ENBRIDGE

Julie Kloss Molina
Sr. Environment Advisor
Environment Projects (US)

Cell 218-591-8920
Julie.Kloss@enbridge.com

Enbridge
11 East Superior Street
Suite 125
Duluth, MN 55802

November 30, 2022

Ben Callan
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Chief, Integration Services Section
Environmental Analysis & Sustainability Program
101 South Webster Street
Madison, WI 53707-7921

Re: WDNR Water Resources Application for Project Permits
Line 5 Wisconsin Segment Relocation Project
October 31, 2022 Data Request Responses
WDNR Docket Number IP-NO-2020-2-N00471

Dear Ben:

Thank you for your work and the work of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Line 5 Wisconsin Segment Relocation Project. This letter provides information requested by the Department on October 31, 2022 to complete development of the final environmental impact statement.

Set forth below please find the individual requests from the October 31, 2022 letter, followed by the response of Enbridge to each request.

If you have questions about the information presented in the attached materials, please contact me at (218) 390-9254.

Sincerely,

Julie Kloss Molina

Julie Kloss Molina
Sr. Environment Advisor
Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership

cc: with enclosures: Adam Mednick, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
Bill Sande, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Enclosures:

- Data Request Responses

Enbridge Line 5 Wisconsin Segment Relocation Project
October 29, 2022 Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Data Request
DNR Docket # IP-NO-2020-2-N00471
Enbridge Responses Submitted November 30, 2022

Data Request Question #1:
Provide a geographic information system (GIS) map layer of High Consequence Areas (HCAs), Unusually-Sensitive Areas (USAs), and Areas of Interest (AOIs) that have been used to evaluate the potential effects of accidental releases of oil and natural gas liquids (NGLs). Include the following within the attribute data:

a. *Whether the HCA, USA or AOI in question was used to identify the 'could affect' segments that Enbridge shared with the DNR for the draft EIS.*

b. *Whether the HCA, USA or AOI in question was or will be used by RPS Group (RPS) as part of its model-based analyses.*

c. *Whether the HCA, USA or AOI in question was identified based on input provided by a federal, state, local, or tribal agency or agencies, or other sources, including the name(s) of the source(s).*

Data Request Question #1 Response:
A file geodatabase layer (**IR1_HCA_USA_Polygons in L5R_WDNRnov2022_IR1.zip file**) has been assembled containing all shareable HCA/USA polygons that are within a 5-mile collection zone of modeled liquid plumes and NGL vapor clouds. However, the Drinking Water USA and NatureServe-sourced Ecological USA polygons are not able to be distributed externally due to data use license agreements. For these features, a separate Excel table (**IR1_HCA_USA_RestrictedPolygons.xlsx**) has been assembled that provides the attributes of these polygons without sharing their location.

Attached as attributes to each of the HCA/USA features are the following:

- **IR1a_AssociatedCouldAffect**
  - 'Yes' = This HCA polygon could be directly or indirectly impacted by a liquid or NGL release, and is associated with a 'could affect' segment
  - 'No' = This HCA polygon is within the 5-mile collection zone, but does not intersect the pipeline/modeled liquid plumes/NGL vapor clouds
- **IR1b_UsedInRPSmodeling**
  - Matches the value from IR1a; any HCA polygons that were identified as being potentially impacted were used in RPS' model-based analyses
- **IR1c_IdentificationProcess**
  - Description of how each individual HCA polygon was identified, including the source used and source URL if applicable

A file geodatabase (**L5_AOIs_2022Nov10.gdb**) has been assembled including all Areas of Interest (AOIs) that were used to evaluate the potential effects of accidental releases. The AOI's include:

1. Wild Rice (WildRiceAreas)
2. State and Federal Lands (StateFederalLands)
3. Lake Superior (LakeSuperior)
4. Bad River Reservation (BadRiverReservation)

The AOIs were not used to identify the 'could affect' segments that Enbridge shared with the DNR for the draft EIS. However, they were used by RPS in the model-based analysis. The AOIs that are included were based upon several years of previous review of the Bad River watershed during mediation and federal court trespass litigation, comments prepared on the draft EIS, meetings between Enbridge and the Bad River Band and their respective external experts along with discussions with local, state, and federal agencies, tribal agencies, and local knowledge of key features and issues.

