
From: Biewer, Christopher Jerome - SDSU Student [REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, January 11, 2015 7:36 PM

To: Hanson, Gary (PUC)

Subject: Dakota Access Pipeline

Hi,

I wanted to reach out to the South Dakota PUC in regards to the Dakota Access Pipeline. I am urging the PUC to not allow this pipeline to be built. The reasons are simple, we don't need it around the most populous area in South Dakota. My concerns are from an environmental standpoint, in terms of pollution and contamination. I also have concerns over the pipeline in regards to how it will effect future growth of Sioux Falls and other areas effected by the pipeline. I most certainly would not want to live near an oil pipeline and potentially see the damage done as in Mayflower Arkansas in 2013. Please do your part and keep Sioux Falls and the rest of South Dakota beautiful.

Thank you!

000964

From: PUC
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 5:29 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Dakota Access Pipeline, HP14-002

Mr. Biewer:

Thank you for your message regarding the Dakota Access Pipeline which is currently an open docket before the commission. Your comments and my response will be posted in the online docket, HP14-002. Here is a link to the docket: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-002.aspx>

Given your interest, I encourage you to follow along as this docket is processed. Since it is an open docket or case, all communications involving commissioners must be done in a public forum or posted for those who are parties to the docket and others to read. Here is a link to a Pipeline Siting Information Guide which helps explain the pipeline construction permit consideration process: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf>

Gary Hanson, Chairperson
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

000965

From: Biewer, Christopher Jerome - SDSU Student [REDACTED]

Sent: Sunday, January 11, 2015 7:38 PM

To: Nelson, Chris

Subject: Dakota Access Pipeline

Hi,

I wanted to reach out to the South Dakota PUC in regards to the Dakota Access Pipeline. I am urging the PUC to not allow this pipeline to be built. The reasons are simple, we don't need it around the most populous area in South Dakota. My concerns are from an environmental standpoint, in terms of pollution and contamination. I also have concerns over the pipeline in regards to how it will effect future growth of Sioux Falls and other areas effected by the pipeline. I most certainly would not want to live near an oil pipeline and potentially see the damage done as in Mayflower Arkansas in 2013. Please do your part and keep Sioux Falls and the rest of South Dakota beautiful.

Thank you!

From: Nelson, Chris
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 10:34 AM
To: 'Biewer, Christopher Jerome - SDSU Student'
Cc: Van Gerpen, Patty
Subject: RE: Dakota Access Pipeline

Christopher,

Thank you for your comments. We will add these comments to the Dakota Access Pipeline docket so they may be considered as we work through this docket.

Sincerely,

Chris Nelson

Public Utilities Commissioner
500 E Capitol Ave
Pierre SD 57501
605-773-3201
Chris.Nelson@state.sd.us

000967

----- Original message -----

From: "Biewer, Christopher Jerome - SDSU Student"

Date:01/11/2015 7:38 PM (GMT-06:00)

To: "Fiegen, Kristie"

Subject: Dakota Access Pipeline

Hi,

I wanted to reach out to the South Dakota PUC in regards to the Dakota Access Pipeline. I am urging the PUC to not allow this pipeline to be built. The reasons are simple, we don't need it around the most populous area in South Dakota. My concerns are from an environmental standpoint, in terms of pollution and contamination. I also have concerns over the pipeline in regards to how it will effect future growth of Sioux Falls and other areas effected by the pipeline. I most certainly would not want to live near an oil pipeline and potentially see the damage done as in Mayflower Arkansas in 2013. Please do your part and keep Sioux Falls and the rest of South Dakota beautiful.

Thank you!

000968

From: Fiegen, Kristie
Sent: Monday, January 12, 2015 5:57 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Douglas, Tina (PUC)
Subject: RE: Dakota Access Pipeline

Mr. Biewer:

Thank you for your message relaying concerns about the Dakota Access Pipeline. I recently notified Gov. Daugaard that I am disqualifying myself from this docket due to family interests along the pipeline route. You may read this letter posted in the docket online, and here is a link to the docket, HP14-002:

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-002.aspx> Scroll down to this filing dated Jan. 8, 2015. I anticipate the Governor will appoint an elected constitutional officer to participate in and ultimately vote on this docket in my place.

