
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

029300

From: Ashley Yonker [REDACTED]
Date: August 5, 2015 at 5:37:32 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.

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.

Lastly, and most important. I know people that have worked on the pipelines. They have told me that the pipes are not safe, are not inspected as they are supposed to be and that they WILL break. It's not if, it's when. When I asked how they get away with it, they basically say the inspectors are paid to look the other way when the integrity of the pipe is in question. It's all about getting it done faster and quality is not in the equation. Also, they told me the cleanups are NOT cleaned up. Most of the oil from spills is left under the water and it simply isn't known.

How can you possibly allow this to happen? Responsible parties simply wouldn't. Please do what is right and deny any pipeline permits. Represent the best interests of the American people as a whole. Show the world that your integrity and common sense prevails.

Ashley Yonker



kalamazoo, MI 49006

From: PUC
Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 10:33 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: HP14-001

Ms. Yonker:

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: Stephen Gambill [REDACTED]
Date: August 5, 2015 at 8:48:29 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 cannot be trusted to safely build the pipeline and it would be a disaster for South Dakotans. The Keystone I line, has seen dramatic corrosion, with portions that are corroded up to 96.8% through the pipeline wall, and that pipeline leaked 14 times in its first year of operation.

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.

These safety issues are of significant concern for local tribes, whose water resources would be threatened by the proposed pipeline. The pipeline would cross through Tribal treaty territory. Yet there has been no risk assessment or analysis of the potential impact on the Tribes' water supply, a failure which is representative of both TransCanada and the PUC's failure to take tribal concerns and treaty rights seriously.

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.

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.

Stephen Gambill



Corpus Christi, TX 78404

From: PUC

Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 10:35 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: HP14-001

Mr. Gambill:

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: Nancy Beech [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, August 06, 2015 12:57:59 PM
To: PUC
Subject: RE: HP14-001
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Thank you for the info and the links.

I personally have been involved with (natural gas) pipelines so I know a little bit about their construction and while natural gas has different specs and poses a different threat to the environment, oil will also have its own risks.

I understand that pipelines are needed but more, tougher and strongly enforced regulations and laws need to be in place prior to any further pipeline construction in South Dakota.

Sadly, companies operating like XL as to how they treat the property owners, their overall construction practices, etc. tend to give the other companies a bad rap.

I trust pipelines if they are built and installed above and beyond SOP's but I do not trust Trans Canada so I cannot support this pipeline. This company has a very poor history and long list of people whom they have taken advantage of.

If this pipeline goes through, please please please make sure there are very strict ramifications/fines/clean-up and damages policies in place before they turn one more shovel in SD.

Thank you,
Nancy Beech
Brookings, SD
[REDACTED]

029307