Data Request Question #2:
Describe how the HCAs, USAs and AOIs referenced in item 1 above were identified, including any outreach efforts or requests that were made for input from federal, state, local, or tribal agencies or other sources. Clearly indicate any resources included in the HCAs, USAs, or AOIs that were identified by tribes or tribal agencies as treaty resources.

Data Request Question #2 Response:
To summarize the attributes for HCA/USA polygons from IR-1c:

- **Other Populated Areas HCAs (HCA_Type = 'OPA')**
  - Federal data was incorporated as part of the release of PHMSA NPMS' (National Pipeline Mapping System) OPA_v4 dataset (https://www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov/PopulationData.aspx)
  - Additional Enbridge-identified OPA polygons were identified based on operator knowledge and recent aerial imagery
- **Commercially Navigable Waterways HCAs (HCA_Type = 'CNW')**
  - Federal data was incorporated as part of the release of PHMSA NPMS' (National Pipeline Mapping System) CNW_V5_NAD83 dataset (https://www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov/CNWData.aspx). As Enbridge's HCA analysis requires all HCA data to be represented as polygons and not polyline features, the NPMS line features were expanded to full extent of Lake Superior using polygons from USGS NHD (National Hydrography Dataset)
- **Ecological USAs (HCA_Type = 'ESA')**
  - NatureServe-sourced federal EcoUSA data was incorporated as part of the release of PHMSA NPMS' (National Pipeline Mapping System) 2018 EcoUSA dataset (https://www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov/USAEcoData.aspx)
  - Federal Coastal EcoUSA data (per PIPES Act of 2020) was incorporated as part of the release of PHMSA NPMS' (National Pipeline Mapping System) Great_Lakes_Eco_USA_V1 dataset (https://www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov/GreatLakesData.aspx)
  - Additional Enbridge-identified EcoUSA polygons were collected from the NOAA Environmental Sensitivity Index (Birds) data
- **Drinking Water USAs (HCA_Type = 'DW')**
  - Federal Drinking Water USA data was incorporated as part of the release of PHMSA NPMS' (National Pipeline Mapping System) 2020 DW USA dataset (https://www.npms.phmsa.dot.gov/USADWData.aspx)

See Enbridge's response to Data Request #1 for further information regarding AOIs.

Data Request Question #3:
Describe whether and how RPS's evaluation of the risk and potential effects of accidental releases of oil and NGLs has informed, or will inform, Enbridge's Intelligent Valve Placement (IVP) process for the proposed Line 5 relocation.

Data Request Question #3 Response:
Enbridge's Intelligent Valve Placement (IVP) methodology incorporates both direct and indirect high consequence areas (HCAs) could-affect segments, with the intent to minimize, to the greatest extent practicable, the risk to those HCAs. The direct and indirect HCA could-affect segments were identified using OILMAPLand modeling conducted by RPS.

Data Request Question #4:
Provide information on whether and how increasing the number of valves, beyond the number presently proposed, would reduce the volume of oil and NGLs released from a segment of pipeline under a full-bore release scenario.

Data Request Question #4 Response:
Seven remote-operated valves were initially recommended for the 41 miles of the Line 5 Wisconsin Segment Relocation Project. Subsequently, an additional three remote-operated valves were included in scope to comply with the new PHMSA rulemaking on valve installation requirements (PHMSA-2013-0255-0005). The valve placement recommendations were made to meet the code requirements as well as Enbridge's IVP guidelines. Multiple factors are considered for valve placement including significance of HCAs, proximity to major water crossings, and the risk reduction achieved. The IVP analysis performed by Enbridge determined that installing these valves at the recommended locations will minimize, to the greatest extent practicable, the risk to the HCAs, water crossings, public, and environment. Placement of additional valves was considered, but there is limited reduction in volume out based on the geography, topography, distance from HCAs, and the current valves being added.

