

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 1:20-cv-00001
Date: May 25, 2022 12:55:17 PM

CAUTION: This is an Ex-Email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony and arguments deposed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject the proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Science that more extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in a short order, so MPSC ought to reject the proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,

Linda Fighera

[REDACTED]

From [\[REDACTED\]](#)
To [\[REDACTED\]](#)
Subject RE: Line 5 2025
Date Friday, May 25, 2022 12:54:42 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request to release their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a final agreement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to store fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject the proposal outright since it would not squish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 60-year-old pipeline, but has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas into the water. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Dom Nique Edmondson

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 1:20-cv-00001
Date: May 25, 2022 12:54:19 PM

CAUTION: This is an Ex-Email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony and arguments deposed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject the proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to continue to move fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Science that more extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in a short order, so MPSC ought to reject the proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Ria Walsh
Michigan, United States

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 0-20763
Date: Friday, May 25, 2022 12:53:30 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request to release their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. It is a tragedy that Enbridge has been allowed to continue to operate in the Great Lakes for as long as they have. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the many issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Law suits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to store fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been known out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risks.

Yours sincerely,
Kathleen Wright
Perry Michigan 8872 United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [REDACTED]
Date: May 25, 2022 12:50:22 PM

CAUTION: This is an Ex-Email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners:

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments deposed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge's operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to transport fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert employed to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while producing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Nathan Raub-Bieri

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 1:20-cv-00533
Date: May 25, 2022 12:48:23 PM

CAUTION: This is an Ex-Email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert is tempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Nancy Warzawski

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Dan at ENR.com](#)
To: [JAMES SCROOGES](#)
Subject: RE: Case 19-0053
Date: Mon, May 25, 2022 12:47:17 PM

CAUTION: This is an Exernal email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@midgigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony and arguments deailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject his proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempt to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate his issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Daniel Uerewyk

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From [redacted]
To [redacted]
Subject RE: Case 19-00703
Date day March 25 2022 12:46:57 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I STRONGLY DEMAND THAT YOU IMMEDIATELY REJECT Enbridge Energy's TO REQUEST THEIR LINE 5 PIPELINE IN A TUNNEL BUILT THROUGH THE BOTTOMLANDS OF THE Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is a TO SWIFTLY REJECT THIS TERRIBLE PROPOSAL. Below are a few of the MAJOR ISSUES THAT I STRONGLY URGE TO CONSIDER IN MAKING YOUR DECISION FOR THE COMMUNITY, THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE SAFETY OF YOUR CITIZENS.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no act on" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Litigation and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shuttles. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a possibility in the case of a "no act on" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state's moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempt to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal on right's sake; it would rely upon public resources while providing no public benefit.

While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that HAS ALREADY LEAKED 30 times and SPILLED OVER 1 MILLIONS OF GALLONS OF OIL AND NATURAL GAS LIQUIDS. MICHIGAN CANNOT AFFORD TO LET ENBRIDGE CONTINUE TO OPERATE THIS POLLUTING PIPELINE SCHEME; ONLY COMPOUNDS THE RISK THAT ENDANGERS US.

Yours sincerely
Mark Feldman

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

From [REDACTED]
To [REDACTED]
Subject RE: Case 1:2023-
Date day, March 25, 2022 12:45:05 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

As a Michigan native and a Michigan homeowner and an Illinois resident who relies on the Great Lakes for my drinking water, I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. We simply cannot place this body of fresh water at such unnecessary risk.

After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the many reasons that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding rapidly now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to continue our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of greenhouse gas emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate its pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Kirk McMurray

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 1:20-cv-00001
Date: Friday, March 25, 2022 12:45:04 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

Fossil fuel pipelines are the highway to past. The future is wind energy and solar power.

