

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

PUC Docket Numbers: PL-9/CN-14-916 and PL-9/PPL-15-137

Commissioners:

I am once again submitting a statement of opposition for the approval of the Line 3 second revised EIS. The public record, flawed as it might have been, led both the Administrative Law Judge Ann C. O'Reilly and the Department of Commerce to recommend against issuing a line 3 permit for the project you subsequently approved and reapproved in 2019 anyway. It seems development of the record has been something of a fool's errand.

Your handiwork, in combination with the appeals process, has stripped away all but consideration of a dilbit spill in the Gitchi-gami watershed. Your concern with the water and wetland crossings studied in the original FEIS wasn't sufficient to block the commission's project approval. The mandatory modeled spill in the Gitchi-gami watershed, using historic weather conditions, shows that spill material is unlikely to make it to the greatest of our lakes. So the new spill study can be added to the others? Do we call them inconsequential spill sites in the record? It's not as though we're out of clean water anyway. Forty-four percent of Minnesota's surface water remains unimpaired. Are we to understand that additional loss is our acceptable risk of Enbridge doing its business on Minnesota? Oh, and when the catastrophic line 3 failure occurs, are we guaranteed a clean-up similar to the Kalamazoo debacle?

But just a minute - spill impacts based on historic weather conditions don't apply today. Our environment has changed. How many 500 year storms will we weather next year? How many 1000 year storms? The real time climate science experiment we are running is yielding painful results around the world with nothing but the promise of elevated misery tomorrow. On some level, Commissioners, you know this to be true. In the short block of time since Enbridge filed the line 3 project application, you have witnessed a rapid ramping up of catastrophic natural events both in terms

of frequency and ferocity. You also know that the proposed project will drive our climate science experiment in the wrong direction. All of this to provide Enbridge's toxic goo with a path to ports unknown.

Please recall Boeing's two 737 MAX crashes during 2018 and 2019. Culpability was clearly fixed on the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the regulatory body, and the Boeing engineering firm. Lax certification procedures, design misrepresentation, and shortcutting engineering were identified as causal to the events. Boeing gambled, the FAA didn't catch it, and 346 people perished. The horrific losses incurred in these preventable events pales relative to the losses resulting from failure to address climate change. If given a second chance, what do you think the FAA and Boeing would choose to do today?

When considering climate change and its correlation to new fossil fuel infrastructure development it's important to recognize that North America is awash in fossil fuel development proposals. Each project will drive emissions in the wrong direction. The line 3 proposal is one of these projects.

This is Minnesota's opportunity to act. As Minnesota's regulator body, Commissioners, you control the certification process outcome. How much risk are you going to sign us up for?

Commissioners, please consider Minnesota's fresh water services, and the health of all of our state's people and inhabitants, including the animals and plants that make up this home of ours. Consider not breaking indigenous treaties again. Consider preserving a world compatible with life.

Deny this revised EIS. I hold you accountable.

Jerry Striegel

Saint Paul, MN