C. Spill Data

This section provides support for our Asks. Table 1 summarizes the Enbridge spill history in the US and Canada from 1996 through 2014 of well over 1000 spills and approaching one billion gallons. A partial list of major spills follows Table 1 illustrating a track record of pervasive, systemic environmental and safety issues. The data in Table 1 and the accompanying partial list support our charges of repeated willful, reckless behavior, negligence, and gross negligence on the part of Enbridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Spills</th>
<th>Quantity in Barrels</th>
<th>Quantity in US Gallons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13,698</td>
<td>575,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19,853</td>
<td>833,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9,830</td>
<td>412,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28,760</td>
<td>1,207,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7,513</td>
<td>315,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25,980</td>
<td>1,091,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14,683</td>
<td>616,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6,410</td>
<td>269,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3,252</td>
<td>136,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9,825</td>
<td>412,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5,663</td>
<td>237,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13,777</td>
<td>578,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>112,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8,441</td>
<td>354,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34,258</td>
<td>1,438,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>95,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10,224</td>
<td>429,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>4,298</td>
<td>180,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,943</td>
<td>123,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>224,374</td>
<td>9,423,708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data compiled from Enbridge websites
Archived data available on request
Enbridge Major Spills
2000 - 2014

2000: A spill of 1,500 barrels of crude oil near Innes, Saskatchewan on the Enbridge (Saskatchewan) System. More than 2,000 tons of contaminated soil were removed for off-site disposal.\(^8\)

2000: In Northwest Minnesota 50 barrels of crude oil were released oil on the Lakehead System into wetlands in a remote area.\(^8\)

2000: At the Superior Terminal in the Lakehead System 1,200 barrels were released on company property.\(^8\)

January 17, 2001: In Hardisty, Alberta approximately 23,900 barrels of crude oil were released on land and a nearby slough after a seam failure on the Energy Transportation North pipeline near the Hardisty Terminal.\(^8\)

February 13, 2001: In Satartia, Mississippi approximately 100 barrels of crude oil were released from the Enbridge Pipelines (Midla) Inc.’s Tinsley System.\(^8\)

September 3, 2001: In Fairbanks, Louisiana approximately 7 million cubic feet of natural gas and 428 barrels of an oily mixture were released from the Enbridge Pipelines (Midla) System. Contaminated liquids were removed.\(^8\)

September 29, 2001: In Binbrook, Ontario approximately 598 barrels of crude oil were released from the Energy Transportation North System.\(^8\)

January 18, 2002: In Kerrobert, Saskatchewan approximately 6,133 barrels of crude oil were released from a leaking gasket on the Energy Transportation North pipeline at the Kerrobert Station.\(^8\)

---
\(^8\) These data from Enbridge websites are no longer available on-line. Archived website data is on file with 350Kishwaukee and is available on request.
May 8, 2002: In Glenboro, Manitoba approximately 598 barrels of crude oil were released onto agricultural land after a seam failure on the Energy Transportation North pipeline.8

July 4, 2002: July 2002: A 34-inch-diameter pipeline owned by its affiliate Enbridge Energy Partners ruptured in a marsh near the town of Cohasset, Minnesota, contaminating five acres of wetland spilling 6,000 barrels of crude oil. In an attempt to keep the oil from contaminating the Mississippi River, the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources set a controlled burn that lasted for one day and created a smoke plume about 1-mile (1.6 km) high and 5 miles (8.0 km) long.8 9

January 24, 2003: Approximately 4,500 barrels of crude oil spilled from the Lakehead System at the Enbridge Terminal near Superior, Wisconsin. The leak was caused by a failure in a section of terminal pipe during oil delivery from the pipe to a storage tank. About 500 barrels breached the terminal’s containment system and flowed off site onto the nearby Nemadji River, a tributary of Lake Superior. The ground and river were frozen at the time, helping to prevent spread of the oil into soils or downstream.8 10

2004: The U.S. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) proposed a fine of $11,500 against Enbridge Energy for safety violations found during inspections of pipelines in Illinois, Indiana and Michigan. The penalty was later reduced to $5,000. In a parallel case involving Enbridge Pipelines operations in Minnesota, an initial penalty of $30,000 was revised to $25,000.11

February 22, 2004: Approximately 1,635 barrels of crude oil were released when a valve failed on the Athabasca pipeline system. Approximately 735 barrels of free product and contaminated debris were recovered.8

