

From: [Joanne Tioran](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:51:01 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Joanne Tioran
West Bloomfield Township, Michigan, 48324, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Laura Kaufman](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:45:29 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Laura Kaufman


Chelsea, MI 48118

From: [Lori Bonifas](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:48:26 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Lori Bonifas


Alpena, MI 49707

From: christina.yocum
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:33:20 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I CALL ON YOU TO REJECT Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

I WANT YOU TO HELP US PROTECT the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
christina.yocum


Tecumseh, MI 49286

From: [Grace Strong](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:33:06 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Grace Strong


Ironwood, MI 49938

From: [Peggy Greenwood](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:32:24 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Peggy Greenwood


Menominee, MI 49858

From: [Kathy Mason](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:25:07 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Kathy Mason


Sebewaing, MI 48759

From: [M Leszczynski](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:22:59 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
M Leszczynski


Lapeer, MI 48446

From: [mark Szof](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:36:19 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
mark Szof


Macomb, MI 48042

From: [Nancy Keck](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Case No. U-20763: Enbridge Line 5 pipeline Declaratory Ruling
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:26:36 AM

As a lifelong resident of West Michigan currently living on the Lake Michigan coastline I am directly impacted by any effect on the lake. It is prudent of MPSC to put a hold on this ruling which has upmost significance and ultimately dangerous and destructive to our primary natural resource. I am opposed to the construction of a tunnel and continuation of operation of Enbridge Line 5. It has been 67 years since construction, literally a lifetime without using advances in science and technology to evaluate. If Enbridge were truly interested in the well being of Great Lakes citizens they would embrace testing and transparency from any and all sources to ensure our safety. Since that is not the case their apparent motivation is greed at all cost to our way of life. Do not allow Enbridge to sidetrack and ram through this selfish agenda. Most sincerely, Nancy Keck West Olive, Michigan

From: [Tammy Kraeger](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Case No. U-20763: Enbridge Line 5 pipeline Declaratory Ruling
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:52:28 AM

[REDACTED]

I am totally against the Line 5 pipeline operation. As Michigan residents, we are so fortunate to live within the largest fresh water bodies IN THE WORLD. There is no way we should jeopardize these 5 lakes.

Tammy Kraeger
Saline, Michigan

From: [RON RENAUD](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Comments: Case Number U-20763 (Enbridge Line 5) With excerpts of the 1953 Easement agreement.
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 11:33:29 AM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[image.png](#)

Comments: Case Number U-20763 (Enbridge Line 5)

State of Michigan

Michigan Public Service Commission

Reference case number U-20763

Commissioners,

When we consider the Line 5 Tunnel, let's not forget that much of Michigan is dependent on the petroleum that comes through the U.P. and down through Line 5 into Lower Michigan and the Propane that travels to the Upper Peninsula. I can't imagine anything worse than a few hundred thousand tanker trucks going across the Mackinaw Bridge and down through our state on a regular basis, or a train with a row of hundreds of tankers rolling through our cities and countryside. The possibility of disaster with trucks and trains is extremely higher than that of a pipeline that has been in use for 57 years without a leak and a proposed tunnel that would ensure never to have one in the future.

I point you to the actual 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., where it states that the a tunnel, such as requested, is within the rights afforded to the pipeline company as it states that here:

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, application has been made by Grantee for an easement authorizing it to construct, lay and maintain pipe lines over, through, under and upon certain lake bottom lands belonging to the State of Michigan, and under the jurisdiction of the Department of Conservation, located in the Straits of Mackinac, Michigan, for the purpose of transporting petroleum and other products; and

I also point to the section that has already taken place, the written approval of the replacement by the State of Michigan government. A unanimous approval from the three-member Mackinac Straits Corridor Authority of Michigan approved an agreement between Gov. Rick Snyder's administration and the Canadian pipeline company Enbridge. It calls for drilling the 4-mile (6.4 kilometer) tunnel through bedrock under the Straits of Mackinac.

