

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 1 -1	<p>The United States of America as well as any and all States that have federally recognized tribes must uphold their Trustee status and honor tribal decisions. "Worcester V. Georgia (1832), States have no power within the boundaries of Indian reservations-Congress, not the states have plenary power, or overriding power regarding Indian Tribe." Fond Du Lac reservation is my focus with that Supreme Court decision that has been affirmed many times. Enbridge, by federal law is operating illegally on tribal lands. Tribal council doesn't have sole-decision making authority either, by law it should have gone to a referendum vote by the band members of FDL.</p> <p>PL-280 gave states powers over criminal matters, not civil, in which this matter is and needs to be addressed as such. The state of Minnesota has a fiduciary responsibility to Tribes, not corporations that use inhumane treatment of Indigenous Peoples rights and beliefs.</p> <p>Article VI of the United States Constitution- Supremacy Clause "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance of thereof; AND ALL TREATIES MADE, OR WHICH SHALL BE MADE, UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES, SHALL BE THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND; AND THE JUDGES IN EVERY STATE SHALL BE BOUND THEREBY, anything in the Constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.</p> <p>The ignorance the PUC is showing towards Indigenous People is clear. The PUC has chose to ignore Tribal input at any length and ultimately put our culture under attack yet again by state officials who are acting out of ignorance and hatred for our way of life. The Cannons of Construction are very clear, any ambiguities that arise in tribal matters, must be decided in favor of Tribes.</p> <p>Yet we are left to fight corruption and racism all in one basket. When will our needs be met? when will we get to stop fighting for clean water and when will we get treated equally in this world? Ever?</p>	<p>The Enbridge Energy - Clearbrook Terminal does not lie in Indian Country. This Capped Air Permit application only applies to the existing/operating Clearbrook Terminal facility located at 17816 470th St. in Clearbrook, Minnesota, and not the pipeline as a whole.</p>
I- 2 -1	<p>Not a single project that produces air emissions should be approved in this state without consideration for climate change and the already abysmal number of days Minnesotan's are breathing in particulate counts higher than 0 PPM for PM2.5 and other pollutants.</p>	<p>The facility to which the Capped Permit applies is the existing crude oil storage facility, which is already in use. The proposed Line 3 replacement project is not expected to cause an increase of emissions from the crude oil storage facility. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than the eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 2 -2	The EPAs current standards for particulate are old fashioned and don't consider emerging science	The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.
I- 3 -1	Enbridge proposes a replacement line ... sounds like a responsible position by management ... It is bringing constructed according to current environmental rules and regulations ... sounds like a responsible position by management ... the company is insuring the abandoned line is taken care of for years to come ... sounds like a responsible position by management ... there is still a demand and need for the product, China will buy all they can get their hands on, so a USA company figures it will be a good investment ... sounds like a responsible position by management ... Although I have heard from a number of extreme environmentalist, none of their positions are supported by facts...supported by emotions yes and a belief anything oil is bad ... I am in full support of the Line 3...	The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.
I- 4 -1	Its time to let Line 3 proceed all of the information and state of the art alert system are in place. Its time to build it.	The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 5 -1	<p>This company has a bad record of leaking pipelines. I do not want to take the risk of having their line run through Minnesota. We are dependent on clean water and this should be clear to the . Stop this company from putting their leaking pipes on our land and polluting our fresh water. Deny this permit and keep Minnesota clean.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mary Seim</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 6 -1	<p>No. There is enough evidence before the authorities to argue for "no". Use it.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 7 -1	<p>"The poor growth was attributed to suffocation of the plants caused by exclusion of air by the oil or exhaustion of oxygen by increased microbial activity, interference with plant-soil-water relationships, and toxicity from sulfides and excess available Mn produced during the decomposition of the hydrocarbons."</p> <p>Available at: <a href="https://dl.sciencesocieties.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/4/4/JEQ0040040537">https://dl.sciencesocieties.org/publications/jeq/abstracts/4/4/JEQ0040040537</a></p> <p>Please consider your contribution to society, to the many.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 8 -1	<p>Reasonable evaluation and judgement clearly shows the improvements incorporated into the entire plan will result in lowered environmental risks and exposures. If Enbridge is not already Eligible for this permit, eligibility for and awarding of the Capped Air Emission permits should be provided in a very short, near term, time frame.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>
I- 9 -1	<p>I am disgusted by the idea of giving this permit. The Minnesota Environmental Policy Act, which declares that "projects that cause significant damage to the environment should not be permitted when reasonable and prudent alternatives exist". This pipeline construction will lead to toxicity in the air and damage our wetlands. You cannot get wetlands back through the artificial building! Please do not let this happen to our beautiful state. Do the right thing and keep the air clean. Money is not worth this.</p> <p>Olivia Kunshier</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 10 -1	<p>Please see my comments in the attached pdf file. Thank you!</p>	

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 10 -2	<p>(Text from pdf)</p> <p>Public Comment on the Draft Capped Air Emission Permit Application for Line 3 New Corridor: As a public citizen living in Hubbard County, I am interested in the air quality of our northern lakes area in MN. In researching the existing air pollutants / emissions of Clearbrook facility, there is already a large amount of CO2e emissions in pounds and also of nitrogen oxides pounds based on the 2018 information below. These chemicals are components of acid rain – see page 3 EPA Information. With the additional projected emissions from the proposed project at Clearbrook – Table 1-1 reference on Page 2, these pollutants when emitted may become acid rain – see Page 3 - and damage surface water and forests which are present in Clearwater and Hubbard County and northern lakes in our area with the prevailing winds blowing from the Northwest toward Hubbard County and many of the State Forests and our Northern MN lakes in the area shown on page 4.</p>	<p>The facility to which the Capped Permit applies is the existing crude oil storage facility, which is already in use. The proposed Line 3 replacement project is not expected to cause an increase of emissions from the crude oil storage facility. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than the eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope.</p>
I- 10 -3	<p>(Continued text from pdf)</p> <p>These emissions could be treated / cleansed prior to release. It is not clear from the application for the permit that treatment of emissions occurs.</p>	<p>As long as the Permittee is able to meet the emission limits of the Capped Permit, additional treatment or control equipment is not required by the applicable rules.</p>
