



2610 OLD RED TRAIL STE. C
MANDAN, ND 58554-1447
701-667-1800

RECEIVED

July 1, 2011

JUL 01 2011

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

North Dakota Public Service Commission
Darrell Nitschke
Executive Secretary
600 E. Boulevard Avenue Dept. 408
Bismarck, ND 58505-0489

Re: Case No. PU-07-791 Contract No. PU-599-10

Dear Mr. Nitschke,

The State of North Dakota, acting through its North Dakota Public Service Commission (NDPSC), Division of Public Utilities, has engaged Keitu Engineers & Consultants, Inc. to perform consulting services for post-construction siting inspections. Final reports were sent to you electronically via email. Enclosed are an original and copy for both the final reports of the post-construction inspection of Case No. PU-07-791.

The Executive Summary identifies items that still need attention by the Commission staff and siting applicant to ensure that the facilities for the project have been constructed in compliance with items identified by the ND Public Service Commission. Once these items are addressed, the Commission can act on final closeout of the construction phase of the project.

Should Commission staff or the NDPSC have any questions, please contact me for assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Timothy Spilman". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Timothy Spilman
Project Manager

Enclosures

154 PU-07-791 Filed: 7/1/2011 Pages: 34
Final report for the post-construction inspection



Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC
11 Pumping Station Upgrades
July 2, 2008 Penn Station Orders (Ramsey County, ND)

Prepared by Timothy Spilman, Project Manager, Keitu Engineering & Consultants, Inc.
Final Report

Executive Summary

Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC upgraded eleven existing pump stations in North Dakota on its existing Alexander to Clearbrook crude petroleum pipeline. This post construction report is to help the Commission with verification that Penn Station order's set for by them are completed by Enbridge. This post construction report addressed the Penn Station July 2, 2008 Orders in case file PU-07-791.

No record of tests to establish maximum operating pressure tests for the design maximum operating pressure (MOP) was found for the station piping in the case file. Passing the pressure test insures that no irreparable damage occurred on the station piping during construction and operation of the stations are within design limits. A written record of the Penn Station pressure test should be requested from Enbridge by the Commission to complete the case file Order # 8 & #18.

In reviewing the site using Google Earth aerial photos of before and after construction, no trees or shrubs were required to be inventoried, cleared, and replaced. Therefore, the Commission's Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications may not have been required for this project. Enbridge should provided written verification that no trees or shrubs were affected or comply with the Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specification to complete Order #19.

Enbridge provided a CD (Docket #129) on March 4, 2010 of the as built GIS drawing 534-P-10001 in GIS format according to the cover letter in the case file. No record of the GIS electronic version was found in the records provided to Keitu Engineers & Consultants, Inc. for the post construction inspection. Enbridge also provided a CD (Docket #130) of the Penn Station as built .pdf drawing on March 18th, 2010 of drawing 534-P-10001 plot plan (hard copy substitute). Completion of the Penn Station was complete as of October 9, 2009 according to the weekly progress reports. The as built sent to the Commission was only a site plan. Penn Station as built was sent with other as built stations within the 3 month period of the other station sites completion dates but not the Penn Station. The Penn Station as built information was provided about 5 months after the Penn Station site was completed. Order #20 is completed but after the 3 month completion requirement.

Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC has complied with all other Order requests of the Commission for the Penn Station upgrade for PU-07-791.



Preliminary Statement

Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC (Enbridge) owns and operates an existing crude petroleum pipeline extending from near Alexander, North Dakota, to Clearbrook, Minnesota.

On February 20, 2008 Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC (Enbridge) filed a consolidated letter of intent and request for waiver of procedures and time schedules, and a request to amend its existing corridor certificates or route permits. Enbridge proposed to upgrade the existing Alexander Station in McKenzie County, the Trenton Station and Beaver Lodge Station in Williams County, Stanley Station and Blaisdell Station in Mountrail County, Minot Station in Ward County, Denbigh Station in McHenry County, Pleasant Lake Station in Benson County, Penn Station and Bartlett Station in Ramsey County, and Larimore Station in Grand Forks County on its existing crude oil pipeline.

On March 26, 2008 the Commission issued a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing and Notice of Informal Hearing. The notice provided until May 6, 2008 for comments or requests for hearing.

On May 6, 2008 John Sandberg, a resident of Penn, North Dakota requested a Hearing concerning the Penn Station and upgrades.

On May 21, 2008 the Commission issued a Notice of Hearing scheduling a public hearing to begin Friday, June 20, 2008 at 11:00 am at the Ramsey County Courthouse, Devils Lake, North Dakota concerning the Penn Station.

On May 23, 2008 the Commission held an informal hearing to discuss the pump station upgrades and siting for each pump station with the exception of the Penn Station. On June 4, 2008 the Commission issued an order granting Enbridge certificates of corridor compatibility and route permits for the upgrade of the Alexander, Trenton, Beaver Lodge, Stanley, Blaisdell, Minot, Denbigh, Pleasant Lake, Bartlett, and Larimore Stations.

On June 11, 2008 John and Lorrie Sandberg by email and Enbridge by letter requested that the Commission cancel the June 20, 2008 formal hearing with respect to the Penn Station.

On June 13, 2008 the Commission issued a notice of cancellation of the formal hearing and scheduled an informal hearing on June 19, 2008 at 1:30 p.m. in the Commission Hearing Room, State Capitol, Bismarck, ND. The informal hearing was held as scheduled.

On October 12, 2006 Enbridge was issued Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 95 and Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 105 to construct the Penn Station, Case No PU-06-349. The proposed upgrades to the Penn Station include the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, and the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment. All construction took place on land already owned by Enbridge within the existing station boundaries.



The State of North Dakota, acting through its North Dakota Public Service Commission (NDPSC), Division of Public Utilities, has engaged Keitu Engineers & Consultants, Inc. to perform consulting services for post-construction siting inspections. This report addresses the Orders established by the NDPSC and issues established in case file No. PU-07-791 for the Penn Station upgrade.

The Commission Orders of July 2, 2008 for Penn Station:

1. Enbridge is issued Second Amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 95 and Second Amended Route Permit Number 105 granting authority to upgrade the Penn Station.

The transmission facility corridor number 95 is designated by the Commission's September 20, 2006 Order in Case No. PU-06-349; is amended by the Commission's June 4, 2008 Order in Case No. PU-07-791 for Blaisdell, Denbigh, and Larimore Station upgrades; and is amended by the Commission's July 2, 2008 Order in Case No. Pu-07-791 for Penn Station upgrades.

The transmission facility route number 105 is designated by the Commission's September 20, 2006 Order in Case No. PU-06-349; is amended by the Commission's June 4, 2008 Order in Case No. PU-07-791 for Blaisdell, Denbigh, and Larimore Station upgrades; and is amended by Commission's July 2, 2008 Order in Case No. PU-07-791 for Penn Upgrades. Order #1 completed.

2. Second Amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 95 and Second Amended Route Permit Number 105 are effective for the life of the pipeline, but are subject to modification by order of the Commission if deemed necessary to further protect the public or the environment.

On July 2, 2008 the Commission granted a Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor Second Amended Corridor Certificate No. 95 and Route Permit for Construction of a Transmission Facility Second Amended Permit 105 (Docket #50) for construction of the Penn Station upgrade in Ramsey County, ND. Construction started the week of September 19th, 2008 with completion occurring November 6, 2009 at the Penn Station. The associated facilities were for upgraded. The Commission with Order # 2 has the option to modify the order if deemed necessary. No documentation was found in the case file to require the Commission to modify the corridor and route permits at this time.



3. Enbridge must obtain approval from the Commission prior to any changes in the pipeline route or structural locations.

As part of the Application (Docket #06-050) the conceptual site plan for Penn Station drawing No. 534-PSC-1001 was submitted to the Commission. Clouds on the drawing denoted the new work. The Penn Station as built drawing 534-P-10001 (Docket #130) was compared to the conceptual plan and it was determined that no changes in the pipeline route or structural locations occurred. Therefore, Order #3 was followed.

4. Enbridge shall comply with all the rules and regulations of all other agencies having jurisdiction over any phase of the proposed project, and prior to construction of any particular pumping station, shall obtain all other necessary licenses and permits for construction of that station, and shall provide copies to the Commission prior to construction of each station.

Reviewing the Exhibits from the Corridor Certificate and Route Permit (Docket #6) and correspondence letters in the case file (Docket #16-19), the following state and federal agencies: North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office; North Dakota Game and Fish Department; North Dakota Job Service, ND Parks & Recreation and the US Army Corp of Engineers commented on the eleven existing station upgrades.

Past cultural resource investigations had been conducted for the proposed Penn Station study area. The cultural resource material supplied from Case No. PU-06-349 (Docket #26) demonstrated that there will be minimal adverse effects by the proposed Penn Station construction. All construction took place on land already owned by Enbridge within the existing station boundaries. This material was used as evidence for case file PU-07-791.