E. In the event of any relocation, replacement, major repair, or abandonment of either of the pipe lines authorized by this easement, Grantee shall obtain Grantor's written approval of procedures, methods and materials to be followed or used prior to commencement thereof.

We are a petroleum based economy. We are greatly dependent on petroleum and its by-products and will be far into the future.... and more and more people will contribute to the need as our population and the economy grows.

We don't have a good alternative at this time and won't for quite a while. We need the tunnel.

According to reports; the line carries about 540,000 barrels (22.7 million gallons) per day of product, consisting of about 432,000 barrels of crude oil and 108,000 barrels of natural gas liquids, which include propane. The use of other modes of transportation like Rail or Trucking is not in any way safer than the pipeline that has been in use for over 57 years in the interim while a Tunnel is made to place a new pipeline and other infrastructural connections to the U.P that are dearly needed; I.E. High Speed Broadband internet, Secure Electricity and Communication connections.

I own a house in the Upper Peninsula (Garden, MI) that relies on the Propane to heat it. My extended family members also have homes there too that rely on the availability and lower cost of the propane to heat and cook. They are very concerned about the costs of Electricity and Propane going up. They have been waiting for many years for a better Broadband system to ignite the economy in the Upper Peninsula. The Tunnel could be that trigger to a better way of life in the U.P.

The plans and engineering are well thought out and address all possibilities for the tunnel. The tunnel is to be placed 100 feet into the Bedrock of the straits, as such, it is impenetrable short of a shift in the earth's crust of an Armageddon scale. This should alleviate the concerns that people have for the new pipeline.

This project will result in hundreds of well-paying jobs at no cost to the State and will ensure a continuous flow of energy while significantly reducing the chance of an accidental spill. Absolutely a win-win for Michigan.

Let's get started.

The tunnel is the right approach.

Please do everything you can to support and hasten the completion of this project as it has been planned for three years so far.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our opinion.

Ron Renaud

Garden, MI and Oxford, MI

From: [Grant Carey](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 11:18:55 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Grant Carey

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [William Ostler](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 11:08:10 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
William Ostler

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Martin Kimpston](#)
To: [LARA:MPSC:EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:54:43 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Martin Kimpston
Chicago, Illinois, 60640, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Debbie Belmonte](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:52:35 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Debbie Belmonte

[REDACTED]

From: [Susan Najita](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:49:43 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Susan Najita

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [clark crowe](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:45:30 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
clark crowe

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Dawn Thomas](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:39:39 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Dawn Thomas

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Mary Underwood](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:20:18 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac.

There is not enough need for continuing this pipeline when looking at the potential catastrophic damage a leak or spill could cause. There are better and safer ways to transport this oil that will not endanger the primary water source for the entire great lakes population.

And with continued efforts to mitigate the earth's warming from fossil fuels, the expense and risk are completely unnecessary for what we hope will be a temporarily relevant source of energy. In the coming years our funds and creative energy must instead go to funding and building alternative energy resources.

The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Mary Underwood
Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48105, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [GARY THOMPSON](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:15:16 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Brianna Yagiela](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:10:41 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Brianna Yagiela
Ray, Michigan, 48096, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Kathryn Frerichs](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 10:07:46 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Kathryn Frerichs
Northport, Michigan, 49670, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Judy McFarlane](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 9:57:02 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Judy McFarlane
Royal Oak, Michigan, 48067, United States

[REDACTED]

From: [gary.powell](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 9:36:09 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
gary powell
Traverse City, Michigan, 49684, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Jessica Walz](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 9:31:18 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Jessica Walz
Columbus, Michigan, 48063, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Erik Blome](#)
To: [LARA:MPSC:EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 9:28:29 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Erik Blome

[REDACTED]

From: [Charlotte Blome](#)
To: [LARA:MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 9:04:19 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Charlotte Blome
Crystal Lake, Illinois, 60014, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Katherine Kinas](#)
To: [LARA:MPSC:EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:58:56 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Katherine Kinas
Kalamazoo, Michigan, 49008, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Gary Stauffer](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:58:31 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Gary Stauffer
Kewadin, Michigan, 49648, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Patty Dressler](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:51:56 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Patty Dressler

