

From: cheryl Deelstra [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 6:49 AM

To: Nelson, Chris

Subject: Kxl

As a concerned citizen of the great rural state of South Dakota I totally oppose the Keystone oil pipeline. I am a teacher and can't justify leaving an ugly and potentially dangerous structure as a legacy to future generations. Please deny this threat to our beautiful state. Thank you. Cheryl Deelstra [REDACTED] Madison SD 57042

025831

From: cheryl Deelstra [REDACTED]

Date: July 31, 2015 at 6:53:23 AM CDT

To: <gary.hanson@state.sd.us>

Subject: Kxl

Please deny the KXL pipeline. Our state is so beautiful and our water and air quality excellent.

This pipeline is a threat to all of these rare qualities. Thank you. Cheryl Deelstra

[REDACTED], Madison SD 57042

025832

From: PUC

Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 7:57 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: HP14-001

Ms. Deelstra:

Thank you for your message regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. It will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is Keystone XL Pipeline Updates. These documents explain the processing of a pipeline siting case according to the South Dakota laws governing this commission. The latter links to some of the most-often-heard questions about the project and process and the answers.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

www.puc.sd.gov

025833

From: Walter Portz [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 7:27 AM
To: Nelson, Chris
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

Please please please do not let this pipeline run through our state. I know we are super supportive of big business here but I honestly feel the long term consequences outweigh the few short term gains. it's not a matter of if, but when. I really don't want my daughter to be paying for a clean up 50 years from now.

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristine grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.

Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit. I feel it is common sense. Deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

Thank you for your consideration.

Walter Portz

Walter Portz

[REDACTED]
Sioux Falls, SD 57108

Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 8:03 AM

Subject: HP14-001

Mr. Portz:

Thank you for your message regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. It will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is Keystone XL Pipeline Updates. These documents explain the processing of a pipeline siting case according to the South Dakota laws governing this commission. The latter links to some of the most-often-heard questions about the project and process and the answers.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

www.puc.sd.gov

025835

From: Anne Dilenschneider[REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 10:01:45 PM

To: PUC Consumer Info

Subject: Letter to the South Dakota PUC re: the KXL Pipeline

Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear PUC Members:

Please read the attached letter.

Regards,
Anne

025836

Anne Dilenschneider, PhD
Sioux Falls, SD 57104

July 29, 2015

Members of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

This week you will begin to consider whether or not permits should be renewed for TransCanada's Keystone XL (KXL) pipeline. As you gather in Pierre, you may be interested to know that TransCanada apparently believes the matter is a "done deal." Every day more pipeline pipes are being off-loaded from rail cars to a growing stockpile at the "agricultural" storage facility at the Worthing, South Dakota exit off Highway I-29.

According to TransCanada's online "primer" explaining the KXL pipeline, in 2010 the South Dakota PUC "determined that Keystone XL would not significantly impact the environment or the health, safety or welfare of those in the state of South Dakota."¹

I beg to differ with your 2010 determination; the evidence that has accumulated since that time proves otherwise.

In the months since the KXL South Dakota permits expired on June 29, 2014², there have continued to be rail accidents involving the transport of crude oil. Pipeline proponents have tried to use these reports to convince the public that "trains are bad" and "pipelines are safe." However, pipelines have proven to be more dangerous than trains when it comes to transporting oil across our country.

Noah Greenwald reported in January 2015:

A new analysis of federal records reveals that in just the past year and four months, there have been 372 oil and gas pipeline leaks, spills and other incidents, leading to 20 deaths, 117 injuries and more than \$256 million in damages.

The new data adds to a June 1, 2013 independent analysis of federal records revealing that since 1986, oil and gas pipeline incidents have resulted in 532 deaths, more than 2,400 injuries and more than \$7.5 billion in damages.³

Information from the federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration was used in the creation of a video showing the timing and locations of the nearly 8,000 pipeline incidents (leaks,

¹ <http://keystone-xl.com/a-primer-on-the-keystone-xl-south-dakota-public-utilities-commission-hearings/#sthash.bPrwvrvr.dpuf>

² <http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20140617/expiration-south-dakota-keystone-permit-another-hurdle-transcanada>

³ http://www.huffingtonpost.com/noah-greenwald/pipeline-accidents_b_6174082.html

ruptures, explosions, fires, evacuations) that have occurred from 1986 to 2013.⁴ During those 19 years, an average of 200 barrels (8,400 gallons) of oil was spilled each and every day from pipelines in the U.S.⁵ Clearly, pipelines are not the answer. The Keystone KXL is not the answer.