In case file No. PU-06-349, Earthworks, Inc. completed a Class III Cultural Resource Inventory within the Penn Station area of potential effects, as defined through consultation with the ND SHPO (North Dakota State Historic Preservation Officer). The inventory recorded six new cultural resource sites. Five of the six sites are not recommended for NRHP. The grain elevator near the project area is unevaluated and assumed to be potentially eligible for inclusion on NRHP. Earthworks, Inc. recommended that the site be avoided by development of the pump station (Docket 1 Appendix C). In the application (Docket #1 Appendix C) Enbridge determined the site would be avoided with the proposed project. Earthworks, Inc also recommended a finding of No Historic Properties Affected.

On October 6, 2006 (PU-06-349 Docket # 26) The North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office issued a review letter of the Class III Cultural Resource Inventory for the pump station in Ramsey County, North Dakota. SHPO found the report acceptable. They concurred with a "No Historic Properties Affected" determination.

On April 8, 2008 the State Historical Society of North Dakota authored a letter (Docket #17) stating that they received and reviewed March 26, 2008 correspondence regarding 08-0604



“Enbridge Pipelines, LCC, Eleven (11) Existing Station Upgrades in North Dakota”, and offered no comments.

Exhibit E (Docket #6) of the application was a December 21, 2007 letter from the North Dakota Game and Fish Department. The letter was for Enbridge Pipelines Phase VI Expansion which involved the Penn Station. They had reviewed the project for wildlife concerns and did not believe it would have and significant adverse effects on wildlife or wildlife habitat, including endangered species.

North Dakota Job Service sent a letter of correspondence (Docket #16) on April 23, 2008 stating that they had no comments regarding the proposed project.

The North Dakota Parks & Recreation (NDP&R) sent a letter of correspondence (Docket #18) on April 15, 2008 on the Enbridge Pipelines LLC Pump Station Upgrades Case No. PU-07-791. The North Dakota Natural Heritage biological conservation database was used to review and determine if any plant or animal species of concern or other significant ecological communities are known to occur within an approximate one-mile radius of the project area. Based on the review, no occurrences were identified within or adjacent to the Penn Station project. They deferred further comments regarding animal species to the North Dakota Game and Fish Department and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

The NDP&R Department recommended that the project be accomplished with minimal impacts and that all efforts be made to ensure that critical habitats not be disturbed in the project area to help secure rare species conservation in North Dakota. Enbridge submitted a biological and wetland assessment as studies to determine where critical habitats and rare species were in the area to assist in following Enbridge’s Environmental Guidelines for Construction (Docket #6 Exhibit G).

The US Army Corp of Engineers sent a letter (Docket #19) with review comments about the Enbridge Pipelines pump station upgrades sitting application. The follow are comments and discussion:

The Federal flood plain management criterion basically states that construction which could be damaged by floodwaters or which could obstruct flood flows should not be located in the 100-year flood plain. Any nonresidential construction that could be damaged by floodwater must be placed above or flood proofed to above the 100-year floodwater surface elevation. All construction should be designed to minimize potential harm to or within the flood plain. Higher levels of protection are encouraged to provide added safety. If the operation of the constructed facilities is considered critical during flood periods, the facilities should be protected from at least the 500-year flood. The Penn Station is out of the flood plains.

Other agencies had an opportunity to mandate any requirements to be follow by their agency but did not respond. Agencies such as the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the North Dakota Health Department, and the North Dakota State Water Commission’s usually comment on PSC projects of this nature. None of the agencies had any objection to the Penn Station Upgrade Project. Order #4 was followed.



- 5. Enbridge shall obtain written waivers from affected landowners for location of the pipeline within 500 feet of a residence, school, or place of business prior to any construction in those areas.**

Penn Station was the only station that had affected landowners for locations within 500 feet of the construction area. On July 2, 2008 the Commission received correspondence (Docket #51) from Enbridge providing waiver letters from all affected landowners within 500 feet of the construction area. Letters signed also granted late permission for the 2006 construction upgrade at the Penn Station site. Order #5 was completed.

- 6. A preconstruction conference shall be held prior to the commencement of any construction. The conference shall include an Enbridge representative, Enbridge's construction supervisor, and Commission staff, to ensure that Enbridge fully understands the conditions set forth in this order.**

A memorandum (Docket #55) from Patrick Fahn on July 18, 2008 stated that on May 17, 2008 a pre-construction conference was held (by conference call). In attendance were Brent Horton (Manager, Regional Services and Development, Enbridge); Trent Mattick (Supervisor, Construction Services, Enbridge); Edward Kelly (Supervising Project Manager, Rooney Engineering); Troy Pierantoni (Project Execution Manager, Rooney Engineering); Tim Kinney (Project Manager for Penn and Larimore, Rooney Engineering); Gene Rieker (Lead Engineer for Penn and Larimore, Rooney Engineering); Paul Giron (Project Manager for Minot, Denbigh, Pleasant Lake and Bartlett, Rooney Engineering); Josh Whisenhunt (Lead Engineer for Minot, Denbigh, Pleasant Lake and Bartlett, Rooney Engineering); and Ty France (Project Manager for Alexander, Trenton, Beaver Lodge, Stanley, and Blaisdell, Rooney Engineering), and himself.

The conference included a review of the Commission's Order, the penalty provisions of NDCC § 49-22-21, and a question and answer period. Order # 6 is completed.

- 7. Enbridge shall inform the Commission of the date construction will start just prior to the commencement of construction; report to the Commission on the date construction is started; and, once construction has started, shall keep the Commission updated on construction activities on a weekly basis.**

On July 28, 2008 the Commission received official email notice (Docket #56) stating that construction was to start August 4th, 2008 at the Larimore station. Penn Station started construction on the week of September 19, 2008. 2008 construction continued with weekly progress reports to November 14, 2008. Penn station started construction again on March 27, 2009 with construction and cleanup being completed by November 6, 2009. Weekly updates were sent for construction during the Penn Station construction period. Therefore, Order #7 was followed.



8. Enbridge shall construct and operate the pipeline facilities in the manner described in its application, as revised at the hearing or in late filed exhibits and supplemental materials, and in accordance with all applicable safety requirements.

Design, construction and operation of the pipeline and related facilities were to be in accordance with U.S. Department of Transportation regulations governing the 195 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Transportation of Hazardous Liquids by Pipelines.

Size, type, and design information was identified in the amended application/route permit application (Docket # 6 Section A.3 corridor). The application, weekly progress reports (Docket # 58-77, 81-96, 99-127), and as built drawings (Docket # 130) gave information to assist in the evaluation of Order #8. The proposed upgrades to the Penn Station included the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, and the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment.

In the application (Docket # 6), size and design was spelled out. The application in this section identified what was to be done at the stations and the 10 year plan also identified design pressures.

The weekly progress reports identified start dates, and had minor construction information about the design. The weekly progress reports identified what, where, and when things were completed on the project. Some pictures were provided. Pictures showed proper supports being used, use of ladders, fire extinguisher on site, PPE being worn, and proper sloping for excavations.

The as built diagrams showed the actual piping design site plan for the Penn Station. The as built was compared with the conceptual site plan in the application to verify the facilities were constructed in the manner described in application. The new upgrade piping at the station was connected to the pipeline's cathodic protection.

No record of tests to establish maximum operating pressure for the design maximum operating pressure (MOP) was found for the station piping in the case file. Passing the pressure test insures that no irreparable damage occurred on the station piping during construction and operation of the stations are within design limits. A written record of the Penn Station pressure test should be requested from Enbridge by the Commission to complete the case file. Letter can be submitted with a summary of description what was tested, actual pressure, length of time tests occurred, and dates. Letter should state that all new materials and equipment was tested and has proper pressure rating.

Based on the limited information in the case file and a post-construction field inspection, Enbridge had constructed the pipeline in the manner identified in the application, late exhibits and supplemental material. Enbridge is currently operating the pipeline and is following the manner described by the Commission's requirements. Once a written record of the Penn Station pressure test is obtained for the Commission's file, Order # 8 will be complete.



- 9. Enbridge shall promptly report to the Commission the presence in the permit area of any critical habitat of threatened or endangered species, or of bald or golden eagles which Enbridge becomes aware of and that were not previously reported to the Commission.**

At the pre-construction conference on May 17, 2008 with the Commission's staff (Docket # 55), Enbridge understood and agreed that it shall promptly report to the Commission the presence in the permit area of any critical habitat of threatened or endangered species, or of bald or golden eagles that Enbridge becomes aware of during construction. Construction occurred within existing fenced industrial area. A review of the weekly construction progress reports (Docket # 58-77, 81-96, 99-127) did not note any critical habitat in the area during construction. No report of any critical habitat of threatened or endangered species, or of bald or golden eagle's notification to the Commission was found in case file No. PU-07-791. Therefore, Order #9 is completed.

- 10. Crossings of graded roads shall be bored unless the responsible governing agency specifically permits Enbridge to open cut the road.**

The new construction occurred on a parcel of land that was owned by Enbridge. The Penn Station did not require any road crossings. Therefore, no boring or trenching of roads occurred. Order # 10 was followed.