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel beneath the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject his proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no act or" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Law suits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to encourage our state to move fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly changing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject his proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,

Kathryn Rose

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 19-20763
Date: Wed, Mar 25, 2022 12:33:32 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I at long last urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline as a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no act on" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid consent. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well lead to the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no act on" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transition to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order. No MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 60-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
JERRY BELTER
Baraboo, Wisconsin 53913 United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Megan Raphael
To: JUDGE SCOTT
Subject: RE: Case 3:20-cv-00033
Date: May 25, 2022 12:45:24 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline to a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the main issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to route our state's moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of greenhouse gas emissions for this project, which would be a mistake. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected greenhouse gas impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2019. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit area's industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric heating, showing the rapid diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Megan Raphael

[Redacted signature block]

From [James Dawson](#)
To [James Dawson](#)
Subject RE: Line 5 (0/0/0)
Date Friday, May 05, 2023 12:44:28 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@im.chigan.go

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to his plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a solid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to make significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for his project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Science that time extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automakers industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for his products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject his proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 66-year-old pipeline, but has already leaked over 30 times or 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate his pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
James Dawson

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Laura Judge](#)
To: [JAMES SCROGGS](#)
Subject: RE: Case 1:20-cv-01013
Date: Mon, May 25, 2022 12:43:59 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners:

It is ludicrous for the MPSC to consider approval and escalation of a fossil fuel based future for North America. I am appalled that you would consider imperiling our precious Great Lakes waters for minimal Michigan benefits. It is a bad business decision. It is an even worse ethical decision.

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the many issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a detailed assessment. Litigation and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefits. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 60-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Laura Judge
Honorable Member, Michigan State Board of Natural Resources

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Joe & Jo-Michigan](#)
To: [ABRAM SCROOGES](#)
Subject: RE: Case 19-00783
Date: Mon, 25 May 2020 12:43:42 M

CAUTION: This is an Ex-ternal email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@midgigan.go

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony and arguments delivered before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject his proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempt to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate his issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Until recently, we owned property on Grand Traverse Bay. I can't even imagine what those beautiful waters would look like covered in a sheen of oil.

Yours sincerely,
Laura VerMeulen

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 1:20-cv-00001
Date: Mon May 25 2022 12:42:45 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to mining fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel cannot be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risks.

Yours sincerely,
Charlie Huns

[REDACTED]

From [\[REDACTED\]](#)
To [\[REDACTED\]](#)
Subject RE: Line 5-2025
Date Friday, May 25, 2022 12:42:22 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I sincerely urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request to release their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision:

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid agreement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to store our state's fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject the proposal outright since it would not squish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 60-year-old pipeline, but has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Judy Bruce

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From [REDACTED]
To [REDACTED]
Subject RE: Case 5-20253
Date day, May 25, 2022 12:41:07 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues, but I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to his plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a final easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to mining fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been browned out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risks.

Yours sincerely,
Suzanne Kirby

[REDACTED]

From
To
Subject
Date

RE: Case 19-20763
Wed May 25 2022 12:41:01 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request to release their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid assessment. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to move fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been known out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 60-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely
Barbara Mastorgi

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From
To
Subject
Date

[John M. McQuinn](#)
RE: Line 5 (2/25)
Fri, Mar 25, 2022 12:32:19 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief, testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to mining fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been proven out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can easily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risks.

Yours sincerely,
Lee Kane

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From [Sharon Pal](#)
To [MPSC Staff](#)
Subject [RE: Line 5 2025](#)
Date Friday, March 25, 2022 12:31:49 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel beneath the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject his proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Litigation and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to force our state to move fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order. No MPSC ought to reject his proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline, but has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Sharon Pal

[Redacted Signature Block]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 1:20-cv-00047
Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2022 12:31:08 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of greenhouse gas emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Stacey Nongackwa
Harbor Springs, Michigan 970 United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [James Talbot](#)
To: [JAMES.TALBOT@MICHIGAN.GOV](#)
Subject: RE: Case 19-00763
Date: Mon, May 25, 2022, 12:38:55 PM

