

Rice, Robin (PUC)

From: Carter & Florence Hedeem <hedeencf@arvig.net>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 10:49 PM
To: Heydinger, Beverly (PUC)
Cc: #PUC_Public Comments
Subject: Deny Enbridge Pipeline permit

We must consider the impact of our decisions today to the seventh generation. Our fossil fuel dependence will cost the generations to come dearly.

All pipelines leak eventually. Tar sands are more dangerous to transport than crude oil. Bitumen (tar sands oil) is so thick, it has to be diluted with highly toxic chemicals and pumped at very high pressures. The heat generated through this process causes corrosive dilbit to act like hot sandpaper inside a steel pipeline. The Alberta Clipper crosses the Red River, Mississippi River (several times) and the St. Louis River, sources of drinking water and recreation for millions of Minnesotans.

Enbridge is not a responsible pipeline manager. There were 800 spills on Enbridge pipelines between 1999 and 2010. In Minnesota alone, Enbridge has spilled nearly 1.5 million gallons of oil over 30 years and two workers were killed. The first known USA dilbit spill in Kalamazoo, MI, was the largest on-land spill in this country. Enbridge is still resisting EPA's orders to continue clean up almost 3 years after the spill in July 2010.

Please deny the phase one permit to expand the Enbridge Alberta Clipper Pipeline.

Florence Hedeem
703 First St. West
Park Rapids, MN 56470
218-732-9226

Rice, Robin (PUC)

From: Danny Saunders <ddominics6@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 2:53 PM
To: #PUC_Public Comments
Subject: Enbridge Pipeline

Dear Public Utilities Commission,

Many Minnesotans have put in great effort to reduce their carbon footprint. Using energy efficient lightbulbs, recycling and using public transit are some very common examples of millions of people trying to work towards a sustainable city, county, state and country.

Even with all these efforts, the science is telling us we have a lot more work to do. Years and years of rigorous research has told us the future problems we'll have to deal with will bring far more inconvenience than switching lightbulbs or sorting through trash.

Upgrading the Enbridge Pipeline is not in the best interests of the Minnesotans who will end up bearing the cost due to environmental disasters, degradation and pollution. Although it may look economically enticing at the moment, in the not so distant future we will either wish we had not upgraded the pipeline, or realize how beneficial it was to our state to decide against it.

Be apart of the first sustainable generation. The time has come to open our eyes and realize how little we can defend against climate change. The commissions eyes will be seen as closed if the upgrade is approved.

Sincerely,
Daniel Saunders
Age 22 of Hastings, MN

--

Rice, Robin (PUC)

From: Lois Norrgard <lnorrgard@lnmn10.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 12:27 PM
To: Heydinger, Beverly (PUC); Boyd, David C (PUC); Nancy.Lang@state.mn.us; O'Brien, Dennis (PUC); Wergin, Betsy (PUC)
Cc: #PUC_Public Comments
Subject: RE: Certificate of Need - Enbridge Alberta Clipper Line 67

Dear:

Chair Beverly Jones Heydinger Beverly.Heydinger@state.mn.us

cc: Commissioner David C. Boyd David.C.Boyd@state.mn.us, Commissioner Nancy Lang Nancy.Lang@state.mn.us,
Commissioner J. Dennis O'Brien Dennis.Obrien@state.mn.us, Commissioner Betsy Wergin Betsy.Wergin@state.mn.us

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
121 7th Place East, Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

June 19, 2013



RE: Certificate of Need – Enbridge Alberta Clipper Line 67

Thank you for providing this opportunity to comment on the Certificate of Need for the Line 67 Pipeline Project. I am submitting these comments because although I may not fit the “legal” definition of “adversely affected party” I certainly fit the description. I am adversely affected, as is my family, friends and other citizens of Minnesota, and Minnesota as a whole – our nature and waters.

This permit should be denied, the pipeline should not be expanded. Allowing the pipeline to be expanded could result in irreversible damage to our natural environment and threaten the public health of the citizens of Minnesota.

Minnesota and Minnesotans do not “Need” this pipeline. It is a false choice we are being asked to make, the increased capacity requested by Enbridge does not benefit Minnesota at all. I believe not even in any tax revenue (due to it being dilbit). I do not believe there will be many jobs created because it is an existing line with just a capacity expansion – present employment will probably not change.