- 11. All pre-existing roads and lanes used during construction must be restored to a condition that will accommodate their previous use, and areas used as temporary roads or working areas during construction must be restored to their original condition.**

Enbridge used existing public roads and access roads to the construction sites. Existing roads that were paved or graveled did not require modification. Original roads looked the same as prior to construction using Google Earth aerial images. Order # 11 is completed.

- 12. If any cultural resource, paleontological resource, archeological resource, historical resource, or gravesite is discovered during construction of the facility, earth disturbing activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery must be halted. The resource must be marked, preserved and protected from any further disturbance until a professional examination can be made in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). A report of such examination must be filed with the SHPO and the Commission. Clearance to proceed must be given by the SHPO and the Commission.**

Past cultural resource investigations had been conducted for the proposed Penn Station study area. The cultural resource material supplied from Case No. PU-06-349 (Docket #26) demonstrated that there will be minimal adverse effects by the proposed Penn Station construction. All construction took place on land already owned by Enbridge within the existing station boundaries. This material was used as evidence for Case No. PU-07-791.



In Case No. PU-06-349, Earthworks, Inc. completed a Class III Cultural Resource Inventory within the Penn Station area of potential effects, as defined through consultation with the ND SHPO (North Dakota State Historic Preservation Officer). The inventory recorded six new cultural resource sites. Five of the six sites are not recommended for NRHP. The grain elevator near the project area is unevaluated and assumed to be potentially eligible for inclusion on NRHP. Earthworks, Inc. recommended that the site be avoided by development of the pump station (Docket 1 Appendix C). In the application (Docket #1 Appendix C) Enbridge determined the site would be avoided with the proposed project. Earthworks, Inc also recommended a finding of No Historic Properties Affected.

On October 6, 2006 (PU-06-349 Docket # 26) The North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office issued a review letter of the Class III Cultural Resource Inventory for the pump station in Ramsey County, North Dakota. SHPO found the report acceptable. They concurred with a "No Historic Properties Affected" determination.

On April 8, 2008 the State Historical Society of North Dakota authored a letter (Docket #17) stating that they received and reviewed March 26, 2008 correspondence regarding 08-0604 "Enbridge Pipelines, LCC, Eleven (11) Existing Station Upgrades in North Dakota", and offered no comments.

No cultural resource, paleontological site, archeological site, historical site, or grave site was discovered during construction. This is based on review of weekly construction progress reports and verification that no correspondence was identified in the case file. Order #12 was followed.

13. During construction, at least 12 inches of topsoil, where available (or topsoil to the depth of cultivation, whichever is greater), over and along areas where facilities will be placed must be stripped and segregated from subsoil. Any area on which excavated subsoil will be placed must first be stripped of topsoil. After backfilling with subsoil is completed, any excess subsoil must be placed over the excavation area, blending the grade into existing topography. Topsoil must not be placed within the footprint of the pump station, and must be placed over areas containing topsoil.

All construction took place on land already owned by Enbridge within the existing station boundaries. Penn Station upgrades took place in the existing fenced class 5 gravel area. The top soil had been removed in this area when the site was constructed previously. The top soil was removed in this area because the site was graveled and fenced. By removing the top soil permanently, it helps reduce vegetation growing in the graveled area in the future. The PSC field inspection on June 9, 2011 verified the topsoil was not placed back within the footprint of the pump station. Order #13 is completed.



14. Construction must be suspended during periods when weather conditions are such that construction activities would cause irreparable harm to the environment, unless adequate measures approved by the Commission are taken.

Penn Station started construction on the week of September 19, 2008. The 2008 construction continued with weekly progress reports to November 14, 2008. Construction was suspended at that time due to weather. Penn station started construction again on March 27, 2009 with construction and cleanup being completed by November 6, 2009.

Enbridge acted responsible based on review of the construction progress reports. Based on review of the progress reports, construction was suspended when weather conditions were such that construction should not occur. Order # 14 was followed.

15. Reclamation and clean-up along the right-of-way must be continuous and coordinated with ongoing construction.

Clean up included clean up, station painting, and insulating smaller piping according to the weekly progress reports. Based on weekly progress reports, cleanup started the week of August 7, 2009 and completion on October 9, 2009 with completion of insulation. Reclamation and clean-up was continuous and coordinated with ongoing construction. The PSC post construction field inspection verified reclamation and clean-up occurred. Order #15 was followed and is complete.

16. Reclamation, fertilization and reseeding must be done by Enbridge according to the Natural Resource Conservation Service unless otherwise specified by the landowner and approved by the Commission.

No correspondence about reclamation, fertilization, and reseeding measures were found in the case file. The property used for the Penn Station was owned by Enbridge. The station site where construction occurred was graveled with Class 5 material and fenced. Therefore, no reclamation, fertilization and reseeding was required. Order # 16 was completed.

17. Enbridge's obligation for reclamation and maintenance of the right-of-way shall continue throughout the life of the pipeline.

The site upgrade occurred within the station facility that is fenced and graveled. The site area is relatively flat. The PSC post construction field inspection of June 9, 2011 verified class 5 material was installed around the upgrade project additions as part of the reclamation. Additional reclamation and maintenance required at Station site would be annual weed control. The PSC post construction field inspection verified excellent weed control. Based on viewing Google Earth 2011 images of the sites (8/31/09 for the Penn station), proper weed maintenance occurs at this facility. Reclamation and maintenance has occurred at this station. Compliance of Order #17 has occurred.



18. Enbridge shall construct and operate the pipeline in the manner described in its application, and in accordance with all applicable safety requirements.

Design, construction and operation of the pipeline and related facilities are to be in accordance with U.S. Department of Transportation regulations governing the 195 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Transportation of Hazardous Liquids by Pipelines.

Initial Design information was identified in the application (Docket #6), weekly progress reports (Docket # 58-77, 81-96, 99-127) , and as built drawings (Docket #130) gave information to assist in the evaluation of order #18.

Size, type, and design information was identified in the amended application/route permit application (Docket #6 Section A.3 corridor). The application, weekly progress reports (Docket # 58-77, 81-96, 99-127), and as built drawings (Docket # 130) gave information to assist in the evaluation of Order # 8. The proposed upgrades to the Penn Station included the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, and the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment.

In the application (Docket # 6), size and design was spelled out. The application identified what was to be done at the stations and the 10 year plan identified design pressures.

The weekly progress reports identified start dates, and had minor construction information about the design. The weekly progress reports identified what, where, and when things were completed on the project. Some pictures were provided. Pictures showed proper supports being used, use of ladders, fire extinguisher on site, PPE being worn, and proper sloping for excavations.

The as built diagrams showed the actual piping design site plan for the Penn Station. The as built was compared with the conceptual site plan in the application to verify the facilities were constructed in the manner described in application. The new upgrade piping at each station was connected to the pipeline's cathodic protection.

No record of tests to establish maximum operating pressure for the design maximum operating pressure (MOP) was found for the station piping in the case file. Passing the pressure test insures that no irreparable damage occurred on the station piping during construction and operation of the stations are within design limits. A written record of the Penn Station pressure test should be requested from Enbridge by the Commission to complete the case file. Letter can be submitted with a summary of description what was tested, actual pressure, length of time tests occurred, and dates. Letter should state that all new materials and equipment was tested and has proper pressure rating.

On September 16th, 2006 (PU-06-300, Docket #29) Enbridge addressed potential noise levels. Enbridge calculated dBA levels to be 45 and below past 300 feet from the source. Enbridge expected no concerns with noise near the neighboring buildings near the stations.



Based on the limited information in the case file and a post-construction inspection, Enbridge had constructed and is maintaining the station in the manner described in its application, and in accordance with all applicable safety requirements. The written record of the pressure test is required for completion of Order #18.

19. Enbridge shall comply with the Commission's Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications attached to this order.

Part of the Order granting the Certificate of Corridor Compatibility and Route Permit of July 2, 2008 (Docket # 50) included a Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications that were required as part of the Orders. The Penn Station upgrade occurred within existing industrial station site where all trees and scrubs had been removed previously prior to the Commission's orders.

In reviewing the site using Google Earth aerial photos of before and after construction, no trees or shrubs were required to be inventoried, cleared, and replaced. Therefore, the Commission's Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications may not have been required for this project. Enbridge should provided written verification that no trees or shrubs were affected or comply with the Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specification to complete Order #19.

20. Enbridge shall provide the Commission with a hard copy and electronic copy of the design specifications for the construction of the Penn Station showing the location of the project facilities as built, and an electronic version of the as-built design specifications that can be imported into ESRI GIS mapping software, and shall provide this information within 3 months of the completion of the construction.