I- 10 -4	<p>(Continued text from pdf)</p> <p>Also – I am concerned that this “Capped” air emission permit is not the actual type of permit that should be utilized for the Line 3 New Corridor application for emissions for the facility. I can see that the application information for the permit on Page 5 explains under eligibility that a utility is not able to utilize a capped permit. I believe that since the MN Public Utilities Commission is “approving” the proposed new corridor, that this is indeed a “utility” proposed new corridor. This capped permit should not be the type allowed for the facility permit. The proposed new corridor would be placed in an existing electrical “utility” corridor from West Hubbard County to Lake Superior. The proposed project is able to force landowners that do not want to allow the pipeline on their property to submit to the “utility” placement also. Therefore, the capped permit is not the correct type of permit. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>This permit application is for a crude oil storage facility, which does not qualify as a utility.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 11 -1	<p>Line 3 is needed. Enbridge has operated a tank farm in Clearbrook for over 70 years. They have always done a great job, protecting our environment. There plan will help to keep our environment safe.</p> <p>Thanks</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 12 -1	<p>I ask that the MPCA promptly process and approve the permits and authorizations needed for the Line 3 Replacement Project to move forward.</p> <p>The replacement of Line 3 is needed in order to meet the state's energy needs and has become the most thoroughly studied pipeline project in the history of Minnesota.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The MN Public Utilities Commission approved the revised Final Environmental Impact Statement, certificate of need and route permit for the Project – confirming that Line 3 needs to be replaced.</li> <li>- Replacing an aging pipeline with new, modern construction, is the safest and best option for protecting the environment and communities.</li> </ul>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 13 -1	<p>As a father of three children and a community physician, I am horrified to see our state and country continue to allow any fossil fuel projects or infrastructure to be build. How much more evidence do we need to come to the conclusion that this is harming our health and well-being today and only will get worse for our children and future generations. I implore our leaders to take action and stop this madness and have the courage to put an end to this detrimental course of action. We have much better alternatives not just for the future of our children but for our economy as well.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 14 -1	<p>I am commenting on the draft 401 water quality certification, draft National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System wastewater permit, and draft capped air emission permit application for the proposed Line 3 pipeline project. I am deeply concerned about the pipeline's impacts and believe that these permits must be denied.</p> <p>As a physician, I am particularly concerned about the impact of this project on water quality and climate change, which have direct effects on human health. The draft of the 401 permits states that this project will inevitably degrade high-quality waters and, by law, the MPCA cannot approve a project that degrades waters of the state unless the agency finds the project has enough 'social and economic benefits' to offset this degradation. The proposed 401 permit does not account for net social costs and economic benefits. The Minnesota Department of Commerce has consistently maintained that the project does not carry enough potential benefits to outweigh its flaws. The MPCA must do its own accounting of costs and benefits rather than abdicating its authority in this regard to the Public Utilities Commission's split decision, where even the commissioners could not reach consensus on the overall need for the project.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 14 -2	<p>Over 11,000 acres of wetlands are connected to the pipeline route and could be permanently degraded, and yet Enbridge only reported about 300 acres in their application. The MPCA must follow the requirements of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act, as it declares that projects that cause significant damage to the environment should not be permitted. With the predicted number of leaks and spills over the lifespan of Line 3 that will inevitably result in damage to streams, wetlands, lakes, and aquifers, the impact will be widespread.</p> <p>An oil spill would not only ruin water quality, it would negatively impact our drinking water, our critical aquatic and riparian habitats, and the sacred wild rice beds and other food sources that are central to the lives and livelihoods of Indigenous people. The FEIS states that adverse impacts of this project fall disproportionately on Native communities, which is incompatible with MPCA's stated commitment to environmental justice.</p> <p>I am opposed to the blatant disregard for the pipeline's toxic contents and its potential danger for spills, as drinking water from St. Cloud to Minneapolis is sourced from the Mississippi River. These waters are secured downstream of pipeline crossings and are not mentioned in the draft permit.</p> <p>The proposed Line 3 project is incompatible with certification under section 401 of the Clean Water Act. In order to uphold the MPCA's mission to protect and improve the environment and human health, the 401 certification and other permits under consideration must be denied.</p> <p>If the agency is unwilling to deny the permits at this time, then I petition the MPCA for a contested case hearing on the 401 certification and the NPDES permit, to address the issues of net societal costs and benefits that are not fully developed in the record, including the MPCA's failure to do its own accounting of these costs and benefits, as well as a need for updated oil market analysis in light of rapidly changing oil prices. This would allow for the introduction of expert testimony to inform a determination consistent with the requirements of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>
I- 14 -3	<p>It is vital that the MPCA evaluate this pipeline from the standpoint of public best interest rather than corporate profits, as the agency's mission is to protect and improve the environment and human health. The preeminent threat to the environment and human health is climate change. Line 3 would carry a climate impact of 193 million tons of CO2 per year, more than Minnesota's entire economy, for a 30-year social cost of \$287 billion. A warming and destabilized world poses grave risks to the integrity of our rivers, lakes, and streams.</p>	<p>The potential emissions associated with the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Permit applies are 858 tons per year of CO2 equivalent, well below the Capped Permit's limit of 85,000 tons per year of CO2 equivalent.</p>



Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 15 -1	<p>The Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project has been designed to use the most advanced technology and products. This Capped Air Emission Permit needs to be granted to Enbridge so this project can get started. This project is critical for the environment and all of Northern Minnesota. This project has been studied more than any project in Minnesota history, it is time to let the contractors go to work!</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 16 -1	<p>Enbridge cannot give assurance that the placement of Line 3 will be conducted in a manner that will not violate applicable water quality standards, and/or groundwater contamination. Therefore, it is imperative the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency cease the approval of all Enbridge line 3 Water, air, stormwater and wastewater certification permits, indefinitely and with-out further delay.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 17 -1	<p>The Line 3 Pipeline Replacement Project has been designed to use the most advanced technology and products. This Capped Air Emission Permit should be granted to Enbridge so this project can get started. This project is critical for the environment and all of Northern Minnesota. This project has been studied more than any project in Minnesota history, it is time to let the work begin.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 18 -1	<p>1. MPCA, Life and Breath Report : "Overall, the analyses estimate that in 2013 across Minnesota [particulate matter and ozone were responsible for] roughly 2,000 to 4,000 deaths, 500 additional hospital stays, and 800 emergency room visits."</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>
I- 18 -2	<p>2. MN350, A Giant Step Backwards : See Figure 1 - Line 3 will have carbon emissions 25% greater than the entire state [which includes sources that don't generate PM or O3].</p>	<p>The potential emissions associated with -the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Permit applies are 858 tons per year of CO2 equivalent, well below the Capped Permit's limit of 85,000 tons per year of CO2 equivalent.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 18 -3	<p>3. Enbridge, Why Minnesota needs Line 3 : "About 8,600 jobs (6,500 of them local) in Minnesota over a two-year period"</p> <p>Analysis: If the old Line 3 is over 50 years old, it seems we should expect a minimum of 125,000-250,000 premature deaths over the length of this new project in return for 6500 local jobs that last two years. This is what is meant by slow violence. In a time when Western Canadian Select Crude is hitting \$5 a barrel, approving this permit will be choosing a slow motion genocide over public service.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 18 -4	<p>It is vital that the MPCA evaluate this pipeline from the standpoint of public best interest rather than corporate profits, as the agency's mission is to protect and improve the environment and human health. The preeminent threat to the environment and human health is climate change. Line 3 would carry a climate impact of 193 million tons of CO2 per year, more than Minnesota's entire economy, for a 30-year social cost of \$287 billion. A warming and destabilized world poses grave risks to the integrity of our rivers, lakes, and streams.</p>	<p>The potential emissions associated with -the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Permit applies are 858 tons per year of CO2 equivalent, well below the Capped Permit's limit of 85,000 tons per year of CO2 equivalent.</p>