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Jim Ladd](#)
To: [LARA:MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:48:12 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Jim Ladd
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan, 48304, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Lily Sacks](#)
To: [LARA-MISC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:45:08 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Lily Sacks
Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48104, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Darrell Amlin](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:21:40 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Darrell Amlin
Harbor Springs, Michigan, 49740, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Debra Halabis](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 8:13:52 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Debra Halabis

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Clarice McKenzie](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 11:34:50 AM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Clarice McKenzie
Grand Rapids, Michigan, 49506, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

To Whom It May Concern,

This is in regard to the planned tunnel construction for Line 5.

My father was in the oil business all his adult working life. He worked on and was responsible for well maintenance. At end of his career he worked in oil supply; much of which was pipe and pipeline supplies. He told me that a pipeline is by far the safest way to ship oil and oil products.

The tunnel construction proposed is very similar to that used by the Albany NY metro area to supply their water. It has proven itself safe over a number of years: no ruptures, spills, leaks. As Albany is the capital of NY state; if there were problems Gov Cuomo would be in the press complaining about it.

The response to protests by residents of the area to be affected is quite flippant. Obviously the promoters of shutting down Line 5 have never experienced a U.P. or Northern LP winter. They use words like may, could, maybe, perhaps, possibly, etc to describe the situation. An asteroid could strike the earth tonight. That doesn't mean it will. This is simply sensationalism to promote an agenda.

They also flippantly say that the oil products could easily be shipped by truck or train. How a truck is supposed to navigate seasonal roads, back roads, or even highways during UP blizzards or lake effect windstorms is a question I'd challenge any environmentalist to answer. In Canada there have been a number of oil delivery truck explosions and fires due to accidents. Many times weather is a factor. In Quebec a few ~~ago~~ years ago a train carrying oil derailed. The resulting explosion and fire destroyed an entire town. Another problem is that the cost of heating your home ~~could~~ ^{would} go up 5X. How is a low income person supposed to afford that?

I would like to see environmentalists offer to pay that but I am not holding my breath waiting for that. The current COVID situation is driving No. Michigan and the UP into depression territory given the unemployments and tourism being shutdown. I do have a rooting interest here as my cousin and his wife live in Glen Lake.

Another problem is the actual delivery of the oil product should the truck make it. Machines do not work well when the ~~to~~ wind chill is 20-50 below zero not to mention the health of the person ~~eff~~ effecting the delivery.

One issue that is overlooked here is that Canada could sue the US and Michigan given that shutting down Line 5 ~~out~~ would have a negative impact on their economy. This is covered under NAFTA; now USMCA. Our AG doesn't seem to be aware that Treaties supersede the Constitution. Given the current ~~ecome~~ economic ~~sti~~ situation in Michigan risking billions in an international lawsuit seems to me to be foolish.

In sum, the technology being suggested here has been proven safe and would benefit Michigan citizens living in the affected area. The Commission should approve the Enbridge request unanimously.

Sincerely,

Doug
Downhour

Mt. Pleasant resident

My name is Judy Beckett, I live
at [REDACTED] and I am here to
oppose the granting of application
U-20763 to replace and relocate
the segment of line 5 crossing the
straits of Mackinac into a tunnel.

I'm aware that the oil & gas
folks want it but, they're wrong!

Sincerely
Judy A. Beckett

This is to let you know I am in
favor of line 5!

Don Thomas
Jimsing

From: [Sister Mary Brigid Clingman](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 11:38:28 AM

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

The Dominican Sisters ~ Grand Rapids have expressed our concerns about the safety and integrity of Line 5 for many years. We continue to be concerned and strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac.