Enbridge provided a CD (Docket #129) on March 4, 2010 of the as built GIS drawing 534-P-10001 in GIS format according to the cover letter in the file. No record of the GIS electronic version was found in the records provided to Keitu Engineers & Consultants, Inc. for the post construction inspection. Enbridge also provided a CD (Docket #130) of the Penn Station as built .pdf drawing on March 18th, 2010 of drawing 534-P-10001 plot plan (hard copy substitute). Completion of the Penn Station was complete as of October 9, 2009 according to the weekly progress reports. The as built sent to the Commission was only a site plan. Penn Station as built was sent with other as built stations within the 3 month period of the other station sites completion dates but not the Penn Station. The Penn Station as built information was provided about 5 months after the Penn Station site was completed. Order #20 is completed but after the 3 month completion requirement.



**Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC
10 Pumping Station Upgrades
Alexander(McKenzie), Trenton (Williams), Beaver Lodge (Williams),
Stanley (Mountrail), Blaisdell (Mountrail), Denbigh (McHenry), Minot
(Ward), Pheasant Lake(Benson), Bartlett (Ramsey), and Larimore
(Grand Forks)**

Prepared by Timothy Spilman, Project Manager, Keitu Engineering & Consultants, Inc.
Final Report

Executive Summary

Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC upgraded eleven existing pump stations in North Dakota on its existing Alexander to Clearbrook crude petroleum pipeline. This post construction report is to help the Commission with verification that the June 4, 2008 Order's (Docket #36) set for by them are completed by Enbridge for 10 pumping station upgrades. This post construction report addressed the June 4, 2008 Orders in File PU-07-791 for 10 station upgrades. Prior facility orders for the pipeline were not included in the post construction. The Penn Station upgrade was issued with a separate set of Order on July 2, 2008.

As built drawings for Trenton and Minot stations are still required to be provided by Enbridge. The drag reducer agent (DRA) skid location needs to be provided on the Alexander and Pleasant Lake as built drawings. Some structural locations and pipeline routing in Beaver Lodge, Blaisdell, Minot, Pleasant Lake, Bartlett, and Larimore station are different in the siting application conceptual drawings compared to the as built. No record was found in the case file that approval of these structural location changes were approved by the Commission. Additional equipment or facilities were installed in the Stanley, Blaisdell, and Minot stations that were not identified in the Enbridge's siting application. Final painting within the stations is occurring at the Stanley, Alexander, and Minot stations in June of 2011. See Order #6 for more detail. These issues need to be resolved between Enbridge and the Commission to complete Order # 6.

Beaver Lodge Station, Stanley Station, Blaisdell Station, Minot Station, Pleasant Lake Station and Denbigh Station need addition documentation that final clean-up, painting, and insulation at these stations occurred and when. Alexander Station weekly progress reports were not complete to verify continuous and coordinated reclamation and clean up occurred. The November 8th, 2010 progress report identified 0% of clean-up completed at the Alexander Station. That was the last progress report for the Alexander Station in the case file. More information is required by Enbridge for these seven stations to verify reclamation and clean up was continuous and coordinated with ongoing construction to complete Order # 10 & # 18.



Based on the limited information in the case file and a post construction inspection, Enbridge had constructed the pipeline in the manner identified in the application, late exhibits and supplemental material unless noted in this report. Enbridge is currently operating the pipeline and is following the manner described by the Commission's requirements. Once a written record of the station pressure tests are obtained for the case file, Order # 11 and #21 will be complete.

The Commission's Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications may not have been required for this project. Enbridge should provided written verification that no trees or shrubs were affected and that the Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specification was not required or comply with the mitigation specification to complete Order #22.

For Order # 23, the facility plot plans for Beaver Lodge, Denbigh, Penn, Blaisdell, Pleasant Lake, Bartlett, Larimore, and Stanley Stations were provided within the 3 months of completion of the construction. No as built drawings have been provided for Trenton Station. Minot and Alexander station as built drawings were provided after the 3 month completion date based on Ed Kelly's email (Docket #127) of December 11, 2009. Enbridge need to send the Commission as built drawings for Trenton and Minot station for the case file. The Alexander, Trenton, and Minot station as built design specification were not provided within 3 months of completion of the construction based on the documentation in the case file.

Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC has complied with all other June 4, 2008 Order requests of the Commission for the 10 station upgrades.

Preliminary Statement

Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC (Enbridge) owns and operates an existing crude petroleum pipeline extending from near Alexander, North Dakota, to Clearbrook, Minnesota.

On February 20, 2008 Enbridge Pipelines (North Dakota) LLC (Enbridge) filed a consolidated letter of intent and request for waiver of procedures and time schedules, and a request to amend its existing corridor or route permit to upgrade 11 existing stations in North Dakota. Enbridge upgraded the existing Alexander Station in McKenzie County, the Trenton Station and Beaver Lodge Station in Williams County, Stanley Station and Blaisdell Station in Mountrail County, Minot Station in Ward County, Denbigh Station in McHenry County, Pleasant Lake Station in Benson County, Penn Station and Bartlett Station in Ramsey County, and Larimore Station in Grand Forks County on its existing crude oil pipeline. With the exception of a small parcel of land at Beaver Lodge Station to be acquired by Enbridge, all construction took take place on land already owned by Enbridge within the existing station boundaries. The Penn Station upgrade was address in separate orders on July 2, 2008. The Commission found it appropriate to waive procedures and time schedules as requested in the application.



Alexander Station

In its October 12, 2006 Amended Order, Case No. PU-06-317, the Commission issued to Enbridge a Second Amended Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 40 and Second Amended Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 49 granting authority to upgrade the Alexander Station. An environmental assessment update and a cultural resource survey were provided in that proceeding. The Alexander Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, a control station, and a drag reducer agent skid and equipment.

Trenton Station

In its October 12, 2006 Amended Order, Case No. PU-06-317, the Commission issued to Enbridge a Second Amended Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 40 and Second Amended Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 49 granting authority to upgrade the Trenton Station. An environmental assessment update and a cultural resource survey were provided in that proceeding. The Trenton Station upgrades included the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment.

Beaver Lodge

In its October 12, 2006 Amended Order, Case No. PU-06-317, the Commission issued to Enbridge a Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 93 and a Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 103 granting authority to upgrade the Beaver Lodge Station. An environmental assessment and cultural resource survey were provided in that proceeding. The Beaver Lodge Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, the modification of an existing pump, manifold modification, and the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, and upgrades to the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system.

A new cultural resource investigation was conducted for the Beaver Lodge Station since some of the upgrade work was on new land acquired by Enbridge. The cultural resource survey material was compiled for the application.

Stanley

In its October 12, 2006 Amended Order, Case No. PU-06-317, the Commission issued to Enbridge a Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 93 and a Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 103 granting authority to upgrade the Stanley Station. An environmental assessment and cultural resource survey were provided in that proceeding. The Stanley Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, upgrades to the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system, and a new power service installation.



Blaisdell

In its October 12, 2006 Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, Case No. PU-06-349, the Commission issued to Enbridge a Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 95 and a Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 105 granting authority to construct the new Blaisdell Station. An environmental assessment and cultural resource inventory were provided in that proceeding. The Blaisdell Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, and a new power service installation.

Minot

The Minot Station was constructed in the early 1960s prior to the Siting Act. In this proceeding, the Minot Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, and a new power service installation.

A new cultural resource investigation was conducted for the Minot Station. The cultural resource survey material was compiled for the application.

Denbigh

In its October 12, 2006 Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, Case No. PU-06-349, the Commission issued to Enbridge a Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 95 and a Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 105 granting authority to construct the new Denbigh Station. An environmental assessment and cultural resource inventory was provided in that proceeding. The Denbigh Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, and the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment.

Pleasant Lake

The Pleasant Lake Station was constructed in the early 1960s prior to the Siting Act. In this proceeding, the Pleasant Lake Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, new header and piping including valves, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, and a new power service installation.

A new cultural resource investigation was conducted for the Pleasant Lake Station. The cultural resource survey material was compiled for the application.

Bartlett

The Bartlett Station was constructed in the early 1960s prior to the Siting Act. In this proceeding, the Bartlett Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, new header and piping including valves, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, and a new power service installation.



A new cultural resource investigation was conducted for the Bartlett Station. The cultural resource survey material was compiled for the application.

Larimore

In its October 12, 2006 Amended Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order, Case No. PU-06-349, the Commission issued to Enbridge a Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 95 and a Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 105 granting authority to construct the new Larimore Station. An environmental assessment and cultural resource inventory was provided in that proceeding. The Larimore Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and upgrades to the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system.

The State of North Dakota, acting through its North Dakota Public Service Commission (NDPSC), Division of Public Utilities, engaged Keitu Engineers & Consultants, Inc. to perform consulting services for post-construction siting inspections. This report addresses the July 2, 2008 orders established by the NDPSC and issues established in case file No. PU-07-791.