I- 19 -1	<p>I am commenting on the draft 401 water quality certification, draft National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System/State Disposal System wastewater permit, and draft capped air emission permit application for the proposed Line 3 pipeline project. I am deeply concerned about the pipeline's impacts and believe that these permits must be denied.</p> <p>The draft of the 401 permits states that this project will inevitably degrade high-quality waters and, by law, the MPCA cannot approve a project that degrades waters of the state unless the agency finds the project has enough 'social and economic benefits' to offset this degradation. The proposed 401 permit does not account for net social costs and economic benefits. The Minnesota Department of Commerce has consistently maintained that the project does not carry enough potential benefits to outweigh its flaws. The MPCA must do its own accounting of costs and benefits rather than abdicating its authority in this regard to the Public Utilities Commission's split decision, where even the commissioners could not reach consensus on the overall need for the project.</p>	<p>The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 19 -3	<p>It is vital that the MPCA evaluate this pipeline from the standpoint of public best interest rather than corporate profits, as the agency's mission is to protect and improve the environment and human health. The preeminent threat to the environment and human health is climate change. Line 3 would carry a climate impact of 193 million tons of CO2 per year, more than Minnesota's entire economy, for a 30-year social cost of \$287 billion. A warming and destabilized world poses grave risks to the integrity of our rivers, lakes, and streams.</p>	<p>The potential emissions associated with -the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Permit applies are 858 tons per year of CO2 equivalent, well below the Capped Permit's limit of 85,000 tons per year of CO2 equivalent.</p>
I- 19 -4	<p>Over 11,000 acres of wetlands are connected to the pipeline route and could be permanently degraded, and yet Enbridge only reported about 300 acres in their application. The MPCA must follow the requirements of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act, as it declares that projects that cause significant damage to the environment should not be permitted. With the predicted number of leaks and spills over the lifespan of Line 3 that will inevitably result in damage to streams, wetlands, lakes, and aquifers, the impact will be widespread.</p> <p>An oil spill would not only ruin water quality, it would negatively impact our drinking water, our critical aquatic and riparian habitats, and the sacred wild rice beds and other food sources that are central to the lives and livelihoods of Indigenous people. The FEIS states that adverse impacts of this project fall disproportionately on Native communities, which is incompatible with MPCA's stated commitment to environmental justice.</p> <p>I am opposed to the blatant disregard for the pipeline's toxic contents and its potential danger for spills, as drinking water from St. Cloud to Minneapolis is sourced from the Mississippi River. These waters are secured downstream of pipeline crossings and are not mentioned in the draft permit.</p> <p>The proposed Line 3 project is incompatible with certification under section 401 of the Clean Water Act. In order to uphold the MPCA's mission to protect and improve the environment and human health, the 401 certification and other permits under consideration must be denied.</p> <p>If the agency is unwilling to deny the permits at this time, then I petition the MPCA for a contested case hearing on the 401 certification and the NPDES permit, to address the issues of net societal costs and benefits that are not fully developed in the record, including the MPCA's failure to do its own accounting of these costs and benefits, as well as a need for updated oil market analysis in light of rapidly changing oil prices. This would allow for the introduction of expert testimony to inform a determination consistent with the requirements of the Minnesota Environmental Policy Act.</p> <p>Joshua Colton, MD Minnesota Gastroenterology MNGI</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 20 -1	Not applicable	<p>The MPCA lacks enough information on this comment to respond appropriately.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 21 -1	<p>I oppose Line 3 because it is unneeded.</p> <p>In 2017, the Minnesota Department of Commerce testified that our state's economy had no need for the new pipeline, and that we'd be better off if the old one were shut down entirely without a replacement.</p> <p>It invests in a dying past instead of building the bright future we need.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 22 -1	<p>We oppose Line 3 because it is unneeded.</p> <p>In 2017, the Minnesota Department of Commerce testified that our state's economy had no need for the new pipeline, and that we'd be better off if the old one were shut down entirely without a replacement.</p> <p>We oppose Line 3 because it makes 227 crossings of Minnesota's cleanest streams, rivers, and lakes. Tar sands oil is heavier than other forms of crude and sinks in water, making it virtually impossible to remove once leaked. We oppose Line 3 because this expansion along over 300 miles of new corridor, in addition to the hundreds of miles of existing pipelines that cross Minnesota, threatens the health of people, land and wildlife.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 22 -2	<p>We oppose Line 3 because the oil it would carry would have a worse yearly climate impact than the entire economy of Minnesota from every sector combined. Every year the pipeline runs as intended is the emissions equivalent of 50 new coal plants running year round. (Minnesota currently has 4 coal plants.)</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 22 -3	<p>We oppose Line 3 because it will despoil treaty lands guaranteed to the Ojibwe people in Minnesota, violating their rights and threatening their culture and health.</p> <p>We oppose Line 3 because it invests in a dying past instead of building the bright future we need.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 23 -1	<p>I urge the MPCA to deny the Capped Air Emission Permit to the Enbridge Line 3 pipeline. I have three reasons for this. First, this discussion has been going on for far too long. Some Line 3 supporters use this fact to say that we need to push through, but I see it differently. If something is this controversial, and needs to be discussed and re-discussed for years, why are we doing it? If we need to think about something this hard, we should take that as a sign that there is something seriously wrong going on here.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>
I- 23 -2	<p>Second, I have heard the arguments that the old pipeline is unsafe, and that we need more jobs in northern MN. Why not employ people to take out the old pipeline in a safe way, and NOT put in a new one? This will provide jobs and protect the environment.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>
