

February 17, 2010

Dear Ms. Collins;

Thank you for sending your comments to the PUC regarding TransCanada's request to construct the Keystone XL hydrocarbon pipeline. In order for the Commissioners and others interested in the siting case to see your comments, they will be made part of the official docket. The docket and its filings are posted online at www.puc.sd.gov. Click on "Commission Actions," "Commission Dockets," "Hydrocarbon Dockets," "2009 Hydrocarbon Dockets," and "HP09-001." If you do not wish your comments made part of the docket, please respond to me and I will remove them. Since this is an open docket and Commissioners will need to make a decision on it after reviewing the files, communication with them regarding the docket must be available to the public.

Pipeline siting and safety regulation involves both the federal and state government. Current regulations allow the construction and operation of pipelines within specific and extensive regulation. Without regulatory change, the siting process is legally available to all applicants such as TransCanada. I understand your concern, but wish to assure you the SD PUC does not grant a permit to build and the federal government does not allow the operation of a pipeline unless the facility meets all siting and safety standards. You may be interested in South Dakota siting regulation found at SDCL 49-41B. "Need" is not an element in the standard of proof the Commission may consider. (SDCL 49-41B-22) The chapter requires detailed study and findings with regard to threats to the environment, health, safety and welfare of inhabitants. You may also be interested in the many hours of public input afforded interested individuals and the information available on our website produced through the discovery and hearing process.

Specifically, I understand you have concerns related to the EIS, or the Environmental Impact Study. The EIS is a study performed by the federal government to comply with NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act. The EIS is intended as a mechanism to study environmental impacts on a national scale. The PUC on the other hand has jurisdiction on a state level only. South Dakota siting regulations require a state specific environmental study. The applicant in this case completed the study in ample time for expert and Commission review. I understand your concern and want to assure you an environmental study was done. The SD PUC studied a South Dakota specific environmental assessment.

You also question the status of the Emergency Response Plan. Interstate Hazardous Liquid pipeline safety and operations are regulated by the federal government through the Pipeline Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA). The 8th Circuit Court of Appeals and the US District Court found the federal government has exclusive authority and state or local regulation in these areas is strictly preempted. Emergency Response plans are required by the federal pipeline safety code thus expressly regulated by the federal government. Before this or any other federally regulated pipeline can be operated, it must submit the emergency plan to (PHMSA). PHMSA examines the plan and will not allow operation of the pipeline until it is sufficient. The state of SD cannot impose regulations regarding this plan as we are strictly preempted by the federal government.

South Dakota siting regulations require this Commission issue a decision within one year of receipt of an application. We are approaching that one year deadline. While various federal processes are still in progress, I assure you, the PUC did not rush the process within its jurisdiction. Thank you for taking the time to write. The PUC Commissioners appreciate hearing from the affected consumers about issues before them.

Sincerely,

Kara Semmler
SD Public Utilities Commission, Staff Attorney
500 E. Capitol
Pierre, SD 57501

From: Lorraine Collins
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2010 12:34:38 PM
To: PUC
Subject: Keystone pipeline
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Sirs: I am writing to express my opposition to a permit for the Keystone XL pipeline in South Dakota. I think any action on this at this time is premature inasmuch as not all of the necessary and proper reports and proposals have been filed by TransCanada at this time. There is also some serious question about whether the proposed pipeline is even necessary because of other underutilized pipelines from Canada. I don't know what the hurry is to approve of this and I hope you will tell TransCanada to come back when they can assure the citizens of South Dakota that they have filed an EIS, and an emergency response plan, and that they can demonstrate there is actually a need for this pipeline.

Thanks for your consideration of citizen concerns.

Lorraine Collins, Spearfish