You may wish to follow along as the docket progresses and attend one of the public input hearings to be held next week. Your message and my response will be added to the docket under Comments and Responses.

Commissioner Kristie Fiegen
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
www.puc.sd.gov

000969

introduce myself as Wayne Schmidt from Moberg who was the Constitution candidate for the P.L.L.C. last fall ~~as~~ ~~the constitution party~~ party and there were over 12,000 people who voted for me, so I feel I am here to represent them.

1. How many people here have heard of the oil spill from a pipeline north of Glendive, MT, last Saturday which shut down their drinking water. It will also contaminate the Missouri river which will affect Moberg and all those who are on W&P water.
2. However we are not here opposed to all pipelines as I know we need oil to run our cars & homes. What I want people to be aware of is that it is much easier to clean up oil spills that are refined as compared to pumping crude oil. For those who didn't know, almost ALL oil pipelines leak somewhere sooner or later.
3. ~~So therefore~~
3. and also Governor Dargatzis said in his state of the state address that he wants to create high paying jobs here in S. Dak. and the jobs created by the oil pipeline construction are temporary. What we need are permanent high paying jobs.
4. So we now have a golden opportunity to create good jobs and at the same time lessen the environmental impact of pipeline leaks & spills. ~~the~~
5. The solution therefore is for you on the P.L.L.C. to require that the pipeline companies build enough refinery capacity so that the pipelines will carry refined oil products to market, rather than pumping crude oil hundreds of miles to refineries elsewhere, thereby also saving energy needed to transport these refined products back to the upper midwest. If they refuse to build refineries, then refuse to issue them a pipeline permit. If we don't take advantage of this window of opportunity, then we have lost our chance to acquire the good paying jobs that a refinery would provide. This oil WILL be refined somewhere, and that "Somewhere" should be here.
6. If someone here is totally against pipelines, then are you willing to give up your automobile & burn wood or coal to heat your house? at some point, your car & house fuel has traveled through pipelines. So lets make pipelines that transport the finished product.

New Reply Delete Archive Junk Sweep Move

Search email

Folders

- Inbox 6790
- Junk 439
- Drafts 34
- Sent
- Deleted
- adland 230
- arbitration 16
- christianity 101
- coins 3
- constituti9on party 2...
- earnings 6
- e-bay 828
- e-books 32
- economy 93
- family 564
- health 181
- home based business...
- hyip 278
- investing 305
- lhair 112
- liberty 4 us 356
- money makers 525
- mystery shop 26
- nigeria money 150
- passwords 62
- Pictures 42

pipeline stuff MORE TO COME



Mr. GayLynn Lang 7:37 AM
To: WAYNE SCHMIDT

A list of pipeline spills starting 2000 p
copies and file along with everything
PUC

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_pipeline_spills

Factbox: Recent North American oil pipeline spills

WASHINGTON | Thu Oct 10, 2013

(Reuters) - A leak of thousands of barrels of oil from a pipeline operated by Tesoro Logistics LP late last month was one of the pipeline accidents that are a costly side effect of the industry's expansion.

The spill of about 20,600 barrels was first disclosed about it until Thursday when the company's officials could not be immediately reached for comment.

The string of spills have stirred opposition from environmental groups such as TransCanada Corp's Keystone XL pipeline that will pass through refineries in Texas. Supporters of the projects argue that the benefits of the pipelines outweigh the risks of spills and trucks.

Below are the major recent North American oil pipeline spills.

September 29: The Tesoro Logistics LP pipeline spill was the largest since 1 million barrels of salt water brine, a byproduct of oil refining, leaked from a well near the pipeline.

Office 365

Office 365

The power of Office. Everywhere.

Try for free

Microsoft

Officials took initial steps Tuesday to decontaminate the water system. Glendive Mayor Jerry Jimison said it was unknown when the water treatment plant would be back in operation.

Until that happens, Salvin said the company will provide 10,000 gallons of drinking water a day to Glendive.

The company established a hotline for people with questions about the water supply and to report any wildlife injured by the spill: (888) 959-8351.

