

From: Dana Haan [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 07, 2015 8:36:07 PM
To: PUC
Cc: Mary Beth Haan; l-s.com, dave.haan
Subject: Comments on docket # HP14-002; Dakota Access Pipeline proposed project
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Dear Chris Nelson and Public Utilities Commissioners,

After having attended the January 23 public hearing in Sioux Falls, I would like to submit a few comments.

First of all, thank you for your patience during the meeting and allowing everyone to voice their comments, even when repetitive.

The proposed pipeline currently is projected to run approximately 1/2 mile from our family farm; so it does impact us as it impacts the community, but does not have the direct impact of running through our property. Our property is on the west edge of I-29, about one mile south of the Harrisburg exit.

After listening to various speakers and people who know much more about these matters than I do, I come away from the meeting considering the pipeline to be indeed the safest, most economical, and environmentally friendly method of oil transport.

However, I cast our "vote" for approval for the project with adjustments.

Reasons:

1. Proximity to high population areas.
2. The high water table of Lincoln County.
3. Economic impact

As I review the information sheet handed out at the public hearing, I question whether the current route can meet two points of what the applicant must prove to the PUC:

* "will not pose a threat of serious injury to the environment nor to the social or economic condition of inhabitants or expected inhabitants in the siting area."

* "will not unduly interfere with the orderly development of the region with due consideration having been given to the views of the governing bodies of affected local units."

Certainly moving away from the 85th St. area of Sioux Falls was an improvement, but the current route runs very close to Tea and Harrisburg; The south side of Sioux Falls, Harrisburg, and Tea are areas that we know are growing at record rates and do not show any signs of slowing up. The pipeline running through the area will definitely have an impact on the potential for the continuance of growth that is already taking place in the area (not just talked about.)

Wherever the line would run, it will impact the landowners and the community, but moving the line a "significant" distance west and south will take the line through much less populated areas.

I have no doubt that a lot of effort and the best of current technology would go into the construction of the pipeline and that there are a host of regulations governing the construction of the pipeline, but in 50 years, the product will become "old". There were not truly proactive, concerned responses given when those issues were raised at the hearing. The reality of life is that there will be some breakdown sometime along the way. As commented, the Lincoln Co. water table is very high. A spill will instantly be into the water system, and Dakota Access will not be able to bring the area and drinking water back to its original condition/quality, no matter how much they say today they will restore an area. Other water drainage questions and issues need to be clearly resolved before any route, anywhere in the State would be approved.

The economic impact aspect of the presentation was very rosy. I think all aspects of those matters need to be reviewed carefully:

Will there truly be 4,000 temporary jobs for South Dakota residents? In a state that has as low an unemployment rate as we do, where will those workers come from? What job skills will be required? Will those people be prepared to do the work to the high quality level that we all will want?

Some nice, high numbers were given as the economic tax gains for South Dakota; although exact revenue figures can't be set now as discussed at the hearing, a hard look needs to be taken as to what are realistic numbers based amortizing values and other factors.

This easement request is different from those that we have running through our communities that are providing utilities that meet the daily needs of the residents of the area. This project is a privately owned business that will financially benefit the shareholders of Dakota Access, yet they are proposing to pay a one-time fee to have full rights to the easement areas. The people whose land is affected, along with their descendants will have to adjust how they live and many will have to adjust how they make their livelihood, yet they will not be receiving any on-going remuneration for this. I question whether that meets "will not pose a threat of serious injury to . . . the economic condition of inhabitants or expected inhabitants in the siting area."

Thank you, Commissioners, for considering these comments and for your work with the Commission, striving to best serve the citizens of South Dakota.

Dana Haan

In behalf of the family of Iva Haan,

including children: Mary Beth Haan and Dave Haan in addition to myself

██████████
Lennox, SD 57039
██████████