone: 218-652-3090

Street Address: 24164 200th St

City: NEVIS State: MN ZIP: 56467

Email: bwiebesick@gmail.com

My comments pertain to:

- ☐ **Sandpiper Pipeline Project**
- ☐ **Line 3 Replacement Project**
- ☒ **Both Projects**

Enbridge should not be allowed to put this pipeline through our most valuable MN assets! Clean water is much more valuable to MN than oil! The land they want is drinking water through the whole middle of the country. They have a terrible environmental record, and there is a 99 to 1 chance over the life of this pipeline that it will leak. Put it through a less environmentally vulnerable area! Don't ruin the best part of our state! Don't let big business buy their way through this! Find an alternative! We prefer the route that Friends of the Headwaters suggests - far away from the headwaters. We must be good stewards for our state.

RECEIVED

MAY 17 2016

MAILROOM

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

From:	Ken Warner
To:	*COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject:	Scoping EIS comment for Sandpiper (13-473 & 13-474) and Line 3 Replacement (14-916 & 15-137)
Date:	Monday, May 23, 2016 10:50:06 AM

Dear Ms. MacAlister,

Members of the Public Utilities Commission and Department staff,

As you know, the development of the Sandpiper Pipeline is a major and important project for the state of Minnesota. As President of the Willmar Lakes Area Chamber of Commerce, I can verify that the benefits will be felt statewide – not simply along the route. Whether in direct jobs for folks in our community or reduced competition for scarce rail capacity – the benefits are clear, obvious and should be delayed no further.

A fair, timely, and final evaluation of this project has been delayed for far too long. Any entity attempting to do business in Minnesota relies on a predictable and timely regulatory process. I ask that the Department of Commerce adhere to the 280-day time limit to prepare the EIS to keep the project on track.

The scope of the EIS is vital. It needs to serve the public and private purpose of the Sandpiper project. It should not be so narrow that it would be inadequate, but it should also not be too broad. This balance must be met.

The economic benefit, safety of shipping oil through pipelines, and public support for this project should emphasize the importance of seeing this process through, in a timely and effective manner.

Thank you for the work you do for the state of Minnesota and thank you for your dedication in moving this project forward.

Sincerely,

Ken Warner

President

Willmar Lakes Area Chamber of Commerce

Sincerely,

Ken Warner
2104 Highway 12 E
Willmar, MN 56201
kwarner@willmarareachamber.com

From:	Mark Witt
To:	*COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject:	Scoping EIS comment for Sandpiper (13-473 & 13-474) and Line 3 Replacement (14-916 & 15-137)
Date:	Thursday, May 12, 2016 4:00:07 PM

Dear Ms. MacAlister,

Approve pipeline project!

Sincerely,

Mark A. Witt
1500 Lipan Rd
Roswell, NM 88203
welder.mark@yahoo.com

From:	Dan Wolpert
To:	*COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject:	Sandpiper EIS
Date:	Tuesday, May 24, 2016 12:17:33 PM

To whom it may concern, I have founded and run a retreat center in NWMN, just outside of Crookston. I write to you to strongly encourage that you reject the Sandpiper pipeline proposal. As I write to you I am teaching in West Virginia where they are fracking for gas and wreaking similar devastation on the environment that the ND fracking fields have done there. With the earth warming at an alarming, and so far out of control rate, we should not be encouraging further fossil fuel development. Rather it should be the opposite: we should be discouraging the drilling of any new wells and we should be putting our money towards conservation of energy and renewable energy sources. This is the only intelligent, sustainable, and faithful way forward for humanity. I hope that you have the courage to reject this unneeded development.

Peace,
Rev. Daniel Wolpert

www.micahprays.org

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain privileged and confidential information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

From:	Mr. & Mrs. James Wyatt, Jr
To:	*COMM_Pipeline Comments
Subject:	Scoping EIS comment for Sandpiper (13-473 & 13-474) and Line 3 Replacement (14-916 & 15-137)
Date:	Thursday, May 05, 2016 4:20:10 PM

Dear Ms. MacAlister,

I support the Sandpiper and line 3 replacement. This will continue our country's effort to become energy independent. It will also provide jobs both to construction workers but will infuse money to the local economy. Pipelines have be time tested to be the safest way to transport products.

Thank you

Sincerely,

James Wyatt Jr.
192 Leggett Rd
Mount Olive, MS 39119

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Comment Form: Scoping
Energy Environmental Review and Analysis

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

Name: June Wynne Phone: 218-243-2848

Street Address: 29440 Haggerty Dr NW

City: Puposky State: MN ZIP: 56667

Email: jbug52@gmail.com

My comments pertain to:

- ☐ Sandpiper Pipeline Project
- ☐ Line 3 Replacement Project
- ☒ Both Projects

Eminent Domain.

The power to take private property for public use by a state, municipality, or private person or corporation authorized to excercise character, following the payment of just compensation to the owner of that property.

How can Enbridge justify using eminent domain to take public and private property when these oil pipelines are not for the benefit of the public or for public use as an art gallery, Hospital, highway would be for public use. The oil pipeline is for the benefit of the oil company, and its owners. This oil will cross our state without benefit to the people who live near the line. The potential of toxic spills affecting the public are too great to ignore. This is NOT for public use.

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