Another pipeline spill along the Yellowstone River in Montana released 63,000 gallons of oil in July 2011. An Exxon Mobil Corp. pipeline broke during flooding, and oil washed up along an 85-mile stretch of riverbank.

Exxon Mobil faces state and federal fines of up to \$3.4 million from the spill. The company has said it spent \$135 million on the cleanup and other work.

The Poplar pipeline involved in Saturday's spill runs from Canada to Baker, Montana, picking up crude along the way from Montana and North Dakota's Bakken oil-producing region.

The pipeline receives oil at four points in Montana: Poplar Station in Roosevelt County, Fisher and Richey stations in Richland County, and at Glendive in Dawson County. The section of pipeline that crosses the Yellowstone River was last inspected in 2012, in response to the Exxon accident, according to company officials.

At that time, the line was at least 8 feet below the riverbed where it crosses the Yellowstone.

No cost estimate for the Glendive spill was yet available.

Incidents like this prove our current laws are not adequate to protect the public let alone the environment at this time. As indicated by the previous articles the crude discharge was from a 12" pipeline how much multiplication of the problems from a spill like this would come from the much larger "Dakota Access Pipeline"? We must not forget the City of Mobridge along with WEB water intakes it's waters from the Missouri River which supplies a high number of customers in the NE quadrant of SD. They do not need to be declared unfit for consumption because we unwisely choose to permit "Dakota Access Pipeline". It would be a much wiser thing to refuse permitting of these crude oil pipelines with hopes the crude oil policy be converted to processing the crude here in the Dakota's then pipeline the refined products. Number one on a list of benefits to this wiser line of thinking would be a much improved national defense, both environmentally and militarily, posture. Pipelining refined products would be a much simpler cleanup when a spill occurs, as we can see they do and they will continue spilling into the future. We now have a expandable refinery in Mandan ND with a new refinery coming on the Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nation Fort Berthold Reservation ND. Promising infrastructure which will provide good paying jobs here in the Dakota's where our for to long now youth exodus would be slowed or made to stop with the economic stimulation refining crude would provide!

An Exxon Mobil Corp. pipeline broke near Laurel during flooding in July 2011, releasing 63,000 gallons of oil that washed up along an 85-mile stretch of riverbank.

Montana officials are trying to determine if oil could have been trapped by sediment and debris and settled into the riverbed.

Exxon Mobil is facing state and federal fines of up to \$3.4 million from the spill. The company has said it spent \$135 million on the cleanup and other work.

Montana and federal officials notified Exxon that they intend to seek damages for injuries to birds, fish and other natural resources from the 2011 spill. The company also is being asked to pay for long-term environmental studies and for lost opportunities for fishing and recreation during and since the cleanup.

BILLINGS, Mont. — After two years of review, Montana and federal officials notified Exxon Mobil Corp. on Thursday that they intend to seek damages for injuries to birds, fish and other natural resources from a major crude oil spill into the Yellowstone River.

The Texas company's 12-inch Silvertip pipeline broke near Laurel during flooding in July 2011, releasing 63,000 gallons of oil that washed up along an 85-mile stretch of the scenic river.

The move puts Exxon Mobil on notice that Montana and the Department of Interior expect the company to make up for harm done to wildlife and their habitat. The company also is being asked to pay for long-term environmental studies and for lost opportunities for fishing and recreation during and since the cleanup.

Separate fines totaling \$3.4 million for safety and water pollution violations already have been resolved or are pending before state and federal agencies.

Exxon Mobil has told regulators it spent \$135 million on the cleanup and related repair work intended to prevent a repeat of the spill, which came on a line installed just a few feet beneath the riverbed.

State officials said some of the damage is ongoing and will take years to fully understand and quantify.

That includes harm done to the river and its banks during the cleanup itself, when Exxon Mobil brought in 1,000 workers who removed hundreds of oil-stained wood piles along the river.

"You picked up the oil, but you picked up the stuff that makes the habitat work, as well," said Bob Gibson, a spokesman for Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks. "We know there's damage out there that has not been mitigated, cleaned up or compensated for. We need to decide what further can be done."

An Exxon Mobil spokeswoman said the company is working to reach an amicable settlement, but she declined to say whether the company intends to contest any damages sought by

government officials.