February 19, 2004: In Grand Rapids, Michigan, during a maintenance dig on the Lakehead System, crews discovered a slow leak of crude oil, caused by a dent resulting from the pipe lying on a rock. Soil excavations and groundwater monitoring wells revealed contaminated soil and groundwater and the loss of about 1,000 barrels of crude oil.8

2005: Liquids Pipelines recorded 70 reportable liquid spills totaling 9,825 barrels from Enbridge pipelines in Canada and the United States.8

---

9 Enbridge - Spills and Violations, http://www.liquisearch.com/enbridge/spills_and_violations
March 18, 2006: In Willmar, Saskatchewan an estimated 613 barrels of crude oil were released when a pump failed at Enbridge Pipelines (Saskatchewan) Inc.’s Willmar Terminal. According to Enbridge, roughly half the oil was recovered.\cite{1}

December 22, 2006: In Sheridan County, Montana approximately 2,000 barrels of oil were released when a two-inch nipple failed downstream of a pump at a lease site on our North Dakota System in Sheridan County, Montana. The released oil gathered in a low spot in a pasture approximately 150 yards from the pump.\cite{1}

January 1, 2007: An Enbridge pipeline in Clark County that runs from Superior, Wisconsin to near Whitewater, Wisconsin cracked open and spilled 1,250 barrels of crude oil onto farmland and into a drainage ditch.\cite{1,12}

February 2, 2007: Construction crews struck an Enbridge pipeline, near Exeland in Rusk County, Wisconsin, spilling 3,000 barrels of crude. Some of the oil filled a hole more than 20 feet deep and contaminated the local water table.\cite{1}

April 2007: Approximately 6,227 barrels of crude oil spilled in a field downstream of Liquids Pipelines’ pumping station at Glenavon, Saskatchewan. The line is a 34-inch, 490,000 barrel-per-day line transporting heavy and medium crude oil from Edmonton, Alberta, to Superior, Wisconsin.\cite{1}

November 28, 2007: A spill occurred on Enbridge Line 3 in Clearbrook, Minnesota resulting in an explosion. “The accident happened when Enbridge attempted to complete a repair of a longitudinal seam leak by installing a new 11-foot section of pipe. One of the couplings used to join the new section of pipe slipped during restart of the line, allowing the release of crude oil that formed a flammable cloud. An open flame heater positioned at the edge of the excavation ignited the cloud resulting in a fire that caused the deaths of two Enbridge employees as well as property damage to the pipeline and construction equipment.” The PHMSA later fined the company $2,405,000 for safety violations connected to the incident.\cite{13}

2008: The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources charged Enbridge with more than 100 environmental violations relating to the construction of the Line 61 pipeline across much of the state. “Pipeline construction was plagued by problems, including illegal harm to wetlands and streambeds and failure to control erosion next to

\cite{13} See Exhibit #3
waterways.” “The case was settled for a record $1.1 million in fines and mandated reclamation work.”

January 23, 2008: Approximately 629 barrels of crude oil were released when a flange gasket on a Line 4 pump unit at Cromer Terminal failed near Cromer, Manitoba.

February 23, 2008: Approximately 157 barrels of crude oil were released at the Weyburn Truck Terminal facility when a drainage line from a receiving trap to an underground sump tank was mistakenly left open causing the sump tank to overflow onto the facility property near Weyburn, Saskatchewan.

March 29, 2008: Approximately 252 barrels of crude oil were released when a drain line on a meter manifold at Athabasca Terminal failed near Fort McMurray, Alberta.

April 6, 2008: Approximately 550 barrels of crude oil were released from a small corrosion hole in the floor of a storage tank at Enbridge’s Eldorado Terminal near Eldorado, Kansas.

April 15, 2008: approximately 260 barrels of crude oil were released when a thermal relief line on Tank 79 at Griffith Terminal was broken by a swing stage during tank painting operations near Griffith, Indiana.

July 6, 2008: Approximately 252 barrels of crude oil were released from Tank 25 at Edmonton Terminal when a nitrogen purge from a third-party feeder pipeline following a delivery caused oil to flow onto the roof near Edmonton, Alberta.