The Commission Orders of June 4, 2008 for 10 Station Upgrades:

- 1. Enbridge is issued Fourth Amended Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 40 and Fourth Amended Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 49 granting authority to upgrade the Alexander Station and the Trenton Station.**

Certificate of Corridor Compatibility No. 40 and the Route Permit No. 49 were to construct and operate an 8-inch oil pipeline with associated facilities and pipeline interconnections from the Alexander Station to the Beaver Lodge Station in Williams and McKenzie Counties, ND. The fourth amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility and fourth amended Route Permit of June 4, 2008 are for Case No. PU-07-791 to construct the Alexander and Trenton Station upgrades. Order # 1 is completed.

- 2. Enbridge is issued First Amended Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission Facility Corridor No. 93 and First Amended Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 103 granting authority to upgrade the Beaver Lodge Station and the Stanley Station.**

Certificate of Corridor Compatibility No. 93 and the Route Permit No. 103 were to construct and operate the Beaver Lodge Station and Stanley Station with associated facilities and pipeline interconnections in Williams and Mountrail Counties, ND. The first amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility and first amended Route Permit of June 4, 2008 are for Case No. PU-07-791 for Beaver Lodge and Stanley Station upgrades. Order #2 is completed.



- 3. Enbridge is issued First Amended Certificate of Site Compatibility for Transmission facility Corridor No. 95 and First Amended Permit for the Construction of a Transmission Facility No. 105 granting authority to upgrade the Blaisdell Station, the Denbigh Station, and the Larimore Station.**

Certificate of Corridor Compatibility No. 95 and the Route Permit No. 105 were to construct and operate the Blaisdell Station, Denbigh Station, Penn Station, and Larimore Station with associated facilities and pipeline interconnections in Mountrail, McHenry, Ramsey, and Grand Forks Counties, ND. The first amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility and first amended Route Permit of June 4, 2008 are for Case No. PU-07-791 for Blaisdell, Denbigh, and Larimore Station upgrades. Order # 3 is completed.

- 4. Enbridge is issued Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 103 and Route Permit Number 113 granting authority to upgrade the Minot Station, the Pleasant Lake Station, and the Bartlett Station.**

Certificate of Corridor Compatibility No. 103 and the Route Permit No. 113 were to construct and operate the Minot Station, Pleasant Lake Station, and Bartlett Station with associated facilities and pipeline interconnections in Ward, Benson, and Ramsey Counties, ND. The Certificate of Corridor Compatibility and Route Permit of June 4, 2008 are for Case No. PU-07-791 for Minot, Pleasant Lake, and Bartlett Station upgrades. Order #3 is completed

- 5. Fourth Amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 40, Fourth Amended Route Permit Number 49, First Amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 93, First Amended route Permit Number 103 First Amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 95, First Amended Route Permit Number 105, Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 103 and Route Permit Number 113 are effective for the life of the pipeline, but are subject to modification by order of the Commission if deemed necessary to further protect the public or the environment.**

On June 4, 2008 the Commission granted a fourth amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 40, Fourth Amended Route Permit Number 49, First Amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 93, First Amended route Permit Number 103 First Amended Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 95, First Amended Route Permit Number 105, Certificate of Corridor Compatibility Number 103 and Route Permit Number 113 for the construction of 10 station upgrades. Construction started the week of August 4th, 2008 at Pheasant Lake with completion occurring November 8, 2010 at the Alexander Station. The associated facilities were for upgraded. The Commission with this Order # 5 has the option to modify the order if deemed necessary. No record was found in the Commission's file that should require a modification by order of the Commission at this time. Order #5 remains in effect for the life of the pipeline.



6. Enbridge must obtain approval from the Commission prior to any changes in the pipeline route or structural locations.

As part of the Application (Docket #06-050) the 11 conceptual site plans for the stations were submitted to the Commission. Clouds on the drawings denoted the new upgrade additions. The conceptual site plans were compared to the as built plans. The following are the PSC inspector's findings;

Alexander Station

The Alexander Station upgrades proposed were to include the addition of pumps, a control station, and a drag reducer agent skid and equipment. The Alexander Station as built drawing was sent on March 22, 2011 (Docket #150). All upgrade additions were installed in the conceptual locations except the DRA skid. No record was found on the as built drawing of the location of the DRA skid at the Alexander Station. Enbridge needs to provide an as built with the DRA skid to verify the location is the same as the proposed.

Trenton Station

The Trenton Station proposed upgrades were to include the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment. No final as built drawing of the Trenton Station was found in the Commission case file PU-07-791. The PSC field inspection on June 8th, 2011 verified construction at Trenton was complete. The Commission should request Enbridge provide an as built drawing of this station to verify Trenton station upgrades were located as in the proposed conceptual drawing.

Beaver Lodge

The Beaver Lodge Station proposed upgrades include the addition of pumps, the modification of an existing pump, manifold modification, and the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, and upgrades to the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system. The conceptual site plan (DWG. No. 534-PSC-0401) had 3 options of an additional 55,000 barrel tank. Option 3 was selected base on the as-built drawing (Docket # 130-20). The DRA skid location was different on the as-built compared to the conceptual. No record was found in the case file that approval of the structural location change was approved by the Commission. All other upgrade additions were installed in the conceptual locations.

Stanley

The Stanley Station upgrades were to include the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent (DRA) skid and equipment, upgrades to the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system, and a new power service installation. Two Stanley Station as built drawings were sent to the Commission. The first was DWG. No. 609-P-05001 issued by Rooney Engineering on 10/24/2009 (Docket #130-120) and DWG. No. 609-P-05001 issued by Rooney Engineering on 2/24/2011 (Docket #150). All upgrade additions in the siting application proposed conceptual drawing were installed as shown based on the as built



drawings. However, the two as built drawings showed a new meter run, booster pumps, a sump tank, and a new fill manifold that were also installed but were not identified in the siting application and no record of approval of these additional property unit items were found in the case file PU-07-791. The second as built drawing of 2/24/2011 (Docket # 150) also shows a new tank installed in the northeast corner of the site that is not in the proposed conceptual siting application record.

Blaisdell

The Blaisdell Station upgrades were to include the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, and a new power service installation. The DRA skid location was different on the as-built compared to the conceptual. No record was found in the case file of approval of the structural location change by the Commission. An additional piece of equipment which is a property unit was installed that was not described in the siting application. A heat exchanger was installed in the northwest corner of the facility based on the as built drawing (Docket #130-60). All other upgrade additions were installed in the conceptual locations.

Minot

The Minot Station upgrades included the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, and a new power service installation. No as built drawing of the Minot station was found in the case file. On June 8th, 2011 during the PSC field inspection, Enbridge provided an as built 1/26/10 site plan drawing (DWG. No 534-P-07001). Enbridge should send this as built drawing to the Commission for their case file. In comparing the conceptual proposed drawing (DWG. No. 534-PSC-0701) to the as built drawing, the following was verified. The DRA skid location was different on the as-built compared to the conceptual. No record was found in the case file that approval of the structural location change was approved by the Commission. Additional equipment which is property units was installed that was not described in the siting application. In the southwest corner of the station a meter set with 3 meters was installed. South of the DRA skid, a launcher, and a sump tank was added that was not in the siting application and no record of approve of this equipment was found in the case file. Also, just west of the berm between tank M-6005 and tank M-6004 a meter set with 3 meters, and 2 booster pumps were installed that were not part of the siting application conceptual drawing. The conceptual piping manifold in this area was relocated from a north/south piping route to an east/west piping route. No Commission approval of these additions or reroutes were found in the case file. All other upgrade additions were installed in the conceptual locations.



Denbigh

The Denbigh Station upgrade were to include the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, and the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment. All upgrade equipment and buildings were installed in there conceptual locations at this station.

Pleasant Lake

The Pleasant Lake Station upgrades were to include the addition of pumps, new header and piping including valves, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent (DRA) skid and equipment, and a new power service installation. The Control building location was different on the as-built compared to the conceptual. No record was found in the Commission file that approval of the structural location change was approved by the Commission. The DRA skid was not found on the as-built drawing (Docket 130-070). All other upgrade additions were installed in the conceptual locations. The existing pumps and DRA skid were removed from the old site and retired as part of this project.

Bartlett

The Bartlett Station upgrades were to include the addition of pumps, new header and piping including valves, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent skid and equipment, and a new power service installation. The Control building location was positioned different on the as-built compared to the conceptual. No record was found in the Commission file that approval of the structural location change was approved by the Commission. All other upgrade additions were installed in the conceptual locations. The existing mainline pumps were removed from the old site and retired as part of this project.

Larimore

The Larimore Station upgrade was to include the addition of pumps, the addition of a control building, the addition of a drag reducer agent (DRA) skid and upgrades to the Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition system. The DRA skid location was different on the as-built compared to the conceptual that was part of the siting application. No record was found in the Commission file that approval of the structural location change was approved by the Commission. All other upgrade additions were installed in the conceptual locations.

