

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

**From:** Kolbeck, Steve  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 18, 2010 11:00 AM  
**To:** Mary  
**Cc:** Axthelm, Demaris  
**Subject:** RE: Caution/slow down on Keystone xl

Mary,

Thanks for taking the time to email me your personal thoughts on the Keystone XL project. State law (SDCL 49-41B-24) requires the Commission render a decision within one year of application filing, which for this docket would be March 12. We have spent more than eleven months studying this project and taking evidence.

Since 2007 the Commission has reviewed thousands and thousands of pages of information and heard testimony from more than two dozen witnesses on the siting of interstate hydrocarbon pipelines. On the Keystone XL pipeline specifically, five Commission staffers, three Commissioners, and a number of outside expert consultants have spent months reviewing the project. Our environmental review has been conducted independently from any EIS and is not dependent upon the completion of an EIS. Our process reviewed hydrology, wildlife, plants and vegetation, erosion, soil types, noise, and many other areas of concern.

Have you taken an opportunity to review the Commission's order on the Keystone I pipeline (<http://puc.sd.gov/commission/orders/HydrocarbonPipeline/2008/hp07-001.pdf>)? I do not know if the Commission's decision on Keystone XL will be similar, but reading the Keystone I order will provide you some context for the due diligence that is conducted for projects of this type, and for the many conditions the Commission can place upon them, I think reading the Keystone I order is well worth the time.

Thanks again,  
*Steve Kolbeck*  
*Commissioner*  
*South Dakota Public Utilities Commission*  
*500 E. Capitol Ave.*  
*Pierre, SD 57501-5070*  
Ph. 605-773-3201

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

**From:** Mary  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 17, 2010 1:45 PM  
**To:** Kolbeck, Steve  
**Subject:** Caution/slow down on Keystone xl

Dear Commissioner Kolbeck,

Wait at least for the Environmental Impact Statement and wonder loudly at the

pressure for thinner pipes and increased pressure for the safety of SD ground water and South Dakotan's health.

We need clean energy sources for our future health and the health of our children. We depend on clean water, clean air, good soil.

The Alberta Sands product is the dirtiest kind of energy to remove from the ground, replaces Boreal forests with toxic seep pools, and produces more greenhouse gases than any other kind of energy we could endorse by permitting it to transit SD.

That places a great deal upon your shoulders, in your hands. You have children, and this should scream danger concerning the future of our environment and the health of all our children.

Energy issues are not just regional concerns, nor will be the liability.

Surely with all that is at risk with this project, this type of energy, waiting for the Environmental Impact Statement to become public information for comment is an essential element in fulfilling the commissioners' role. Please stand up for clean energy and a clean process.

Dig in for clean energy, not toxic substances.

The bottom line is that associating with the Alberta Sands project just delays clean energy production, strengthens dirty energy lobbies as they dig in to the public pocket, and makes climate conditions worse so more energy is needed. The cycle is not for sustaining but is viciously for destruction with dirty energy.

I am of the opinion that vast research shows that the Boreal Forests are a necessary part of a healthy planet. Don't put your name on anything that risks that. One man can make a difference in South Dakota and I pray very sincerely that you will be that man and stand up for clean energy and a less toxic future for us and all our children to come.  
Sincerely, Mary