

5-9-2021 LEPC MEETING – QUESTIONS TO ENBRIDGE

RESPONSES SHOULD BE EMAILED TO THE FOLLOWING:

Kenneth Pundsack Kenneth.pundsack@gmail.com
Victoria Hachtel victoriahachtel@gmail.com
Ronni Monroe ronnimonroe@gmail.com
Anita J Martin anitam@jeffersoncounty.wi.gov
Zach Wilson chirow1@gmail.com

1. What do you plan to do to help us protect our health and our property.
2. Where are the local governments – they have heard nothing from the DNR the Township.
3. How well is their property protected.
4. Would like carbon filters at Enbridge's expense for the wells.
5. Why didn't they get a call from Enbridge about the spill they only found out from a citizen in Lake Mills.
6. Should I be trying to file Felony Charges against Enbridge for trying to poison us?
7. I want someone to tell me that there wasn't anything in it from the time that it happened – over a year and ½ before we were notified.
8. Tell me that you are going to protect me from here on out.
9. Are you not essential workers?
10. Did Enbridge contact residents nearby the spill area to inform them of this meeting?
11. Did any governmental agency contact the residents specifically about this meeting?
12. Please explain what a confined aquifer is and how this could be affected if diluent get into it.
13. Please explain how flood and drought conditions as well as typical seasonal variability affect the shallow aquifers and how this affects concentrations of Gasoline Range Organics and BTEX chemicals in the aquifers and monitoring wells over time. Does either increase or decrease concentration of chemicals?
14. Has a PHMSA update been filed with the correct information regarding pipeline depth, valve depth and will the update include any new spill volume that may come from the additional testing?
15. Have other valves of the same type along the pipeline been checked for this problem?

16. Has this type of valve problem occurred before Line 13 or any Enbridge Pipelines in the US or Canada?
17. Is this style of valve currently used or planned for the rebuilds on Line 5 and Line 3?
18. I would like to recommend the following actions that could be taken in terms of safety for residents along the pipe:
 - a. It would be reasonable for County Emergency Personnel to have a map of the pipeline in detail with properties located within the consultation zone.
 - b. In addition, a list of residents residing in the consultation zone with addresses and phone numbers and a reverse 911 system in place for use for evacuation.
 - c. Given how profound the vapor and gas release was from this small volume spill, it concerns me how much could be released in a larger spill, so I am asking for personal gas monitors, one per household for those residing in the consultation zone along with yearly training regarding the device and how to react to safety hazards along the pipeline.
19. What is Enbridge's Environmental Impairment Liability Insurance Coverage?
20. How much total Liability Insurance coverage does Enbridge currently have? It is important to know if your company has enough insurance to cover pipeline spill costs which may not be paid for by the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund. There is such a fund I don't know how much money is in it but if the dollars exceed them then we need to know.
21. Have the internal delays that prevented the \$700 fee to the DNR from being paid been resolved?
22. Has the internal delay caused delay in the implementation of the interim action plan?
23. For future spills:
 - a. Please notify the municipality where the spill occurred
 - b. Notify the County in writing as soon as possible. No matter if you initially think the spill is less than 5 gallons.
 - c. Please Enbridge Representatives conduct community training for our residents that live on the pipeline regarding safety issues, responding to a spill, evacuation etc. This needs to be a public meeting, clearly and properly noticed, videotaped and posted on a municipal site for those unable to attend to view.
 - d. Whenever Enbridge representatives meet with county staff and or County Elected officials to discuss a pipeline spill which has already occurred there needs to be a mechanism for transparency and public access to these discussions.

May 19, 2021
Statement for the LEPC
Ronni Monroe, RN BSN
Pipeline Safety Advocate
Brave Wisconsin

Thank you for this opportunity to speak. The updated Interim Action Report was just released 2 days prior to this meeting so that has not given the public much time to review it but it seems like quite the change in approach. This seems to me to be a highly proactive, highly technical approach that would have been beneficial to have been applied from the outset. I am thankful this additional testing is being done but I want to say the fact that 14 months elapsed before reporting and 20 months before monitoring wells were put in, and only after public outcry, is a violation of public trust. Residents near the spill site should have been notified immediately and have been allowed to make the decision about their personal health and welfare. The burden of notifying residents in the consultation zones should not be left up to volunteer citizen activists. It is the moral obligation of Enbridge to do that and notification should also be done by the county. I do appreciate that now there are effective and comprehensive plans in place to delineate and remediate the spill.