January 3, 2009: A leak occurred near Cheecham, Alberta at Enbridge Athabasca’s Cheecham Terminal where approximately 5,749 barrels of oil was released when a three-quarter-inch nipple connected to a vent valve failed on a vertical expansion loop. The leak resulted in oil spraying vertically from the connection, covering a considerable area of the terminal and associated facilities with oil. Most free product was contained on-site, but an oil mist was also blown off-site, contaminating an area of approximately 450 meters by 1,500 meters downwind of the facility.

February 9, 2009: Approximately 704 barrels of oil was released near Kisbey, Saskatchewan from the Liquids Pipelines Saskatchewan system into a field in southeastern Saskatchewan.

June 2, 2009: PHMSA assessed a civil penalty of $105,000 against Enbridge Pipelines LLC-North Dakota for a January 25, 2007 accident that released 9,030 gallons of crude oil gallons of crude oil 9,030. The accident occurred on January 25, 2007, at the company’s Stanley Pump Station.\(^\text{15}\)

January 8, 2010: Approximately 3,748 barrels of synthetic crude oil was released from Line 2B at milepost 774.18, just across the international border downstream from the Gretna (Manitoba) Station near Neche, North Dakota.\(^\text{8}\)

February 25, 2010: A release of crude oil occurred at a broken nipple on the drain valve of a booster pump at Enbridge’s Edmonton, Alberta, terminal. Approximately 818 barrels of diluent was released into a concrete containment pit.\(^8\)

On April 1, 2010: Just southwest of the town of Virden, Manitoba, 16 barrels of crude oil were released from a 6-inch Enbridge Pipelines (Virden) Inc. pipeline into the creek bed of Bosshill Creek, causing an oily sheen to form in a portion of the creek.\(^8\)

June 22, 2010: A release of crude oil occurred due to an o-ring seal failure at the Line 4 sending trap located at Enbridge’s Cactus Lake, Saskatchewan, pump station. Approximately 157 barrels of crude oil was released onsite. The crude oil was found in the area of the sending trap, drainage ditch and on the surface of the storm water pond.\(^8\)

On July 26, 2010: A release of crude oil on Line 6B of Enbridge Energy Partners, L.P.’s (EEP) subsidiary’s Lakehead system was reported near Marshall, Michigan.\(^8\) On 7/10/2012 the National Transportation Safety Board posted the following press release:\(^{16}\)

WASHINGTON - Pervasive organizational failures by a pipeline operator along with weak federal regulations led to a pipeline rupture and subsequent oil spill in 2010, the National Transportation Safety Board said today.

On Sunday, July 25, 2010, at about 5:58 p.m., a 30 inch-diameter pipeline (Line 6B) owned and operated by Enbridge Incorporated ruptured and spilled crude oil into an ecologically sensitive area near the Kalamazoo River in Marshall, Mich., for 17 hours until a local utility worker discovered the oil and contacted Enbridge to report the rupture.

\(^{15}\)Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Final Order: CPF No. 3-2007-5022

The NTSB found that the material failure of the pipeline was the result of multiple small corrosion-fatigue cracks that over time grew in size and linked together, creating a gaping breach in the pipe measuring over 80 inches long.

"This investigation identified a complete breakdown of safety at Enbridge. Their employees performed like Keystone Kops and failed to recognize their pipeline had ruptured and continued to pump crude into the environment," said NTSB Chairman Deborah A.P. Hersman. "Despite multiple alarms and a loss of pressure in the pipeline, for more than 17 hours and through three shifts they failed to follow their own shutdown procedures."

Clean up costs are estimated by Enbridge and the EPA at $800 million and counting, making the Marshall rupture the single most expensive on-shore spill in US history.

Over 840,000 gallons of crude oil - enough to fill 120 tanker trucks - spilled into hundreds of acres of Michigan wetlands, fouling a creek and a river. A Michigan Department of Community Health study concluded that over 300 individuals suffered adverse health effects related to benzene exposure, a toxic component of crude oil.

Line 6B had been scheduled for a routine shutdown at the time of the rupture to accommodate changing delivery schedules. Following the shutdown, operators in the Enbridge control room in Edmonton, Alberta, received multiple alarms indicating a problem with low pressure in the pipeline, which were dismissed as being caused by factors other than a rupture. "Inadequate training of control center personnel" was cited as contributing to the accident.

The investigation found that Enbridge failed to accurately assess the structural integrity of the pipeline, including correctly analyzing cracks that required repair. The NTSB characterized Enbridge's control room operations, leak detection, and environmental response as deficient, and described the event as an "organizational accident."