Data Request Question #5:
Provide GIS map layers of oil plumes modeled by RPS using 'OILMAPLand' for the purpose of comparing the proposed and alternative pipeline relocation routes. Aggregate the model outputs by sub-watershed, according to the feature attributes and scenarios listed in items 5-a through 5-f below – one layer per unique combination. (For example, the combined extent of plumes modeled along route alternative 01 within the 'Troutmere Creek-Marengo River' sub-watershed, assuming full-bore ruptures under "low flow" [winter] conditions.)

a. *Pipeline route (existing, proposed, RA-01, RA-02, RA-03)*
b. *Sub-watershed (12-digit HUC) in which the release point is located*
c. *Type of release point (100-meter interval or stream crossing)*
d. *Release volume (full-bore rupture, average historical accidental release, or any other volume modeled by RPS)*
e. *Hydrographic and environmental conditions ("low flow" [winter], "average flow" [summer/fall], "high flow" [spring], 100-year storm event, or storm event equivalent to July 11, 2016)*

f. *Petroleum type (if modeled separately: Bakken light crude or synthetic light crude)*

Data Request Question #5 Response:
A Route Alternatives Assessment is being conducted by RPS (Appendix B to the Main Report) to compare the Proposed Route, Existing Route, and each route alternative (RA-01, RA-02, and RA-03). This report will provide a quantitative route alternatives assessment complete with relative ranking, and summarize findings based upon a series of tables, figures, and maps. This report is forthcoming.

Data Request Question #6:
Provide GIS map layers of oil plumes modeled by RPS using 'OILMAPLand' for the detailed segment analysis of the proposed route. Aggregate the model outputs by sub-watershed, according to the feature attributes and scenarios listed in items 6-a through 6-e below – one layer per unique combination. (For example, the combined extent of plumes modeled along the proposed relocation route within the 'Potato River' sub-watershed, assuming the average historical release volume under "high flow" [spring] conditions.)

a. *Sub-watershed (12-digit HUC) in which the release point is located*

b. *Type of release point (10-meter interval or stream crossing)*

c. *Release volume (full-bore rupture, average historical accidental release, or any other volume modeled by RPS)*

d. *Hydrographic and environmental conditions ("low flow" [winter], "average flow" [summer/fall], "high flow" [spring], 100-year storm event, or storm event equivalent to July 11, 2016)*

e. *Petroleum type (if modeled separately: Bakken light crude or synthetic light crude)*

Data Request Question #6 Response:
A detailed high-resolution segment analysis was conducted by RPS (Appendix B to the Main Report) to determine the lengths of pipeline over which potential releases might directly enter the Bad River and White River Crossings for the Proposed Route and each Route Alternative within the Bad River watershed (RA-01 and RA-02). This report will provide segment lengths that will be used in the probability assessment to quantify the likelihood of a release directly into each waterway, and summarize findings based upon a series of tables, figures, and maps. This report is forthcoming.

Data Request Question #7:
Provide GIS map layers representing the spatial outputs of Spill Impact Model Application Package ('SIMAP') models run by RPS for its detailed segment analysis of the proposed route. Map layers should illustrate the trajectory and fate of hypothetical oil releases into each of the four rivers listed below, under the different hypothetical release volumes and hydrographic/environmental conditions listed in items 5-c and 5-d above, plus any other scenarios modeled by RPS.

a. *White River*

b. *Marengo River*

c. *Bad River*

d. *Potato River*

Data Request Question #7 Response:
A Hydrocarbon Trajectory, Fate, and Effects Assessment is being conducted by RPS (Appendix C to the Main Report) to compare hypothetical releases at the Bad and White River along the Proposed Route. The assessment investigated a range of environmental conditions (e.g., river flow conditions [low, average, high, and flood], temperature, winds, and ice cover) present throughout the year, representative release volumes that could occur [full bore rupture (FBR), historic average release volume (HARV), recent average release volume (RARV)], and various emergency response mitigation measures and associated timings and efficiencies for collection that may be undertaken following a release. In total, 28 SIMAP scenarios were simulated for this assessment for the Proposed Route. In addition, scenarios from other assessments prepared by RPS and filed with the District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin were considered here that investigated hypothetical releases at the Existing Route crossing of the Bad River under overbank flows during flood conditions and hypothetical releases where oil may be transported within Lake Superior. This report will provide a quantitative assessment of the range of potential movement, behavior, and potential for effects. The report will summarize findings based upon a series of tables, figures, and maps. This report is forthcoming.

Release scenarios were not simulated in SIMAP for the Marengo River nor the Potato River. However, additional modeling should not be required. There were numerous simulations that considered all waterways (these rivers included) within the OILMAPLand Assessment (Appendix B to the Main Report) for releases along the Proposed Route and Route Alternatives. In addition, the upstream portions of the Marengo River and Potato River are similar to the White River, which was simulated. Therefore, the trajectory, fates, and effects predictions for simulations on the White River could be considered analogous or representative of these other rivers. In addition, the downstream portions for the Marengo and Potato Rivers are within the Bad River, which was also modeled extensively in this assessment and others. Therefore, additional modeling should not be necessary to quantify movement, behavior, and potential for effects as this range is already bounded by the existing scenarios and OILMAPLand modeling.

