



Minnesota Coalition of Lake Associations
Resolution

Regarding
Enbridge Energy, Inc.
Line 3 Replacement Project

Public Comment on
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

In reference to PUC Dockets, with comments concerning both:

CN-14-916: Line 3 Certificate of Need

PPL-15-137: Line 3 Route Permit

Whereas, the economic value of clean water is well established, regarding the tourism industry and livability standards of all people in the region;

Whereas, the macro-economic situation of oil production has not been adequately analyzed regarding costs and risks of transporting oil long distances from remote continental areas;

Whereas, the proposed preferred routing of oil pipelines imperil the unspoiled Mississippi Headwaters, lakes and streams in Minnesota, which constitute an irreplaceable heritage for the future generations;

Whereas, the wetlands, aquifers, and soils of the affected region are integral to the health of the overall water heritage;

Whereas, the wild rice beds within the affected region are both sacred to indigenous peoples and a key source of nourishment for all;

Whereas, additional utility corridors create the potential for further habitat fragmentation given the request of a 750 foot wide rout width that would likely be clear-cut;

Whereas, the preferred routing of Line 3 endanger these delicate and remote regions;

Whereas, Enbridge, like all pipeline operations, has a record of spills and uncorrected leakage that put this water heritage at risk;

Whereas, the record of oil pipeline spillage far exceeds that of both rail and truck transport methods combined;

Whereas, the recovery of spilled oil from pipelines has been shown to be less than 50%;

Whereas, the types of oil products proposed for transport through these water-rich regions are particularly dangerous due to their volatility, and density causing them to sink into the water;

Whereas, many of the additives to facilitate the flow of oil have remained secret, posing an unknown and further risk to clean-up efforts;

Whereas, safety testing and safety preparations to protect the remote region through which the preferred route would travel cannot be adequate to the difficulty of the task;

Whereas, the safety factors and pipe specifications have been dominated by industry, with minimal independent analysis;

Whereas, there has not been adequate requirements for site specific analysis of potential soil subsidence that could affect the performance and safety of the proposed pipelines;

Whereas, the abandonment of Line 3 and replacement in a new corridor sets a precedent for abandoning and replacing the entire set of aging oil pipelines in the present corridor;

Whereas, the preferred corridor has not been adequately analyzed for its cumulative environmental impact of additional oil pipelines in need of replacement if this route is established;

Whereas, the abandonment of Line 3 in place along its present corridor will require a thorough cleaning, gating and continuing maintenance of the pipe that by its continuing presence constitutes further risk to that region;

Whereas, the abandonment of pipes with significant leakage present, many sections of which are bored and uninterrupted underneath water bodies and wetlands, poses the additional risk of unintended drainage and material transport affecting the natural ecosystem;

Whereas, the abandonment of Line 3 in place along its present corridor prevents the analysis and cleanup of potential contaminants present underneath the pipeline due to the long history of anomalous leakage;

Whereas, the abandonment of Line 3 in place along its present corridor eliminates the possibility of reusing an established route;

Whereas, the present DEIS provides only a cursory overview of the potential environmental impacts of pipeline abandonment;

Whereas, without further study, an established electric transmission corridor is not necessarily appropriate for the co-location of oil pipelines due to the potential for dangerous conditions during a oil cleanup operation, nor for restoring a damaged electrical line;

Whereas, there is no direct availability for the transported oil products in the State of Minnesota for either refinement operations or for consumption, but only an indirect oil-market supply effect;

Whereas, unlike regulations in Canada, there are no Minnesota State Guidelines that address the special conditions inherent to the region regarding the mitigation and restoration of an abandoned oil pipeline;

Whereas, there is no guaranteed bonding or escrow for cleanup of future spills or eventual retirement, mitigation and restoration of Enbridge oil pipelines, but only meager and voluntary grants program from Enbridge for emergency response training that expects public agencies to bear additional costs;

Whereas, the intended oil flowing in a new Line 3 would be for tar-sands oil bitumen, which additionally requires the use of toxic “dilbit” that would be piped back to the source at further risk;

Whereas, tar-sands oil bitumen contributes a particular threat to global climate change;

Whereas, jobs necessitated by the construction of an oil pipeline through Minnesota are not dependant on the particular route chosen;

Whereas, the additional cost of either replacing Line 3 in its current route, or removing it altogether with mitigation and restoration should not be a concern for Minnesota regulators;

Whereas, the removal and restoration of the present Line 3 would create many additional jobs for Minnesotans;

Whereas, the property values and potential groundwater pollution of landowners and Tribes of an abandoned and historically anomalous oil pipeline has not been fully considered, nor have the landowners and Tribes been adequately consulted;

Whereas, the analysis in the DEIS of alternative means of transport by rail or truck are unrealistic, economically infeasible, and simplistic, serving to eliminate those possibilities, including the possibility of constructing no alternative at all;

Whereas, the Enbridge Company has engaged in deceptive public messaging, inadequate environmental review, undisclosed information about the oil itself, lack of transparency about future plans, and exploitation of inadequate regulation; and

Whereas, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources and the Pollution Control Agency have each expressed serious reservations as to the preferred routing of the earlier Sandpiper and Line 3 replacement proposal and the adequacy of its environmental impact;

It is HEREBY RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of the Minnesota Coalition of Lake Associations:

1) urges the MN Dept of Commerce and Public Utilities Commission to withdraw from the approval process and restore it to Minnesota's Environmental Quality Board, Pollution Control Agency and Department of Natural Resources.

2) urges the PUC and DOC to take greater caution, transparency and independence from industry in assessing the need and determining the routing of the proposed Enbridge pipelines;

3) urges the PUC and DOC to seriously consider the true need for these pipelines through Minnesota, and the alternative routings that have been proposed by others;

4) urges the PUC and DOC to consider more rigorously the issues surrounding the proposed abandonment of the present Line 3.

5) urges the PUC and DOC to allow landowner and Tribes to decide if they would allow the old Line 3 to remain abandoned on their property;

6) urges the PUC and DOC to consider more rigorously the economic aspects and complexity of this proposal ranging from the immediate effects on individual landowners to the overall economic feasibility of the need for this remotely located resource, and the cost implications to county, state and national for disaster relief and cleanup; and

7) urges both the State and Federal governments to create greater regulation of the oil transport industry within their jurisdictions to ensure that the environmental and economic impacts of such projects are full vetted in all their aspects.

Submitted by the Board of Directors of the Minnesota Coalition of Lake Associations (MN COLA), this day, July 10, 2017.



Thomas K. Nelson,
President, Minnesota Coalition of Lake Associations

Motion by Joseph Schneider, Coalition of Minnehaha Creek Waters
Second by Kathy Jonsrud, Wright County COLA
Passed by unanimous decision of the Board of Directors, MN COLA

Attest:
Joseph Shneider, Secretary, MN COLA