Despite the 2010 PUC ruling, Keystone XL will significantly impact the environment and the health, safety and welfare of all who live in the state of South Dakota.

For example:

- The Keystone XL violates the 1851 and 1868 Fort Laramie treaties with Native American nations. Lou Thompson, TransCanada's "liaison" to the tribal nations, has dismissed these American treaties as irrelevant.⁶ Usually foreign companies do not determine which of our treaties are valid and which are invalid. These American treaties were re-affirmed by our country's Supreme Court in 1980⁷; they are still in effect in 2015, despite TransCanada's claims.
- Mr. Thompson has also dismissed Native American communities' larger concerns about present and long-term care for the earth and water. He said, "If tribes protest, they're taking food off tables of others. There are people who are relying on the project to put food on the table."⁸
- It crosses the Ogallala aquifer that supplies 1/3 of the water for American food production, as well as 3 major rivers (Missouri, Yellowstone, Red).⁹ Allowing a foreign company to endanger our food supply and our water is a national security issue.
- In addition, a foreign company (TransCanada) is threatening farmers and ranchers and seizing American farm and ranch land by "eminent domain."¹⁰ Usually foreign companies do not have the right to force Americans off their land. If the pipeline company was called "TransIran Oil" American citizens would be up in arms about this theft of American land.
- TransCanada's president for Keystone Projects, Corey Goulet, misrepresented the facts during an international radio broadcast on October 7, 2014. He claimed that TransCanada had "all the land needed" in South Dakota.¹¹ Although that is true, the South Dakota KXL permits had expired on June 29, 2014¹² and the re-approval hearings begin this week, 9 months later. Why would Americans support a foreign company whose president flagrantly misrepresents the commitments it has from our states and our federal government?
- The Keystone XL Pipeline will benefit private foreign investors and its oil will be bound only for duty-free and tariff-free export, not for American domestic consumption.¹³ Philip Verleger, who

⁴ http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/americas_dangerous_pipelines

⁵ http://www.huffingtonpost.com/noah-greenwald/pipeline-accidents_b_6174082.html

⁶ <http://blog.nrcprograms.org/treaty-series-keystone-xl-pipeline>

⁷ <https://bulk.resource.org/courts.gov/c/US/448/448.US.371.79-639.htm>

⁸ http://www.dailynebraskan.com/endowment/yankton-sioux-launch-protect-the-sacred-campaign-to-preserve-lands/article_c2b765d4-a53f-11e2-98d1-001a4bcf6878.html

⁹ <http://www.foe.org/projects/climate-and-energy/tar-sands/keystone-xl-pipeline>

¹⁰ <http://www.pri.org/programs/america-abroad/keystone-xl-pipeline-international-town-hall>

¹¹ <http://www.pri.org/programs/america-abroad/keystone-xl-pipeline-international-town-hall>

¹² <http://insideclimatenews.org/news/20140617/expiration-south-dakota-keystone-permit-another-hurdle-transcanada>

¹³ <http://www.api.org/~media/files/policy/keystone-xl-pipeline/ftz-tax-summary.pdf?la=en>

has served as an energy policy adviser to the U.S. Treasury and the Council of Economic Advisers, has warned that Gulf Coast refineries already have long-term commitments with Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and Mexico -- three countries with major ownership stakes in Texas refineries. So, as Verleger points out, "There will be too much oil, it's got to go somewhere, and it's going to China."¹⁴ TransCanada is not invested in American soil, water, and families; it is invested in its own financial gain at our expense.