Data Request Question #8:
Describe how waterfalls in the Bad River and Potato River would affect the following:

a. *The trajectory and fate of oil released into those rivers*

b. *The recovery of oil that passes over those falls*

Data Request Question #8 Response:
Waterfalls have been included in the Hydrocarbon Trajectory, Fate, and Effects Assessment that is being conducted by RPS (Appendix C to the Main Report) which investigates the potential movement, behavior, and potential for effects following a release. The report quantifies the potential for entrainment of oil into the water column and the resulting changes in mass balance (i.e., enhancement of dissolution, changes to evaporation and volatilization, the potential for sinking oil, resurfacing oil, etc.), whether and how this oil is able to be recovered by containment and collection methods, and how all of this affects the potential for effects. The report will summarize findings based upon a series of tables, figures, and maps. This report is forthcoming.

Data Request Question #9:
Describe how seasonal differences affect the trajectory, fate, and cleanup of accidental releases of oil, including the effect of weather conditions (e.g., snow, rain) on transportation, access to affected locations, and equipment.

Data Request Question #9 Response:
Seasonal differences (i.e., river flow conditions [low, average, high, and flood], temperature, winds, and ice cover) have been considered in the Hydrocarbon Trajectory, Fate, and Effects Assessment that is being conducted by RPS (Appendix C to the Main Report). A range of predicted movement, behavior, recovery, and potential for effects is provided based upon the changing environmental conditions that result in a range of different behaviors and changes to the physical and chemical characteristics of the oil itself. Conservative approximations regarding emergency response timing, locations, equipment, recovery/containment efficiency, etc. were considered to bound the potential for effects from the extremely unlikely, completely unmitigated release up through a successful emergency response effort. The report will summarize findings based upon a series of tables, figures, and maps. This report is forthcoming.

Data Request Question #10:
Provide GIS or GIS-compatible map layers representing the spatial outputs of models run by RPS to simulate vapor clouds resulting from accidental releases of NGLs.

Data Request Question #10 Response:
NGL modeling of vapor clouds is not included in the oil spill modeling report prepared by RPS. Based on the low probability of an NGL release, and a release of NGL would become a gaseous phase and disperse, the report was limited to oil releases and sediment discharges to surface waters as these have the greatest potential for environmental impacts. NGL HCA could-affect segments were provided to the WDNR for preparation of the DEIS. The NGL modeling to determine the could-affect segments was prepared by Enbridge. The NGL information submitted to PHMSA is classified as "confidential corporate information" pursuant to 49 C.F.R. 190.343. Enbridge does not provide the underlying modeling to PHMSA and is not providing it with this response.

Data Request Question #11:
Provide updated information on the impacts of accidental releases of oil on groundwater, including historical releases (e.g., Bemidji, MN), as well as hypothetical releases modeled by RPS where plumes overlay areas of higher groundwater recharge as modeled by the U.S. Geological Survey (Leaf et. 2015, see figure 12)[1]. Describe the likely and worst-case impacts on drinking water wells and the Copper Falls Aquifer.

[1] Leaf, A.T. M.N. Fienen, R.J. Hunt, and C. Buchwald. 2015. *Groundwater/Surface-Water Interactions in the Bad River Watershed, Wisconsin*. Scientific Investigations Report 2015–5162. U.S. Geological Survey. See Figure 12 (Estimated annual recharge to the groundwater system, following smoothing of the Soil Water Balance results, and adjustment during calibration of the groundwater model.) Data available at https://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/sir20155162.

Data Request Question #11 Response:
Following an oil spill, there is the potential for hydrocarbons to make their way to groundwater. However, the quantity of oil making its way to groundwater is dependent on the release volume, the environmental conditions at the time of the release, any recovery or remediation efforts that might be employed, and the physical characteristics of the subsurface (soil, bedrock, groundwater) itself. As an example, under frozen wintertime conditions or conditions where the ground may be saturated with water, little or no groundwater contamination may be likely.

