

HUBBARD COUNTY HC COLA P.O. BOX 746 PARK RAPIDS, MN 56470

www.HubbardCOLAmn.org HCCOLAmn@gmail.com

July 7, 2017

Jamie MacAlister Environmental Review Manager Minnesota Department of Commerce 85 7th Place East, Suite 280 St. Paul. MN 55101-2198

Re: PUC Docket Numbers CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137; Public Comment: Line 3 Project (CN-14-916 and PPL-15-137)

Dear Ms. MacAlister:

Hubbard County Coalition of Lake Associations ("HC COLA") is a coalition of 29 lake associations and their approximate 2,100 members that represent 37 lakes in Hubbard County. HC COLA's mission is to protect and enhance the quality of our lakes and rivers, preserve the economic, recreational and natural environmental values of our shore lands and promote the responsible use of our waters and related habitats. HC COLA's mission enhances, promotes and protects the interests of lakeshore property owners, lake associations, local government, the general public and future generations.

Our goal in commenting is to ensure that the EIS for the Line 3 Replacement oil pipeline crossing Minnesota fully complies with all State laws and provides for the highest level of protection of its natural resources.

Hubbard County is blessed with an abundance of natural resources, and is especially noted for its clean lakes and rivers. The proposed route of the new Line 3 Replacement pipeline, if approved, would be exposed to 760,000 barrels of Canadian heavy crude oil per day for the project lifetime. A spill of diluted bitumen which sinks in water demonstrated by the 2010 Enbridge spill in Kalamazoo, MI would be catastrophic to this pristine environment, its waters, wildlife, land, and inhabitants.

On May 15th, 2016, HC COLA requested the following as part our EIS scoping comments:

- 1. The Memo of Understanding (MOU) with the MN Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the MN Pollution Control Agency (PCA) should be strengthened by the inclusion of specific provisions and tasks that turn potential assistance and oversight into actual assistance and oversight. Currently marginalized by the Department of Commerce, scientists, specialists and managers at the MPCA and the MN DNR should have active opportunities to monitor and supervise the EIS.
- 2. As authorized by MEPA, we request the establishment of an expert panel to provide oversight and assistance with the scientific, economic, technical and procedural aspects of EIS scoping.
- 3. Any outside consultant contracts used in the EIS scoping should be awarded based on an open, unbiased bid procedure.
- 4. All "system alternative routes" submitted for this pipeline corridor should be included and compared in the EIS analysis.

After reviewing the draft EIS, it is evident that our scoping EIS comments / recommendations were not heeded. The Draft EIS of the potential environmental, human and economic impacts of the Line 3 Project and its proposed routes is inadequate due to the following issues directly affecting water resources:

- 1. Chapter 10 Accidental Crude Oil Releases comments
 - a) The oil release (spill) analysis was supplied by Enbridge, and their paid contractors who were also hired by the State to formulate the EIS. This is an obvious conflict of interest. The spill analysis was done without an independent 3rd party analysis.
 - b) The numbers used to calculate the spill scenarios were redacted; limiting the public to incomplete analysis and understanding.
 - c) The oil spill analysis was limited to only 7 sites, all along Enbridge's proposed route. This is insufficient as it does not represent all of the topographical features found on their proposed route nor features found on route alternatives.
 - d) The long term risk assessment for the life of the project is missing; this project life is at least 50 years based on the current age of Line 3.
 - e) There is no long term risk assessment of leaving the pipe in the ground indefinitely.
 - f) Missing winter spill analysis with the complexities of cleaning a river or lake covered by ice.
 - g) Missing the effect on a spill site where first response personnel are hampered from accessing the site of a spill where there are no existing roads.
- 2. Chapters 5, 6, 7, 9, and 11 in addition to 10 above - Economics-related comments
 - a) The oil release (spill) analysis is missing the economic analysis of the damage to our natural resources:
 - i. Tourism
 - ii. Itasca State Park
 - iii. Property Values
 - b) Post construction impacts and costs to our natural resources
- 3. Chapters 5, 6, 7, 9, and 11 - Environmental-related comments
 - a) Considering there are 192 water crossings in Minnesota via the proposed route, there appears to be no apparent usage of the MN PCA comprehensive water crossings report done for the Sandpiper, which follows the same proposed route in Minnesota. This is a gap.
 - b) There is no disclosure (or analysis) of hydraulic drilling fluids used to tunnel under streams, but which are known to be toxic to aquatic life.
 - c) Water body analysis appears only quantitative, not qualitative resulting in shallow lakes being equated with water-filled ditches.
 - d) In addition we found insufficient analysis of pipeline construction impact regarding the potential spread of invasive species.
- 4. Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 System Alternative SA04 and Line 3 comments
 - a) The System Alternative SA04 that bypasses the Mississippi River and the clean lakes region of Northern Minnesota was not adequately considered.
 - b) Minor route alternatives which resulted in reduced impacts of proposed Line 3R were not considered in SA04 like bypass karst areas
 - c) The construction impact on ground water discrepancy of 1000 ft Line 3R versus 2500 ft for SA04

Thank you for considering our Hubbard County Coalition of Lake Associations comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. If you have any questions or want to discuss these matters further, please contact our current HC COLA President, Sharon Natzel, at email address hccolamn@gmail.com.

Sincerely,