



**REGION 5**

CHICAGO, IL 60604

October 12, 2023

Via Email

Mr. Joe McGaver  
Manager Environment Projects  
Enbridge, Inc.  
11 East Superior Street, Suite 125  
Duluth, Minnesota 55802

Dear Mr. McGaver:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed Version: 2 of Enbridge's Water Quality Monitoring Plan for the Line 5 Wisconsin Segment Relocation Project, dated August 5. Please see the enclosure with the Agency's comments. EPA requests that Enbridge provide written responses to these comments by November 1, 2023.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Melissa Blankenship at 312-886-9641 or [blankenship.melissa@epa.gov](mailto:blankenship.melissa@epa.gov).

Sincerely,

10/12/2023

**X** David Pfeifer

---

David Pfeifer  
Manager, Watersheds and Wetlands Branch  
Signed by: DAVID PFEIFER

**ENCLOSURE**

EPA Comments on Enbridge "Water Quality Monitoring Plan Line 5 Wisconsin Segment Relocation Project" (Version: 2)

ecc: Bill Sande, St. Paul District ACOE, ([William.M.Sande@usace.army.mil](mailto:William.M.Sande@usace.army.mil))  
Rebecca Graser, St. Paul District ACOE, ([Rebecca.M.Graser@usace.army.mil](mailto:Rebecca.M.Graser@usace.army.mil))  
Naomi Tillison, Bad River Tribe, ([nrdirector@badriver-nsn.gov](mailto:nrdirector@badriver-nsn.gov))  
Jessica Strand, Bad River Tribe, ([environmental@badriver-nsn.gov](mailto:environmental@badriver-nsn.gov))  
Greg Pils, Wisconsin DNR, ([Gregory.Pils@wisconsin.gov](mailto:Gregory.Pils@wisconsin.gov))

## EPA Comments on Enbridge “Water Quality Monitoring Plan Line 5 Wisconsin Segment Relocation Project” (Version: 2)

### Previous comments not addressed:

EPA notes that several of its comments<sup>1</sup> made on the previous version of the Water Quality Monitoring Plan (Plan)<sup>2</sup> do not appear to have been fully addressed in Version: 2 of the Plan. EPA is reiterating its comments on the previous version of the Plan that have not been fully addressed. In responding to these and any future comments, it would be helpful if Enbridge provided point-by-point responses to track Plan development. EPA recommends that Enbridge address the following comments in a revised version of the plan.

- *Comment 1. Native “spoil” procedures.* Fish habitat component and visual assessment appear to have been added, but larger consideration of habitat comparison was not addressed.
- *Comment 2. Dam removal.* Not addressed.
- *Comment 3. Temporary increases in Total Suspended Solids.* There is no additional information on how habitat or substrate will be evaluated. There is no information on evaluating the macroinvertebrate community. Mussels were added (with no sampling details) but mussel sampling would not adequately address concerns expressed by EPA and others in comments on the first draft of the monitoring plan. No additional explanation was provided about evaluating cumulative impacts from multiple crossings on downstream conditions.
- *Comment 5. Pre-construction monitoring period.* No information was added on how the pre-construction monitoring data will be used to determine background concentrations of water quality parameters. Enbridge has not identified what it considers to be an acceptable exceedance of parameters from background or pre-construction conditions.
- *Comment 7. Pre-construction water quality parameters.* In-stream bed sediment, habitat, and macroinvertebrate community sampling have not been addressed.
- *Comment 8. Active construction sampling distances.* Enbridge has not explained how 100 feet upstream is appropriately outside of the influence of the zone of construction activities.
- *Comment 13. Additional parameters not considered.* Enbridge did not address or explain their consideration of the following parameters: fish community, discharge, organic matter.

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter from David Pfeifer to Joe McGaver dated November 18, 2022, Re: Draft Water Quality Monitoring Plan for Line 5 Wisconsin Segment Relocation

<sup>2</sup> Enbridge Water Quality Monitoring Plan Line 5 Wisconsin Segment Relocation Project Version: 1 dated September 6, 2022.

## **Comments on Version: 2 of the Water Quality Monitoring Plan**

**Comment 1. 2023 Sampling.** EPA understands that Enbridge has already begun sampling for 2023 without getting input on a final sampling plan from all relevant parties. Please provide information on whether pre-construction sampling will continue into 2024 and how pre-construction sampling will specifically be used to examine impacts from pipeline and roadway construction.

**Comment 2. Methods for water quality parameters.** Methods for chemical parameters (and some physical parameters) are included in the Water Quality Testing Methods, Attachment 2, and Quality Assurance Project Plan, Attachment 3; however, many physical and biological parameters do not have associated detailed methods. The project QAPP should contain details on all parameters and methods.

**Comment 3. Reporting and data comparison for nitrogen compounds.** For nitrate+nitrite and ammonia, please clarify how results are being reported - whether as nitrogen (e.g., ammonia-N, NH<sub>4</sub>-N) or the compound itself (e.g., ammonia, NH<sub>4</sub>). This is important for accurately comparing monitoring results to other datasets and established thresholds.

**Comment 4. Mussels versus macroinvertebrate community.** Although mussels are an important focal group, inclusion of mussels does not address concerns about the macroinvertebrate community and evaluating impacts to biotic integrity from construction activities. This would be accomplished by sampling the entire macroinvertebrate community using standard methods comparable to Wisconsin DNR sampling. EPA reiterates the importance of including macroinvertebrate community sampling during pre- and post-construction periods for evaluating near- and long-term recovery of biological communities as indicators of the integrity of the waterbodies themselves.

**Comment 5. Site-specific sampling.** Section 2.1.1.1 states that the parameter list will be expanded for three impaired waterbodies; however, total phosphorus is already included in Table 1, so language around this parameter should be updated here – i.e., it will be sampled in all streams, not only in Bay City Creek.

**Comment 6. Active construction sampling for TSS.** EPA recommends that TSS be sampled as part of active construction sampling. This will provide a useful comparison to pre- and post-construction samples and to modelling results.

**Comment 7. Active construction sampling – distances.** Section 2.2 indicates that “Enbridge will collect additional water quality samples at the first downstream public road crossing” when certain turbidity conditions are observed. Enbridge should indicate what further actions it will take if turbidity conditions are also elevated at the first downstream road crossing (e.g., additional sampling at the next downstream access point).

**Comment 8. Notification of Bad River Band.** Enbridge indicates it will notify the Bad River Band if there is an inadvertent return to a stream. Enbridge should specify the timeframe within which it will notify the Tribe.

**Comment 9. Exceedance of Bad River Band water quality standards.** The Plan indicates that it will evaluate water quality parameters at the furthest downstream sampling location before entering the Bad River Reservation to determine if parameters exceed the Tribe's water quality standards (section 4.2). Please explain how exceedance of water quality standards will be determined for all parameters. Narrative criteria and criteria with narrative components will require numeric interpretation to determine exceedance.

**Comment 10. Data reporting.** Enbridge should provide all raw data collected during sampling/analysis so that full independent analyses can be conducted. EPA recommends that Enbridge upload all raw data to the national water quality database after each sampling event to the Water Quality Portal at [waterqualitydata.us](http://waterqualitydata.us) to increase transparency.