As built drawings for Trenton and Minot stations are still required to be provided by Enbridge. The drag reducer agent (DRA) skid location needs to be provided on the Alexander and Pleasant Lake as built drawings. Some structural locations and pipeline routing in Beaver Lodge, Blaisdell, Minot, Pleasant Lake, Bartlett, and Larimore station are different in the siting application conceptual drawings compared to the as built. No record was found in the Commission file that approval of these structural location changes was approved by the



Commission. Additional equipment or facilities were installed in the Stanley, Blaisdell, and Minot stations that were not identified in the Enbridge's siting application. Final painting within the stations is occurring at the Stanley, Alexander, and Minot stations in June of 2011. These issues need to be resolved between Enbridge and the Commission to complete Order # 6.

- 7. Enbridge shall comply with all the rules and regulations of all other agencies having jurisdiction over any phase of the proposed project, and prior to construction of any particular pumping station, shall obtain all other necessary licenses and permits for construction of that station, and shall provide copies to the Commission prior to construction of each station.**

Reviewing the Exhibits from the Corridor Certificate and Route Permit (Docket #6) and correspondence letters in the case file (Docket #16-19), the following state and federal agencies: North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office; North Dakota Game and Fish Department; North Dakota Job Service, ND Parks & Recreation and the US Army Corp of Engineers commented on the eleven existing station upgrades.

Cultural resource investigations were conducted for all the proposed study areas around the projects. Previous studies were done for the Alexander, Trenton, Stanley, Blaisdell, Denbigh, and Larimore stations. A new study was done for Beaver Lodge, Minot, Pleasant Lake and Bartlett stations. The new study and old study concluded that no historic properties would be affected by the proposed Phase 6 project sites.

Two wetlands were sites identified by the Pleasant Lake station. However, these wetlands were not disturbed during the project activities. No wetlands were found around any of the other station sites.

Enbridge's biological studies did not identify any areas where animals or plant species that are unique or rare animals to the State would be irreversibly damaged by the proposed projects. All upgrades to station sites were constructed on land already owned by Enbridge except where the Beaver Lodge tank farm facility was added.

On October 6, 2006 (PU-06-349 Docket # 26) The North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office issued a review letter of the Class III Cultural Resource Inventory for the pump station in Ramsey County, North Dakota. SHPO found the report acceptable. They concurred with a "No Historic Properties Affected" determination.

On October 17, 2007 (Docket #6 Exhibit C) the North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office issued correspondence that it reviewed ND SHPO REF. 08-0047 Phase 6 Expansion Beaver Lodge Station, Minot Station, Pleasant Lake Station, and Bartlett Station in North Dakota and concurred with a "No Historic Properties Affected," determination provided the projects are on the nature specified and in the mapped locations.

On April 8, 2008 the State Historical Society of North Dakota authored a letter (Docket #17) stating that they received and reviewed March 26, 2008 correspondence regarding 08-0604



PU-07-791 Post-Construction Report
Enbridge Pipeline (North Dakota) LLC
Upgrade of 10 Pump Stations-Phase 6 expansion
June 15, 2011

“Enbridge Pipelines, LCC, Eleven (11) Existing Station Upgrades in North Dakota”, and offered no comments.

Exhibit E (Docket #6) of the application was a December 21, 2007 letter from the North Dakota Game and Fish Department. The letter was for Enbridge Pipelines Phase VI Expansion. They had reviewed the project for wildlife concerns and did not believe it would have and significant adverse effects on wildlife or wildlife habitat, including endangered species.

North Dakota Job Service sent a letter of correspondence (Docket #16) on April 23, 2008 stating that they had no comments regarding the proposed project.

The North Dakota Parks & Recreation (NDP&R) sent a letter of correspondence (Docket #18) on April 15, 2008 on the Enbridge Pipelines LLC Pump Station Upgrades Case No. PU-07-791. The North Dakota Natural Heritage biological conservation database was used to review and determine if any plant or animal species of concern or other significant ecological communities are known to occur within an approximate one-mile radius of the project area. Based on the review, several occurrences were identified within or adjacent to the Pleasant Lake project area including *Cypripedium parviflorum* (small yellow lady’s-slipper orchid), *Equisetum sylvaticum* (wood horsetail), *Charadrius melodus* (piping plover), *Populus tremuloides*-*Populus balsamifera*/*Calamagrostis canadensis* swamp (poplar wetland), and *Betula pumila*/*Carex prairea* seepage shrubland (bog birch rich fen). No other occurrences were found at any other stations. They deferred further comments regarding animal species to the North Dakota Game and Fish Department and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

The NDP&R Department recommended that the project be accomplished with minimal impacts and that all efforts be made to ensure that critical habitats not be disturbed in the project area to help secure rare species conservation in North Dakota. Enbridge submitted a biological and wetland assessment as studies to determine where critical habitats and rare species were in the area to assist in following Enbridge’s Environmental Guidelines for Construction (Docket #6 Exhibit G).

The US Army Corp of Engineers sent a letter (Docket #19) with review comments about the Enbridge Pipelines pump station upgrades sitting application. The follow are comments and discussion:

The Federal flood plain management criterion basically states that construction which could be damaged by floodwaters or which could obstruct flood flows should not be located in the 100-year flood plain. Any nonresidential construction that could be damaged by floodwater must be placed above or flood proofed to above the 100-year floodwater surface elevation. All construction should be designed to minimize potential harm to or within the flood plain. Higher levels of protection are encouraged to provide added safety. If the operation of the constructed facilities is considered critical during flood periods, the facilities should be protected from at least the 500-year flood. All stations were out of the flood plains.



Other agencies had an opportunity to mandate any requirements to be followed by their agency but did not respond. Agencies such as the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the North Dakota Health Department, and the North Dakota State Water Commission's usually comment on PSC projects of this nature. None of the agencies had any objection to the Station Upgrade Projects. Order #7 was followed.

- 8. Enbridge shall obtain written waivers from affected landowners for location of the pipeline within 500 feet of a residence, school, or place of business prior to any construction in those areas.**

No residences, schools, or place of businesses were within 500 feet of the construction areas of the ten stations (Trenton, Alexander, Beaver Lodge, Stanley, Blaisdell, Minot, Denbigh, Pleasant Lake, and Bartlett). Therefore, no written waivers were required. Order # 8 was completed.

- 9. A preconstruction conference shall be held prior to the commencement of any construction. The conference shall include an Enbridge representative, Enbridge's construction supervisor, and Commission staff, to ensure that Enbridge fully understands the conditions set forth in this order.**

A memorandum (Docket #55) from Patrick Fahn on July 18, 2008 stated that on May 17, 2008 a pre-construction conference was held (by conference call). In attendance were Brent Horton (Manager, Regional Services and Development, Enbridge); Trent Mattick (Supervisor, Construction Services, Enbridge); Edward Kelly (Supervising Project Manager, Rooney Engineering); Troy Pierantoni (Project Execution Manager, Rooney Engineering); Tim Kinney (Project Manager for Penn and Larimore, Rooney Engineering); Gene Rieker (Lead Engineer for Penn and Larimore, Rooney Engineering); Paul Giron (Project Manager for Minot, Denbigh, Pleasant Lake and Bartlett, Rooney Engineering); Josh Whisenhunt (Lead Engineer for Minot, Denbigh, Pleasant Lake and Bartlett, Rooney Engineering); and Ty France (Project Manager for Alexander, Trenton, Beaver Lodge, Stanley, and Blaisdell, Rooney Engineering), and himself.

The conference included a review of the Commission's order, the penalty provisions of NDCC § 49-22-21, and a question and answer period. Order # 9 is completed.



- 10. Enbridge shall inform the Commission of the date construction will start just prior to the commencement of construction; report to the Commission on the date construction is started; and, once construction has started, shall keep the Commission updated on construction activities on a weekly basis.**

On July 28, 2008 the Commission received official email notice (Docket #56) stating that construction was to start August 4th, 2008 at the Larimore station. Weekly progress reports were sent weekly from August 7, 2008 (Docket #58) to December 12, 2008 (Docket #77), January 16, 2009 through December 11, 2009 (Docket 81-96, 99-127), and August 23, 2010 to November 8, 2010 (Docket #131-144).

The weekly progress report of December 11th, 2009 stated that construction clean-up and punch list for Beaver Lodge Station, Stanley Station, Blaisdell Station, Minot Station, and Denbigh Station would be completed the following week with a return in the spring for painting. No weekly progress report for the following week December 18th, 2009 and spring 2010 painting was found for these stations in the case file. Some station piping still required painting at the Minot station as of June 9th, 2011.

The December 11th, 2009 weekly progress report also identified that Civil, Mechanical, and Electrical work at Pleasant Lake Station was 100% complete. Clean-up was only 95% complete. No record was found that Clean-up at the Pleasant Lake Station in the case file. The PSC field inspection on June 9th, 2011 verified clean-up was complete.

In the December 4th, 2008 weekly report the Trenton Station electrical for the DRA skid was completed and that the phase 6 scope at Trenton station was complete. The December 11th weekly report mentioned clean-up and punch list was worked on. Trenton Station construction activities were updated weekly to completion.

The Larimore Station and Bartlett Lake Stations were updated weekly to completion based on the weekly progress reports.