On to my questions.

Did Enbridge contact residents nearby the spill area to inform them of this meeting? Did any governmental agency contact the residents specifically about this meeting?

Please explain to the public what a confined aquifer is and how this could be affected if diluent gets into it.

Please explain how flood and drought conditions, as well as typical seasonal variability affects the shallow aquifers and how this affects concentrations of Gasoline Range Organics and BTEX chemicals in the aquifers and monitoring wells over time. Does either increase or decrease concentration of the chemicals?

Has a PHMSA update been filed with the correct information regarding pipeline depth, valve depth and will the update include any new spill volume that may come from the additional testing?

Have other valves of the same type along the pipeline been checked for this problem? Has this type of valve problem occurred before on Line 13 or any of Enbridge pipelines in the US or Canada? Is this style of valve currently used or planned for the rebuilds on of Line 5 and Line 3?

In closing I would like to recommend several actions that could be taken in terms of safety for residents along the pipe. It would be reasonable for county emergency personnel to have a map of the pipeline in detail with properties located within the consultation zone. In addition, a list of residents residing in the consultation zone with addresses and phone numbers, a reverse 911 system in place for use for evacuation. Given how profound the vapor and gas release was from this small volume spill, it concerns me how much could be released in a larger spill, so I am asking for personal gas monitors, one per household for those residing in the consultation zone along with yearly training regarding the device and how to react to safety hazards along the pipeline.

Again thanks for the opportunity to speak.

5-19-2021 LEPC PUBLIC COMMENT SIGN IN SHEET

NAME - PLEASE PRINT	EMAIL ADDRESS
Kenneth Pundsack	kenneth.pundsack@gmail.com
Victoria Hachtel	victoriahachtel@gmail.com
Ronni Monroe	ronnimonroe@gmail.com
Anita J. Martin	Amartin J Co
Bj	anitam@jeffersoncounty.wv.gov
Zach Wilson	chirozw1@gmail.com

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS OFFSITE PLANS 5-19-2021

JONES DAIRY FARM

CHEMICAL	LOCATION	AMOUNT
ANYHDOUS AMMONIA	PLANT 2 & WEST ADDITION	94,500 LBS
ANYHDOUS AMMONIA	SOUTH PLANT	27,000 LBS
SULFURIC ACID – FORKLIFT BATTERIES	PLANTS 1, 2 & WEST ADDITION	4,210 LBS
SULFURIC ACID – FORKLIFT BATTERIES	SOUTH PLANT	892 LBS
SULFURIC ACID 93%	WASTEWATER TRTMT PLANT SOUTH	9,564 LBS

GENERAC – 351 N COLLINS RD JEFFERSON

CHEMICAL	LOCATION	AMOUNT
SULFURIC ACID BATTERIES		4,700 LBS

TYSON – FKA KEYSTONE 1015 INDUSTRIAL AVE - JEFFERSON

CHEMICAL	LOCATION	AMOUNT
ANHYDROUS AMMONIA		1,637 LBS

WALMART – JEFFERSON

CHEMICAL	LOCATION	AMOUNT
SULFURIC ACID BATTERIES		2,625 LBS

CLARK EQUIPMENT DBA DOOSAN BOBCAT FKA SCHILLER GROUNDSCARE – JOHNSON CREEK

CHEMICAL	LOCATION	AMOUNT
SULFURIC ACID BATTERIS		7,200 LBS
SULFURIC ACID	PAINT LINE WASHING PROCESS	2,680 LBS

TREK – JOHNSON CREEK

CHEMICAL	LOCATION	AMOUNT
SULFURIC ACID (BATTERIES)		4,325 LBS

FRONTIER TOWER SITE FKA INSGHT FS - LAKE MILLS

CHEMICAL	LOCATION	AMOUNT
SULFURIC ACID (BATTERIES)		1,225 LBS