I- 23 -3	<p>Third, this hearing has been moved to digital and telephone format due to coronavirus. We are deeply and rightfully afraid of things that have the power to kill us. I want to share some numbers: COVID19 has, so far, killed 81,259 people. To put that in perspective, the World Health Organization calculates that air pollution kills more than 7 million people every year. No matter what measures are taken to minimize air pollution on Line 3, we know that the pipeline WILL contribute to air pollution, and therefore, the decision to approve the Line 3 pipeline will be directly responsible for the deaths of innocent people.</p> <p>Any further approval on this project is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 24 -1	<p>The MPCA needs to acknowledge climate change is a public health threat, and to count that as a "social cost" in their calculation of benefit from this project. Critical public health risks include threats to farming communities, threats to indigenous communities, endangerment of basic infrastructure, adverse mental health impacts, exacerbation of existing health conditions (such as asthma and some allergies), and increased prevalence of tick-borne and mosquito-borne diseases.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 25 -1	<p>The only way to improve this Capped Air Emission Permit is to deny the permit. Anything allowing the Enbridge Line 3 Tar Sands pipeline to move forward will seriously degrade the environment here in Minnesota and all the way back to Alberta. You are the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency! Do your job. Control pollution. Stop the Enbridge Line 3 Tar Sands pipeline now. Thank you.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 26 -1	<p>I am commenting on Enbridge's Capped Air Emissions Permit Eligibility. I ask that this permit be denied. Why are we even considering pollutive air emissions to be allowed from a company who has a poor record of responsibility to land and water use? In Minnesota, we pride ourselves on caring for the resources we have been given. This goes against what the citizen's of Minnesota believe in, and corporate greed and shady political dealings need to be replaced with cleaning up land and water already affected by Enbridge , and promoting clean energy.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 27 -1	<p>My name is Judy.and I live in Minneapolis. I am urging the MPCA to oppose the construction of the Enbridge Line 3 Pipeline. I was in high school in the late 60s and early 70s during the time period when the Clean Air &amp; Water Acts were created, along with the establishment of the EPA. It was a time of great optimism for the future and well being of the environment and an era when most Americans genuinely believed that regulatory agencies across the land were here to serve the public's best interests rather than to do the bidding for corporations.</p> <p>But if you fast forward to today, it seems that corporations have once again reinserted their stranglehold over the entire environmental regulation process, including the certification and permit processes that most often fall under the jurisdiction of state agencies. And that is why I am here today to oppose the (Draft) 401 Certification as well as the Industrial Waste Permit and Capped Air Permit for the construction of the Enbridge Line 3 Pipeline.</p> <p>It is the job of the MPCA to enforce all state water quality standards. This being the case, the MPCA must deny construction of Line 3 due to the impact its construction will have on streams and on the actual water quality within the state. Enbridge's proposed "dry crossing" method of 161 streams in Minnesota, including 4 trout streams, will increase suspended sediment, destroy stream habitat, increase erosion and deforestation, and destabilize stream banks and beds.</p> <p>Related to this, the MPCA must not allow construction of Line 3 based on the predicted number of leaks and spills over the Project's lifespan that will inevitably cause further damage to wetlands, lakes and aquifers. Nor has the company accurately listed the contents of its supposed "crude oil," including the actual carcinogens it contains.</p> <p>As a 65 year old resident of Minnesota, I care about the future of my grandchildren who live in this beautiful state. I also care about the well being and livelihood of indigenous communities who have inhabited our land for centuries. Allowing the construction of Line 3 will be in direct violation of treaty provisions which we must uphold. This is not a "replacement" project as Enbridge has branded it; it will involve the destruction of 340 additional miles of land in Northern Minnesota along an entirely new route. We must not put corporate profits above the public interest. Just like other pipelines, Line 3 will spill toxic oil over the land and water, destroy sensitive ecosystems and contribute drastically to the acceleration of Climate Change. The MPCA has the authority to stop all of this from happening right now by denying all certification and permits for Enbridge Line 3.</p> <p>Thank you very much.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>



Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 28 -1	<p>April 6, 2020  Commissioner Laura Bishop  Minnesota Pollution Control Agency  520 Lafayette Rd.  St. Paul, MN 55155  Re: Line 3 401 Certification, NPDES and Capped Air Permit Applications</p> <p>Dear Commissioner:</p> <p>I am extremely concerned about the negative impacts of Enbridge Energy's Line 3 Replacement Project on Minnesota's environment, climate, human health, and indigenous peoples, and request these permits be denied.</p> <p>The Minnesota Pollution Control Agency states its mission is to "protect and improve the environment and human health", and is required by law to deny any project permit that degrades the waters of the state unless its social and economic benefits outweigh its costs. The Minnesota Department of Commerce consistently maintains Line 3 Replacement Project costs outweigh any purported benefits. Some of the costs are related to climate change and its impacts on public health. These costs are often referred to as externalities because they are viewed as costs experienced by unrelated third parties. But that is exactly the type of thinking that results in many of our environmental problems. By understanding everything is interconnected, there is no such thing as an unrelated third party, and therefore these costs also need to be addressed. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimates \$180 billion in economic losses by the end of the century to the effects of climate change caused by burning fossil fuels, and \$886.5 billion annually due to impacts on health caused by fossil fuel pollution.</p> <p>The need for Line 3 oil needs to be weighed with our need for a sustainable place to live. 2016 was the warmest year in recorded history, and the ten warmest years on record have all occurred since 1997. There are clear links between our earth's climate changes and anthropogenic sources of carbon dioxide. In the New York Times of January 16, 2015, Michael H. Freilich, director of Earth Sciences at NASA said, "Climate change is perhaps the major challenge of our generation." We are already experiencing its devastating effects on earth's ecosystems. Plants and animals are being driven to extinction at accelerating rates. Polar ice caps are melting and causing seas to rise, forcing millions of people to seek shelter in already overpopulated inland areas. Record droughts in</p>	<p>The potential CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Air Emission Permit applies are 858.22 tons per year, which is well under the Capped Permit limit of 85,000 tons of CO2 equivalent per year. Comments about the total amount of greenhouse gasses created from combusting the total amount of oil passing through the entirety of the Line 3 Pipeline are considered out of scope. This Capped Air Emissions Permit only covers emissions associated with the Clearbrook Terminal crude oil storage facility.</p>
I- 29 -1	<p>We oppose Line 3 because it is unneeded.</p> <p>In 2017, the Minnesota Department of Commerce testified that our state's economy had no need for the new pipeline, and that we'd be better off if the old one were shut down entirely without a replacement.</p> <p>We oppose Line 3 because it makes 227 crossings of Minnesota's cleanest streams, rivers, and lakes. Tar sands oil is heavier than other forms of crude and sinks in water, making it virtually impossible to remove once leaked.</p> <p>We oppose Line 3 because this expansion along over 300 miles of new corridor, in addition to the hundreds of miles of existing pipelines that cross Minnesota, threatens the health of people, land and wildlife.</p> <p>We oppose Line 3 because the oil it would carry would have a worse yearly climate impact than the entire economy of Minnesota from every sector combined. Every year the pipeline runs as intended is the emissions equivalent of 50 new coal plants running year round. (Minnesota currently has 4 coal plants.)</p> <p>We oppose Line 3 because it will despoil treaty lands guaranteed to the Ojibwe people in Minnesota, violating their rights and threatening their culture and health.</p> <p>We oppose Line 3 because it invests in a dying past instead of building the bright future we need.</p>	<p>The potential CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Air Emission Permit applies are 858.22 tons per year, which is well under the Capped Permit limit of 85,000 tons of CO2 equivalent per year. The 50 new coal-fired power plant statistic refers to the crude oil entering the market, but not the amount of CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the Capped Air Emissions Permit, which only encompasses this specific Clearbrook Terminal crude oil storage facility.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 30 -1	<p>I oppose Line 3 because it is unneeded.