Several issues, we believe need to be considered:

- <https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.oilandwaterdntmix.org%2F&data=02%7C01%7CLARA-MPSC-edockets%40michigan.gov%7Cd654797fe49b4b6500fb08d7f0412f8b%7Cd5fb708737742ad966a892ef47225d1%7C0%7C0%7C637242035072900817&data=6%2BMv1bsAdzHy6ZsCYA9513CugbrvZaXPHn0FTBT%2Bom%3D&reserved=0>
 - The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance; it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process. This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary.
 - Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.
 - From 2002 to present, Enbridge and its joint ventures and subsidiaries reported 307 hazardous liquids incidents to federal regulators — one incident every 20 days on average. These spills released a total of 66,059 barrels (2.8 million gallons, or more than four Olympic-sized swimming pools) of hazardous liquids.
 - Thirty Enbridge incidents were reported to contaminate water resources, including 17 which contaminated groundwater.
 - The disastrous 2010 spill of 20,000 barrels (840,000 gallons) of tar sands into the Kalamazoo River in Michigan is Enbridge's largest during this time period, and 42 other incidents were larger than 2,100 gallons (50 barrels).
 - Line 3 was also the source of the largest inland oil spill in the U.S. on March 3, 1991 when 40,000 barrels (1,680,000 gallons) spilled in Grand Rapids, Minnesota.
- <https://gcc01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.greenpeace.org%2Fusa%2Freports%2Fdangereous-pipelines%2F&data=02%7C01%7CLARA-MPSC-edockets%40michigan.gov%7Cd654797fe49b4b6500fb08d7f0412f8b%7Cd5fb708737742ad966a892ef47225d1%7C0%7C0%7C637242035072900817&data=nHP8JYQQdxE2yCOAW1qoaxMFJOPYmBVOSkLK18SESbg%3D&reserved=0>
- Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Sister Mary Brigid Clingman
Grand Rapids, Michigan, 49503, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Pierre Balthazar](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:26:40 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Pierre Balthazar
Lansing, Michigan, 48917, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Mary Nolan](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:26:33 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Mary Nolan
Indianapolis, Indiana, 46205, United States

[REDACTED]

From: [Kenneth Kutzeb](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:21:45 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect Michigan. Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

What benefit does Michigan gain by the pipeline? I understand that it is a Canadian company piping oil from Canada to Canada. Michigan and the Great Lakes take the risk, but what do we gain?

Yours sincerely,
Kenneth Kutzeb

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Leahley Alawi
To: LARA:MPSC-EDOCKETS
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:19:47 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Leahley Alawi
Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48103, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Kerry Hodges](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:56:40 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Kerry Hodges
Birmingham, Michigan, 48009, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Carol Kuhn](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:48:55 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Heather Burda](#)
To: [LARA:MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:30:39 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Heather Burda

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Dave & Chance](#)
To: [LARA:MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:27:41 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Dave & Chance
Michigan, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Clarissa Harrison](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:00:19 PM

Dear Michigan Public Service Commission,

Thank you for opening a public comment period on the proposed declaratory ruling on Enbridge's line 5 pipeline. I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge's demands. Its implausible that a 1953 easement approval would somehow cover moving a pipeline into a tunnel to be constructed in 2020, and certainly breaks with the customary permit and approvals process in any large scale project constructed through public waters.

It is my hope that you will recognize the great risk the operation of this line poses to Michigan's ecosystems, drinking water intake, and recreational tourism, and go through a full review process of the proposal.

Thank you,
Clarissa Harrison

From: [Gracie Van Huffel](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:35:43 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Gracie Van Huffel
Birmingham, Michigan, 48009, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Sofia Walker](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:39:17 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Sofia Walker


Ada, MI 49301

From: [Melissa Boduch](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:38:49 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Melissa Boduch


Shelby Township, MI 48317

From: [Donald Garlit](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:35:31 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Donald Garlit


Canton, MI 48187

From: [Heather Cross](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:34:11 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Heather Cross


Hamtramck, MI 48212

From: [Ron Kardos](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:33:48 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Ron Kardos


Fenton, MI 48430

From: mario.maraldo
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:29:59 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
mario maraldo