Following the first alarm, Enbridge controllers restarted Line 6B twice, pumping an additional 683,000 gallons of crude oil, or 81 percent of the total amount spilled, through the ruptured pipeline. The NTSB determined that if Enbridge's own procedures had been followed during the initial phases of the accident, the magnitude of the spill would have been significantly reduced. Further, the NTSB attributed systemic flaws in operational decision-making to a "culture of deviance,"
which concluded that personnel had developed an operating culture in which not adhering to approved procedures and protocols was normalized.

The NTSB also cited the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's weak regulations regarding pipeline assessment and repair criteria as well as a cursory review of Enbridge's oil spill response plan as contributing to the magnitude of the accident.

The investigation revealed that the cracks in Line 6B that ultimately ruptured were detected by Enbridge in 2005 but were not repaired. A further examination of records revealed that Enbridge's crack assessment process was inadequate, increasing the risk of a rupture.

"This accident is a wake-up call to the industry, the regulator, and the public. Enbridge knew for years that this section of the pipeline was vulnerable yet they didn't act on that information," said Chairman Hersman. "Likewise, for the regulator to delegate too much authority to the regulated to assess their own system risks and correct them is tantamount to the fox guarding the hen house. Regulators need regulations and practices with teeth, and the resources to enable them to take corrective action before a spill. Not just after."

As a result of the investigation, the NTSB reiterated one recommendation to PHMSA and issued 19 new safety recommendations to the Department of the Transportation, PHMSA, Enbridge Incorporated, the American Petroleum Institute, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the National Emergency Number Association.

July 29, 2010: A leaking flange was discovered on Line 2 at the North Cass Lake, Minnesota, Station. Released crude oil was collected and approximately 200 cubic meters of impacted soil was removed. While the initial volume estimate of the leak was several barrels of oil, a low water table at the site allowed oil to travel downward and away from detection. Reassessment of the release, through the installation of additional monitoring wells, now estimates that oil was leaking for some time and as much as 1,500 barrels of oil is present on the groundwater table, extending both on and off Enbridge’s property.

September 9, 2010: A crude oil release from Line 6A of Enbridge Energy, Limited Partnership’s Lakehead System was reported in Romeoville, Illinois. The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) reported that the 34" pipeline “leaked beneath the
street pavement [...] releasing about 6,430 barrels of Saskatchewan heavy crude oil", and that the “[d]amages, including the cost of the environmental remediation, totaled about $46.6 million.”

“The closest residential areas were about 200 yards from the spill site, which was also within populated and ecologically sensitive areas designated as high consequence areas in Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 195.450.”

Enbridge reported that the monitoring system showed no indication of a leak during the several hours before discovering the crude oil release. At 9:36 a.m. on September 9, 2010, a passerby reported a water leak near 717 Parkwood Avenue to the Romeoville Public Works Department (PWD). The PWD immediately dispatched an equipment operator to investigate the water leak. At 9:46 a.m., the equipment operator notified the PWD water superintendent that water was discharging from expansion joints and cracks in the pavement from what he believed was a leaking service line. The equipment operator closed a valve on the water service line to Northfield Block Company, a privately owned business near the leak site, stopping the water discharge. Concluding that the leak was not creating a safety hazard, he turned the valve back on to restore water service to the facility—the water flow resumed from cracks in the pavement. He recommended a water leak detection company to a Northfield Block Company representative.

About 11:30 a.m., a technician from Water Services, Inc., the water leak detection company hired by Northfield Block Company, arrived at the scene to locate the source of the leak. In addition to the leaking water, the technician observed oil discharging from beneath the pavement in the vicinity of the reported water leak.

At 12:04 p.m., the Romeoville Fire Department received a report about a gas-like odor at 719 Parkwood Avenue, the location where oil was flowing out of the ground. Firefighters were dispatched to conduct an outdoor gas odor investigation. Upon their arrival at 12:11 p.m., they observed black oil discharging from expansion joints and cracks in a 30 square foot area of an asphalt-and-concrete driveway at the entrance to the Northfield Block Company. They describe a heavy flow of oil running south along the street gutter in a 4-foot wide stream that was about 6 inches deep (see figure 1). The fire department immediately notified Enbridge, and a control center operator initiated the oil pipeline shutdown at 12:29 p.m.

---

17 See Exhibit #1
The released oil flowed into a storm water drainage ditch and then to a storm water management pond. Both required subsequent excavation and restoration activities to remove the oil.

