



Chris Nelson, Chairperson  
Kristie Fiegen, Vice Chairperson  
Gary Hanson, Commissioner

*South Dakota*

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

500 East Capitol Avenue  
Pierre, South Dakota 57501-5070  
[www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov)

Capitol Office  
(605) 773-3201

Grain Warehouse  
(605) 773-5280

Consumer Hotline  
1-800-332-1782

Email  
[puc@state.sd.us](mailto:puc@state.sd.us)

June 29, 2015

Chairman Steve Friesen  
Hutchinson County Commission  
140 Euclid, Room 128  
Olivet, SD 57052-2103  
*c/o County Auditor Diane Murtha*

Dear Chairman Friesen and Commissioners:

Thank you for your resolution regarding the Keystone XL Pipeline docket. This will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it.

You can access the PUC's docket by going to [www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov) and clicking on Commission Actions, Commission Dockets, Hydrocarbon Pipeline Dockets, 2014 Dockets, and then HP14-001.

On the PUC's homepage, you will find links titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and 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. Copies of these documents are also enclosed.

Sincerely,

Chris Nelson

-----  
From: Sue Grant [REDACTED]  
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 3:53:38 PM  
To: PUC  
Subject: Re: FW: HP14-001: No on Keystone XL Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear South Dakota Public Utilities Commissioners Hanson, Nelson, and Fiegen:

Please reject the Keystone XL Pipeline certification in docket HP14-001. The land, water, indigenous people, farmers, ranchers, and all of us who rely on safe water should not suffer the pollution which will be caused by that pipeline. Keystone is not willing to back its own safety. They know the pipeline will leak and who will be responsible for the clean up. Not Keystone. It is up to you to protect the environment of our state. Reject this project and let's hear the end of it!

Sincerely,  
Sue Grant  
[REDACTED]  
Brookings, SD 57006  
Resident of Brookings, SD

On 4/20/15, PUC <[PUC@state.sd.us](mailto:PUC@state.sd.us)> wrote:

> Thank you for your message. Please provide your mailing or street  
> address along with your message. The street/ mailing and email address  
> will be removed for the public version of your message that will be  
> placed in the Keystone XL Pipeline docket for which you are commenting.

>  
>  
>  
> South Dakota Public Utilities Commission Staff  
>  
> [www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov)<<http://www.puc.sd.gov>>

> -----  
> From: Sue Grant[[SMTP:1604SUE@GMAIL.COM](mailto:SMTP:1604SUE@GMAIL.COM)]  
> Sent: Monday, April 20, 2015 3:36:00 PM  
> To: PUC  
> Subject: HP14-001: No on Keystone XL  
> Auto forwarded by a Rule

>

> Dear South Dakota Public Utilities Commissioners Hanson, Nelson, and  
> Fiegen:  
>  
> Please reject the Keystone XL Pipeline certification in docket  
> HP14-001. The land, water, indigenous people, farmers, ranchers, and  
> all of us who rely on safe water should not suffer the pollution which  
> will be caused by that pipeline. Keystone is not willing to back its  
> own safety. They know the pipeline will leak and who will be  
> responsible for the clean up. Not Keystone. It is up to you to protect  
> the environment of our state. Reject this project and let's hear the end of it!  
>  
> Sincerely,  
> Sue Grant  
> Resident of Brookings, SD  
>

-----  
From: Sierra Club on behalf of Don Kelley[SMTP:SIERRA@SIERRACLUB.ORG]

Sent: Saturday, June 27, 2015 11:33:33 AM

To: PUC

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

Jun 27, 2015

South Dakota PUC

Dear PUC,

Although I understand the SD PUC's need to dismiss what may seem like emotional or non-pragmatic objections to the Keystone XL pipeline project, I believe that the PUC has excessively narrowed the discussion by excluding some very practical and germane considerations. I

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. Some will say that tar sands bitumen will find alternate routes to market, making objections to this pipeline irrelevant to climate disruption, but such alternatives are sufficiently less attractive so as to make broader development of the tar sands less likely.

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,

Dr. Don Kelley

[REDACTED]

Deadwood, SD 57732-7407

[REDACTED]