</p> <p>In 2017, the Minnesota Department of Commerce testified that our state's economy had no need for the new pipeline, and that we'd be better off if the old one was shut down entirely without a replacement.</p> <p>I oppose Line 3 because it makes 227 crossing of Minnesota's cleanest streams, rivers, and lakes. Tar sands oil is heavier and dirtier than other forms of crude and sinks in water, making it virtually impossible to remove once leaked.</p> <p>I oppose Line 3 because this expansion along 300 plus miles of new corridor, in addition to the hundreds of miles of existing pipelines that cross Minnesota, threatens the health of people, land and wildlife.</p> <p>I oppose Line 3 because the oil it would carry would have a worse yearly climate impact than the entire economy of Minnesota from every sector combined. Every year the pipeline runs as intended is the emissions equivalent of 50 new coal plants running year round. (Minnesota currently has 4 coal plants.)</p> <p>I oppose Line 3 because it will despoil/take away treaty lands guaranteed to the Ojibwe people in Minnesota, violating their rights and threatening their culture and health.</p> <p>I oppose Line 3 because it invests in a dying past instead of building the bright and clean future we need for the next generation. Further, Minnesota agency scientists have previously stated that the biggest threat to Minnesota's water quality is climate change! Carbon emissions from Line 3 would be equivalent to that of 50 new coal-fired power plants. We also need intact natural wetlands and streams to help our communities mitigate the effects of climate change.</p> <p>There is no good reason to allow this project and too many good reasons that I can't even list them all. Stop the madness! Minnesota has the power to stop this project. The temporary benefits from construction jobs are outweighed by the certain destructive consequences to our climate, public health, lands, and waters.</p>	<p>The potential CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Air Emission Permit applies are 858.22 tons per year, which is well under the Capped Permit limit of 85,000 tons of CO2 equivalent per year. The 50 new coal-fired power plant statistic refers to the crude oil entering the market, but not the amount of CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the Capped Air Emissions Permit, which only encompasses this specific Clearbrook Terminal crude oil storage facility.</p>
I- 31 -1	<p>It's time to APPROVE the permits. Let's get L3 replaced for all of us to enjoy Minnesota's natural beauty for generations to come. Enbridge is a frontrunner in Environmental Stewardship, always working to surpass government and regulatory requirements by leaving the land/communities where it works better than before.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 32 -1	Line 3 would create a great deal of problems for future generations in the form of possible leaks and definitely greater CO2 emissions. This Line 3 insanity needs to STOP. It is dangerous and not needed.	The potential CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Air Emission Permit applies are 858.22 tons per year, which is well under the Capped Permit limit of 85,000 tons of CO2 equivalent per year.
I- 33 -1	A) I oppose the allowing the permit "Capped Air Emissions" for Enbridge Line 3 because breathing clean air for health in Minnesota will not be safeguarded.	Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.
I- 33 -2	B) Given the new COVID-19 pandemic, breathing air pollution is a threat multiplier causing death, especially in at-risk populations, per MPCA. C) Given the 2019 Worldwide Threat Assessment of DNI Dan Coates, bad actors and foreign nations have the motivation and means to disrupt critical infrastructure (pipelines, electrical controls, networks/data). pages 5 & 6. <a href="https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/2019-ATA-SFR---SSCI.pdf">https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/2019-ATA-SFR---SSCI.pdf</a>	The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 33 -3	<p>D) We assume best intentions of Line 3 operators, against a backdrop of pandemic diseases, Greenhouse Gas emissions/Climate impacts, and bad foreign actors. For the lifetime of Line 3, can operators assure the public that Minnesotans and people in the region will breathe without harm/death caused by their operations?</p> <p>Priority permits should be given to other energy-producing options that are safer and less costly to Minnesotans.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>
I- 34 -1	<p>Comments by Janette Dean of Caledonia, MN urging denial of all permits for the Line 3 Replacement Project including the Capped Air Emission permit</p> <p>My name is Janette Dean from Caledonia, Minnesota. I was raised in La Crescent, MN where I enjoyed several science classes covering the fields of basic science in grade school as well as biology, chemistry, and physics in junior high and high school. I ask you: Was all that education that we've each taken to earn our basic high school diplomas all for naught?</p> <p>For it does not take much knowledge or research at all to understand that allowing continued greenhouse gas emissions to heat up our planet is perhaps the most negligent and harmful act we can be taking when we have already reached nearly 420 ppm of CO2 in the atmosphere while dangerously polluting our planet's oceans, water bodies and surface areas at the same time. Our esteemed U.S. government agency of NASA has plainly stated that the "relentless rise in CO2 shows a remarkably constant relationship with fossil-fuel burning" in their similarly-titled graphic on their Global Climate Change website, and scientists across the world have raised the alarm about this same fact for decades.</p>	<p>The potential CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Air Emission Permit applies are 858.22 tons per year, which is well under the Capped Permit limit of 85,000 tons of CO2 equivalent per year.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 34 -2	<p>It is therefore extremely personal to me and ALL human beings on Earth (whether they yet realize it or not like our indigenous people indeed do) — as well as ALL the many spectacular and important species we are supposed to share our planet with — that the State of Minnesota including the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency ethically choose to deny all and any permits for the crude oil Line 3 replacement project in order to protect our global climate as well as our statewide ecosystems and human health. The carbon dioxide emissions that Enbridge's Line 3 would enable through the transport capacity of 760,000 barrels of crude oil per day is a crime against humanity and nature at this point in our increasingly perilous human history. In fact, National Geographic stated in April 2019 that the Alberta tar sands oil operations are the most destructive oil operation in the world and that it is growing. I would like to remind you that Minnesota is currently a key partner in crime in that activity which should be illegal because it is so unjust to all.</p> <p>Minnesota must therefore not support Line 3's replacement project because it does not provide social or economic benefits in either the short-term or the long-term with, again, the many increasing dangers and costs of climate change impacts to us all and the harm to our state's own ecosystems as a result. Since MPCA's mission is to not only PROTECT but to IMPROVE the environment and human health, they cannot with any good conscience approve any Line 3 permits knowing the pipeline's overall purpose. Please keep the big picture in mind. Minnesota absolutely must help the world transition much more rapidly to safe, renewable energy production and use and approving Line 3 permits would do the exact opposite.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 35 -1	<p>I pray for justice in this time of inequity.</p> <p>I pray for an outcome that serves the highest good for All.</p> <p>My name is Jean Lazarus. I am speaking to you today because of the climate that is changing, my deep concern for the health of our water systems and concerns about the violations of native peoples through potential breaches of historic treaties.</p> <p>We are all aware of the very real threats of climate change including wildfires, mega storms and this winter was the warmest on record not least of all in Minnesota. This tar sands oil should stay in the ground to preserve a healthy world for our children and our grandchildren. It is time for us to take brave decisions that turn towards a more sustainable future rather than the dark Path of fossil fuels and extractive economies of short term profits.</p> <p>Enbridge has a terrible history of spills and of having a negative impact on the environment. If they spill oil in our wetlands it will be impossible, impossible to clean up. They are not even planning to clean up their old pipeline yet. They were unable to clean up the Kalamazoo spill. All pipeline spill. This pipeline crosses two huge watersheds and endangers the health of the water systems and ecosystems that rely on it, all the way below a spill.