Three days later, Enbridge crews excavated the area around the damaged water and crude of pipelines. Investigators observed a 1.5-inch diameter hole on the underside of the oil pipeline directly above the leaking 6-inch diameter water pipe that crossed 5 inches beneath the Enbridge pipeline. The earthen material around the pipes contained large rocks and coarse gravel. The water pipe was severely corroded and had three large holes on top of the pipe facing the oil pipeline.17

Although Enbridge reported that eight in-line inspections from 2000 to 2008 did not identify problems with the pipe in the area of the damage, “an August 2008 inspection using a magnetic flux leakage (MFL) tool identified a metal object near the area of the damaged pipeline. Records indicated no history of excavation to repair or work on the pipeline at the location of the leak.”17 The NTSB investigation determined the probable cause of the pipeline leak to be “erosion caused by water jet impingement from a leaking 6-inch diameter water pipe 5 inches below the oil pipeline” but did not determine the cause of the erosion of the waterline.17 Enbridge filed suit against the Village of Romeoville alleging that the Village “negligently failed to prevent the leak of a lateral water service Line”.18 The Village argued, inter alia, that “according to Enbridge's experts, the cause of the water leak was stray current corrosion which led to the Water Jet Slurry which led to the impingement or erosion of a hole in the Oil Pipeline”, with the stray current emanating from a corrosion protection system on the Enbridge pipe.18 The village filed a motion for summary judgment, and on August 10, 2016 the Court granted the motion.19

October 15, 2010: A release of crude oil occurred at a sample port in a meter bank at Enbridge’s Nanticoke, Ontario, terminal. Approximately 124 barrels was released onto industrial property in the area.8

May 9, 2011: A leak was discovered on Enbridge’s Norman Wells Pipeline approximately 50 meters south of Wrigley and 150 meters south of Willowlake River in the Northwest Territories. Enbridge estimated the leak volume to be about four barrels. After implementing a full-scale environmental site assessment (ESA) program, which included subsurface analysis and investigation, Enbridge discovered the leak volume and subsurface contamination was greater than originally estimated. The ESA indicated that a large quantity of oil was held below the surface by permafrost, which served as a cap

18 See Exhibit #4
19 See Exhibit #5
preventing the upward movement of the oil and an initial visual determination of the full extent of the leak volumes. Based on estimates provided by third-party experts on site, Enbridge later reported that it anticipated the leak volume to range from 700 to 1,500 barrels. The subsurface that was affected is about one acre.\(^8\)

December 2011: a Canadian judge fined Enbridge $875,000 for safety violations linked to a 2003 natural gas pipeline explosion in Toronto that killed seven people.\(^20\)

March 3, 2012: Two third-party vehicles left the end of a public road (T-intersection) within an industrial area and struck an above ground pig sending trap within an Enbridge fenced facility on Line14/64 near New Lenox, Illinois. A drain line on the bottom of the pig sending trap severed, and a release of crude oil and fire occurred. The collision resulted in two fatalities at the scene; both were occupants of the third-party vehicles. An estimated 1,500 barrels of crude oil were released from the pig sending trap; of that amount, more than 1,200 barrels were estimated to have been consumed during the fire.\(^8\)

June 18, 2012: Approximately 1,446 barrels of crude oil leaked at Enbridge’s Elk Point Pump Station on Line 19 (Athabasca Pipeline) near the town of Elk Point, Alberta. Approximately 188 barrels was released on an adjacent landowner’s field.\(^8\)

July 27, 2012: EEP reported a release of crude oil from Line 14 on its Lakehead System near Grand Marsh, Wisconsin. The oil was contained in a field. The initial estimate of the volume released was approximately 1,200 barrels. On July 30, 2012, the Pipelines and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) issued a Corrective Action Order with conditions to return Line 14 to service, and on August 1, 2012, PHMSA issued an amendment to the Corrective Action Order with additional restart conditions. Enbridge submitted the Restart Plan to PHMSA on August 1 and the Lakehead Plan to PHMSA on August 2. The Lakehead Plan describes improvements that to be made in operational areas on the Lakehead System.\(^8\)

Jul 29, 2012: The Grand Marsh spill occurred shortly after the publication of the damning National Transportation Safety Board report blasting Enbridge’s handling of the July 2010 Kalamazoo disaster. U.S. Representative Ed Markey responded by saying: “Enbridge is fast becoming to the Midwest what BP was to the Gulf of Mexico.” PHMSA told the company not to reopen the pipeline until the agency had approved a plan for corrective action.\(^21\)