"Exxon Mobil Pipeline Company regrets that the Silvertip Pipeline incident occurred and has worked cooperatively with the federal and state natural resource trustees in investigating the nature and extent of potential injuries to natural resources as a result of the spill," spokeswoman Amber Gardner wrote in an emailed statement.

The break spurred Congress to demand a Department of Transportation review of oil and other hazardous liquid pipelines that cross beneath major rivers and other waterways across the U.S. The agency last year said there were more than 2,800 such locations.

The Transportation Department recently revised its estimate to 18,136 hazardous pipeline crossings, including 5,110 locations where the body of water has a width of 100 feet or greater.

Federal officials have said they will return to Congress in early 2014 with a determination on whether rules such as a 4-foot depth requirement for pipeline crossings are sufficient.

The Yellowstone spill also prompted oil companies including Exxon to rebury pipelines at other water crossings where the lines were considered at risk of failure due to erosion. In the case of Silvertip, the company installed new sections of line dozens of feet beneath the surface at the Laurel site and two other crossings.

Negotiations with Exxon Mobil are ongoing but no agreement has been reached, said Robert Collins, the state's lead attorney in the case.

If the company resists paying for the upcoming studies or for compensation, Collins said the state and federal government could take legal action. It's uncertain how long it will take to gauge the extent of damages. For other spills the process has taken many years.

"We're anticipating we could go to court, but we want to give (negotiations) a try before we take that step because that would string things out even further," Collins said.

HOUSTON — Oil producers in the Bakken fields of North Dakota don't seem ready to give up their rail cars just yet.

Enterprise Product Partners has shelved plans for a pipeline out of the prolific Bakken Shale after the company was unable to secure enough crude shipments along the route to make the project viable.

The proposed 340,000 barrel-per-day line would have run 1,200 miles from the oil fields of North Dakota to the nation's largest oil transportation hub in Cushing, Oklahoma. Houston-based Enterprise Product Partners originally announced that it would solicit shipping commitments from Sept. 4 to Oct. 17 — a process called an open season.

It expanded the sign-up period to Nov. 14, then called off the project Friday with a short announcement.

Pipelines linking Bakken crude to markets are facing competition from rail lines. Pipelines generally provide cheaper transit, but rail has offered producers a more flexible path that can reach both the East and West coasts, where crude oil can realize higher prices, said Skip York of constant group Wood Mackenzie.

On the East and West coasts, barrels of Bakken crude are often priced more in line with the more expensive international Brent crude, rather than the U.S. benchmark price used at the Midwest hub in Cushing, York said. Bakken barrels also avoid competing with the oil barrels pumped from other central plays such as the Eagle Ford and Permian.


"What this open season suggests is that the producers still see some value in having at least some production on rail," he said.

Producers have shipped more than 800,000 barrels per day of crude by rail in recent months compared to the 100,000 barrels per day shipped out of the region via railcar in 2011, according to North Dakota state data. The massive increase in shipments has led to safety concerns and pushed regulators to examine hazardous shipping standards.

LOCKSMITH

WAE

Wayne E. Schmidt



000975

Pipeline

Saudi Arabia reduced crude ~~oil~~
dramatically - cheap oil.

1. Environmental and Economic ^{Least} Impact

a. failed to consider either one

1. Need an accurate proposed route and alternate routes. Plan drawn thru residents - We need detailed ^{routes}

2. pipeline leaks - need right to access line forever

2. Follow the money.

a. Houston based company constructing the pipeline

b. Houston refining companies will market the fuel according to the world mkt. price.

c. We will ^{lose} control of our own natural resources.

3. A very wise program for the years in the future would be to control our energy as much as possible to strengthen our midwest economy.

a. We have millions of acres of high producing ag land. We need an adequate supply of fuel produced at minimum cost.

b. We live in a world where terror strikes unpredictably - (twin towers) one of many; how long before they would target Houston, the oil capital of the world?

(Make a long term) c. It makes no sense to build the wealth of the oil claim - better to ^{avoid the problem!} fortunes by giving them our crude to refine and then price it back to the midwest market at World Prices!