Harrison Township, MI 48045

From: [Erik Peterson](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:26:27 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Erik Peterson


Troy, MI 48084

From: [Holly Nickerson](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:25:48 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Holly Nickerson
[REDACTED]
Milford, MI 48381

From: [James Zalba](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:25:47 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
James Zalba


Okemos, MI 48864

From: [Lorne Beatty](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:25:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Lorne Beatty


Brighton, MI 48114

From: [Kenneth Winters](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:25:13 PM

Dear Commissioners,


RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Kenneth Winters

Haslett, MI 48840

From: [Nan Nelson](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:24:42 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Nan Nelson


Ann Arbor, MI 48104

From: [Janice Ellison](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:24:33 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Janice Ellison


Detroit, MI 48215

From: [Roland Schaedig](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:23:54 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Roland Schaedig


Ann Arbor, MI 48104

From: [Carol Richards](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:23:14 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Carol Richards


Milford, MI 48381

From: [Marcel Dijkers](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:22:10 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Marcel Dijkers


Berkley, MI 48072

From: [Ray Keeling](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:22:08 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Ray Keeling


Milford, MI 48381

From: [Susan Kalis](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:20:27 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Susan Kalis


Canton, MI 48187

From: [Carrie Fawcett](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:20:05 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Carrie Fawcett


Ann Arbor, MI 48104

From: [Erika Chapman](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:19:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,
Erika Chapman

Sincerely,
Erika Chapman


Grand Rapids, MI 49505

From: [Randal LaMothe](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:19:17 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Randal LaMothe


LAKE ORION, MI 48362

From: [Heather McWee](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:18:31 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Heather McWee


Brighton, MI 48116

From: [William Barr](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:17:29 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
William Barr


Ann Arbor, MI 48103

From: [Abbie Nesbitt](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:12:33 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

Enbridge Energy should not be permitted to do anything without public approval. Therefore I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Abbie Nesbitt

[REDACTED]
Sterling Heights, MI 48313

From: [Ann Williams](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:11:33 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Ann Williams


Royal Oak, MI 48073

From: [Dean Fogarasi](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:09:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Dean Fogarasi


Ann Arbor, MI 48104

From: [Michael Anderson](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:09:29 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Michael Anderson
[REDACTED]
Mason, MI 48854

From: [Claudette Ashley](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:08:59 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

P.S. Please shut down Enbridge's (line 5). Remember their previous oil spill in our river.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Claudette Ashley


Waterford, MI 48329

From: [Joseph Suarez](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:06:09 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Joseph Suarez


Canton, MI 48188

From: [helen huff](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:04:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
helen huff


tecumseh, MI 49286

From: [Melinda Finnie](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:04:36 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Melinda Finnie


Beverly Hills, MI 48025

From: [Theresa Ruby](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:04:25 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Theresa Ruby


Rochester Hills, MI 48309

From: [Richard Jakubec](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:02:52 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Richard Jakubec


SHELBY TOWNSHIP, MI 48316

From: [Kathy Kibbie](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:01:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Kathy Kibbie


Pinckney, MI 48169

From: [Carol Rahbari](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:00:45 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Carol Rahbari


Ypsilanti, MI 48197

From: [Debra Schauss](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:59:07 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Debra Schauss


Ypsilanti, MI 48196

From: [Ann Poznanski](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:58:55 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.


This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,

Ann Poznanski


Ann Arbor, MI 48105

From: [Debra Schauss](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:58:09 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Debra Schauss


Ypsilanti, MI 48196

From: [Ryan Dittmer](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:57:28 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Ryan Dittmer


Grand Rapids, MI 49504

From: gail.glasgow
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:56:28 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
gail.glasgow
1 donot give it
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48301

From: [Brooks Barnes](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:55:22 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Brooks Barnes


Ann Arbor, MI 48104

From: [Debora Card](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:55:15 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Debora Card


Shelby Township, MI 48316

From: [David Kalush](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:54:23 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
David Kalush


Lake Orion, MI 48360

From: [Jan Sockness](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:53:02 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Jan Sockness