Hydrocarbons may enter groundwater recharge areas following a release. In these cases, it is likely that contamination is contained within tens of meters of the source location, or up to potentially hundreds of meters in the most porous soils. Additionally, subsurface transport is generally very slow (several orders of magnitude lower), with respect to the velocity of water moving within the surface water network. Groundwater contamination is generally considered to migrate over short distances (length scales of meters) over longer periods of time (time scales of months or years). Due to van der Waals interactions, hydrocarbons dissolved in groundwater move more slowly than the calculated flow velocity.

The Bemidji Release, as an example, was an approximately 10,700-barrel release of crude oil in 1979. After cleanup efforts were completed about 2,500 barrels of crude oil remained. Some of the crude oil percolated through the unsaturated zone to the water table near the rupture site (North oil pool). As of 1996, the leading edge of the oil floating on the water table at the North pool had moved about 40 m downgradient since the spill. As of 1996, the leading edge of the plume of groundwater containing a total BTEX concentration greater than 10 micrograms per liter had moved only approximately 200 m downgradient, whereas the advective flow of groundwater since the spill had been about 500m. Biodegradation of the hydrocarbons limits the contaminant migration. This result is typical for what Enbridge sees at historic release locations. More information on the Bemidji Release site can be found at the USGS Minnesota Water Science Center.

As stated previously, and demonstrated at the Bemidji Release, subsurface transport of hydrocarbons is generally very slow, and the contaminant plumes are limited by biodegradation. Additionally, Enbridge's emergency response and remediation efforts would limit the amount of hydrocarbon in the environment. As a result, in the unlikely event that a release would occur, any impacts to drinking water wells and the Copper Falls aquifer would be limited in size.

Data Request Question #12:
Provide updated information on historical accidental releases of oil and NGLs, including the type, cause, volume, and amount of time it took to identify and stop the release, the cleanup time and cost, resources impacted, and damage amounts.

Data Request Question #12 Response:
Release events in WI on Line 5 from 2016 to date consist of one release. In response to the one release, Enbridge followed all appropriate protocols, including notifications to the NRC and PHMSA.

<u>Line 5 MP 1159</u>

On August 10, 2022 at approximately 13:40 CDT, a contractor noticed a one-inch diameter circle of oil staining on the weld of a weld coupling on Line 5 at MP 1159. This piping had been excavated for a project to install three two-inch TOR fittings for future use. The weld in question had been sandblasted

by a contractor two days prior on August 8, 2022 and NDE testing was completed with passing results with no staining observed in that area at that time. Contractor notified Enbridge personnel who then notified the Manager on Call. The Edmonton Control Center was contacted and Line 5 was shut down at 14:05 CDT. Containment was placed under the pipe and staining was monitored until Enbridge Pipeline Maintenance (PLM) crew arrived on site at 14:45 CDT. Staining remained unchanged and was wiped off the weld at 15:45 CDT, and did not reappear. At no time was any soil impacted by the staining which was estimated to have been caused by approximately one drop of product. After local supervision discussed potential repair options, it was determined at 16:15 CDT that the $50,000 NRC reporting threshold would be surpassed, triggering notification to NRC of the event. The estimated property damage included the cost to repair the pipe (sleeving) and backfilling the excavation site. NRC was notified at 17:00 CDT.

A welded sleeve was installed and Line 5 was restarted on August 12, 2022 at 10:45 CDT. Since the PHMSA reporting portal does not recognize volumes less than 0.1 barrels, the volume reported was 0.1 barrels, but the actual volume out was one drop of crude.

Data Request Question #13:
Provide information on the probability of pinhole leaks, and information on how these are typically detected and repaired.

Data Request Question #13 Response:
To support RPS' modeling effort, DNV prepared an analysis of the probability of a release from the relocated pipeline. This report is forthcoming.

Enbridge uses complementary leak detection methods, along with our public awareness program, to detect the presence of leaks within the system. As the primary method to detect leaks, Enbridge employs computer-based pipeline monitoring systems that utilize measurements and pipeline data to detect and alarm on anomalies that could indicate possible leaks. In cases where the leak is too small for these systems to detect, Enbridge relies on the use of scheduled line balance calculations and other methods of detection like inline inspection tools, visual surveillance, and third party and employee reports. In the unlikely event of a pinhole leak it would be repaired by placing a welded sleeve on the pipeline.

Data Request Question #14:
Describe whether and how RPS's evaluation of the risk and potential effects of accidental releases of oil and NGLs is being used, or will be used, to update Enbridge's Integrity Management Plan (IMP) for Line 5. Provide a copy of the current written IMP for Line 5.