- According to a George Mason University study of the KXL, the pipeline will create 20 full-time, permanent jobs.¹⁵ The U.S. State Department is somewhat more optimistic, estimating that the pipeline will create 35 permanent jobs.¹⁶ The pipeline is a very expensive form of job creation. There are, however, other ways to increase job growth. The Union of Concerned Scientists noted that renewable energy results in far more jobs.¹⁷

However, the biggest myth is that pipelines are safe. Pipelines explode, rupture, and leak. Even with automatic shut off valves, the leakage is extensive.¹⁸

Pipeline companies cannot and do not patrol the full length of their pipelines. Even worse, as Jeffrey Wiese of the federal Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), has pointed out, the agency has extreme difficulty in enforcing their regulations.¹⁹ We cannot secure them from leaks, nor can we protect them from terrorist sabotage. Tesoro has been working 24/7 since September 2013 to "clean up" a 865,200 gallon spill near Bismarck, ND -- at this point, 613,200 gallons have saturated the land are now considered "lost."²⁰

TransCanada claims that "pipelines are, by far, the safest mode of transportation for crude oil and natural gas" and that the KXL pipeline "has not only set the standard for pipeline safety but also for environmental protections and maintenance."²¹ However, since it began carrying oil in 2010, TransCanada's Keystone I pipeline has leaked at least 14 times.²² In addition, TransCanada also had 3 pipeline explosions in a 9-month period in 2014.²³ Two were in Canada. The third caused the evacuation of Benton Harbor, Michigan and contaminated farmland. The damage occurred even though the automatic valves in the pipeline started to shut off the flow of oil as soon as the drop in pressure was detected. The U.S. State Department, itself, estimates Keystone XL pipeline could have these types of catastrophic events 100 times during its lifetime.²⁴

¹⁴ <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2011/08/110819-keystone-xl-canadian-oil-and-chinese-market>

¹⁵ <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/552f00fee4b00d8610d2a67a/t/55315208e4b06631eabdd1d3/1429295624237/ECONOMIC-fact-sheet-a2014-MR.pdf>

¹⁶ <http://www.forbes.com/sites/energysource/2013/05/10/pipe-dreams-how-many-jobs-will-be-created-by-keystone-xl>

¹⁷ <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/552f00fee4b00d8610d2a67a/t/55315208e4b06631eabdd1d3/1429295624237/ECONOMIC-fact-sheet-2014-MR.pdf>

¹⁸ http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/americas_dangerous_pipelines

¹⁹ <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2014/10/21/3582480/north-dakota-spill-one-year-later>

²⁰ <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2014/10/21/3582480/north-dakota-spill-one-year-later>

²¹ <http://keystone-xl.com/timetobuildkxl>

²² http://www.huffingtonpost.com/noah-greenwald/pipeline-accidents_b_6174082.html

²³ <http://canadians.org/blog/transcanada-has-third-catastrophic-pipeline-leak-9-months>

²⁴ http://www.huffingtonpost.com/noah-greenwald/pipeline-accidents_b_6174082.html

Clearly, the Keystone XL pipeline will significantly impact the environment, and the health, safety and welfare of all who live in the state of South Dakota.²⁵

We can do better. I ask you to protect the environment, and the health, safety, and welfare of all who live in South Dakota and in these United States. Do not renew the Keystone XL permits.

Sincerely,

Anne Dilenschneider

[REDACTED]

Sioux Falls, SD 57104

[REDACTED]

²⁵ <http://keystone-xl.com/a-primer-on-the-keystone-xl-south-dakota-public-utilities-commission-hearings/#sthash.bPrwvrvr.dpuf>

From: PUC
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 9:10 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: HP14-001

Ms. Heidler:

Thank you for your message regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. I appreciate your sharing your particular issue of concern. Your message will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001:

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is Keystone XL Pipeline Updates. These documents explain the processing of a pipeline siting case according to the South Dakota laws governing this commission. The latter links to some of the most-often-heard questions about the project and process and the answers.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

025841

From: Greg and Melanie Olson [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 7:56:07 PM

To: PUC

Subject: KXL and my opinion for what it is worth.