Ann Arbor, MI 48108

From: [Dolores Arndt](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:52:28 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Dolores Arndt


Dafter, MI 49724

From: [Paul Kerman](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:51:53 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Paul Kerman


Warren, MI 48091

From: [Lynne Bemer](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:51:02 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Lynne Bemer


Northville, MI 48167

From: [Jessica Masse](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:50:39 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,
Jessica Masse

Sincerely,
Jessica Masse


Kalamazoo, MI 49006

From: alan_erickson
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:48:52 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
alan erickson

spring lake, MI 49456

From: [Brian Furney](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:48:35 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Brian Furney


Lake Orion, MI 48360

From: [Nancy Potter](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:48:09 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Nancy Potter


Traverse City, MI 49684

From: [Sally Cole-Misch](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:47:42 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Sally Cole-Misch


Bloomfield Hills, MI 48301

From: [Josh Guy](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:47:09 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Josh Guy


Grand Ledge, MI 48837

From: [David Stone](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:46:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
David Stone


Ann Arbor, MI 48104

From: [Julie Preis](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:46:11 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Julie Preis


Ann Arbor, MI 48103

From: [Anne Pavlic](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:46:05 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Anne Pavlic


Northville, MI 48167

From: [LINDA WYNBEEK](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:46:04 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
LINDA WYNBEEK

[REDACTED]
Rockford, MI 49341

From: [Erica Wiethorn](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:45:35 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Erica Wiethorn


Beverly Hills, MI 48067

From: [virginia Braun](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:45:34 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
virginia Braun
[REDACTED]
FLINT, MI 48504

From: [Geraldine Drake](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:45:24 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Geraldine Drake


Northville, MI 48168

From: [JoAnn Render](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:44:41 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
JoAnn Render


East Lansing, MI 48823

From: [MaryAlice Pickering](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:43:04 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,
MaryAlice Pickering

Sincerely,
MaryAlice Pickering
[REDACTED]
East China, MI 48054

From: [Greg Gumina](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:41:56 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Greg Gumina


Birmingham, MI 48009

From: [Noa Jacob](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:37:55 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Noa Jacob


Ann Arbor, MI 48108

From: [Teri Hammer](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:37:18 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Teri Hammer


Van Buren Twp, MI 48111

From: [Duncan Vance](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:36:41 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Duncan Vance


Royal Oak, MI 48067

From: [Angela Hall](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:36:07 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Angela Hall


Milan, MI 48160

From: [DAVID SCHNEIDER](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:34:11 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,

DAVID SCHNEIDER


CLARKSTON, MI 48346

From: [Donna Thibodeau](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:34:05 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Donna Thibodeau


Novi, MI 48375

From: [Randall Smith](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:32:09 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.


This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Randall Smith

Sincerely,
Randall Smith


West Bloomfield Twp, MI 48322

From: [Cheryl Miller](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:31:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Cheryl Miller


Ann Arbor, MI 48103

From: [Dave Monforton](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:30:39 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge the MPSC to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and a subsurface tunnel was neither considered or specifically authorized in granting the easement. Further, as you are no doubt aware there is a lawsuit in process asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Dave Monforton


MILAN, MI 48160

From: [Matthew Sawyer](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:28:38 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Matthew Sawyer


Farmington, MI 48336

From: [Susan Gollon](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:27:53 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Susan Gollon


Milford, MI 48381

From: [Carol McKay](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:27:09 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Carol McKay


Sault Ste Marie, MI 49783

From: [Frank Gonzales Jr](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:26:44 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Frank Gonzales Jr


Plymouth, MI 48170

From: [Steve Rall](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:26:42 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Steve Rall


Lansing, MI 48915

From: [Gerald Fisher](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:26:40 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Gerald Fisher


Dearborn Heights, MI 48125

From: [Susan Martin](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:26:19 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Susan Martin


Waterford, MI 48329

From: [Janet Peterson](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:25:18 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Janet Peterson