The December 11th, 2009 weekly progress report stated that work at Alexander Station had been deemed not necessary at that time. If it became necessary at a later date, Enbridge would advise the Commission. Alexander Station weekly progress reports began on August 23, 2010 (Docket #131) and continued to November 8th, 2010 (Docket #144). That was the last weekly progress report on the Alexander Station. The November 8th, 2010 progress report identified 0% of clean-up, 70% of Civil, 82 % of mechanical and 10% of the electrical completed at the Alexander Station completed. Alexander Station was not updated to completion of weekly activities. More information is required to be provided by Enbridge that the Alexander Station was completed. The PSC field inspection of June 8th, 2011 verified that minor station piping still required painting. The piping was constructed during the winter months with painting to occur in June of 2011.

The Trenton Station, Larimore Station, and Bartlett Lake Stations had weekly updates on construction activities to their completion. Beaver Lodge Station, Stanley Station, Blaisdell Station, Minot Station, Pleasant Lake Station and Denbigh Station had updates except final



clean-up, painting, and insulation at these stations. Alexander Station was not updated to completion of weekly activities. The November 8th, 2010 progress report identified 0% of clean-up, 70% of Civil, 82 % of mechanical and 10% of the electrical completed at the Alexander Station. More information is required to be provided by Enbridge for these stations to complete part of Order # 10.

11. Enbridge shall construct and operate the pipeline facilities in the manner described in its application, as revised at the hearing or in late filed exhibits and supplemental materials, and in accordance with all applicable safety requirements.

Design, construction and operation of the pipeline and related facilities were to be in accordance with U.S. Department of Transportation regulations governing the 195 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Transportation of Hazardous Liquids by Pipelines.

Size, type, and design information was identified in the amended application/route permit application (Docket #6 Section A.3 corridor). The application, weekly progress reports (Docket # 58-77, 81-96, 99-127, 131-144), and as built drawings (Docket # 130) gave information to assist in the evaluation of Order #11. Items required for each station upgrade were identified in the application and are give in the Preliminary Statement at the beginning of this report.

In the application (Docket # 6), size and design was spelled out. The application in section A.3 or the corridor identified what was to be done at the stations and the 10 year plan also identified design pressures.

The weekly progress reports identified start dates, and had minor construction information about the design. The weekly progress reports identified what, where, and when things were completed on the project. Some pictures were provided. Pictures showed proper supports being used, use of ladders, fire extinguisher on site, PPE being worn, and proper sloping for excavations.

The as built diagrams showed the actual piping design site plan for the stations. The as built was compared with the conceptual site plan in the application to verify the facilities were constructed in the manner described in application. An as built drawing for the Trenton was not provided in the case file. The conceptual site plan was compared to the actual site during a PSC post construction field inspection to verify the facilities were constructed in the manner described in the application. The new upgrade piping at each station was connected to the pipeline's cathodic protection.

No record of tests to establish maximum operating pressure for the design maximum operating pressure (MOP) was found for the station piping in the case file. Passing the pressure test insures that no irreparable damage occurred on the station piping during construction and operation of the stations are within design limits. A written record of the Station pressure tests should be requested from Enbridge by the Commission to complete the Case file. A letter can be submitted with a summary of description what was tested, actual



pressure beginning and ending, length of time tests occurred, and dates. The letter should state that all new materials and equipment was tested and has proper pressure rating.

Based on the limited information in the case file and a post-construction inspection, Enbridge had constructed the pipeline in the manner identified in the application, late exhibits and supplemental material except as noted in this report. Enbridge is currently operating the pipeline and is following the manner described by the Commission's requirements. Once a written record of the station pressure tests are obtained for the Commission's file, Order # 11 will be complete.

- 12. Enbridge shall promptly report to the Commission the presence in the permit area of any critical habitat of threatened or endangered species, or of bald or golden eagles which Enbridge becomes aware of and that were not previously reported to the Commission.**

At the pre-construction conference on May 17, 2008 with the Commission's staff (Docket # 55), Enbridge understood and agreed that it shall promptly report to the Commission the presence in the permit area of any critical habitat of threatened or endangered species, or of bald or golden eagles that Enbridge becomes aware of during construction. Construction occurred within existing fenced industrial area except the area of the new tank at Beaver Lodge (4.2 acres). A review of the weekly construction progress reports (Docket # 58-77, 81-96, 99-127, #131-144) did not note any critical habitat in the area during construction. No report of any critical habitat of threatened or endangered species, or of bald or golden eagle's notification to the Commission was found in Case File No. PU-07-791. Therefore, Order # 12 is completed.

- 13. Crossings of graded roads shall be bored unless the responsible governing agency specifically permits Enbridge to open cut the road.**

All new construction occurred on a parcel of land that was owned by Enbridge. The Stations did not require any road crossings. Therefore, no boring or trenching of roads occurred. Order # 13 was followed.

- 14. All pre-existing roads and lanes used during construction must be restored to a condition that will accommodate their previous use, and areas used as temporary roads or working areas during construction must be restored to their original condition.**

Enbridge used existing public roads and access roads to the construction sites. Existing roads that were paved or graveled did not require modification. Original roads looked the same as prior to construction using Google Earth aerial images. Order # 14 is completed.



- 15. If any cultural resource, paleontological resource, archeological resource, historical resource, or gravesite is discovered during construction of the facility, earth disturbing activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery must be halted. The resource must be marked, preserved and protected from any further disturbance until a professional examination can be made in consultation with the SHPO. A report of such examination must be filed with the SHPO and the Commission. Clearance to proceed must be given by the SHPO and the Commission.**

Cultural resource investigations were conducted for all the proposed study areas around the projects. Previous studies were done for the Alexander, Trenton, Stanley, Blaisdell, Denbigh, and Larimore stations. A new study was done for Beaver Lodge, Minot, Pleasant Lake and Bartlett stations. The new study and old study concluded that no historic properties would be affected by the proposed Phase 6 project sites.

On October 6, 2006 (PU-06-349 Docket # 26) The North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office issued a review letter of the Class III Cultural Resource Inventory for the pump station in Ramsey County, North Dakota. SHPO found the report acceptable. They concurred with a "No Historic Properties Affected" determination.

On October 17, 2007 (Docket #6 Exhibit C) the North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office issued correspondence that it reviewed ND SHPO REF. 08-0047 Phase 6 Expansion Beaver Lodge Station, Minot Station, Pleasant Lake Station, and Bartlett Station in North Dakota and concurred with a "No Historic Properties Affected," determination provided the projects are on the nature specified and in the mapped locations.

On April 8, 2008 the State Historical Society of North Dakota authored a letter (Docket #17) stating that they received and reviewed March 26, 2008 correspondence regarding 08-0604 "Enbridge Pipelines, LCC, Eleven (11) Existing Station Upgrades in North Dakota", and offered no comments.

No cultural resource, paleontological site, archeological site, historical site, or grave site was discovered during construction. This is based on review of weekly construction progress reports and verification that no correspondence was identified in the Commission's file. Order #15 was followed.

- 16. During construction, at least 12 inches of topsoil, where available (or topsoil to the depth of cultivation, whichever is greater), over and along areas where facilities will be placed must be stripped and segregated from subsoil. Any area on which excavated subsoil will be placed must first be stripped of topsoil. After backfilling with subsoil is completed, any excess subsoil must be placed over the excavation area, blending the grade into existing topography. Topsoil must not be placed within the footprint of the pump station, and must be placed over areas containing topsoil.**

All construction took place on land already owned by Enbridge within the existing station boundaries. Station upgrades took place in the existing fenced/ Class 5 material area with the



exception of a 4.2 acre tank area at Beaver Lodge Station. The top soil at the stations had been removed previously when the sites were constructed previously. The top soil was removed in this area because the site was graveled and fenced. By removing the top soil permanently, it helps reduce vegetation growing in the graveled area in the future.

The 4.2 acres of grassland that was converted to industrial land at the Beaver Lodge Station had the top soil removed before construction. In the weekly progress report for October 17, 2008 (Docket # 69) pictures showed the black dirt stripped off the surface and bermed at the Beaver Lodge Station. The PSC post construction field inspection verified the topsoil was not placed back within the footprint of the pump station. Order # 16 was completed.

17. Construction must be suspended during periods when weather conditions are such that construction activities would cause irreparable harm to the environment, unless adequate measures approved by the Commission are taken.

Construction started on the week of July 7, 2008 (Docket #58). The 2008 construction continued with weekly progress reports to December 12, 2008 (Docket #77). In the weekly report for November 21, 2008, weather delayed construction at Stanley Station. After the week of December 12, 2008 the Bartlett Station was put on hold until spring due to snow. Work continued again on January 9, 2009 but was suspended until spring at the Minot Station, Denbigh Station, Pleasant Lake Station, Blaisdell Station, and Larimore Station until spring. Only work on the Beaver Lodge Station continued during the winter of 2009. Work was slowed and stopped at times due to winter conditions on the tank at Beaver Lodge. In May of 2009 construction was delayed due to dewatering efforts at many of the stations. Final clean up and painting was delayed until spring of 2010 for 5 stations due to weather.

