Enbridge, Canada’s largest pipeline company, is proposing to abandon its old leaky “Line 3” pipeline through northern Minnesota and build a higher capacity pipeline along a new route. It will carry Canadian tar sands oil, an extremely dirty fossil fuel. This project won’t improve our energy security. It will threaten Minnesota’s waters and wild rice. The state is currently going through Line 3’s permit process.

**Q: Will building Line 3 increase our energy security?**

No. Since the oil crisis of the last 1970s, this country has lived with a fear of energy dependence. Government statistics tell a surprising story. The United States still is a net importer of crude oil, but we already are importing more than we need to meet U.S. demand. This is seen by the fact that we are exporting small but growing amounts of crude oil to other countries. For the past five years, this country has been a net exporter of refined oil products, such as gasoline. In 2016, we exported nearly 3 million gallons a day of refined petroleum. Line 3 is about increasing oil company profits through exports, not our energy security.

**Q: What are the trends in U.S. crude oil imports?**

Our crude oil imports peaked in 2005; today, imports have dropped to mid-1990s levels. Our sources of crude oil have changed. In 2015, we got more crude oil from Canada than we did from all OPEC countries combined.

**Q: What are the trends in U.S. demand for refined petroleum?**

This may come as a surprise, but U.S. fuel demand was down 5 percent in 2015 compared to its 2007 peak. In Minnesota, fuel demand was down 19 percent in 2016 compared to its 2004 peak. Clearly, higher efficiency cars and other factors are making a difference.
Q: DOES ENBRIDGE LINE 3 BENEFIT MINNESOTA?

No. The risks of Line 3 far outweigh the minimal benefits for Minnesota. There are several parts to this answer.

• Neither the United States nor Minnesota need the increased crude oil capacity reflected in this proposal. The crude oil from Line 3 would simply free up oil produced in other parts of the country for export.

• The project will create some jobs, but they will be very temporary jobs. There is critical work to be done to create good-paying, long-term jobs in this state. This project isn’t it.

• The current Line 3 is at the end of its useful life and is falling apart. Something needs to be done. Enbridge proposes a new larger pipeline that clearly is not needed. One option is simply to shut down Line 3 and follow the basic kindergarten rule: Clean up your mess.

• The new route would take Line 3 through the Mississippi headwaters area. Ruptures and leaks threaten Minnesota’s waters and wild rice areas. In the long run, Enbridge will eventually abandon this pipeline to rot in the ground, too.

Q: WHAT ABOUT TEN YEARS FROM NOW? WON’T WE NEED IT THEN?

A 2012 Canadian government report lays bare the economic reality of the situation: It said: “The overall gasoline and diesel demand in North America and other OECD countries is expected to decline over the next two to three decades. On the other hand, the global demand for crude oil, especially in emerging economies, is projected to continue to increase ‘for the next 25 years and beyond’, which presents attractive export opportunities, considering Canada’s sizeable oil reserves.” This makes it clear, projects like Line 3 are not serving a public purpose for Minnesota, or the United States.

For more information or to get involved:

• See the Sierra Club North Star Chapter website: http://www.sierraclub.org/mn and Facebook: SierraClubMN

• Attend one of the monthly “Beyond Oil and Tar Sands” volunteer committee meetings, fourth Tuesday of the month, 6:30 p.m. at the Sierra Club office, 2327 East Franklin Ave., Minneapolis. All are welcome!

• Request a Speaker on Line 3 for your organization or classroom. Contact Committee Coordinator Natalie Cook at natalie.cook@sierraclub.org or 612-259-2445 with this, or for other questions.
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