February 2, 2013: Approximately 220 barrels of crude oil leaked from an Enbridge gathering line near Storthoaks, Saskatchewan. The surface area of the leak was approximately 335 square yards and the subsurface contamination reached approximately 3,348 square yards. The leak was caused by corrosion damage caused by the failure of the external coating of the pipe’s surface.\(^8\)

May 13, 2013: Approximately 2,200 barrels of crude oil spilled from an Enbridge trunk line at the South Terminal in Cushing, Oklahoma. The oil traveled in a ditch to a small containment pond near an Enbridge tank. The oil flowed from the small containment pond into an adjacent creek and then into a large containment pond. This incident involved several animal fatalities and rehabilitations.\(^8\)

June 22, 2013: Ground movement caused a spill on Enbridge Line 37 of approximately 1,300 barrels of oil near Cheecham, Alberta. The spill traveled above ground and into a nearby lake.\(^8\)

August 3, 2013: Approximately 140 barrels of crude oil spilled from the Enbridge Griffith Terminal. The spill impacted approximately 7.33 acres of land.\(^8\)

November 21, 2013: Approximately 101 barrels of crude oil spilled from Enbridge Line NB-07 near Stoughton, Saskatchewan.\(^8\)

March 14, 2013: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency today ordered Enbridge to do additional dredging to clean up oil from the company’s July 2010 pipeline spill in Kalamazoo River “above Ceresco Dam, upstream of Battle Creek, and in the Morrow Lake Delta.”\(^22\)

January 18, 2014: Approximately 113 barrels of crude oil spilled from the Rowatt pump station, south of Regina, Saskatchewan, on Line 67 after a pressure transmitter steel flex hose failed in the station piping. The oil spilled onto the grounds of the pump station and onto nearby farmland. An incident investigation concluded that the support of the pressure transmitter assembly did not sufficiently protect the steel braided hose from excessive stress associated with the high winds in the area.\(^8\)

February 22, 2014: Enbridge Line 9 through Ontario, Canada, has had at least 35 spills but Canada’s National Energy Board (NEB), “which regulates pipelines in Canada, has

\(^22\) News Releases - Emergency Response, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, [https://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/324e040292e1e51f85257359003f533a/19cdd21822f762cd85257b2a06ecbb9%21opendocument](https://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/324e040292e1e51f85257359003f533a/19cdd21822f762cd85257b2a06ecbb9%21opendocument)
records of seven spills”. CTV W5 investigations revealed the false reporting, raising questions about other spill numbers in NEB records.²³

February 25, 2014: Approximately 975 barrels of crude oil spilled from station piping within a manifold inside the Griffith, Indiana Terminal caused by a failed piping connection.⁸

March 21, 2014: Enbridge recovered approximately 200 barrels of oil from a spill at the Maxbass station in Maxbass, North Dakota, caused by a leak in an underground tank line that had been connected to previously removed tank.⁸

April 18, 2014: Approximately 113 barrels of crude oil leaked from a tank mixer at the Enbridge Edmonton Terminal after a seal failed.⁸

December 16, 2014: Enbridge reported a flange or valve failure caused spill of approximately 1,346 barrel oil spill from its Line 4 pipeline at the Regina Terminal in Saskatchewan, Canada.²⁴ ⁸

²⁴ Enbridge says no restart time yet for biggest oil export pipeline, Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/enbridge-line4-leak-idUSL1N0U218R20141218
July 2015: Canada’s National Energy Board (NEB), released an audit report that concluding that “the Calgary-based energy giant wasn’t addressing threats to public safety from its pipelines and [was] failing to adequately protect whistleblowers.”

But the final report deleted parts the draft version that was privately shared with Enbridge in February 2015 regarding the ability of the company to monitor and repair pipeline cracks caused by corrosion. Don Deaver, a pipeline and oil and gas industry expert said after reviewing documents provided by whistleblowers, “They don't even understand their limitations and the NEB has no idea what the issues are.” Deaver continued “Whenever there’s a lawsuit on a spill or something like that, the agencies allow the companies to hold back the reports until there’s a settlement. It could be embarrassing to the regulatory people (to reveal what’s in these company reports) because it could show that they (regulators) failed to take action.”

---