The expansion of the Line 67 capacity does not benefit Minnesota as much as it does downstream refineries. And the conversion of large refineries to tar sands oil **instead** of leaving them as processors of crude (shale) increases imports, costs more energy to transport oil hither and yon, and does not foster energy independence.

It is only a matter of time until this pipeline leaks dangerous toxins into Minnesota's environment and water resources. Tar sands are very dangerous to transport, they are diluted with toxic chemicals and pumped at very high pressures. The corrosive nature of the dilbit being pushed through this line at very high pressure is like sandpaper against metal – it will wear out and burst.

The most recent spill (June 18, 2013) being reported has killed 40 hectares (approximately 75 football fields!!) of boreal forest – all trees, plants and creatures large and small dead – all dead. This **massive toxic waste spill** from an oil and gas operation in northern Alberta is being called one of the largest recent environmental disasters in North America. See "Every Plant And Tree Died": Huge Alberta Pipeline Spill Raises Safety Questions As Keystone Decision Looms by Kiley Kroh, posted June 18, 2013.

<http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2013/06/18/2167151/every-plant-and-tree-died-huge-alberta-pipeline-spill-raises-safety-questions-as-keystone-decision-looms/>

Brief excerpt:

"Following initial speculation that the leak stemmed from aging infrastructure, officials from Apache Corp. revealed that the pipeline was only five years old and had been designed to last for 30."

In Minnesota the Alberta Clipper pipeline passes through sensitive ecosystems and over countless rivers, including crossing the Mississippi River 5 times. Many of these rivers and waterways provide drinking water to millions of people. **As you can see above – the age of the pipeline does not matter – new pipelines are breaking and spilling.**

Kalamazoo MI is still suffering and struggling to get the Enbridge spill from 2010 cleaned up. We do not "NEED" to be in this same situation here in Minnesota.

Another quote from the same article cited above: "A recent [Global News investigation](#) found that over the past 37 years, Alberta's extensive network of pipelines has experienced 28,666 crude oil spills in total, plus another 31,453 spills of a variety of other liquids used in oil and gas production — from salt water to liquid petroleum. That averages out to two crude oil spills a day, **every day**" (emphasis added).

I am especially worried with Enbridge's flawed track record. There were 800 spills from Enbridge pipelines between 1999 and 2010. In Minnesota alone, Enbridge has spilled almost 1.5 million gallons of oil. We cannot trust Enbridge to properly clean up a spill. Let's prevent catastrophe before it happens.

I know that it has been well pointed out in previous comments the tragic impact that tar sands oil is, and will continue to have, on the local communities in Alberta Canada and across northern Minnesota. I also know that the tragic impact tar sands oil has on our warming planet has been pointed out – this should not be taken lightly. It may be hard to wean ourselves off of oil – a step that we must take, but it would be far harder to wean ourselves off of water. Water is one of our most precious resources, along with clean air and our soils and ecosystems.

Carbon emissions are a cause of global climate change, and have recently exceeded 400ppm. Tar sands oil causes 14% - 20% more carbon dioxide emissions than regular oil. Expanding Enbridge Alberta Clipper pipeline capacity will facilitate increased extraction of this dirty, carbon intensive fuel. To have a truly sustainable environment, 97.7% of scientists believe we need to stay below 350ppm.

Personally my husband and I enjoy our northern outdoors a lot. In the past spending many vacations on Winnibigoshish Lake, in the Chippewa National Forest, in Duluth and along the north shore of lake Superior, as well as in many other locations. We love and enjoy the many assets our great outdoors have to offer. This is all at risk.

My family also owns land along the Kettle River in Pine County. This would be another river system at risk from a spill – our waters are all connected and the risk of devastation immense with dilbit crossings. I also have family in both Duluth and Cloquet, places that would be greatly affected by any possible spills.

I hope that this letter comes across to you person-to-person. I realize you have a tough job having to make these types of decisions – but please consider the immense implications of any expansion - toxic lands and waters, and runaway climate change will be your legacy.

In denying this certificate you would not be alone – others are waking up and realizing the folly of continued tar sands expansion.