I feel it necessary to send this message to express my concern about the KXL pipeline. My main reason for opposing this venture is the risk of polluting our ground water and the Ogallala aquifer. Water is more important than oil. We need it to live. We can find other ways to make energy. Look at California and what is happening there. Do we want to risk our water, really? Think about what will happen if the aquifer is polluted, how is that water being used now. What would be lost? No amount of safe guards and promises can bring that water back if/when something happens. Are you really willing to take that risk?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Melanie Olson

[REDACTED]

Chamberlain, SD 57325

025842

From: PUC
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 10:10 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: HP14-001

Ms. Olson:

Thank you for your message regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. It will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is Keystone XL Pipeline Updates. These documents explain the processing of a pipeline siting case according to the South Dakota laws governing this commission. The latter links to some of the most-often-heard questions about the project and process and the answers.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and
<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

025843

From: Jerry Meyer [REDACTED]
Date: July 31, 2015 at 4:43:19 PM CDT
To: <chris.nelson@state.sd.us>
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristine grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.

Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected. Pipeline ruptures or leaks can have devastating effects on water and nearby land, as evidenced by the Enbridge pipeline company oil leak in a fish and wildlife reserve in 2010 in Michigan, the oil pipeline leak into the Yellowstone River this spring and the massive salt water pipeline spill that eventually reached the Missouri River near Bismarck, N.D. in January 2015. Sooner or later, all pipelines are prone to rupture or leak.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit. I feel it is common sense. Deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

And even if you granted the permits, there are many landowners and Native American tribes who do not want the pipeline crossing their land and will continue to fight against the use of eminent domain.

Plus, there's no guarantee Keystone would hire even one South Dakotan to build the pipeline, as they will likely hire the necessary skilled labor at the point the pipeline begins and maintain that crew all the way to Houston, rather than hiring other people along the way or state-specific.

Jerry Meyer



Black Hawk, SD 57718

-----Original Message-----

From: Jerry Meyer [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 4:43 PM

To: Hanson, Gary (PUC)

Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

Dear Chairman Hanson,

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

I am writing to tell you I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota, and I am asking you to vote no.

TransCanada has shown time and time again they are unwilling - or unable - to adequately protect South Dakota's land and water. Six years after building Keystone I, they still have land that has not been reclaimed, and many landowners did the reclamation themselves because they were fed up with dealing with TransCanada. That's not a way for a company to act in our state, particularly when they now want to build Keystone XL over hundreds of miles of pristine grassland - exactly the kind of land they have a problem reclaiming.


Additionally, TransCanada has no emergency response plan for Keystone XL. Their permit was granted five years ago. There is no excuse to not have an emergency response plan in place. Our land, water, and especially our people should be protected. Pipeline ruptures or leaks can have devastating effects on water and nearby land, as evidenced by the Enbridge pipeline company oil leak in a fish and wildlife reserve in 2010 in Michigan, the oil pipeline leak into the Yellowstone River this spring and the massive salt water pipeline spill that eventually reached the Missouri River near Bismarck, N.D. in January 2015. Sooner or later, all pipelines are prone to rupture or leak.

TransCanada will not be able to meet the conditions of their permit. I feel it is common sense. Deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

And even if you granted the permits, there are many landowners and Native American tribes who do not want the pipeline crossing their land and will continue to fight against the use of eminent domain.

Plus, there's no guarantee Keystone would hire even one South Dakotan to build the pipeline, as they will likely hire the necessary skilled labor at the point the pipeline begins and maintain that crew all the way to Houston, rather than hiring other people along the way or state-specific.

Jerry Meyer


Black Hawk, SD 57718

-----Original Message-----

From: Joan Thimjon [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, July 27, 2015 10:15 AM

To: Hanson, Gary (PUC)

Subject: Keystone

Please look at the big picture when deciding the Keystone project. Why do we need this? First of all it is oil (dirty oil at that). Why feed into the oil industry at all? We should be more foresighted than that. Let alone the real potential for pollution. Canada can ship its oil to their own coast. Why bother us? Please consider the long term and not just the short term. Thanks. Joan Thimjon Sent from my iPhone

025848