Troy, MI 48084

From: [Carol Fletcher](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:25:09 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


As a lifetime resident of Michigan and lover of the Great Lakes I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Carol Fletcher


Ann Arbor, MI 48103

From: [richard.smith](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:24:50 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
richard.smith

Melvindale, MI 48122

From: [Randolph Paschke](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 12:24:27 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Randolph Paschke


Holland, MI 49424

From: [Sofia Walker](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:39:51 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Sofia Walker


Ada, MI 49301

From: [Joyce Reed](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:47:06 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Joyce Reed

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Courtney Rauch](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:44:22 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Courtney Rauch
Dearborn, Michigan, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Amber Sullivan](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:38:54 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Amber Sullivan

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Barbara Wyatt](#)
To: [LARA:MPSC:EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:17:33 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Barbara Wyatt
Muskegon, Michigan, 49444, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Tim Minotas](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:58:37 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Tim Minotas
Rochester, Michigan, 48306, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Barbara Starnis](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:48:52 PM

[REDACTED]

The people of MI depend on the MPSC to reject this attempt by Enbridge to sidestep necessary regulation of a new design in a new time. A tunnel was certainly not part of the 1953 Line 5 easement approval. MI does not benefit from or need this proposed new pipeline in a tunnel in 2020 and beyond. Please pursue a rigorous assessment of this self serving corporate request.

Urgently,
Barbara Starnis

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [John Altan Kusku](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:48:30 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
John Altan Kusku


Commerce Township, MI 48382

From: [Christina Nevshehir](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:47:17 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Christina Nevshehir


Lansing, MI 48917

From: [Anne Wilson](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:39:51 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Anne Wilson


Ada, MI 49301

From: [Arick Rushing](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:39:22 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

To my elected representatives:

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement. An oil spill would be a disaster of unparalleled destruction to the Great Lakes - a disaster that would cause permanent damage to the ecosystem and leave future generations the legacy of our careless disregard for our planet.

Under the original 1953 definition of two pipelines on the lakebed, the tunnel is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve and our environment by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Arick E. Rushing

Sincerely,
Arick Rushing



Ypsilanti, MI 48197

From: [Lindsey Walker](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:33:01 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Lindsey Walker
[REDACTED]
petoskey, MI 49770

From: [Dawn Sanchez](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:25:41 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,

Dawn Sanchez


Brighton, MI 48116

From: [David Brose](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:22:20 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
David Brose


Kalamazoo, MI 49008

From: [R.P](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:21:59 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
R P


Canton, MI 48188

From: [Joyce Harrington](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:19:54 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Joyce Harrington


Belleville, MI 48111

From: [Joanne Miller](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:18:51 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Joanne Miller


Kalamazoo, MI 49008

From: [Steven Kronenberg](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:17:49 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

As we continue to heat up our world, clean water increasingly becomes the most valuable, life-sustaining resource we have. Oil and gas on the other hand, are (like coal), a dirty scourge. I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Steven Kronenberg

Ann Arbor, MI 48103

From: [Bruce Findling](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:17:31 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Bruce Findling


Ann Arbor, MI 48103

From: [Song Kim](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:16:08 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Song Kim


Westland, MI 48185

From: john.assenmacher
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:15:10 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
john.assenmacher


Canton, MI 48187

From: [Clayton Brillhart](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:14:18 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Clayton Brillhart


Grand Rapids, MI 49505

From: [Taylor Card](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:13:42 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Taylor Card


Shelby Township, MI 48316

From: [Galib Choudhury](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:10:28 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Galib Choudhury


Kalamazoo, MI 49009

From: [Ann Krantz](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:07:26 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Ann Krantz


Traverse City, MI 49685

From: [Sam Eisenbach](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:05:34 PM

Dear Commissioners,


RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Sam Eisenbach

Mecosta, MI 49332

From: [Kate Koeze](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:04:39 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Kate Koeze


Grand Rapids, MI 49506

From: [Philip Koster](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:04:07 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Philip Koster