B.C. rejects Enbridge Northern Gateway pipeline proposal

'Our questions were not satisfactorily answered,' environment minister says

Posted: May 31, 2013 10:32 AM PT

Go to original: <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/story/2013/05/31/bc-northern-gateway-rejected.html>

Stop the madness, the insanity. Deny the expansion.
Thanks for the opportunity to weigh in as an “affected party”.

Sincerely,

Lois Norrgard
lnorrgard@lnmn10.com
10368 Columbus Circle
Bloomington MN 55420

Rice, Robin (PUC)

From: John Schmid <nvic1396@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 3:07 PM
To: staff, cao (PUC)
Subject: Alberta Clipper increase

ear Commissioners Heydinger, Boyd, Langer, O'Brien and Wergin,

As an inhabitant of the earth I feel that I will be directly impacted by the proposed increases in the Alberta Clipper tar sands pipeline capacity in that it will add to the increasing supply of fossil fuels available for consumption. Climate scientists overwhelmingly agree that if our climate is to have a chance at stability ppm. of CO2 in the atmosphere must be returned to no more than 350. As you are well aware global CO2 ppm has recently passed the 400 ppm mark. They estimate that at the 350 ppm level our global temperature would rise about 2 degrees F.

Recent Studies completed at the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Co. at the University of East Anglica in England have found that at the rate we are now spewing CO2 into the Atmosphere we are on track to increase global temperature as much as 9 degrees.

Not only will the added supply of oil of this pipeline expansion increase the availability of oil but it is among the dirtiest contributing 20% more CO2 to the atmospere than traditional oil.

If we are to salvage a decent planet for future generations and other species we must stop the continuing increase of fossil fuel use. We cannot continue on our present path. The time to say no to global warming is now. The time to say yes to a stable, sustainable future is now for our children and their's is now.

I will be directly impacted by these proposed pipeline increases.
WE all will be.

Minnesota citizens will not benefit form the capacity increase. The earths citizens will not. Please say "No".

Rice, Robin (PUC)

From: Helen Roland <helen.ap.roland@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 8:20 AM
To: Heydinger, Beverly (PUC)
Cc: #PUC_Public Comments
Subject: Against Enbridge expansion

Dear Chair and PUC Commissioners,

I urge you NOT to support expansion of the Enbridge pipeline expansion, especially an expansion in close proximity to our fresh water treasures, the Great Lakes, and the mighty Mississippi.

For decades we have been working to improve the quality of the water and we must continue to do so. That work is not finished. We must remain vigilant to protect our precious water. What are we without clean water?

Our family grew up with regular visits to the headwaters of the Mississippi and Lake Itasca. We now own property on Lake Superior. We have a deep appreciation for clean fresh water and for the need to continually act as its stewards. Year after year, we have watched the changes, some good, some bad. Lately, we have been very much aware of the negative impact of global warming with lower lake levels, higher lake temperatures, and more vegetation. We cannot afford to put our water at greater risk.

We ask that you act sensitively to our natural bodies of water and do nothing to increase the risk of their harm or the concomitant harm to all of the people dependent on fresh water.

Sincerely,
Helen Roland

Rice, Robin (PUC)

From: Matt Johnson <northfalke@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 14, 2013 12:04 PM
To: Heydinger, Beverly (PUC); Boyd, David C (PUC); Nancy.Lang@state.mn.us; O'Brien, Dennis (PUC); Wergin, Betsy (PUC)
Cc: #PUC_Public Comments
Subject: I oppose expanding the enbridge alberta clipper tar sands pipeline

To all of you decision makers,

I am writing to say that I oppose the expansion of this pipeline through Minnesota. I have avid outdoors many and biologist and believe expanding this pipeline is a bad idea. We're headed into a very rocky time for the climate and for MN to help expand this problem by assisting with tar sand transport is a bad idea.

Additionally as MN moves to a greener energy mix it doesn't make sense to increase the risk of an oil spill anywhere near the Mississippi river.

Please take these considerations into account as you decide what to do with this request. I believe MN would be better off in the long run with sustainable jobs here and a clean environment than we would if we expand last centuries energy sources.

All the best,
Matt Johnson
Minneapolis