</p> <p>We have harmed native people over and over through the history of America. We need to step up to protect treaties which promised ongoing capacity to harvest wild rice and other crops. Spills in this area will destroy these crops and us make these treaties void. Just because our ancestors broke treaties before the ink was dry, does not invalidate our commitments.</p> <p>This oil is not for Minnesota. It is to be distributed to International markets. It is to bring profits to a foreign corporation. Minnesota can make more money from tourism and other sustainable economies rather than from temporary jobs and temporary income putting in this pipeline. People who need work in the north land can be employed to remove the old pipeline and install new clean technologies. Those that do not pollute.</p> <p>The great surge of temporary workers who come into Minnesota to install this pipeline will bring COVID-19 to these communities.</p> <p>The man camps that house pipeline workers bring crime including drugs and sex trafficking to our rural neighborhoods that are not prepared for that volume of crime.</p> <p>I pray you vote with your conscience. You know that pipelines always spill. You know the devastation that this Tarsands oil will have on our pure Minnesotan water. It is your job to protect our waters from pollution. I pray that you will think of the kind of world that you want to leave for your children and your grandchildren.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope.</p> <p>The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 36 -1	<p>I pray for justice in this time of inequity.  I pray for an outcome that serves the highest good for All.  My name is Sage Morningstar. I am speaking to you today because of the climate that is changing, my deep concern for the health of our water systems and concerns about the violations of native peoples through potential breaches of historic treaties.  We are all aware of the very real threats of climate change including wildfires, mega storms and this winter was the warmest on record not least of all in Minnesota. This tar sands oil should stay in the ground to preserve a healthy world for our children and our grandchildren. It is time for us to take brave decisions that turn towards a more sustainable future rather than the dark Path of fossil fuels and extractive economies of short term profits.  Enbridge has a terrible history of spills and of having a negative impact on the environment. If they spill oil in our wetlands it will be impossible, impossible to clean up. They are not even planning to clean up their old pipeline yet. They were unable to clean up the Kalamazoo spill. All pipeline spill. This pipeline crosses two huge watersheds and endangers the health of the water systems and ecosystems that rely on it, all the way below a spill.  We have harmed native people over and over through the history of America. We need to step up to protect treaties which promised ongoing capacity to harvest wild rice and other crops. Spills in this area will destroy these crops and us make these treaties void. Just because our ancestors broke treaties before the ink was dry, does not invalidate our commitments.  This oil is not for Minnesota. It is to be distributed to International markets. It is to bring profits to a foreign corporation. Minnesota can make more money from tourism and other sustainable economies rather than from temporary jobs and temporary income putting in this pipeline. People who need work in the north land can be employed to remove the old pipeline and install new clean technologies. Those that do not pollute.  The great surge of temporary workers who come into Minnesota to install this pipeline will bring COVID-19 to these communities.  The man camps that house pipeline workers bring crime including drugs and sex trafficking to our rural neighborhoods that are not prepared for that volume of crime.  I pray you vote with your conscience. You know that pipelines always spill. You know the devastation that this Tarsands oil will have on our pure Minnesotan water. It is your job to protect our waters from pollution. I pray that you will think of the kind of world that you want to leave for your children and your grandchildren.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 37 -1	<p>Do not allow line 3 to go ahead with plans. Line 3 is destructive, treaties are being ignored, science is being ignored, and even the MN Department of Commerce is being ignored. Line 3 is unlawful, unmoral, the long-term negatives far outweigh the positives, and line 3 is simply not necessary.</p> <p>Line 3 will cost millions of dollars to maintain the pipe in order to attain the lowest possible oil leaks. The pipeline is guaranteed to leak, and the attempt at cleaning the oil from the wetlands, streams, and lakes will cost another hefty amount. When the pipeline is no longer used, removing and disposing of it will cost another many million. Does this pipeline actually function at profit if it is truly kept in prime condition with very few leaks? Is this going to benefit humanity 100 years from now? Is the pipeline going to be kept up with as few leaks as possible? Or will it remain in use even though there are obvious leaks as distinguished by a dramatic drop in output vs. input?</p> <p>If line 3 goes ahead, it will cause the destruction of wetlands, which as we all know, is the natural way of cleaning water. We are quickly approaching an era where clean drinking water is scarce and difficult to obtain. It is of utmost importance to preserve the wetlands, our natural water filters at all costs.</p> <p>The oil can be transferred by truck or train, using roads and railways that are already built.</p> <p>Once we destroy even more of our ecosystem, more plants and animals will become endangered or extinct. It is our moral obligation as humans to protect the natural world we live in. Many of our medicines are derived from plants. By eradicating, or at the least, severely scarring an entire ecosystem, we lose medicines which western science has not yet researched or used, as well as scores of natural herbal remedies and acres of wild food.</p> <p>It is appalling and disgusting line 3 is even a debate, given the statistics of how much oil leaks from pipelines into the surrounding land and lake superior.</p> <p>The MPCA is indicating that they will grant the permits. They state that they are required to make their decision by a specified date or lose control over their authority to issue the permits. The MPCA is rigidly using legacy processes to make projects possible and is not including...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...increasing precipitation in Minnesota due to climate change and the effects that this has on soil stability and runoff,</li> <li>• ...the implications of dam failures due to...</li> </ul> <p>o</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>



Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 38 -1	<p>I opposed Enbridge line 3 because the low quality oil that is moved through this pipeline is not only a threat to thousands of acres of wetlands, but when processed releases toxins into the air which increase green house gases. We need alternatives to oil. This is going backwards in progress. Minnesota's clean water is our most important asset. The MPCa should protect our water over corporate interest. We need to protect our drinking water and critical habitat that lives in the area the pipeline travels. Please protect our valuable water tables in Minnesota. It is the headway to our country's waterways. It's all connected.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 39 -1	<p>My name is Tashina Perry. I represent the Sandy Lake Band of Mississippi Chippewa. My family has resided on Big Sandy Lake for hundreds of years. I am a representative of our tribal council. I am formally requesting that Enbridge stop their permitting process and construction of the line 3 pipeline. This pipeline is a direct threat to our usufructuary rights, as well as our very being, both on and off reserve. This country's need for crude oil does not surpass our inherent right to live on a viable, clean planet. We ask you to please cease and desist.