

From: Joshua Howardson [REDACTED]
Date: August 5, 2015 at 4:01:32 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.

I have a great suggestion to you... Let's take a field trip and go take a visit to the oil & gas fields in Wyoming, North Dakota, Louisiana, Oklahoma, or Texas. Then lets go look at an oil spill site see how that looks after 5 years, 10 years, 15 years. Let's go look at a TransCanada spill site... let's look at their previous work.

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.

We don't need it, don't want it! Go take a visit to the oil & gas fields in Wyoming, or in Louisiana.

Go look at an oil spill site see how that looks after 5 year, 10 years

Joshua Howardson



Dell Rapids, SD, SD 57022

From: PUC

Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 10:27 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: HP14-001

Mr. Howardson:

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

From: Sherry Korthals [REDACTED]
Date: August 5, 2015 at 4:46:49 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 expect 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. In its first year of operation, the Keystone 1 line leaked 14 times. 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 SOUTH DAKOTA, 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.

Sherry Korthals
[REDACTED]
Sioux Falls, SD 57103

From: PUC
Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 10:30 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: HP14-001

Ms. Korthals:

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

027442

From: Sierra Club on behalf of Catchi Diaper[SMTP:SIERRA@SIERRACLUB.ORG]

Sent: Wednesday, August 05, 2015 12:12:10 PM

To: PUC

Subject: Please reject the recertification of Keystone XL (Docket HP14-001) Auto forwarded by a Rule

Aug 5, 2015

South Dakota PUC

Dear PUC,

I'm writing to urge the South Dakota PUC to reject TransCanada's application for recertification of the Keystone XL pipeline construction permit in South Dakota.

The Keystone XL pipeline, which would pump toxic tar sands from Canada through our state to the Gulf of Mexico, is all risk and no reward for South Dakota.

TransCanada has yet to reveal an emergency response plan showing that they can even respond to a major oil spill. Increasing these risks is the fact that the proposed pipeline route places it through 200 miles of high-risk landslide areas in South Dakota and crosses significant waterways, including the Missouri River, a major source of drinking water.

The impacts of so-called "man-camps" and the increased risks of crime, sex trafficking, and sexual violence on vulnerable South Dakota and Native communities, have not been taken into account either.

I am also troubled by the decision to exclude aboriginal rights and off-reservation rights from the discussion on the whether the KXL pipeline permit should be granted recertification. Construction of this pipeline would put indigenous sacred sites and significant cultural areas at risk.

Finally, I profoundly disagree with the PUC's decision to preclude testimony on climate change from the recertification process. The carbon-intensive tar sands that Keystone XL would unlock will significantly exacerbate climate change, which puts South Dakota's agriculture, water resources, and tourism at risk.

I urge the PUC to think about what's truly in the best long-term interest of South Dakota and reject the recertification of the Keystone XL pipeline.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Catchi Diaper

027443

[Redacted]
Woodford, SD 57551
[Redacted]

From: PUC

Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 12:38 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: HP14-001

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

027445