Data Request Question #14 Response:
Enbridge's Integrity Management Program (IMP) is an overarching document supported by processes and procedures. The IMP outlines the means by which Enbridge manages the integrity of our liquid pipeline system. As part of the IMP, Enbridge completes dispersion analysis for both NGL and liquid pipelines. Dispersion analysis is used to determine and integrate High Consequence Areas (HCA) (as per PHMSA regulations Part 195.452) into Enbridge's IMP. The IMP will not be revised due to the RPS report but will be updated with the HCAs identified along the relocation route.

Overview material highlighting Enbridge's approach to Integrity Management including threat prevention, monitoring and mitigation to maintain fitness, has been provided in Section 4.8.1 of the EIR. The Company's Integrity Management Program (IMP) contains confidential business information and trade secrets. Accordingly, the IMP document is not intended for public distribution. The IMP meets or exceeds the criteria established for pipeline operators in 49 C.F.R. § 195.452.

Data Request Question #15:
Provide GIS or GIS-compatible map layers representing the spatial outputs of models run by RPS or other Enbridge consultants to simulate the fate and transport of drilling fluids inadvertently released into streams.

Data Request Question #15 Response:
A Sediment Discharge Modeling Assessment is being conducted by RPS (Appendix D to the Main Report) to assess the potential concentrations of sediment Total Suspended Solids (TSS) within the water column in exceedance of background values, the downstream extent of elevated concentrations, and the depositional footprint of sediments that may be caused by both planned and accidental discharges of sediment due to installation techniques of the relocated pipeline as it crosses the range of water bodies within the Project Area. The report will summarize findings based upon a series of tables, figures, and maps. This report is forthcoming.

Data Request Question #16:
Identify drilling fluid products anticipated to be used for the proposed relocation project. Provide the following information in table format: manufacturer, product name, function, and maximum percent by weight. Note in the table which products are on the Wisconsin Approved Drilling and Sealing Product List, the NSF/ANSI/CAN 60: Drinking Water Treatment Chemicals – Health Effects list, or the Wisconsin Approved Horizontal Directional Drilling Products List. Also submit Material Safety Data Sheets for each of the products.

Data Request Question #16 Response:
Enbridge has reviewed the WDNR's Approved Horizontal Directional Drilling Products List, Approved Drilling and Filling Sealing Products List including Heat Exchange Drillhole Products List, and the National Sanitation Foundation (NSF) Drinking Water Treatment Chemicals NSF/ANSI/CAN 60-Health Effects List. The Project does not propose to use any product not included in these lists as part of the horizontal directional drill (HDD) process. The specific approved product used at each HDD will be dependent on field conditions encountered during the drilling operations and will be selected to assist in the successful completion of the HDD. The quantity of each product (maximum percentage by weight) will adhere to manufactures recommended application rates.

Data Request Question #17:
Describe whether and how RPS's evaluation of the risk and potential effects of accidental releases of oil, NGLs, and drilling fluids is being used, or will be used, to update Enbridge's emergency response plans for Line 5.

Data Request Question #17 Response:
Enbridge emergency response plans are regularly evaluated with the goal of continuous improvement. The RPS report conservatively modeled strategies and tactics taken from existing Enbridge Emergency Management plans and programs. Based on the modeling results, no immediate revisions are anticipated, although Enbridge emergency response plans are regularly reviewed for potential updates with the goal of continuous improvement.

Data Request Question #18:
Describe how the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa would be notified in the event of an accidental release of oil or drilling fluids upstream from the Bad River Reservation. Explain how Enbridge would coordinate with the Mashkiiziibii (Bad River) Natural Resources Department, including permission to enter lands within the Bad River Reservation.

Data Request Question #18 Response:
Should an incident occur either during construction or operation of the pipeline that resulted in an accidental release of reportable quantities of oil or drilling fluid upstream of the Bad River Reservation, Enbridge would follow the notification process as outline in Section 29 of its Environmental Protection Plan (EPP). Notifications will be made to Federal, State, and Local agencies as applicable (see Appendix E of the EPP). Enbridge will notify the director of the Mashkiiziibii Natural Resources Department and the Tribal Council of any release of oil or drilling fluid within a wetland or waterway after the Federal, State, and Local notifications are made. In the event that access to the Reservation is required Enbridge will follow the Bad River Band's Access Permit process.