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 40 -1	<p>I am commenting on Enbridge's Capped Air Emissions Permit Eligibility. Do not approve permits for Enbridge Line 3. FOLLOW SCIENCE. DENY LINE 3 PERMITS. The MPCA has a legal responsibility to "Protect and improve the environment and human health". Enbridge Line 3 fails on each of these. Thus, the MPCA does not have authority to approve this project. We know that the pipeline WILL contribute to air pollution and climate change, therefore, the decision to approve the Line 3 pipeline will be directly responsible for the deaths of innocent people. The supporters of Line 3 all will make significant revenue with this project. Their opinions are NOT objective and should not even be considered. Enbridge has An extremely dismal reputation for leaks and pollution. Any wastewater from Line 3 will destroy our water and thus these permits should not be approved. WATER is our most valuable resource and Line 3, while crossing over 200 bodies of water with it's toxic chemicals, will render the water unfit for drinking, agriculture, recreation and SURVIVAL. There is NO need for Line 3. At our home we produce more than enough electricity for our needs. It's not rocket science any more. With an electric car there is no need for dirty tar sands oil. The only reason our nation is not producing sustainably is because of GREED of a few. Climate change impacts alone from Line 3 would have a social cost of \$287 billion over 60 years. In addition, Line 3 is a of the violation of the treaty rights of our native peoples. Yes, we need jobs but there are many good jobs in renewable energy! DENY LINE 3 PERMITS!</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 41 -1	<p>Thank you for taking these comments regarding the draft Capped Air Emission for the proposed Line 3. I understand the MPCA has determined they have no authority to deny the permit. Nevertheless, I feel compelled to object to the construction of Line 3, because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of Line 3 will add more carbon into the atmosphere and exacerbate climate change. We are presently microwaving the atmosphere. We must stop. Saying "No" to line 3 is, in effect, tapping the brakes on climate change.</li> </ol>	<p>The potential CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the crude oil stroage facility to which the Capped Air Emission Permit applies are 858.22 tons per year, which is well under the Capped Permit limit of 85,000 tons of CO2 equivalent per year.</p>
I- 41 -2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The construction and operation of Line 3 puts at risk—of destruction, disruption and degradation—lands, waterways, habitats and wildlife that are utilized by sovereign native nations under treaties with the U.S.A. These nations contend they have not been adequately consulted. The Public Utilities Commission contends this is a Federal issue. The issue of impact on ceded lands should be resolved at the Federal level—until then no action should be taken on Line.</li> <li>3. Line 3 adds to the fossil fuel infrastructure of the country at a time we should be decommissioning wells, mines, pipelines and refineries in a thoughtful and planned manner.</li> <li>4. Line 3 will transport tar sands oil that is being mined in Canada. The environmental destruction and degradation—as well as the energy needed for that mining—is having and will have a tremendous negative impact on environmental and climate quality.</li> <li>5. It has been determined by the Minnesota Commerce Department that Line 3 is not needed. I agree: it is not needed.</li> </ol>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 42 -1	<p>Dear Minnesota and Wisconsin community on 'Line 3' permits, I am writing today in critical concerns around an increase into our fossil fuel industry. I am writing to seek clearance on the behalf of the safety of Minnesotan residents on safety concerns regarding the impact of placement of a new pipeline 'Line 3'. These concerns not only involve me, a Minnesota resident of the Twin Cities area, but also towards all of the rural communities of Northern Minnesota, Northern Wisconsin. These communities include the tribal lands ceded and unceded territories, and the promises made to the indigenous communities promising that their foodways are protected alongside hunting and gathering.</p> <p>My concerns also lay with the tourism in the uppermost Wisconsin areas including uppermost Minnesota areas. My concerns are: current tourism revenue loss due to placement of 'Line 3' in the Great Lakes region, and carbon emissions created by 'Line 3'.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 42 -2	<p>Carbon emissions would increase, as to Minnesota has pledged to fighting for more sustainable ways of transportation and sustainable energy. I am worried that Minnesota will not live up to our new set standards due to the acceptance of Line 3 permits, and therefore will contribute to the increase in Carbon emissions due to the act of the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission(s). I am worried that if there is an acceptance of 'Line 3' permits, that Minnesota will be sued by federal demands on this issue and loss of money be accredited against Minnesota.</p> <p>Sincerely, Another concerned Minnesota resident.</p>	<p>The potential CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the crude oil storage facility to which the Capped Air Emission Permit applies are 858.22 tons per year, which is well under the Capped Permit limit of 85,000 tons of CO2 equivalent per year. The 50 new coal-fired power plant statistic refers to the crude oil entering the market, but not the amount of CO2 equivalent emissions associated with the Capped Air Emissions Permit, which only encompasses this specific Clearbrook Terminal crude oil storage facility.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
I- 43 -1	<p>I outright oppose any permitting that would allow for Line 3 to destroy our lands, waters, and deteriorate our already at-risk health. The MPCA has the right and duty to protect the health of Minnesotans, the lands we live on, and the air we breathe. Water quality WILL be affected by this, which puts us at risk. The well-being of people (and by proxy, the environment in which we live) should be the TOP priority here. Nothing is more important: not corporations, and especially not 'economic benefits.'</p> <p>This is not the only reason to deny the permit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Enbridge's report says this will impact streams and wetlands: ecosystems will be disrupted and destroyed, putting plant and animal species at risk, and degrading water and air quality (which affects people as well as the natural world). Construction and oil spills have the potential to cause this damage.</li> <li>-Indigenous communities will lose their ability to access food sources, which historically we have already damaged enough.</li> <li>-The health of Minnesotans (particularly indigenous Minnesotans) will be impacted by the reduction in quality of drinking water/natural resources. This is a THREAT TO PUBLIC HEALTH, particularly to underserved people who are and have always been at higher risk, and less able to cope with impacts.</li> </ul> <p>In summary: I implore you to deny this permit to Enbridge, and not allow for it to be permitted.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>
I- 44 -1	<p>We oppose the Enbridge pipeline, and urge the MPCA to deny the requested permit. Enbridge cannot give assurance that the placement of Line 3 will be conducted in a manner that will not violate applicable water quality standards, and/or groundwater contamination. Therefore, it is imperative the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency cease the approval of all Enbridge line 3 water, air, stormwater and wastewater certification permits, indefinitely and without further delay.</p> <p>MN needs protection of our invaluable land, water, and air. Fast-tracking the permit process is not acceptable and does a disservice to all people of our state. Please ensure that the MPCA upholds its duty to regulate, enforce, and ensure the safety and protection of our land and people.</p>	<p>The MPCA received many comments in support of and opposition to the Line 3 project. These comments are noted but are beyond the scope of eligibility of the facility for the Capped Permit. The Capped Permit does not apply to the pipeline itself, only to the crude oil storage facility identified in the permit application. The MPCA considers comments on topics other than eligibility of the this crude oil storage terminal facility for the Capped Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit application during the public notice period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
O- 1 -1	<p>The Minnesota/Wisconsin Petroleum Council is an affiliate of the American Petroleum Institute (API). API represents all segments of America's oil and natural gas industry. Its more than 600 members produce, process, and distribute most of the nation's energy. The MN/WI Petroleum Council and its member companies support the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) prompt approval of the draft capped air emission permit application at Enbridge's Clearbrook terminal.</p> <p>Throughout the permitting process Enbridge has sought to address issues raised by MPCA and other agencies. Enbridge has met or exceeded the required due diligence for the project. The MN/WI Petroleum Council and API strongly support the MPCA's approval of the appropriate air emission permit. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>
O- 2 -1	<p>Attached please find comments from Consumer Energy Alliance (CEA) on the Enbridge Line 3 Air Permit.</p>	