Norton Shores, MI 49441

From: [Elizabeth Khumprakob](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:02:25 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Khumprakob


Boardman, OH 44512

From: [Marilyn Alimpich](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:59:10 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Marilyn Alimpich |
[REDACTED]
Plymouth, MI 48170

From: [Jeff Pelath](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:55:24 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Jeff Pelath


Port Huron, MI 48060

From: [Susan Welsford](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:54:37 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Susan Welsford


Norton Shores, MI 49441

From: [Carol Mohr](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:53:34 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Carol Mohr


Ann Arbor, MI 48108

From: [Thomas Rewoldt](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 1:43:10 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Thomas Rewoldt


Ann Arbor, MI 48108

From: [William Jones](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:48:48 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
William Jones


Allegan, MI 49010

From: [Gwendolyn Krupa](#)
To: [LARA-MISC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:53:33 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Gwendolyn Krupa

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Resha Reneau](#)
To: [LARA:MPSC:EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:51:56 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Resha Reneau
Detroit, Michigan, 48221, United States

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: roger.marsden
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:00:08 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
roger marsden

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Kelly Anderson](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:55:56 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Kelly Anderson


Ann Arbor, MI 48103

From: [Allison Mitchinson](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:54:08 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Allison Mitchinson


Dexter, MI 48130

From: [Zach Dietrich](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:51:21 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Zach Dietrich


Ann Arbor, MI 48105

From: [Charlotte Tomaszewski](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 2:51:14 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,
Ray and Charlotte Tomaszewski

Sincerely,
Charlotte Tomaszewski
[REDACTED]
clinton township, MI 48036

From: [Ricardo Bartelme](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:02:24 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Ricardo Bartelme


Ann Arbor, MI 48103

From: [Jesse LoVasco](#)
To: [LARA-MISC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:15:50 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Jesse LoVasco

[REDACTED]

From: [Larry Boonstra](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: Enbridge Application Case No. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:17:07 PM

[REDACTED]

RE: Case U-20763

Dear MPSC Commissioners,

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potentially disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary, and your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Impacts on the climate must now be taken into account with any new fossil fuel infrastructure. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed are substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Yours sincerely,
Larry Boonstra
Fennville, Michigan, 49408, United States

[REDACTED]

From: [Mark Messing](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:14:59 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763

I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Mark Messing


Traverse City, MI 49684

From: [Alan N. Connor](#)
To: [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)
Subject: RE: Case no. U-20763
Date: Monday, May 4, 2020 3:20:49 PM

Dear Commissioners,

RE: Case no. U-20763


I strongly urge you to reject Enbridge Energy's request for a declaratory ruling that they do not need MPSC approval for their proposal to build an oil tunnel in the bottomlands of the Straits of Mackinac. The 1953 easement granted to Enbridge's predecessor, Lakehead Pipeline Co., was an easement to operate twin pipelines on the lakebed and contained no consideration of a subsurface tunnel. Further, as you are aware there is currently an ongoing lawsuit on behalf of the people of Michigan asserting among other things that the 1953 easement ought to be considered void because the potential disastrous impact of an oil spill in the public trust waters of the Straits of Mackinac was not fully considered prior to issuance of the easement.

This is obviously a new project despite Enbridge's claims to the contrary. Your role in reviewing this project is essential to protect the Michigan public by determining whether or not this project is in the public interest and whether or not there are prudent and feasible alternatives to the proposed oil tunnel that could meet Michigan's energy needs without the substantial risk involved. Twin oil pipelines sitting on the lakebed is substantially different than one oil pipeline in a subsurface tunnel. This cannot be considered maintenance, it is a substantial change in design and a new project that the MPSC has a responsibility to thoroughly review through robust public engagement and a contested case process.

Please protect the Michigan residents that you serve by denying this request for a declaratory ruling and ensuring that members of the public have ample opportunity to be heard and fully engage in this process before making your determinations in this case.

Respectfully,

Sincerely,
Alan N. Connor


Ann Arbor, MI 48103