CAUTION: This is an Ex-ernal email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony and arguments deaile before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject his proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempt to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate his issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
James Talbot Talbot
Austin, Texas 78701 United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Janet Walker](#)
To: [\[REDACTED\]](#)
Subject: RE: Case 1:20-cv-01073
Date: Wed May 25 2022 12:30:53 PM

CAUTION: This is an Ex-external email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners:

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, cost money, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could end it. The decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy, and the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can easily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products of this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would renege on public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 66-year-old pipeline, but has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Janet Walker

[REDACTED]

From [J. Layman](#)
To ["Abuse" at MPSC](#)
Subject RE: Case 5-20253
Date Wed, Mar 25, 2022 12:30:47 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I at long last urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate the Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the many issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision:

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to his plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid assessment. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now, but could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts on consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state's ongoing fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of greenhouse gas emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempt to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, the evidence is so public need for his project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 65-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Allison Layman
Concerning George's 2009 United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From [\[REDACTED\]](#)
To [Judy Ho](#)
Subject RE: Line 5 (2023)
Date Wed, Mar 25, 2022 12:35:40 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I at long last urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate the Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the many issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision:

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to his plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a final agreement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now, but could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts on consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state's only fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of greenhouse gas emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempt to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, the evidence is so public that it is no longer necessary to merely point to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 65-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Judy Ho
Seabrook, Texas 77586 United States

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sandra Remien](#)
Subject: RE: Case 19-0053
Date: Mon, 25 Dec 2012 12:34:11 M

CAUTION: This is an Ex-ternal email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@midgigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our states to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert is tempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automobile industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Sandra Remien
North Miami, Florida 33161, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 5:2023
Date: day, March 25, 2022 2:23:19 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious email to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline to a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now, but could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal per capita impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to move fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be a welcome step. The MPSC staff's expert is tempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2019. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 301 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Bill Simpson
Chairman, Michigan Board of State Land

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CAUTION This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

- Yours sincerely
Jess ca Hayes

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 5-2023
Date: May 25, 2022 1:16:01 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to transport fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert employed to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate his issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,

Bretton C. Lielle, MPA

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From [Abuse@Michigan.gov](#)
To [Abuse@Michigan.gov](#)
Subject RE: Case 5:2021
Date day, Mar 25 2022 1:15:45 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline to a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject his proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shore ages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to force our state to move fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of greenhouse emissions for this project, which would be nonsense. The MPSC staff's experts attempted to minimize the projected greenhouse impacts by using formulas that have been known out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2019. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapid diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either ready by a pipeline or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Emi M

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Mary.Fenn@mn.gov
To: ABUSE@MICHIGAN.GOV
Subject: RE: Case 3:2023
Date: Mon, 25 Sep 2023 12:34 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

Although I live in MN I am a Yoopie of Menominee MI for 8 years. Then I didn't realize there was a pipeline flowing under the Mackinac Bridge threatening the Great Lakes. I crossed the bridge many times as well as boated on it. How could I not know it existed? In my year of being 80 with my parts weakening I implore you to shut down Line 5 before the inevitable happens. It should never have been built. The Great Lakes deserve their name and you must help preserve them.

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the many issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision:

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Law suits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to store fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order so MPSC ought to reject his proposal on sight since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Mary Fenn
Mary Fenn runs Fenn Farm
Marine on Saint Croix, Minnesota 55077, United States

[Redacted signature block]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Case 5:2023
Date: Friday, May 19, 2023 1:06:46 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@mc.chugan.go

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bedrock of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to his plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state to moving fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC's staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for his project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject his proposal on right since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risks.

Yours sincerely,
Allison Cianciulli

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

CAUTION This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I live in Arizona but am writing to show there's national interest in this issue. Please reject Enbridge Energy's requests.

