

---

**From:** PUC  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 8:15 AM  
**To:** 'ABRINKMAN@NDOIL.ORG'; 'rness@ndoil.org'  
**Subject:** HP14-001

President Ness:

Thank you for your letter regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. It will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is 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.  
<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and  
<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
[www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov)

008422

---

**From:** PUC  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 8:21 AM  
**To:** 'steve.reed@wce.coop'  
**Cc:** 'JEFF.BIRKELAND@WCE.COOP'  
**Subject:** HP14-001

West Central Electric Co-op CEO Reed:

Thank you for your letter regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket as well as a copy of West Central Electric's Board resolution provided to the U.S. Department of State. These will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is 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.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and  
<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
[www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov)

008423



**SOUTH DAKOTA**  
OIL AND GAS  
ASSOCIATION

PO Box 155 • Sturgis, SD 57785-0155 • Phone: 605-644-6355

E-Mail: [info@sdoil.org](mailto:info@sdoil.org) [www.sdoil.org](http://www.sdoil.org)

July 1, 2015

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capitol Ave  
Pierre, SD 57501

Dear Commissioners:

The South Dakota Oil and Gas Association writes in support of TransCanada's Keystone XL Pipeline project and urges the department to grant the ongoing permit certification.

Our Association is made up of individuals, producers, non-producers, and a multitude of service-related companies throughout the entire State of South Dakota serving the oil and gas industry in the region. The Association has witnessed first hand TransCanada's willingness to share information with South Dakota landowners, government officials, and anyone who has had concerns about the project through countless hours of in depth discussion.

Pipelines provide the most reliable economical and environmentally favorable way to transport oil and petroleum products in South Dakota. Currently, thousands of miles of pipeline safely deliver petroleum and other energy liquids through South Dakota, including the original Keystone operated by TransCanada. The oil sands crudes have been transported in the United States for years. There is nothing new or special about this pipeline other than the overwhelming degree of safety inherent in its engineering. The compliance TransCanada has shown regarding technological advancements elevates the level of dedication they have provided to this project, well above any other pipeline project in the history of the United States.

We would like to reiterate to you how important the Keystone XL Pipeline is to South Dakotans. The Keystone XL Pipeline will cross 8 counties in western South Dakota, making it one of the most complimentary and economically viable projects to impact rural communities in recent history. The State of South Dakota, counties, and local school districts would all increase their tax base seeing up to an additional \$20 million in annual property taxes alone.

With over \$100 million in earnings as a result of construction alone, this project will help fund our schools and help maintain our county roads, where there is continued budgetary strain with little to zero viable opportunities to support these services without raising property taxes to our rural residents. The Keystone XL project has been and continues to be a rewarding opportunity for all of us in South Dakota.

We sincerely hope the Keystone XL project will move forward as another long-term asset in our business-friendly State.

Sincerely,

Adam M. Martin  
Executive Director

Re: Docket HP14-001

008424

---

**From:** PUC  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 9:17 AM  
**To:** 'ADAM.MARTIN@SDOIL.ORG'  
**Subject:** HP14-001

Mr. Martin:

Thank you for your letter regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. It will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is 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.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and  
<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
[www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov)

008425

-----  
**From:** Ken [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 11:02:31 AM  
**To:** PUC  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** HP14-001 Keystone XL  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

To the Honorable Commissioners of the PUC:

I could waste a lot of words and take up your valuable time, but I will be very brief.

The nation and SD needs more projects like the Keystone Pipe Line. We need to become self -sufficient in our energy needs. The need to move away from foreign energy, has never been greater or more evident. With the terrorists and other problems in the middle east, it won't be long before we will have no idea who we will be dealing with, for our oil needs.

The pipeline going thru SD will provide lots of construction jobs, put ready cash into the coffers of local counties and communities and provide millions of dollars a year in property taxes to counties.

I ask that you proceed in allowing the proper permitting process to take place for the Keystone Pipe Line to be built, as soon as possible.

Thanks for your consideration.

Ken Davis

Former Pennington County Commissioner

[REDACTED]  
Rapid City SD 57702  
[REDACTED]

008426

---

**From:** PUC

**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 11:41 AM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** HP14-001

Mr. Davis:

Thank you for your message regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. It will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is 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.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and  
<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
[www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov)

008427

-----  
**From:** Sealey Family [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 11:32:36 AM  
**To:** PUC  
**Subject:** Re: TransCanada, Keystone XL Pipeline  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Glenn Sealey  
[REDACTED]  
Colome, SD 57528

Dear Members of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission,

I write this email today in support of the Keystone XL pipeline project. As you are very aware TransCanada wants to build a pipeline from the Canadian border through South Dakota enroute to refineries in the southern United States. I believe this method to be the safest way to transport not only the tar sand oil but also the crude being produced in North Dakota and Montana. There have been several serious rail car accidents with great loss of life and property damage.

As you know there are hundreds of miles of refined fuel pipelines in the upper Midwest. These pipelines have operated for decades with minimal problems. With todays technology I believe the Keystone will take every possible effort to make sure the people of South Dakota are protected as well as our enviroment. Great strides have been made in the method of protecting and monitoring these pipelines.

