These are quotes from some of the 140+ people who testified about the shortcomings of the DEIS and their opposition to the project.

**Chairman Mike Wiggins, Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa**

“The only thing we've ever asked of the oil company is to get out of our water and that has been ignored and rejected. We told them to take it out of our watershed. We can’t afford to have a foreign oil company’s oil in our drinking water or in Lake Superior of the watershed.”

**Michael Isham, Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission**

“Tribal members depend on clean, healthy and abundant natural resources to meet their physical, social, cultural, and economic needs. Activities that have the potential to threaten those resources must be the subject of careful and thorough scrutiny and deliberate and informed decision making. Unfortunately, the draft EIS does not appear to meet this standard.”

**Angela Evans, Chetek, WI, registered nurse, husband is Navy veteran and data analyst who grew up in Wisconsin**

“I grew up in Bridge City Texas. My whole life I was surrounded by big oil companies as my neighbors. The pollution and toxins in the water were well known. There were signs posted along all the waterways warning you to eat any fish you caught at your own risk. They were poisoned. Toxic. From what I've seen of Enbridge’s record and the way they acted with Line 3 in Minnesota, I don’t have any faith at all that they will be different from the oil companies I grew up around. It’s time to ask if we want them to do in Wisconsin what I saw them do in Texas—poisoning the water so you can’t swim, fish, or even drink it.”

**Bobbi Ronstad, Saxon, WI, property owner adjacent to pipeline route**

“My husband and I are what they call abutters. That means the proposed pipeline expansion, if approved, would be constructed on adjacent property, crossing two streams just upstream from where
they flow through our land. I read the draft EIS. The first thing that struck me is that whoever wrote it should have read it again and done some editing. That is a concern. If the experts who signed off on this can’t even identify typos, mistakes, and conflicting information, how are we to believe that they adequately identified the environmental threats to our land and water? The phrase ‘According to Enbridge’ is used 19 times in the draft. If all you’re going to do is ask Enbridge, then why bother with an EIS at all? Isn’t the point of the study to investigate the impacts independently?“

Jill Ferguson, West Allis, WI

“I’m a 68-year old grandmother concerned about the future of her grandchildren. This draft EIS doesn’t read like something from a government agency with an obligation to uphold the Public Trust Doctrine. What I read came across as an Enbridge propaganda brochure.”

Jamie Dunn, Spooner, WI

“I’m a retired hydrogeologist for the WI DNR with over 30 years of doing cleanups on these spill sites. As far as spills are concerned, it’s not if—it’s when. Even the EIS says that.”

Sheila Mitchell, Ashland, WI

“The draft environmental impact statement, which reads more like a project manual, is lacking in specifics regarding the environment—which I thought was the whole point of an EIS.”

Vincent Mattson, Marengo, WI

“As a research biologist at the Department of the Interior and the EPA, I spent many years working on fisheries, toxicology, and environmental regulations. The potential damage caused by this pipeline would require decades of remediation and years of litigation—with no guarantee that the contamination wouldn’t remain. Protecting our water resources should be a top priority.”

Marsha Somppi, Mellen, WI

“I was born and raised in Ashland County. I moved away but dreamed of returning. I have now retired to Ashland County, and I own property abutting the proposed route. Enbridge is bulldozing through our community. I declined their advances, but other property owners accepted their big dollar offers. The property abutting mine has been bought by Enbridge. What happens if blasting ruins our well? Where will help come from when the leaks happen?”
Dianne Brakarsh, Madison

“The draft EIS says the project would not have a significant climate impact. Even if this were true, supporting the status quo is no longer an option. It’s too late for that—the climate crisis is in an emergency. Instead of extending the life of Line 5, we should shut it down.”