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision:

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge's operation of Line 5 currently without a valid easement, lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to re-route state to monitor fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions from this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established solely by merely pointing out a has dy created and deeply flawed piece of legisla on passed in 1988. Since that time exten e research has shown that the need for heat ng fuel can readily be met w/o heat Line 5. In additi on the De not automati e industry has made dramati e commitme ts to transiti oning to ele tri eci ty while saving 30 to 40 million nee d for the products in its pipeline. If our sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in no short order so MPPC ought to reject it s proposal outright since it would not equate public resources w/ the pro ducing a public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked 6 or 30 times and spilled 1 or 2 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let this pipe rot on time or else its pipe rot and the tunnel project it s proposed.

Yours sincerely
Harriet Cowper
Tucson, Arizona 85730, United States

[illegible]

From [\[REDACTED\]](#)
To
Subject RE: Case 0-20763
Date Wed May 25 2022 1:00:50 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious email to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

All pipelines leak. The only question is When and Where.

Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely
Sam Broder
Augusta, GA 30907, US

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From [John R. ...](#)
To [abuse@mc.com](#)
Subject RE: Case 1:20-cv-00001
Date Tue May 25 2022 1:00:28 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@mc.com

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid easement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shortages. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes, and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to transport fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relinquish public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate his issue, Enbridge continues to run a 68-year-old pipeline that has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Christopher Daubman

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From [\[REDACTED\]](#)
To [\[REDACTED\]](#)
Subject RE: Line 5 20253
Date Wed, Mar 25, 2022 12:55:59 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I at long last urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate the Line 5 pipeline to a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the brief testimony and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion that can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the major issues that I urge you to consider as you make your decision on

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid assessment. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal price impacts to consumers and no shore up. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.

2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to tie our state's oil and gas production to the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempt to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been shown out in previous court cases.

3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either ready by a pipeline or can be made so in short order, so MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would not require public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 60-year-old pipeline, but has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Max Sah

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From [REDACTED]
To [REDACTED]
Subject RE: Case 1:20-cv-00001
Date Wed May 26 2022 12:32:51 PM

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to abuse@michigan.gov

Dear MPSC Commissioners

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's requests to relocate their Line 5 pipeline in a tunnel built through the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. After reading the briefs, testimony, and arguments detailed before you, the only logical conclusion, but can be reached is to reject this proposal. Below are a few of the many reasons that I urge you to consider as you make your decision on this project.

1. Feasible and prudent alternatives to this plan do exist, including the "no action" alternative. It would be incorrect for you to assume that the no action alternative means that the existing pipeline continues to function indefinitely. Enbridge is operating Line 5 currently without a valid agreement. Lawsuits and federal negotiations with Canada are proceeding right now that could very well end in the decommissioning of Line 5. Independent studies have confirmed that the decommissioning of Line 5 could be achieved with minimal impacts on communities and no shorelines. You should not be expected to predict future court and national policy outcomes and so the possible decommissioning of Line 5 as a whole must be considered a valid possibility in the case of a "no action" alternative.
2. The potential climate impacts of a project that seeks to force our state to monitor fossil fuels through the Great Lakes for the next 99 years must be carefully examined. Global climate experts claim we have less than ten years to take significant steps towards a carbon-free economy to avoid the worst impacts of climate change. You rightly decided to consider the impact of GHG emissions for this project, which would be immense. The MPSC staff's expert attempted to minimize the projected GHG impacts by using formulas that have been thrown out in previous court cases.
3. Lastly, there is no public need for this project. Public need cannot be established by merely pointing to a hastily created and deeply flawed piece of legislation passed in 2018. Since that time, extensive research has shown that the need for heating fuel can readily be met without Line 5. In addition, the Detroit automotive industry has made dramatic commitments to transitioning to electric vehicles, showing the rapidly diminishing need for the products in this pipeline. Other sources of energy are either readily available or can be made so in short order. The MPSC ought to reject this proposal outright since it would relegate public resources while providing no public benefit. While regulatory agencies debate this issue, Enbridge continues to run a 60-year-old pipeline, but has already leaked over 30 times and spilled over 1 million gallons of oil and natural gas liquids. Michigan cannot afford to let Enbridge continue to operate this pipeline and the tunnel scheme only compounds the risk.

Yours sincerely,
Anthony Jannat Jannat
Roseville, California 95661, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]