



How to Comment on Line 3

The following information is intended to help you write longer written comments that are as effective or targeted as possible. **Comments must be submitted by Wednesday, November 22, 2017, at 4:30 p.m**

Comments on Line 3 should be addressed to the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (PUC). You may know that Judge Ann C. O'Reilly, an Administrative Law Judge, has been presiding over the public hearings on the pipeline. She will review all public comments and issue a recommendation to the PUC this winter. Ultimately, however, the final decision on Line 3 rests with the PUC, and they receive all comments on the pipeline. Please note that all comments are public; no personal information is deleted.

The PUC is considering two issues related to Line 3: the specific Route that the pipeline would take, and the overall Need for the pipeline. This is because in order to build the pipeline, Enbridge must obtain two documents: a Routing Permit and a Certificate of Need. The Routing Permit pertains to where the pipeline will go; the Certificate of Need pertains to whether or not the pipeline should be built at all. In addition, after a successful court case, the PUC must also consider the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) as well as these rules.

Briefly, Line 3 will be granted a Certificate of Need (the permit that it needs in order to be built) if:

1. "the probable result of denial would adversely affect the future adequacy, reliability, or efficiency of energy supply to the applicant, to the applicant's customers, or to the people of Minnesota and neighboring states"
2. "a more reasonable and prudent alternative to the proposed facility has not been demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence on the record by parties or persons other than the applicant"
3. "the consequences to society of granting the certificate of need are more favorable than the consequences of denying the certificate"
4. "it has not been demonstrated on the record that the design, construction, or operation of the proposed facility will fail to comply with those relevant policies, rules, and regulations of other state and federal agencies and local governments."

These criteria are elaborated upon in [Minnesota Administrative Rule 7853.0130](#). In addition, the criteria for a Routing Permit may be found in [Minnesota Statute 216G.02](#). Although all public comments matter, the most effective public comments on need address one or more of these specific criteria.

You can submit your comments to the PUC directly by following [these instructions](#) (see page 3 of the link), or you can enter them into [this Google form](#) and MNIPL can submit them for you.



Good Facts to Know for Submitting Public Comments on Line 3

Climate Impacts:

- Heavy tar sands oil, such as would be transported on the proposed Line 3 pipeline, contains up to 37% more carbon than conventional oil.
- Permitting Line 3 at full capacity – 760,000 barrels per day - would have an equivalent carbon footprint of 16-18 million cars on the road every year of the pipeline's operation.
- The Final Environmental Impact Statement states the line could have a social cost of carbon of \$287 billion (in 2007 dollars) over just a 30-year time span.
- The Minnesota Environmental Protection Act (MEPA) calls on the state to "fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations." The Minnesota Next Generation Energy Act of 2007 calls on Minnesota to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80% of 2005 levels by 2050. We are not on track to meet this goal, unfortunately.

Water Impacts:

- The proposed new route of Line 3 would cross over 192 bodies of water, including the Mississippi River twice.
- These include some of the most pristine bodies of water in the state, and waters and watersheds currently subject to special state protections.
- More than 1.8 million Minnesotans rely on the Mississippi River for their drinking water.
- The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for Line 3 noted the annual probability of a spill. Extending that probability over the lifetime of a crude oil pipeline, we can expect 14 pinhole leaks, 54 small spills, 4 medium, and 1 catastrophic spills in the proposed Line 3.

Treaty Impacts:

- The proposed Line 3 would cross some of the richest wild rice areas in Minnesota; there are 20 wild rice lakes within one mile of the proposed route.
- This area is covered by the 1855 treaty, which guarantees members of many indigenous nations in MN the right to harvest wild rice from many of these off-reservation lakes (and, more broadly, the right to hunt, fish, and gather on many of these lands).
- The US Supreme Court has upheld these treaty rights - "usufructuary rights" - of native peoples to subsist off the land.

Abandonment

- Enbridge currently plans to leave the existing Line 3 pipeline in the ground after it ceases operation, rather than removing it and cleaning up surrounding soil.