The local counties and school districts stand to gain substantial tax income from fees associated with the transportation of the crude. Right now I can't think of a better way to give these rural economies a shot in the arm. I am from Colome, SD and our area would be a host site for a man camp if the pipeline is built. We have visited one of the man camps in North Dakota and were very impressed on the operation. I truly believe the Keystone XL would be a good neighbor and working partner to have in our area.

In closing, I hope the Commission will look favorably on the TransCanda Keystone XL Project.

Sincerely,  
Glenn Sealey  
Colome City Councilman  
Colome VFD Fire Chief

008428

---

**From:** PUC

**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 11:43 AM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** HP14-001

Mr. Sealey:

Thank you for your message regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. It will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is 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.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman  
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission  
[www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov)

008429

-----  
From: Sierra Club on behalf of Jon & Marcia Maroon[SMTP:SIERRA@SIERRACLUB.ORG]

Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2015 11:45:11 AM

To: PUC

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

Jul 2, 2015

South Dakota PUC

Dear PUC,

I live in Lake county and am dead set against this , please do not let it happen. I have watched this State change over many years and it is not for the better. Our lakes and wildlife have suffered and probably will not recover and this pipeline is just one more nail in the coffin

. I'm writing to urge the South Dakota PUC to reject TransCanada's application for recertification of the Keystone XL pipeline construction permit in South Dakota.

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.

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,

Ms. Jon & Marcia Maroon

[REDACTED]

Madison, SD 57042-0902

[REDACTED]

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

Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2015 11:45:58 AM

To: PUC

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

Jul 2, 2015

South Dakota PUC

Dear PUC,

I have fought this project for 4 years, testified at the State Dept hearings in 2011 and as a career health professional object to the untethered destruction of our prairie and threat to our aquifers and public health. I have studied this project diligently and it is NOT something that is in the best interest of our country nor South Dakota.

This, I am writing to urge the South Dakota PUC to reject TransCanada's application for recertification of the Keystone XL pipeline construction permit in South Dakota.

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.

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. Rebecca Leas

[REDACTED]

Rapid City, SD 57702-7088

[REDACTED]

-----  
From: Sierra Club on behalf of Juli Ames-Curtis[SMTP:SIERRA@SIERRACLUB.ORG]

Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2015 1:17:03 PM

To: PUC

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

Jul 2, 2015

South Dakota PUC

Dear PUC,

I'm writing to urge the South Dakota PUC to reject TransCanada's application for recertification of the Keystone XL pipeline construction permit in South Dakota.

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.

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. Let us get past short term, me-me-me, thinking only in my life time mentality.

Sincerely,

Ms. Juli Ames-Curtis

[REDACTED]

Custer, SD 57730-8142

[REDACTED]

-----  
**From:** Bill Gradoville [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 2:20:26 PM

**To:** PUC

**Subject:** Keystone XL Pipeline

**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

The purpose of my e-mail is to express my support for the building of the Keystone XL Pipeline. The Obama Administration has dragged its feet long enough, & made every excuse under the sun, to not authorize the construction of this pipeline. The EPA has already stated that the building of this pipeline will have little, if any, negative environmental impact. Please reauthorize the construction of this pipeline. South Dakota, & the rest of the country, NEED this pipeline. Let's get it done! Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Bill Gradoville

[REDACTED]  
Rapid City, SD 67701

008436

---

**From:** PUC

**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 2:35 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** HP14-001

Mr. Gradoville:

Thank you for your message regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. It will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is 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.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

[www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov)

008437

-----  
**From:** Dan Kirby [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 3:34:17 PM  
**To:** PUC  
**Subject:** HP401  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

I am writing today in support of the Keystone XL Pipeline. I am a former chair of both the Sioux Falls and South Dakota Chambers of Commerce, and recently finished two terms on the board of directors of the US Chamber of Commerce.

I favour the construction of this pipeline because it will:

1. Support 3,500 jobs during construction,
2. Create \$115 million in earnings during construction,
3. Generate \$810 million in economic activity, and
4. Generate nearly \$18 million in SD property taxes in its first year of operation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dan Kirby

[REDACTED]  
Sioux Falls, SD 57105  
[REDACTED]

008438

---

**From:** PUC

**Sent:** Thursday, July 02, 2015 4:51 PM

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Subject:** HP14-001

Mr. Kirby:

Thank you for your message regarding the Keystone XL pipeline certification docket. It will be posted in the electronic public record so my fellow commissioners and other parties in this docket can read it. Here is a link to the docket, HP14-001: <http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/2014/hp14-001.aspx>

Here are links to two documents found on the PUC's home page online. The first is titled Pipeline Siting Info Guide and the second is 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.

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/commission/Publication/pipelinesiting.pdf> and

<http://www.puc.sd.gov/Dockets/HydrocarbonPipeline/keystoneupdate.aspx>

Chris Nelson, Chairman

South Dakota Public Utilities Commission

[www.puc.sd.gov](http://www.puc.sd.gov)

008439