

CERTIFIED MAIL – RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

November 1, 2010

Mr. Terry McGill
Enbridge Energy Partners, L.P.
1100 Louisiana, Suite 3300
Houston, Texas 77002

Re: CPF No. 3-2010-5008H
Line 6B – Integrity Verification and Remedial Work Plan

Dear Mr. McGill:

Following the failure of Enbridge's Line 6B pipeline near Marshall, Michigan, the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) issued a Corrective Action Order on July 28, 2010, which was subsequently amended on September 22, 2010 (Order). The Order, as amended, requires that Enbridge take corrective actions to ensure the long term safe and environmentally sound operation of the pipeline.

On September 26, 2010, Enbridge submitted a "Line 6B Integrity Verification and Remedial Work Plan" (Plan) as required by the Order. The Plan includes provisions to perform near-term in-line inspections followed by repairs where necessary. As described in various submissions to PHMSA, Enbridge utilized in-line inspection in 2005, 2007, and 2009 to assess Line 6B. Despite these assessments and associated remedial work, the pipeline failed in Marshall, Michigan, releasing a reported 19,500 barrels of crude oil. Based on the in-line inspection data and the repair history of Line 6B, the conditions for crack growth and corrosion growth remain present along areas of the line where pipe and/or pipe coating has not been replaced or repaired, unless mitigative measures are taken to monitor for and address the conditions. While PHMSA appreciates Enbridge's efforts thus far to promptly complete needed repairs under the Order, we are concerned that Enbridge's overall approach to the long term integrity plan is largely an extension of its past practice of in-line inspections and spot repairs and will not fully accomplish the purpose of the Order to ensure that additional failures do not occur in the long term.

Section 3.6 of the Plan describing Enbridge's proposed long term integrity plan reads, in its entirety, as follows:

3.6 Long Term Periodic Testing and Integrity Verification

Enbridge will conduct continuing long-term periodic testing and verification measures in accordance with CAO Item 5.E to ensure the ongoing safe operation of the entire Line 6B. The long-term program will consider results of the analyses, inspections, and corrective measures conducted during all integrity programs.

3.6.1 Recalculate Feature Growth Rates

As shown in Appendix 5, substantive integrity condition information will be gathered prior to year-end 2010. The information will be integrated alongside historical integrity information and any results made available from the NTSB forensic analysis, as required by Item 5.A of the CAO. The collation of this information will provide the basis for a detailed re-evaluation of the growth rate and “just surviving flaw” calculations described in section 2.7.3, above. The results of this reanalysis will provide further direction regarding any additional integrity actions that Enbridge will conduct to continually reaffirm the safe and reliable operations of Line 6B. The results of this reanalysis will be provided to PHMSA.

3.6.2 Future Plans

Further to CAO Item 5.E, current plans for continual integrity evaluation of Line 6B include further inspection using high resolution ILI. The plan incorporates inspections in 2011 utilizing both ultrasonic and magnetic flux leakage metal loss tools. An additional crack inspection is planned for 2013.

Upon integration of all data gathered, Enbridge will examine the benefit and practicality of alternate remediation methods such as pipe replacement.

Based on all available information on Line 6B, PHMSA believes it will be necessary for Enbridge to perform hydrostatic pressure testing on remaining areas of Line 6B to confirm the adequacy of Enbridge’s in-line inspection and repair program. In its current form, however, the Plan does not include sufficient consideration of pressure testing as a method for validating the adequacy of the in-line inspections and associated repairs and confirming the pipeline’s integrity.

Additionally, based on the number, growth rates, and characteristics of Line 6B anomalies, it may not be possible to adequately prevent failures in the long term by continuing to repair excessive numbers of defects in a given area. The Plan submitted on September 26, 2010, however, does not include criteria and an adequate process for considering pipe replacement as a long term solution to such integrity threats. As part of meeting the Order’s 180 day requirement for repair for those anomalies reported in the July 15, 2010, notification, we understand Enbridge will complete smaller scale pipe replacements between Stockbridge and the St. Clair River, pending necessary permit approvals. However, PHMSA believes it will likely be necessary for Enbridge to replace portions of Line 6B to accomplish the purpose of the Order to provide confidence in the prevention of failures in the long term.

Enbridge shall continue to complete actions required by the Order. However, the Plan submitted on September 26, 2010, and specifically section 3.6, is not acceptable to PHMSA in its current form. Enbridge should submit a revised Plan specifying additional measures, including hydrostatic testing, criteria and procedures for replacing pipe where appropriate, and any other actions deemed necessary by Enbridge. These measures need to be incorporated into the Plan with sufficient technical detail to permit an evaluation by PHMSA of whether the Plan will accomplish the long-term safe and environmentally sound operation of the pipeline. I will then review the revised Plan. Upon resubmission, I may approve, disapprove, or provide additional comment and direct Enbridge to make additional modifications to the Plan.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

David Barrett
Director, Central Region
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.