Enbridge acted responsible based on review of the construction progress reports. Based on review of the progress reports, construction was suspended when weather conditions were such that construction should not occur. Order # 17 was followed.

18. Reclamation and clean-up along the right-of-way must be continuous and coordinated with ongoing construction.

The weekly progress report of December 11th, 2009 stated that construction clean-up and punch list for Beaver Lodge Station, Stanley Station, Blaisdell Station, Minot Station, and Denbigh Station would be completed the following week with a return in the spring for painting. Clean up was 90 % complete at these stations as of the week of December 11th, 2009. No weekly progress reports for the week of December 18th, 2009 and spring 2010 painting were found for these stations in the case file.

The December 11th, 2009 weekly progress report for Pleasant Lake Station identified that clean-up was only 95% complete. No additional record was found that clean-up at the Pleasant Lake Station in the case file. Final documentation of completion of clean up is



required to determine that clean-up was continuous and coordinated with ongoing construction at Pleasant Lake Station.

The December 11th, 2009 weekly progress report also stated that work at Alexander Station had been deemed not necessary at that time. If it became necessary at a later date, Enbridge would advise the Commission. Alexander Station weekly progress reports began on August 23, 2010 (Docket #131) and continued to November 8th, 2010 (Docket #144). That was the last weekly progress report on the Alexander Station. The November 8th, 2010 progress report identified 0% of clean-up completed at the Alexander Station. That was the last progress report for the Alexander Station in the case file. More information must be provided by Enbridge to determine that clean-up was continuous and coordinated with ongoing construction at the Alexander Station.

The Trenton Station, Larimore Station, and Bartlett Lake Stations had weekly construction reports that verified that reclamation and clean up was continuous and coordinated with ongoing construction. Beaver Lodge Station, Stanley Station, Blaisdell Station, Minot Station, Pleasant Lake Station and Denbigh Station need addition documentation that final clean-up, painting, and insulation at these stations occurred and when. Alexander Station weekly progress reports were not complete to verify continuous and coordinated reclamation and clean up occurred. The November 8th, 2010 progress report identified 0% of clean-up completed at the Alexander Station. That was the last progress report for the Alexander Station in the case file. More information is required by Enbridge for these seven stations to verify reclamation and clean up was continuous and coordinated with ongoing construction to complete Order #18.

19. Reclamation, fertilization and reseeding must be done by Enbridge according to the Natural Resource Conservation Service unless otherwise specified by the landowner and approved by the Commission.

No correspondence about reclamation, fertilization, and reseeding measures were found in the case file. The property used for the station upgrades was owned by Enbridge. The station sites where construction occurred were graveled with Class 5 material and fenced. Therefore, no reclamation, fertilization and reseeding was required. Order # 19 was completed.

20. Enbridge's obligation for reclamation and maintenance of the right-of-way shall continue throughout the life of the pipeline.

The site upgrades occurred within a site facility that is fenced and graveled except for Beaver Lodge Station tank addition. The Beaver Lodge Station tank addition site was fenced and graveled upon completion of the construction. The reclamation and maintenance required at these industrial station sites would be annual weed control. The post construction field inspection verified that weed control was excellent on June 8 & 9, of 2011. Also viewing Google Earth images of the sites, proper weed maintenance occurs at this facility.



Reclamation and maintenance has occurred at this station. Compliance of Order #20 has occurred.

21. Enbridge shall construct and operate the pipeline in the manner described in its application, and in accordance with all applicable safety requirements.

Design, construction and operation of the pipeline and related facilities were to be in accordance with U.S. Department of Transportation regulations governing the 195 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Transportation of Hazardous Liquids by Pipelines.

Size, type, and design information was identified in the amended application/route permit application (Docket #6 Section A.3 corridor). The application, weekly progress reports (Docket # 58-77, 81-96, 99-127, 131-144), and as built drawings (Docket # 130) gave information to assist in the evaluation of Order #11. Items required for each station upgrade were identified in the application and are give in the Preliminary Statement at the beginning of this report.

In the application (Docket # 6), size and design was spelled out. The application in section A.3 or the corridor identified what was to be done at the stations and the 10 year plan also identified design pressures.

The weekly progress reports identified start dates, and had minor construction information about the design. The weekly progress reports identified what, where, and when things were completed on the project. Some pictures were provided. Pictures showed proper supports being used, use of ladders, fire extinguisher on site, PPE being worn, and proper sloping for excavations.

The as built diagrams showed the actual piping design site plan for the stations. The as built drawing was compared with the conceptual site plan in the application to verify the facilities were constructed in the manner described in application. An as built drawing for the Trenton was not provided in the case file. The conceptual site plan was compared to the actual site during a PSC post construction field inspection to verify the facilities were constructed in the manner described in the application.

No record of tests to establish maximum operating pressure for the design maximum operating pressure (MOP) was found for the station piping in the case file. Passing the pressure test insures that no irreparable damage occurred on the station piping during construction and operation of the stations are within design limits. A written record of the Station pressure tests should be requested from Enbridge by the Commission to complete the Case file. A letter can be submitted with a summary of description what was tested, actual pressure beginning and ending, length of time tests occurred, and dates. The letter should state that all new materials and equipment was tested and has proper pressure rating.

Based on the limited information in the case file and a post-construction field inspection, Enbridge is currently operating the pipeline and is following the manner described by the



Commission's requirements. Once a written record of the station pressure tests are obtained for the Commission's file, Order # 21 will be complete.

22. Enbridge shall comply with the Commission's Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications attached to this order.

Part of the Order granting the Certificate of Corridor Compatibility and Route Permit of June 4, 2008 (Docket # 36) included a Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications that were required as part of the Orders. The Station upgrades occurred within existing industrial station site where all trees and scrubs had been removed previously prior to the Commission's orders except the 4.2 acre area at the Beaver Lodge Station. The Beaver Lodge Station 4.2 acre site was grassland owned by Enbridge. In reviewing the site using Google Earth aerial photos of before and after construction, no trees or shrubs were required to be inventoried, cleared, and replaced.

Therefore, the Commission's Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specifications may not have been required for this project. Enbridge should provided written verification that no trees or shrubs were affected or comply with the Tree and Shrub Mitigation Specification to complete Order #22.

23. Enbridge shall provide the Commission with a hard copy and electronic copy of the design specifications for the construction of the Alexander Station, the Trenton Station, the Beaver Lodge Station, the Stanley Station, the Blaisdell Station, the Minot Station, the Denbigh Station, the Pleasant Lake Station, the Bartlett Station, and the Larimore Station showing the location of the project facilities as built, and an electronic version of the as-built design specifications that can be imported into ESRI GIS mapping software, and shall provide this information within 3 months of the completion of the construction.

In a December 11, 2009 email (Docket #127) from Ed Kelly of Rooney Engineering representing Enbridge to Pat Fahn of the PSC, He state that as of December 11th, 2009 both orders for Case No. PU-07-791 should be considered substantially complete and Enbridge will start the clock on the 90 days for submitting as built drawings.

On March 4, 2010 (Docket #129) Enbridge sent a CD containing GIS as built diagram files for the stations to the Commission. The CD was not provided to Keitu Engineering for the post construction inspection. On March 18, 2010 (Docket #130) Enbridge sent a CD of as built .pdf plot plans. Facility plot plans for Beaver Lodge, Denbigh, Penn, Blaisdell, Pleasant Lake, Bartlett, Larimore, and Stanley Stations were provided. No facility plot plans for Trenton, Minot, or Alexander were provided at that time. A March 22, 2011 Rooney Engineering transmittal sent copies of the Alexander and Stanley Station as built drawings (Docket # 150). An as-built drawing # 534-P-0701 dated 1-25-2010 of Minot Station was provided during the PSC post construction field construction on June 8th, 2011. Enbridge needs to send a copy of this drawing to the Commission staff for the case file records.



**PU-07-791 Post-Construction Report
Enbridge Pipeline (North Dakota) LLC
Upgrade of 10 Pump Stations-Phase 6 expansion
June 15, 2011**

Construction activity for Alexander Station started on August 23, 2010 with the last weekly progress report on November 8, 2010. Alexander Station was still under construction at that time. No records were found in the case file for completion of the Alexander Station.

For Order # 23, the facility plot plans for Beaver Lodge, Denbigh, Penn, Blaisdell, Pleasant Lake, Bartlett, Larimore, and Stanley Stations were provided within the 3 months of completion of the construction. No as built drawings have been provided for Trenton Station. Minot and Alexander station as built drawings were provided after the 3 month completion date based on Ed Kelly's email (Docket #127) of December 11, 2009. Enbridge need to send the Commission staff as built drawings for Trenton and Minot station for the case file. The Alexander, Trenton, and Minot station as built design specification were not provided within 3 months of completion of the construction based on the documentation in the case file.