

From: Casey Snyder [REDACTED]
Date: November 2, 2015 at 1:03:55 PM CST
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.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

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.

As a future farmer and student at South Dakota State University, I feel it is my duty to reach out to protect my future and the future of my family in South Dakota.

Thank you.

Casey Snyder



Sioux Falls, SD 57110

From: PUC

Sent: Monday, November 02, 2015 3:47 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

031298

From: Alberta Rouse [REDACTED]
Date: November 2, 2015 at 1:32:09 PM CST
To: <chris.nelson@state.sd.us>
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL
Reply-To: [REDACTED]

Commissioner

To the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission:

Please vote no!!! I strongly oppose the certification of the Keystone XL pipeline permit in South Dakota.

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.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

It is common sense in my judgement--deny the permit certification, and protect South Dakota's land, water, and people.

Alberta Rouse
[REDACTED]
Pierre, SD 57501

From: PUC

Sent: Monday, November 02, 2015 4:24 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 document 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

031300

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

From: Lisa Canning [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 11:26 AM

To: Nelson, Chris

Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

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 am in solidarity with South Dakotans and the world who realize pollution really knows no borders.

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.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

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.

Lisa Canning

[REDACTED]
San Diego, CA 92126

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

From: Jill allison [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 7:54 AM
To: Nelson, Chris
Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

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.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

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.

Without clean water, life cannot continue. No matter how much oil provides a 'richer' lifestyle to those far away from the environmental disaster that this pipeline will cause, the disaster will be felt by all of us. Our earth is a closed system and it has reached capacity. If you pollute water anywhere, you are killing yourselves as well as the folks considered expendable in the local area. Vote no on this travesty. Sincerely, Jill Allison

Jill allison

[REDACTED]
port townsend, WA 98368

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

From: Jim Johnson [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 7:45 AM

To: Nelson, Chris

Subject: HP014-001 - No on Keystone XL

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.

Finally, TransCanada Keystone clearly did not meet their burden to prove they can continue to meet the permit conditions. Even judging on the merits of their arguments alone, this permit can't be certified.

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.

The pipeline is only a piece of this overall problem we are confronted with - the tar sands use the equivalent of two barrels of oil to produce three and the resulting product is much dirtier than US crude oil

Jim Johnson

[REDACTED]
Sioux Falls, SD 57109

031303