

Speak Up!

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission

Application of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for a Route Permit for the Black Dog Natural Gas Pipeline Project in Burnsville, Minnesota | GP-16-656

Closed Nov 30, 2016 · Discussion · 3 Participants · 4 Topics · 9 Answers · 0 Replies · 2 Votes

3

PARTICIPANTS

4

TOPICS

9

ANSWERS

0

REPLIES

2

VOTES

SUMMARY OF TOPICS

SHOULD ANY SPECIFIC PERMIT CONDITIONS BE PLACED ON THIS PROJECT? 5 Answers · 0 Replies

Linda Loomis · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Nov 14, 2016 3:59 pm
1 Votes

The Lower Minnesota River Watershed District would like a condition placed on the permit that a SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) Permit be submitted to the Watershed District for review once it has been applied for. The District would also request a condition that the District is notified of any temporary dewatering that may need to be done during construction, that would require a Water Appropriation permit from the MN Department of Natural Resources.

Linda Loomis · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Nov 14, 2016 3:59 pm
0 Votes

The Lower Minnesota River Watershed District would like a condition placed on the permit that a SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) Permit be submitted to the Watershed District for review once it has been applied for. The District would also request a condition that the District is notified of any temporary dewatering that may need to be done during construction, that would require a Water Appropriation permit from the MN Department of Natural Resources.

Linda Loomis · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Nov 14, 2016 3:59 pm
0 Votes

The Lower Minnesota River Watershed District would like a condition placed on the permit that a SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) Permit be submitted to the Watershed District for review once it has been applied for.

Application of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for a Route Permit for the Black Dog Natural Gas Pipeline Project in Burnsville, Minnesota | GP-16-656

Closed Nov 30, 2016 · Discussion · 3 Participants · 4 Topics · 9 Answers · 0 Replies · 2 Votes

The District would also request a condition that the District is notified of any temporary dewatering that may need to be done during construction, that would require a Water Appropriation permit from the MN Department of Natural Resources.

Linda Loomis · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Nov 14, 2016 3:59 pm
0 Votes

The Lower Minnesota River Watershed District would like a condition placed on the permit that a SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) Permit be submitted to the Watershed District for review once it has been applied for. The District would also request a condition that the District is notified of any temporary dewatering that may need to be done during construction, that would require a Water Appropriation permit from the MN Department of Natural Resources.

Gilman Dedrick · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Nov 16, 2016 1:51 pm
0 Votes

A permit for this construction to proceed should be acquired from the MN Pollution Control Agency the administrator in the state of MN for the federal agency EPA's Clean Water Act. Specific should be the clear indication that during construction of the pipeline no additional pollutants will enter the already impaired MN River especially mercury and PAHs due to construction and that no other violations of the Clean Water Act will be tolerated.

DOES THIS PROPOSED PROJECT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON HUMANS OR THE ENVIRONMENT? 2 Answers · 0 Replies

Linda Loomis · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Nov 14, 2016 3:45 pm
1 Votes

The Lower Minnesota River Watershed has some specific comments to the application. Representatives of the Watershed District met with Xcel Energy to discuss the comments and were assured the concerns expressed would be addressed. The District's comments are:

1. Section 9.1.1 states: the elevation of the proposed pipeline ranges from 700 – 880 feet about mean sea level. However, Section 9.1.3 does not discuss the project's interaction with groundwater relative to the pipeline's profile. Xcel's staff will provide a profile of the pipeline inclusive of groundwater interactions and other elements.
2. As proposed, the pipeline alignment goes under Black Dog Lake. The route application states that no surface water will be impacted by the project. How does Black Dog Lake interact with groundwater water, and where is the pipeline in relation to them? As stated, Xcel's staff will provide a profile of the pipeline inclusive of groundwater interactions and other elements.

Application of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for a Route Permit for the Black Dog Natural Gas Pipeline Project in Burnsville, Minnesota | GP-16-656

Closed Nov 30, 2016 · Discussion · 3 Participants · 4 Topics · 9 Answers · 0 Replies · 2 Votes

3. Black Dog Fen is near this project and is sensitive to groundwater disturbance. However, other than a calcareous fen notation on Figure 10, an assessment of the project's effect on Black Dog Fen is not addressed. The District requests an assessment of the direct and indirect impacts this Project may have on the Black Dog Fen. Although not mentioned in the route application, Xcel has been in contact with consulting fen experts from Barr Engineering Company and Merjent, Inc. and have received conclusive information that Black Dog Fen will not be adversely impacted by the project.

4. Figure 5 highlights directional drill below a section identified on Figure 9 as NWI (national wetland inventory). What are the direct and/or indirect impacts to the wetland? Xcel acknowledged the omission and noted that the information had been updated in future drafts. Also, Xcel's proposed construction method avoids the surface and subsurface of the wetland, which will be highlighted on the proposed pipeline profile.

5. The District requests, as a permit condition, a review of and an opportunity to comment on the Project's construction stormwater pollution prevention plan and the Project's Department of Natural Resources Temporary Dewatering Permit (if required).

Laura Hedlund · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Nov 23, 2016 2:06 pm
0 Votes

I am not certain this is the best place for these general comments. Like many people around the world, I am deeply moved by the actions of water protectors in Standing Rock. We all know that the way we are collectively relating to the natural world results in climate change and we are breaking the nine boundaries. Those with empathy and those who care about the future FEEL the pain. The system blindly moves forward in ways that are irrational and cruel.

Read Mark Z Jacobson from Sanford Institute. We can choose to have these pipelines be obsolete technology. Instead of "investing" so many millions in pipelines - lets look at our energy situation from an open mind and open heart. If we include empathy our decisions will become more rational.

I assume this segment is added to the \$50 million pipeline going thru Lebanon Hills. How much money is being spent on this pipeline? Because this is so expensive - does spending this much money burden future rate payers? Is this out of date technology? I understand the old pipelines are left in the ground. What are the ecological consequences of leaving the pipes in the ground? As someone who buys energy - I want my money to match my values. I think distributed energy offers us the framework to make empathic and futuristic choices regarding energy. From passive houses, to friction, to tidal and of course solar, we are collectively smart enough to solve the climate crisis. Or we spend - tens of millions of dollars - on extractive pipelines because the people in power make money doing things this way. Other ways also have jobs. Activists may start to inform people of the banks that fund pipelines. As far as the Minnesota Public Utilities - do these pipeline increase cost for future rate payer in harmful ways?

Application of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for a Route Permit for the Black Dog Natural Gas Pipeline Project in Burnsville, Minnesota | GP-16-656

Closed Nov 30, 2016 · Discussion · 3 Participants · 4 Topics · 9 Answers · 0 Replies · 2 Votes

For example, those with financial resources may be able to buy sustainable energy solutions such as passive homes. The grid will be left serving those fewer economic resources. Instead of more pipelines, lets have creative, responsive solutions.

SHOULD THE COMMISSION GRANT OR DENY THE PARTIAL EXEMPTION REQUESTED BY XCEL ENERGY? 1 Answers · 0 Replies

Linda Loomis · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Nov 14, 2016 3:41 pm
0 Votes

The Lower Minnesota River Watershed District does not see any reason the partial exemption should not be granted, with the condition requested; that the Watershed District be provided with the SWPPP permit application for review.

ARE THE COMMISSION'S GENERAL PIPELINE PERMIT CONDITIONS REASONABLE FOR THIS PROJECT? 1 Answers · 0 Replies

Laura Hedlund · Citizen · (Postal Code: unknown) · Nov 23, 2016 2:32 pm
0 Votes

should the Commission require old pipelines be removed?