Comment Code	Comment	Response
O- 2 -2	<p>(from pdf)</p> <p>April 9, 2020 Minnesota Pollution Control Agency Enbridge Line 3 Public Comments – Water Quality / Air Quality 520 Lafayette Road North St. Paul, MN 55155-4194</p> <p>RE: Enbridge Line 3 Public Comments / Water Quality / Air Quality</p> <p>On behalf of Consumer Energy Alliance (CEA) and our 82,000 members in the Great Lakes Region, I write today to thank the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency for receiving public comments on the Line 3 Replacement Project.</p> <p>Founded in 2006, CEA is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization advocating for a balanced energy policy and responsible access to resources. CEA represents virtually every sector of the U.S. economy – from the iron and steel industry to truckers, airlines, agriculture, labor organizations, restaurants, chemical manufacturers, small businesses, and families all across the nation – that are concerned about U.S. energy policies, energy security, and long-term price and supply stability. CEA has more than 550,000 individual members and almost 300 academic, non-profit, corporate, and union affiliates throughout the United States.</p> <p>Our members support a rational, all-of-the-above energy policy that utilizes all of our domestic natural resources – both traditional and renewable – while ensuring commonsense environmental protections are in place.</p> <p>Regardless of the source of energy being developed or transported, CEA believes it is important to ensure that our environment is protected. Based on prior filings for Line 3, it is clear that safeguarding our shared environment has been thoroughly studied through extensive surveys and comprehensive planning to minimize environmental impact – especially the impact on wetlands, waterway, and the air we breathe. Utilizing modern, advanced construction techniques allows for a temporary footprint during construction, with full environmental restoration upon completion.</p> <p>It is important to note that aside from being the most thoroughly reviewed pipeline project ever undertaken in Minnesota, the replacement of Line 3 has been unanimously endorsed by the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission.</p> <p>More than ensuring our environment is protected, the Line 3 Replacement Project will also ensure families, farmers, and local businesses across the state continue to have access to affordable, reliable energy as well as opportunities to restart Minnesota’s economy.</p> <p>As unemployment claims in Minnesota have steadily increased to over 111,000, there is no better time to guarantee stable and predictable energy supplies as families begin tapping their savings accounts and other assistance to make ends meet.</p> <p>Beginning construction on the Line 3 Replacement Project will not only help families and businesses power their lives, but it will also provide employment opportunities. Construction will bring more than 8,500 jobs to communities across northern Minnesota,</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
O- 3 -1	<p>I am writing today on behalf of the Area Partnership for Economic Expansion (APEX) regarding the Draft 401 Water Quality Certification, NPDES Wastewater Permit, and Air Capped Permit for Enbridge's Line 3 Replacement Project.</p> <p>APEX represents over 85 companies employing over 15,000 people in the APEX region of northeast Minnesota and northwest Wisconsin. The APEX mission is to drive investment throughout this region. One key to driving investment is relying on a stable, predictable regulatory process and timeframe. Our organization believes the air, water, wastewater and wetland studies that have occurred over the last several years related to the Line 3 Replacement Project have been thorough and complete and the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency should issue the requested certification and permits to Enbridge.</p> <p>Enbridge is complying with federal and state wetland laws and protections. The route was specifically and carefully selected to mitigate the impact to water bodies and wetlands, with more than 90 percent of the approved route following existing utility corridors ? minimizing environmental impacts. In fact, 99% of the construction impacts of this replacement project are temporary. The conditions proposed in the draft 401 Certification are appropriate and achieve state water quality standards. Unavoidable impacts are minimized by applying recognized best management practices.</p> <p>Line 3 permits were approved by the lead agency for this project, the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission after extensive public input including two contested cases over a five-year period, confirming that the necessary study and public input have been thoroughly completed, and that Line 3 needs to be replaced.</p> <p>Enbridge is committed to protecting the environment and has an excellent track record mitigating risks. This stewardship will continue through construction and operation.</p> <p>Especially given the dire economic situation Minnesota faces today, we need an increase of \$19.5 million in property taxes, a \$2.6 billion investment in critical energy infrastructure, and the 8,600 family-sustaining construction jobs that go with it.</p> <p>APEX and our members urge the MPCA to approve the certification and permits for the Line 3 Replacement Project without delay.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Brian W. Hanson APEX President &amp; CEO</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>

Comment Code	Comment	Response
O- 4 -1	<p>On behalf of the coalition Jobs for Minnesotans, which represents thousands of businesses, labor organizations and communities across the state of Minnesota, I'm submitting a formal comment related to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) public comment period on the Draft 401 Water Quality Certification, and the Capped Air Emission Permit for Enbridge's Line 3 Replacement Project.</p> <p>One of the fundamental principles of our organization is a belief that responsible development projects can coincide with environmental protection. We believe the environmental, water, wetland and air studies that have occurred during the last several years for the Line 3 Replacement Project have been thorough and complete and the MPCA should issue the requested certification and permits to Enbridge.</p> <p>Not only is Enbridge complying with federal and state wetland laws and protections, the route was specifically and carefully selected to mitigate the impact to water bodies and wetlands. More than 90 percent of the approved route follows existing utility corridors which also helps minimize impacts to the environment. The conditions proposed in the draft 401 Certification are appropriate and achieve state water quality standards. Unavoidable impacts will also be minimized by the reduction of construction workspace and utilization of other best management practices.</p> <p>The second revised Final Environmental Impact Statement, Certificate of Need and Route Permit for the Line 3 Replacement Project was also approved by the lead agency for this project, the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission after a rigorous public input process spanning more than five years and two contested cases – one on the Need and Route, the other on the Environmental Impact Statement. This confirms that the necessary study and public input have been thoroughly completed and that Line 3 needs to be replaced.</p> <p>Enbridge is committed to protecting the environment and has an excellent track record mitigating risks. Our organization is confident Enbridge will continue be good stewards of these resources from the construction of the project across the state of Minnesota to continued maintenance and monitoring of the pipeline once it's operational.</p> <p>Minnesota relies on Enbridge pipelines to provide crude oil to its two large refineries in the Twin Cities. The Line 3 Replacement Project is necessary to help ensure that Enbridge continues to meet the needs of the two large refineries in the Twin Cities and the region. Replacing the line will restore capacity and reduce the need for maintenance, preserving the highest possible standards in safety and efficiency. Ultimately, replacing an aging pipeline with new, modern construction, is the safest and best option for</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>
B- 1 -1	<p>This project is needed now more than ever. We have worked on Enbridge projects for over 40 years and they are by far the most environment concerned company ever. We firmly believe they build projects that help protect all US citizens. Thank you for the time</p>	<p>Comment noted. The MPCA considers comments outside of eligibility of the crude oil storage facility for the Capped Air Emissions Permit to be out of scope. The MPCA acknowledges and thanks all commenters who participated in the review of this permit during the public notice comment period.</p>